History of the Manchu Buddhist Canon and First Steps towards its Digitization

By

Marcus Bingenheimer

(Temple University / Philadelphia)

1. Sources on the Creation of the Manchu Canon

The Manchu Canon (ch. *Qingwen fanyi dazangjing* 清文繙譯大藏經, mnc. *Manju gisun i ubiliyambuga amba kanjur nomun*) must be the least used of all canonical editions of the Buddhist canon. Nevertheless, its creation in the 18th century is a fascinating chapter in the translation history of Buddhist scriptures. More than 90 scholars worked for more than 20 years to produce a Manchu version of the Buddhist canon. While *sūtra* texts were translated from the Qianlong edition of the Chinese canon, the *vinaya* texts were translated from Tibetan. This paper gives an overview of the current state of research on the creation of the Manchu Buddhist Canon. It also describes the digital research archive of material related to the Manchu Buddhist Canon at the Library and Information Center at Dharma Drum Buddhist College.[1]

In his 1908 overview of Manchu literature, the otherwise well-informed Berthold Laufer remarks: "Rumors about the existence of a Manchu Kanjur have circulated repeatedly; if it should indeed exist, it must be a manuscript edition."[2] Doubtless, Laufer would have been pleased that his skepticism proved to be unfounded, since in the 20th century the original woodblocks of the Manchu edition of the Buddhist Canon were rediscovered and gradually more information concerning the content and the creation of the edition became available. Three important texts were first noticed and published by Naitō (1929), subsequently translated into German by Fuchs (1930) and, building on Fuchs's translation, by Gao (1983).[3] Kämpfe (1975) made use of two late 18th century biographies of the 2nd Changja Qutughtu 章嘉呼

---

1 I am grateful to Nathalie Köhle and Martin Heijdra for commenting on an earlier draft of the article.

2 Laufer (1908: 48–49 [1976]), translated from German. In 1914 already, Pelliot had reasons to be "moins sceptique" concerning the existence of a Manchu Kanjur (Pelliot 1914: 112–113). Both Laufer and Pelliot correctly doubted the existence of a Manchu translation of the Tanjur, which was erroneously mentioned in some 19th century research notes.

3 Fuchs's version is quoted entirely in Walravens (2004).

圖克圖 (1717–1786)[4] in Tibetan and Mongolian which offer additional information on the translation project. Here the bibliographical information on these five texts:

1. An edict by the Qianlong emperor ordering the translation of the Chinese Buddhist canon into Manchu. Naitō (1929: 295) quotes the edict from the *Donghua xulu* 東華續錄 the second enlarged edition of a huge collection of primary sources on the Qing dynasty compiled by Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1917). Gao (1983: 155–157, translation: 185–188) quotes directly from the *Gaozong shilu* 高宗實錄, the *Veritable Records of Emperor Gaozong*.[5] In both collections the edict is correctly dated Qianlong 38, 2nd month, 15th day (March, 7th 1773).[6]

2. Qianlong's preface to the Manchu canon in Chinese, Manchu, Mongolian and Tibetan, dated Qianlong 55, 2nd month, 1st day (March, 16th 1790). Chinese text quoted in Naitō (1929: 297–298) and Gao (1983: 159–160, translation: 195–197).[7]

3. A *biji* note titled "The Office for [Buddhist] Scriptures in Manchu (*Qingzi jing guan* 清字經館)" by the Manchu noble Zhao Lian 昭 槤 (1776–1833) included in his *Xiaoting xulu* 嘯亭續錄 (Fasc.1).[8]

4. The biography of the 2nd Changja Qutughtu (Lčaṅ skya Rol pa'i rdo rǰe) in Tibetan and Mongolian written in 1787 by his younger brother the 3rd Čʼu bzaṅ Ṅag dbaṅ tʼub bstan dbaṅ Pʼyug at the Čʼu bzaṅ tʼub bstan rab rgyas gliṅ monastery in Amdo.[9]

---

4 This name and title have been transliterated in Western languages in many different ways over the last hundred years owing to its appearance in Tibetan, Mongolian, Chinese and Manchu sources, which have all been romanized by various standards."Changja Qutughtu" follows Tuttle (2005), who has useful comments on the origin of the name (ibid. 248n15). The personal name of this incarnation was Rolpa Dorje. (Tib.-Wylie Lcang skya Rol-pa'i rdo-rje, Chin.-Pinyin Zhangjia Ruobiduoji, Chin.章嘉 若必多吉). A short biography can be found in Smith (2001:133–146). Theincarnation series of the Changja Qutughtu is well studied, see Everding (1988) for more literature. The biographies of the 2nd Changja Qutughtu were translated by Kämpfe (1974 and 1976).

5 *Daqing gaozong chun huangdi shilu* 大清高宗純皇帝實錄. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1978, Fasc. 926, pp.13418–13420. (Cited after Gao (1983: 155)).

6 Gao (1983: 183) explains why Fuchs (1930: 399n1) seems to have seen Qianlong 77 and gives 1790 as Gregorian date. Naitō (1929: 295) states clearly Qianlong 38. Kämpfe (1975: 545n6) 'corrects' Fuchs to Qianlong 55, obviously in order to arrive at 1790 (= Qianlong 55). *Pace* Fuchs (1932b: 485) the edict is from Qianlong 38 and should therefore be translated into the present tense.

7 Naitō quotes from the collection of texts by the Qianlong emperor *Gaozong chun huangdi yuzhi wen* 高宗純皇帝御製文. Fuchs (1930) directly copied the text as given by Naitō. Gao has consulted the original print version of the Manchu canon in the Palace Museum (Taipei).

