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During the editorial work on a Mongolian version of the Buddhistic canonical work Thar-pa čhen-po¹ I came to the conclusion that this important monument in the history of the Mongolian language deserved a critical edition. This critical edition will be based largely on the MSS and xylographs preserved in Hungary. I confined myself to the Mongolian versions in the narrower sense since my colleague and friend G. Kara found an interesting Oyrat version of the same work and is planning to publish it.²

The attention of Mongolists was first drawn to the versions of the Yełede tońboljarđi by Vladimirov³ who mentioned it in 1929. One year later Professor Ligeti described the collection of Schilling von Canstadt⁴ and at the time mentioned a version of 1708. In his Rapport préliminaire⁵ he wrote briefly about a copy which he had brought back from his expedition to Inner Mongolia from 1928 to 1931. From that time on the Mongolian Thar-pa čhen-po was frequently mentioned in the catalogues and descriptions of Mongolian collections. One of the most important items was the xylograph of the Royal Library in Copenhagen the colophon of which contained the cyclic year Čayun bars white tigers. Heissig identified this with 1650 because in 1708 another xylograph of the same work was published in a slightly

² His study will be published in one of the forthcoming volumes of our Acta Orien-
⁵ Rapport préliminaire d'un voyage d'exploration fait en Mongolie chinoise 1928--1931, Budapest 1933, p. 59.
modernized form. Heissig stated that the somewhat faulty xylograph of 1650 was the first known product of the Peking xylographic press.

6 W. Heissig, *Die Pekinger lateinischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache*, Wiesbaden 1964, No 1, p. 9: *Da ein sprachlich etwas modernisiertes Neuschmiedt dieses Werkes bereits wieder K'ung-t'ai 47, 1708 erschien, so ist es wohl nicht möglich das öryan bume Jahr mit 1710 gleichzusetzen, sondern es ist noch im 11. rub byni zu suchen. Einer solchen Doktorang, Shun-chish 7, 1650 aber entspricht auch das alttürkische, der türkischen Schrift ältere Schriftbild des Werkes. As we shall see later there is practically no difference between the language and wording of the 1650 edition (A) and those of the 1708 edition (C), but orthography and the character of the latter corroborate Heissig's datation.

7 There is no indication in the colophon of the 1650 print that it was manufactured in Peking which is explicitly mentioned in the colophon of the 1708 version. The Chinese marginal signs refer undoubtedly to a Chinese workshop, or at least to Chinese craftsmen. We know about the blockprinting of non-Chinese works as early as the Khitan and Jurchen dynasties (cf. Wittfogel - Fong, *History of Chinese Society: The Liao* (907–1125), Philadelphia 1948, pp. 292–293, K. T. Wh: *HJAS XIII* (1950), pp. 447–469). Mongolian books were printed in Peking as early as 1312. The colophon of the Bodhi-
vargyantara version with commentaries from 1312 says clearly öryan-u 3rub-ýgar quluyay-a til 3gu-ir terigii ñara-yin migen 3ñedelcii terigilen Bodisaw-u Čary-a Avelar-u Tugil-buž-3 Daidu-daki Ögovyan subururyu 3ykeNão-mi3 ñaraça 3quluyayu 3miqqum 3teji3 tanyaluryu 3loq-a tayujii. Ögovyan terigii 3oq-tür. On Imperial order the commentary to the B. was cut into blocks and printed in round thousand (copias) for distribution to the multitude on the day of the first crescent moon of the first summer month, rul year (7th May 1312), in the great monastery Ögovyan suburyutu of Daidu. On Daidu, the capital, Peking see note 100 below. The xylographic press of the Chinese capital also published works printed in 'phags-pu script, (cf. e.g. the fragments of the *Subdashaiveinmetall*). We know moreover that in the court of Altan Khan there was a xylographic workshop. In the colophon of the Altun gerd translated and printed between 1678 and 1684 we can read: Altun gerd-i qalbuxan-gur Čiyilfu tanyalurya(h) (cf. Koro, p. 218, see also Heissig, *UAJb XXVI* (1954) p. 103) *Altun gerd being cut into blocks was printed. In 1591 there was cut (qartuyu-) a quadrilingual print, the qutuy-ì Tuungur-yin nere-yi öngör quluyayu kanbii nuer (see Heissig, Beiträge, p. 22). From 1595 we know the qutuy-ì öker-iin uyyu sanjarqil liquluyayu nueri yeke kölgen nuer of which it is said in the colophon: biquluy-ì qalbuxan-dur tanyu Čiyilfu The print was cut into the text-blocks (cf. Heissig, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte*, p. 16). Chinese, Uigur and Tibetan blockprinters took part in the publishing activity of the Mongol rulers. On a Chinese blockprinter working among the Mongols see p. 478 below. It is however striking, that in the terminology of Mongolian printing we can find such Uigur terms as tanyur, keh, such Tibetan words as bar but no Chinese words (see A. Röss-Tas, *Some Notes on the Terminology of Mongolian Writing: Acta Orient. Hung. XVIII* (1965), pp. 136–139). The most important works cited with their short titles in this paper are the following: W. Heissig, *Zur geistigen Leitung der neubekannten Munugan des späten 16. und frühen 17. Jahrh. UAJb XXVI* (1954), pp. 101–116, Beiträge zur Übersetzungsgeschichte des mongolischen buddhistischen Khans.