8 This a continuation of his "Miscellaneous Records from the Pavilion of Whistles" *Xiaoting zalu* 嘯亭雜錄. The Chinese text included in Fuchs (1930) is not, as it was for the edict and the preface, directly copied from Naitō (1929), but was reset and contains a number of mistakes (e.g. 經理 is printed 經三里，干misread for 千, the translation of these passages is correct, however). Gao offers both the more reliable translation and better edited, punctuated Chinese texts.

9 Transliteration and information on this and the following item based on Kämpfe (1975).

5. Another biography of the 2nd Changja Qutughtu in Tibetan written 1792–1794 at Dgon luṅ monastery in Amdo by the 3rd T'u'u bkvan Blo bzaṅ č'os kyi ñi ma, a student of the Changja Qutughtu.[10]

Next to the above sources, Gao (1983: 153–205) has made use of the archives at the Palace Museum (Taipei) and found and transcribed a number of edicts and imperial memorials providing further insights into how the Manchu canon was created.

2. The Creation of the Manchu Canon 滿文大藏經

In 1772 the Qianlong emperor (personal name: Hongli 弘曆, temple name: Gaozong 高宗) (r. 1735–1796) ordered a translation of the Buddhist canon into Manchu. The ambitious task was completed around 1790,[11] after only 18 years. The cutting of the woodblocks had begun earlier, but a fire in June 1790 that destroyed more than 7600 of the woodblocks and some of the already printed text delayed the project.[12] Only in May 1794 the carving of the woodblocks was completed and twelve sets of the Manchu Canon were printed in vermilion ink and distributed.[13]

The creation of the Manchu Canon must been seen in context of the other large-scale 17th and 18th century edition projects of the Kangxi, Yongzheng and Qianlong emperors, the most ambitious and best known of which was the compilation of the immense *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 ("Complete Library in four Branches of Literature") between 1773 and 1782.[14] The translation of Buddhist scriptures into Manchu was ordered after similar large-scale edition and translation projects had resulted in new editions of the Tibetan and Chinese canons, and of the first complete Mongolian Buddhist canon.[15] With the existence of a canon in Chinese, Tibetan and Mongolian, the creation of a Manchu canon had become a political desideratum.

---

10 Translated into Chinese by Chen and Ma (1988).

11 The date of Qianlong's foreword to the canon. There are indications that at least some of the canon was carved and printed after that date, which probably marks the end of the translation project.

12 See Gao (1983: 160–162) for three imperial memorials concerning the incident.

13 Ge (2002b: 31) and, in more detail, Zhang (2008: 342–347).

14 None of these projects addressed public demand, but rather represented imperial power aimed at repressing dissident narratives. The Qianlong emperor, for instance, used the creation of the *Siku quanshu* to eradicate anti-Manchu positions from the textual landscape. Though the 'literary inquisition' was focused on texts, people too were often caught in its net, and dissenting or disobedient literati were severely punished, even executed (Goodrich 1935).

15 The so-called Peking Edition of the Tibetan canon was produced between 1683 and 1700. A Mongolian translation of the Tibetan Kanjur appeared in manuscript form 1628/29 under Ligdan Khan. A printed edition of this was ordered by Kangxi in 1717, the woodblocks being cut 1718–1720 (Ligeti 1942, Grönbold 1984: 16–17). The print edition follows the Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur (1684–92) but contains only 1161 works in 108 cases (Grönbold 2005: 133). A Mongolian Tanjur in 226 cases was made in Peking from 1742 to 1749 (Haissig 1954: 91 + 96). From 1733–1738 a new edition of the Chinese canon was produced in the Xianliang temple 賢良寺 (Beijing) on imperial orders. The result was the Qianlong Canon 乾隆藏經, also called Dragon Canon *Longzang* 龍藏, because of the dragon ornament on its cases.

Like its predecessors, the translation project was deeply rooted in the nature of Manchu rule, which aspired to universal monarchy over all aspects of their empire.[16] It was always obvious that a Manchu canon would never have a large, if indeed any, audience. Manchu leaders never turned to Buddhism to "convert" their people, in the way the Mongols are perceived to have done. There is no evidence that Buddhism was part of the Manchu religious identity before their takeover of China, and it did not play a privileged role among them in the centuries that followed it. The translation of the Buddhist canon into Manchu was one of the many imperial gestures, both helpful and commanding, by which Buddhism was co-opted into Manchu rule. As Crossley argues, the "ultimate aim was to make all true expression, in any language, the property of the emperor".[17]

Nevertheless, the large number and the high quality of translations of Buddhist literature under Qianlong cannot only be explained by the general attitude towards rulership. There is no reason to doubt the personal interest of Hongli in translation; he was himself a competent translator[18] and allegedly fluent in the four key imperial languages (Manchu, Chinese, Mongolian, Tibetan). When the decision was taken to create a Manchu Buddhist canon, the Qianlong emperor and the 2nd Changja Qutughtu, had already collaborated on several translation and edition projects and were able to draw on a pool of translators, editors, copyists and artisans who carved the woodblocks and printed the canon. The emperor and the lama had studied Sanskrit together in their youth some time before Hongli had been designated emperor and their close and, by all accounts, friendly relationship played a crucial role in the use of Tibetan Buddhism at the Qianlong court.[19] From ca. 1750 until his death in 1786 the Changja Qutughtu was the most influential Tibetan cleric at court and a constant adviser to the emperor in questions of Buddhism and especially Buddhist edition projects.[20]

Qianlong and the Changja Qutughtu started their collaboration with the translation of the Mongolian Tanjur that was ordered in early 1742 and completed in May-

16 On the universalist ideology of the Qing rulers, see Crossley (1999). During the Qing, polylingualism was successfully employed by the Manchu rulers to support their role as rulers of a "universal realm that had no external boundaries but was internally marked by distinctions of history, culture, and status." (Crossley 1994: 340). As such Manchu, Mongolian, Tibetan, even Uighur, were given great symbolic importance to balance the ubiquitous and indispensable Chinese, which remained the basic medium of communication for the large majority. On the role of Manchu in particular, see Crossley & Rawski (1993) and Crossley (1994).

17 Crossley 1999: 266.

18 Heissig (1954: 147) mentions Qianlong translating verses of praise to Mañjuśrī in a quadrilingual version.

19 See Wang (2000) for a detailed account of how the Changja Qutughtu influenced Manchu policy on Tibet.

20 See Heissig (1954: 72–158) for details of the extensive collaboration between the emperor and the Changja Qutughtu. It is noteworthy that no further Mongolian or multilingual editions of Buddhist texts are listed for Hongli's reign after the death of the Changja Qutughtu in 1786.

June 1749.[21] During this translation, the Changja Qutughtu was the head of a group of scholars that compiled a Tibetan-Mongolian glossary that served as the basis for all further translations between the two languages. The Mongolian Tanjur was translated from Tibetan, but sutras that existed only in Chinese also received attention. For instance, the translation and quadrilingual edition (Tibetan-Manchu-Mongolian-Chinese) of the apocryphal Chinese *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* 首楞嚴經 (T.945).[22] According to the preface the translations for this edition were begun in 1752 and completed in 1763.[23] Manuscript drafts from this project with Qianlong's emendations exist in the Manchu-Mongolian Collection of the Harvard-Yenching Library[24] and attest that – as claimed in the preface – the emperor indeed examined at least the Manchu translation carefully himself.

Another important translation and edition project was the Dhāraṇī collection *Man Han Menggu Xifan he bi da zang quan zhou* 滿漢蒙古西番合璧大藏全咒 ("All Dhāraṇī of the Canon presented together in Manchu, Chinese, Mongolian and Tibetan", Changja 1773 [2008]).[25] This impressive work of scholarship paid careful attention to the phonetic rendering of Dhāraṇīs and contained detailed essays on e.g. how to pronounce Sanskrit terms in Chinese, Manchu and Tibetan. The edition even makes use of specially created letters that extend the Manchu alphabet to represent Sanskrit more exactly. These so-called "Aligali letters" (*aligali zi* 阿禮嘎禮字) are discussed in one of the essays contained in the collection.[26] Pre-modern in their religious motivation as well in their methodology – discussions about the "true" phonetic value of a Sanskrit syllable were and are highly scholastic – the edition reflects a specific Qing dynasty concern with philology.

It was a matter of course, therefore, that the Qianlong emperor put the 2nd Changja Qutughtu in charge of overseeing the creation of a Manchu canon. The Qutughtu's opinions on what constitutes the Buddhist canon deeply influenced the direction of the project. Regarding the question of what texts to include, Qianlong and the Changjia Qutughtu settled on a rather unusual editorial policy. Qianlong's edict of 1773 cites the suggestion of the Changja Qutughtu: "Concerning the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna treatises in altogether 3676 fascicles, and the writings of the later patriarchs of this region [i.e. China], they were not originally taught by the

21 This according to the emperor's afterword (Heissig 1954: 96). These dates should be considered authoritative and supersede earlier dates in secondary literature.

22 Not to be confused with Kumārajīva's translation of an Indian *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* (T.642), an early Mahāyāna sutra, which was translated into Tibetan in the 9th century by Śākyaprabha and Ratnarakṣita. As Staël-Holstein (1936: 139) remarks the emperor did not doubt the authenticity of the popular Chinese *Śūraṅgama-sūtra*.

23 See the translation of the preface by Staël-Holstein (1936: 142–145).

24 Hanan 2003: 78+113 ff., and figures 30–33.

25 The collection comprises 10,402 *dhāraṇīs* and 451 sutras (Walravens 2004: 63) and has recently been reedited with great care in a much more usable format (Lin Guangming 2001).

26 Cf. *Yuzhi Man Han Menggu Xifan hebi aligali* 御製滿漢蒙古西番合璧阿禮嘎禮.

Buddha. It is not necessary to translate such works." Another passage shows a certain distrust with which Qianlong and the Changja Qutughtu treated the Chinese Buddhist tradition: "The Office for [Buddhist] Scriptures in the National language [i.e. Manchu] has started to set standards [for inclusion and exclusion]. If there were no standards the Chan monks would plagiarize bits and pieces[27] [of older works]. Whenever they have the opportunity they insert them [into the canon] and confuse the order of the sutras and their cases, thus twisting the intended meaning of the sacred texts.". According to Qianlong's directives therefore, Abhidharma and Śāstra literature as well as works from Chinese authors were not translated. The Sutra part of the canon was translated from the Chinese, the Vinaya texts, however, from the Tibetan, a distinction that again shows the hand of the Changja Qutughtu and his assistant editors. In general, the order of the Manchu canon follows the Qianlong canon (*Longzang*) edition, completed earlier in the Qianlong period.

Regarding the number of works contained in the resulting canon we now count 732 works, not 699 or 729 as frequently cited,[28] though even this count awaits further confirmation.[29] A complete set consists of 108 cases, plus one unnumbered case containing a catalog. The catalog contains the imperial preface (ch. *Dazangjing xu* 大藏經序), a roster of collaborators in the project (ch. *mingxian* 名銜), and the catalog proper ordered by case and giving the title and numbers of fascicle (ch. *Yuyi dazangjing zongmu* 御譯大藏經總目). All three texts are provided in Manchu,

27 Lit. "spittle-leftovers".

28 It is unclear why Zhuang (1990: 256), Yang (1991: 25), Luo (2001: 32), Liu (2003: 61) and others give 699 as the number of texts. Gao (1983: 270) and Zhuang (1993: 59) count 729 works, because, in absence of a complete set of the canon, they were working from the catalog. It so happens that MC (Manchu Canon) 373 (*Sheng zhuangyan tuoluoni jing* 勝莊嚴陀羅尼經 (T. 943?)) on pp. 107a+b in Case No. 66 of the Manchu canon is not listed in the catalog. Also MC 423 (Case 66, pp. 425a–428b) a *Huiji jingang jing* 穢跡金剛經, and MC 499 (Case 72, pp.331b–365a), its Chinese title in the margin given as *Xiuxing pusa xingmen zhujing* 修行菩薩行門諸經, do not appear in the catalog. The relationship of the 穢跡金剛經 MC 423 to the similar MC 422 and MC 424, which have clear parallels in the Taishō, needs to be examined further. We therefore count 732 (729 works listed in the catalog + 3 (MC 373, MC 423, MC 499)).

29 Also awaiting further investigation is the exact content of Case 82 which according to the catalog contains MC 570 (=T.100 別譯雜阿含經) and MC 571 (= T.101 雜阿含經). However, the name 雜阿含經 does not appear in the margins. All pages in the case have *encu ubaliyambuha hacingga ag'ama nomun* / 別譯雜阿含經 in the margins. It needs to be determined if T.101, a collection of *Saṃyuktāgama*-type in one fascicle, has gone missing or if it was never translated in the first place. A similar problem exists in Case 40 for which the catalog lists MC 20 the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* 大般涅槃經 (T.374) and MC 21 the 方等般泥洹經 (T.378 ?). The title of MC 21 does not appear in the margin of any of the pages in Case 40. If MC 570 and MC 21 were lost the canon would contain only 730 works. There are numerous other problems which await further investigation, especially confirming the identity of the Taishō parallels, e.g. which version of the 金剛經 was used as original of MC 141. Also it is unclear why MC 242 and MC 494 have the same Chinese name but different Manchu and Tibetan names.

Chinese, Tibetan and Mongolian. The roster of collaborators list more than 90 persons who were involved in the project.[30] Even if the board of general directors (ch. 總裁, mnc. *uheri tuwara amban*), headed by the 6th and the 8th son of Hongli and including the notorious Heshen 和珅 (1750–1799), only had a honorary function, there is no doubt that there was a large team of professional linguists and textual scholars, some of whom had worked on translating Buddhist texts their whole lives.

In 1783 the Jesuit missionary Jean Joseph Marie Amiot, who lived at the Qianlong court, sent two copies of a pentaglot of Buddhist terms to Paris, which in all likelihood was created by the same team that had produced the Manchu canon. According to his description the team was composed of "les plus habiles d'entre les Mantchoux & Mongoux aidés par des *Han-lin* Chinois & des Docteurs Thibetains".[31] The Changja Qutughtu humbly put himself low on the roster of collaborators, but in a category of his own. As "Director of Examining the Sutras" (ch. 閱經總裁, mnc. *nomun be tuwara uheri tuwara hafan*) he and his immediate subordinates were directly responsible for the content and quality of the translation and the publication. This is confirmed by Amiot, who states: "Ces derniers [the 'Docteurs Thibetains'] furent envoyés par le grand Lama [i.e. the Dalai Lama] à la requisition de l'Empereur qui s'en est servi pour vérifier ce qu'on devoit imprimer sur la religion la doctrine de *Fo,* ouvrage qui fera partie de la grande collection à laquelle on travaille toujours avec les mêmes soins & la même assiduité".[32] As a result of the great "care & diligence" twelve sets à 108 cases of the Manchu canon were printed with vermillion ink in 1794 and distributed.[33] The first and last folio of each case was decorated with deity illustrations from the Tibetan Buddhist pantheon.[34] Each set comprised more than 96,400 pages (recto/verso on ca. 48,200 unbound pothi-format sheets). The assembly and wrapping of each case as well as the deity illustrations are similar to the two manuscript editions of the Tibetan canon in golden letter that were produced under Kangxi and Qianlong.[35] It seems that after the first print run of twelve sets no reprints were made until 2001. To our knowledge, only four of the original sets survived largely intact at least until 1932. Two of these were noticed by Walter Fuchs in April 1930 in Jehol 熱河 (now

30 See Walravens (2004: 15–21) for a romanization of the Manchu names of the roster, references to their biographies (where possible) and a register. Only a few of the names can be found in the more general biographical indices for the period consulted by Walravens.

31 Amiot 1784: 517.

32 Amiot *ibid.*

33 The figure is given by Weng (2001a: 64), based on a passage in the *Huoji dang* 活計檔 material for Qianlong 59.02 (CE March 1794), archived at the Number One Historical Archives 中國第一歷史檔案館, Beijing.

34 The represented 709 different deities are an important iconographic source for the time (Walraven 2004: 6). See Luo (2003) and Gugong (2003). In the 2002 reprint the illustrations are reproduced without much attention to historical fact. For the Catalog Case, for instance, the same frontispiece as Case 82 was used, with the Chinese title in the margin clipped off.

35 Li Wenbao (2011), *Tushu wenxian chu* (2011).

Chengde 承德). One was stored in the Wanfa guiyi 萬法歸一 Hall of the Potala temple (108 cases), a second set was found in the Shuxiang temple 殊象寺 (108 cases).[36] A third set was noticed by Fuchs in Peking somewhat later, probably 1931, in the Yinghua dian 英華殿 Hall of the imperial palace (107 cases).[37] A fourth set has survived in the Sa-gsun Iha-khang Hall of the Potala Palace in Lhasa.[38] In 1906 a fifth, incomplete set, had been brought to Tokyo University from the Beita Falun temple 北塔法輪寺 in Mukden (today Shenyang 瀋陽), through the offices of Naitō Kōnan 内藤湖南. This copy perished in the fires following the devastating Kantō earthquake in September 1923 (Pelliot 1924: 285 and Naitō 1929: 275).[39] The Palace Museum in Beijing (76 cases) and the Palace Museum in Taipei (32 cases) own only parts of the canon. It is still unclear whether these holdings originally belonged to the same set.[40] Two cases of unknown provenance have found their way to Europe; one is part of the Wellcome Library for the History of Medicine, London,[41] another in the library of St. Petersburg University. Fortunately, the woodblocks that were cut before 1794 survived into the 21th century in good condition. After completion of the project and the printing of twelve sets, the woodblocks were stored in the Qingzijing guan 清字經館, the Bureau for [Buddhist] Scriptures in Manchu. When the Bureau was dissolved in 1799, the woodblocks were moved into one of the many rooms of the Meridian Gate 午門, the southern entrance of the Forbidden City. There they stayed until moved twice in the 20th century both within the precincts of the Forbidden City. Responsibility for them passed from the Office for Antiquities 古物陳列所 to the National Museum of History 國立北京歷史博物館 in 1928, and from that institution to the National Palace Museum (Beijing) 國立北京故宮博物館 in

36 Fuchs 1930: 388. Weng (2001: 61) mentions that the latter set was seen by Tada Tōkan 多田等觀 (1890–1967) in 1932, but that its whereabouts are unknown today (i.e. 2001). The set in the Shuxiang temple set was also listed in Mizuno Baigyō's inventory of cultural artifacts (Mizuno 1935: 19).

37 Fuchs 1932a: 479. On this visit, Fuchs also discovered that the woodblocks of the Manchu canon had largely survived the fires of 1900 and were stored in the *Tirenge chaofang* 體仁閣朝房 (Fuchs (1932b: 484)).

38 *Tushu wenxian chu* (2011: 35).

39 See also Naitō (1948 [1970]: 45). Fuchs (1930: 390) states that most of the texts were destroyed in the Russian-Japanese War and only "a small rest" was taken to Japan. At the time of his investigation Fuchs still found 158 pages of this print in the Beita Falun Temple.

40 Gao (1983: 163) gives 34 cases for the Taipei collection. Zhuang (1993: 60–63) speaks of 32 and 76 cases respectively, but contents that the actual numbers are much lower. According to him the collection in Beijing contains "only portions of 45 fascicules [sic]" and in the Taipei collection "there are actually only portions of 21 fascicules." According to Zhuang the texts in the Palace Museums of Beijing and Taipei do not belong to the same set as sometimes claimed (e.g. in Zhang & Jiang 2003). If they are one single set it is probably that noticed by Fuchs in the Yinghua dian.

41 This case (No.22) has been digitized and published as CD (Walravens 2004). It was sold 1932 in London by the auction house Glendining & Co. but its provenance cannot be determined anymore (ibid. 2004: 71).

1950.[42] In 2001 the publishing press of the Peking Palace Museum (Zijincheng Publishing House 紫禁城出版社) obtained permission for a facsimile reprint and in 2002 twenty copies[43] of the complete canon were published from the original woodblocks, again in vermilion ink. One of these sets was acquired in the same year by the Library of the Chung-hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies, which is now part of the Library and Information Center at Dharma Drum Buddhist College

3. Description of the Digital Research Archive

In 2007, in an attempt to engage with the Manchu canon, the author and a team of colleagues arranged for Manchu language classes at Dharma Drum Buddhist College, acquired dictionaries, grammars and general literature on the Manchu heritage and proceeded to create a small research archive of material related to the Manchu canon. We lacked the hardware for a high-end, archival quality digitization of the complete canon, but with a grant from the Li Jinchun foundation we were able to finance the digitization of ten of the 109 cases, and assemble some research aids for the study of the Manchu Buddhist canon. Although ideally the Manchu canon ought to have been completely digitized, we wanted to make a start in order to assess the challenges that a larger project would involve. The research archive does for the first time make Buddhist texts in Manchu available online and the improved catalog provides a more accurate overview of the corpus than previously available.

3.1 Digital Images of Cases 1–5, 52, 57, 59, 82 and 109 (Catalog)

The project began as a feasibility study through which we were able to assess the investment needed for a comprehensive digitization of the Manchu canon. In the end we decided that at the time (2007) a complete, professional digitization of the canon, the creation of metadata, and long term maintenance was beyond our means. The main reason for not digitizing the whole canon was the lack of hardware which could produce archival quality digital images. Because the size of the canon's folios we created our images by photographing them. The resulting high-resolution images are clearly legible and useful for researchers. Scanning might yield better image quality, but a table scanner large enough to handle the format (70–73 cm x 24–25 cm) was not available to us. Another result of the feasibility study is that B/W imaging rather than color is sufficient since the text is printed clearly red on white, the paper is of good quality and was only five years old. Using color would have created much larger file sizes for the images, resulting in longer download times, more storage space etc. The first page of each digitized sutra, and of course the miniatures are given in color. Metadata standards for digital images are still evolving. The most mature standard so far is the *NISO Metadata for Images in XML*

42 Li (2001) relates these transfers in great detail.
43 Ge (2002a).

(NISO MIX)[44] developed by the Library of Congress and the National Information Standards Organisation (NISO). NISO MIX is a comprehensive attempt to provide technical metadata for digital still images and we have included MIX data for the zip-archives available online (Cases 52, 57 and 59). The downloadable archives contain all images for the sutra, and an associated MIX metadata file. The images are large (~1.4 mb each, over 3500 pixels in width), and the text is clearly legible provided it is in the print. They have been sharpened to increase legibility, and compressed to reduce the file size.[45]

3.2 Improved Catalog

A catalog in four languages (Chinese, Manchu, Tibetan and Mongolian) is included in the canon as one extra, unnumbered case. Next to the catalog proper – a list of sutra titles with page number – this case contains the preface by Qianlong, and a list of collaborators. The Chinese titles are often shortened, less verbose than their equivalents. At least some of the Manchu sutra titles were translated from Tibetan or Mongolian rather than from Chinese. We have transcribed the titles in Manchu, Chinese and Tibetan to create the digital catalog, while the Mongolian part still awaits romanization. We have added value by clarifying the exact location of sutra texts in the printed edition. Wherever possible, we have identified a Taishō parallel, based on the number for the Qianlong canon given by Gao (1983), with occasional additions. The canon contains three texts (No. 373, 423 and 499), which are not listed in the original catalog.

3.3 Quadri-lingual Glossary

For Buddhist scholars, the Manchu canon provides an opportunity to explore the relationship between Buddhist terminology in the Chinese, Mongolian, Tibetan and Manchu communities of the Qing empire. As mentioned in Section 2 above during the Qing a large number of bi-, tri- and quadri-lingual glossaries were created often in connection with translation projects. In 1961 Raghu Vira reprinted (with indices) a glossary titled *Wuyi hebi jiyao* 五譯合璧集要 (Concise Glossary in Five Languages) under the title *Pentaglot Dictionary of Buddhist Terms – In Sanskrit, Tibetan, Manchurian, Mongolian and Chinese* (Vira 1961) without further bibliographic information concerning the text.

The pentaglot contains 1071 terms in Manchu, Chinese, Sanskrit (written in Tibetan script), Mongolian and Tibetan. Its exact provenance was long unclear until we found a description of the work by Amiot (1784) and a discussion and partial translation by Abel-Rémusat (1814 & 1825). According to Amiot, who send two copies to Paris, the glossary was printed in Beijing and created at the imperial court

44 www.loc.gov/standards/mix/ (accessed March 2011). The current standard is MIX 2.0.

45 Sharpening via the 'unsharp' mask (Set to: 0x55+3+0). JPEG compression quality was set to 80. For the online archives we also added a DDBC watermark.

on demand of the emperor, for the use of officials corresponding with Tibet (Amiot 1784: 516). Judging from the publication date (Qianlong reign, before 1783) and Amiot's description of its editors, quoted above (s. Section 2), it is almost certain that this glossary was produced by the same team that was responsible for the translation of the Manchu canon. It is probably based on the Mahāvyutpatti, of which a Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese-Mongolian edition had been created in the 18th century, and was perhaps intended as an abridged version of it. Our digitization is incomplete as we have not included the Tibetan terms yet. In its current incarnation (2011) the digital pentaglot is in fact but a tetraglot. Nevertheless, since available Manchu dictionaries emphasize general and administrative terminology,[46] the addition of a glossary of Buddhist terms by the translators of the Manchu canon is a natural addition to an archive for the study of this canon. Our edition of the Pentaglot is currently distributed in various formats (StarDict, Epub, PDF etc.) as part of the DDBC Glossary Project.[47]

3.4 Bibliography

Manchu studies is a small field, but it is as old as Sinology itself and literature on the subject was published over more than 200 years in many different languages. The bibliographies of Giovanni Stary (Stary 1990 and 2005) are the most reliable reference tools for the field and cover most of what has been published until 2005. Our bibliography is geared toward secondary literature relevant for the study of the Manchu Buddhist canon and has served as a handlist for acquisition by our library.

3.5 Availability and Distribution

Dharma Drum Buddhist College strives, wherever possible, to make the results of its research openly accessible. Most of its numerous projects are available both through an online interface as well as in various distributable archive formats complete with metadata to ensure long-term availability. The Manchu canon was first published in the 18th century and a facsimile reprint from the original woodblocks cannot support a claim to copyright. The text is now in the public domain[48] and there are no legal

---

46 We consulted mainly Haneda (1937), Norman (1978) and Liu & Li (2005). Only recently I was made aware of the fact that the newest version of Hauer's dictionary (Hauer 1952–55), revised by Corff (Hauer & Corff 2007), has added the 1070 terms of the Qianlong era pentaglot as well as ca. 390 names from Buddhist iconography (personal communication Olivier Corff, 01.08.2011).

47 See http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/glossaries/

48 China and Taiwan's WTO membership copyright issues are regulated according to the *Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights* (TRIPS) which was negotiated in 1994 and is, in turn, based on the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. According to TRIPS (Art.12) the copyright for literary or religious texts extends to 50 years after the death of the author (www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_04_e.htm#1 (accessed March 2007)).

obstacles to create images from either the original or the reprints in order to make the canon more widely available and support its preservation. The materials discussed here are available at http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/manchu/. The site was first established in 2007 and the material, especially the catalog and the bibliography, have been considerably revised since their first publication. We have recently (2010) prepared a DVD edition of the archive that includes smaller images. Next to the material on the website, the DVD contains images of Cases 1–5 containing the first part (Fasc. 1–140) of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra* (T.220), Case 82 containing the Manchu version of the *Shorter Saṃyuktāgama* (T.100) in 16 fascicles, and the complete catalog case. An ISO image of the DVD is available at the website. We hope that the digital research archive on the Manchu Buddhist Canon will be useful to the small but growing field of Manchu studies, as well as for scholarship on Chinese Buddhism in the Qing dynasty.

References

For an extensive list of online sources, see http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/manchu/. The most comprehensive printed bibliographies are Stary 1990 and 2005.

Abel-Rémusat, Jean-Pierre. 1814 (rev.1825). “San, si-fan, man, meng, han tsi yao ou Recueil nécessaire des mots Samskrits, Tangutains, Mandchous, Mongols et Chinois”. *Fundgruben des Orients / Mines de l’Orient* Vol 4 (1814): 183–201 (+ figure after p.330). Revised and expanded as “Sur un vocabulaire philosophique en cinq langues, imprimé à Peking”. In: Mélanges Asiatiques ou Choix de Morceaux Critique et de Mémoires. Vol.1 (1825): 153–183. (Errata 452–454).

Amiot, Jean Joseph Marie. 1784. “Extrait d'une autre lettre de M. Amiot – Ecrite de Péking le 2 Octobre 1784”. *Mémoires concernant les Chinois* Vol.11 (1786): 516–517.

Changja Qutughtu 章嘉呼圖克圖 (Ed.). 1773 [2008]. *Yuzhi Man Han Meng Guxifan he bi da zang quan zhou* 御制滿漢蒙古西番合璧大藏全咒. Reprint Beijing: Zhongguo shudian. Compiled 1748–1758, printed in 1773. The 2008 reprint based on the 1928 edition (涵芬樓影印本) printed in Shanghai (Commercial Press). See Lin (2001) for a modern re-edition.

Chen Qingying 陳慶英, Ma Lianlong 馬連龍. 1988. *Zhangjia guoshi ruobi duoji zhuan* 章嘉國師若必多吉傳. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe民族出版社.

Chun, Hua 春花. 2001. “Lun ‘Manwen dazangjing’ de yuyan jiazhi 論滿文大藏經的語言價值”. Gugong bowuyuan yuankan 故宮博物院院刊, vol. 6 (2001): 66-69.

Crossley, Pamela Kyle; Rawski, Evelyn S. 1993. “A Profile of the Manchu Language in Ch'ing History”. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 53, no.1 (June 1993): 63–102.

Crossley, Pamela Kyle. 1994. “Manchu Education”. In: Education and Society in Later Imperial China 1600–1900, eds. Benjamin A. Elman and Alexander Woodside. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994: 340–378. (Studies on China, 19).

Crossley, Pamela Kyle. 1999. *A Translucent Mirror – History and Identity in Qing Imperial China Ideology.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Everding, Karl-Heinz. 1988. *Die Präexistenzen der Lcang skya Qutuqtus: Untersuchungen zur Konstruktion und historischen Entwicklung einer lamaistischen Existenzenlinie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Fuchs, Walter. 1930. “Zum Manjurischen Kandjur”. *Asia Major* 6 (1930): 388–402.

Fuchs, Walter. 1932a. “Neues Material zur Mandschurischen Literatur aus Pekinger Bibliotheken”. *Asia Major* 7 (1932): 469–482.

Fuchs, Walter. 1932b. “Nachtrag zum Artikel ‘Zum Manjurischen Kandjur’”. *Asia Major* 7 (1932): 484–485.

Gao, Mingdao 高明道 (aka Friedrich Grohmann). 1983. “Rulai shiyin sanmai jing fanyi yanjiu 如來智印三昧經翻譯研究”. Unpublished M.A.-thesis, Taipei: Chinese Culture University, 1983. (Esp. Chapter 2: 滿文藏經之譯本. pp. 153–205. Includes a transcript of the Chinese Catalog of the Manchu Canon at pp.233–272.)

Ge, Wanzhang 葛婉章. 2002a. “Qianlongban manwen dazangjing fuxian 乾隆版滿文大藏經復現”. *Tu shu guan li lun yu shi jian* 圖書館理論與實踐, Vol. 2 (2002a): 31–32.

Ge, Wanzhang 葛婉章. 2002b. “Qing manwen dazangjing 清滿文大藏經”. *Gugong wenwu* 故宮文物, Vol. 20–9. No. 237 (2002b .12): 31–32.

Goodrich, Luther Carrington. 1935. *The literary inquisition of Ch'ien-Lung.* Baltimore: Waverly Press. [Reprint: New York : Paragon Book Reprint, 1966. (American council of learned societies. Studies in Chinese and related civilizations) No.1.]

Grönbold, Günter. 1984. *Der Buddhistische Kanon – Eine Bibliographie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Grönbold, Günter. 2005. *Die Worte des Buddha in den Sprachen der Welt: Tipiṭaka – Tripiṭaka – Dazangjing – Kanjur , eine Ausstellung aus dem Bestand der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München. = The words of the Buddha in the languages of the world.* München: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek [Exhibition at the Bavarian State Library, Munich, 27. Jan – 20. March 2005].

Gugong Bowuyuan (National Palace Museum, Beijing) 北京故宮博物院 (Ed.). 2003. *Ch'ien-lung Man-wen ta-tsang-ching hui-hua* 乾隆滿文大藏經繪畫藏傳佛教眾神. Beijing: Zijincheng chubanshe 紫禁城出版社.

Hanan, Patrick (Ed.). 2003. *Treasures of the Yenching – The Seventy-fifth Anniversary Exhibit Catalogue of the Harvard-Yenching Library.* Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Library.

Haneda Tōru 羽田亨. 1937. *Man-wa Jiten* 滿和辭典 */ Manju Ži-ben Gisun Kamcibuha Bithe.* Kyoto. [Reprint: Taipei, Xuehai chubanshe 學海出版社, 1998].

Hauer, Erich. 1952–55. *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache.* Tokyo, Hamburg, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hauer, Erich; Corff, Oliver (Hrsg.). 2007. *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache – 2. durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kämpfe, Hans-Rainer. 1974. "Die soziale Rolle des 2. Pekinger Lcang skya qutuqtu Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–1786): Beiträge zu einer Analyse anhand tibetischer und mongolischer Biographien". Unpublished PhD thesis, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn.

Kämpfe, Hans-Rainer. 1975. "Einige Tibetische und Mongolische Nachrichten zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Mandjurischen Kanjur". *Zentralasiatische Studien* 9 (1975): 537–546.

Kämpfe, Hans-Rainer. 1976. *Ñi ma'i 'od zer / Naran-u gerel. Die Biographie des 2. Pekinger IČaṅ skya-Qutuqtu Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–1786).* St. Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag. (Monumenta Tibetica Historica. Abt. ii: Vitae, Bd. 1.)

Laufer, Berthold. 1908. "Skizze der Manjurischen Literatur". *Keleti Szemle* 9: 1–53. Reprinted in H. Walravens (ed.). 1976. *Kleinere Schriften von Berthold Laufer. 2* vols. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Ligeti, Louis. 1942. *Catalogue du Kanjur Mongol imprimé*. Budapest.

Li, Baowen 李保文. 2011. "Xiaozhuang Taihuang Taihou yu Kangxi zhao 'Nijin xieben zangwen longzangjing' 孝莊太皇太后與康熙朝 泥金寫本藏文龍藏經". *Gugong wenwu* 故宮文物 No. 335 (Feb. 2011): 8–17.

Li, Zhitan 李之檀. 2001. "Manwen Dazangjing 滿文《大藏經》". *Zijincheng* 紫禁城 4 (2001): 2–8.

Lin, Guangming 林光明 (Ed.). 2001. *Xinbian dazang quanzhou* 新編大藏全咒 *(The new edition of all mantras in Mahapitaka)*. 16+2 vols. Taipei: Mantra Publisher / 嘉豐出版社.

Liu, Housheng 劉李樂 & Li, Leying 李樂營 (Eds.). 2005. *Han man cidian* 漢滿詞典. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe 民族出版社.

Liu, Menglin 劉蒙林. 2003. "Manwen dazangjing gaishu 滿文大藏經概述". *Mengguxue xinxi* 蒙古學信息 Vol. 237–4 (2003): 61–62.

Luo, Wenhua 羅文華. 2001. "Manwen dazangjing zangzhuan fojiao huihua – jianji cunshen minghao zhong de manwen aligalizi《滿文大藏經》藏傳佛教繪畫--兼及尊神名號中

的滿文阿禮嘎禮字 (Tibetan Buddhist Paintings in Manchu Kanjur – With Simultaneous Discussion of Manchu Alikali in Deity Titles)". 故宮博物院院刊 (*Palace Museum Journal*), Beijing: 紫禁城出版社, 2001 n. 3, (總第107期): 32–42.

Mizuno, Baigyō 水野梅曉. 1935. "Nekka ni genzon-seru bunkateki shiryō: tokuni Man Mō Zōbun san Daizōkyō ni tsuite 熱河に現存せる文化的資料特に満蒙蔵文三大蔵経に就いて". *Pitaka* ピタカ Vol. 3–5 (1935): 4–24.

Naitō, Torajirō 内藤虎次郎 (*aka* Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866–1934)). 1929. "Shōshitsu seru mōmanbun zōkyō 燒失せる蒙滿文藏經". in *Dokushi zōroku* 讀史叢錄. 京都市 : 弘文堂, 昭和 4 [1929]: 275–308.

NISO Framework Advisory Group (2004). *A Framework of Guidance for Building Good Digital Collections. 2nd edition.* Bethesda, MD: National Information Standards Organization, 2004. Available from: http://www.niso.org/framework/framework2.pdf

Norman, Jerry (1978): *A Concise Manchu-English dictionary.* Seattle: University of Washington Press. [Revised from earlier edition: A Manchu-English dictionary. Taipei, 1967.]

Pelliot, Paul. 1914. "Notes à propos d'un catalogue du Kanjur". *Journal Asiatique* XI, (1914 Jul-Dec.): 111–150.

Pelliot, Paul. 1924. "Chronique". *T'oung Pao* II, 23 (1924): 284–285.

Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1936. "The Emperor Ch'ien-Lung and the Larger Śūraṅgamasūtra". *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* Vol.1 (1936): 136–146.

Stary, Giovanni. 1990. *Manchu Studies. An International Bibliography*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Stary, Giovanni. 2005. *"What's Where" in Manchu Literature*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tushu wenxian chu 圖書文獻處. 2011. *Gugong wenwu* 故宮文物 No. 335 (Feb. 2011): 18–36.

Tuttle, Gray. 2005. *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Walravens, Hartmut (Ed.). 2004. "Der Mandjurische Kandjur/The Manju Kanjur. – Reproduktion des Londoner Fragments/Reproduction of the London Fragment". CD containing one PDF with images of the single case (No. 22) of the Manjur Canon in the Wellcome Library, London, and an introduction and study by H. Walravens. 2004. Harald Fischer Verlag.

Weng, Lianxi 翁連溪. 2001. "Qianlong ban Man wen dazangjing kan ke shu lüe 乾隆版《滿文大藏經》刊刻述略". *Gugong bowuyuan yuankan* 故宮博物院院刊 2001 vol. 6: 61–65.

Yang, Yuliang 楊玉良. 1991. "Manwen dazangjing 滿文大藏經". *Zijincheng*《紫禁城》 Beijing: 故宮博物院 1991 (總第62期) : 25.

Zhang, Nan 張楠; Jiang Ying 江英: "Chong yin ben Man wen dazangjing chu ban 重印本滿文大藏經出版". *Fayin* 法音, No. 5, Vol. 225 (2003.05): 29.

Zhuang, Jifa (Chuang, Chi-fa) 莊吉發. 1990. "Guoli gugong bowuyuan dianzang dazangjing manwen yiben yanjiu 國立故宮博物院典藏《大藏經》滿文譯本研究". *Studies in Oriental Religions* 東方宗教研究. Taipei: 國立故宮博物院 Vol. 2 (1990): 255–319.

Zhuang, Jifa (Chuang, Chi-fa) 莊吉發. 1993. "A study of the Ch'ing dynasty Manchu translation of the Tah Tsang Ching". *Proceedings of the 35th Permanent International Altaistic Conference, September 12–17, 1992, Taipei*. Edited by Chieh-hsien Ch'en. Taipei: Center for Chinese Studies Materials, 1993: 59–71.