

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
Method of preparation	8
Acknowledgments	12
Bibliography	12
ABBREVIATIONS	13
CATALOGUE	15
Pander A Collection	17
Pander B Collection	292
APPENDIX	352
Text classification based on subject matter	352
Philosophy	352
Discipline	354
Polemics	355
Grammar	356
Astrology	356
History	357
Catalogues	357
Art	358
Biographies	359
Commentaries on prayers	361
Guides to holy places	363
Collected works	363
Tantric practice	365
Rnying ma texts	371
Ritual texts	374
Prayers	390
Sutras	398
Index of the authors	399
Sample scans of the Pander hand list	411

INTRODUCTION

At the end of the 19th century Eugen Pander, a German scholar,¹ brought from Beijing to Berlin a collection of old Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian and few Manchu texts. After the Second World War the body of writings found its way to Poland and ended up in the magazines of the Jagiellonian Library. Pander had divided the items of his collection into six parts described as Pander A, Pander B, Pander C, Pander E, Pander F and Pander Pantheon. Pander A contains 369 volumes of Tibetan works. Pander B comprises 315 volumes (xylographs in majority) of works in Tibetan language. Pander C is much shorter – only 40 Tibetan and Sino-Tibetan volumes. Pander E is a collection of Mongolian and Manchu books contained in 12 volumes. Pander F are 68 volumes of the Chinese Buddhist canon. Pander Pantheon is the Wanli Kanjur – 60 volumes.

In 2007–2009 mentioned collection so-called “Berlinka” or collection of Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian and Manchu age-old manuscripts and xylographs of Pander stored in the Jagiellonian Library in Cracow was examined for the first time. The team of researchers consisting of Professor Marek Mejer, Dr. Agnieszka Helman-Ważny and Dr. Thupten Kunga Chashab carried out a project financed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education, whose aim was to prepare a preliminary report on the contents of the collection.

That first project focused mainly on the description of the Tibetan Buddhist canon – the Wanli Kanjur edition contained in one of the parts of the collection – the so-called Pander Pantheon. However, the first team also provided a general description of all the components of the Tibetan collection. The results of their work have been published in *A Preliminary Report on the Wanli Kanjur Kept in the Jagiellonian Library, Kraków*.²

That (2007–2009) project became a starting point for works on the Pander collection. Subsequently, in 2011 a new project was started. “Scholarly description of Tibetan manuscripts and xylographs of Pander A and B collections kept in the Jagiellonian Library, and critical analysis of selected excerpts” – 2011/01/B/HS2/01154 – was a project headed by Dr. Thupten Kunga Chashab with the assistance of Dr. Filip Majkowski (Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw). The project was funded from a grant received in Poland from the National Science Centre (Narodowe Centrum Nauki). This new undertaking focused on parts A and B of the collection.

The main goal of the second Pander project was to prepare a detailed catalogue of Pander A and Pander B texts – at least as many of them as possible. Thus, all 369 vol-

¹ Mejer, Marek, Helman-Ważny Agnieszka, Chashab, Thupten Kunga, 2010, *A Preliminary Report on the Wanli Kanjur Kept in the Jagiellonian Library*, Kraków, pp. 7–8.

² Ibid.

umes of Pander A collection have been identified and described. Collection Pander B was examined partly. Basically, during this project the first 104 volumes of Pander B were scrutinized, however volumes 32–50 could not be taken into account as they were in a very bad state and at the time of the project were still undergoing conservation.

An important part of the project was the comparison between the Jagiellonian Library's Pander collection and other collections of Tibetan texts available in major libraries in the world. For this purpose, two trips were undertaken to the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives (LTWA) in Dharamsala, India and one to Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, Oriental Department, in order to assess the availability of certain Pander titles (especially manuscripts) in other collections of Tibetan writings.

Method of preparation

At the beginning of each text listed below one will find accession numbers given by Jagiellonian Library and given by Eugen Pander himself. For example “Acc. No: Pander A 1: acc. 1889.336, Tib. print 325 l. Shirab Rinchen Phring wa”. Here “Pander A 1” is a number found on covering paper prepared by Jagiellonian Library. And “acc. 1889.336, Tib. print 325 l. Shirab Rinchen Phring wa”, is information provided by Pander himself; “acc. 1889. 336” and “Tib. Print 325 l” and title are found on the first folio of the text and text binding slip respectively. We kept the titles as they were written on the slip. In the later part of the collection notes are shorter than at the beginning. Pander gave only number, for example “555” or “678” and number of leaves, without acc. number and title.

As in every catalogue, here we present all indispensable elements for a catalogue such as title, author, place and year of writing, scribe, description etc. by their abbreviations. In traditional Tibetan works all of this information is given at the end in a colophon. Therefore, we extracted and copied all the colophons found in these works. Often in prayers they were missing. Also the fact that a text has a colophon does not mean that it contains all the necessary information for cataloguing. Pander materials actually prove that in traditional Tibetan publications dates and places are less important than scribes and those who requested or sponsored the composition of a text. While preparing this catalogue for the Pander collection, Pander A and a part of Pander B, kept in the Jagiellonian Library in Cracow, we were able to compare it with several different catalogues as well as with a manuscript list of the Pander collection found at Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. These were³:

1. Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center (TBRC, electronic catalogue),
2. Catalogue of Library of Tibetan Works and Archive (LTWA),
3. *Shes bya'i gter mdzod, bod gangs can gyi grub mtha'ris med kyi mkhas dbang brgya dang brgyad cu lhag gi gsung 'bum so so'i dkar chag phyogs gcig tu bsgrigs pa*

³ Bibliographical details are provided on page 7.

- (Treasure of Knowledge, A Compiled Catalogue of the Works of More Than One Hundred and Eighty Different Tibetan Scholars), vol. 1–2–3,
4. *Gsung 'bum dkar chag, Zha ser bstan pa'i sgron me rje tsong kha pa chen po'i gtsos skyes chen dam pa rim byung gi gsung 'bum dkar chag phyogs gcig tu bsgrigs pa'i dri med zla shel gtsang ma'i me long* (Compiled Catalogue of the Collected Works of Eminent Gelugpa Teachers, Tsongkhapa and others, called “Mirror of Pure and Clean Crystal Moon”).
 5. *Rnying ma'i gsung 'bum dkar chag, bod 'jongs gsar dpe tho gzhung (95) ang rtags 037* Catalogue of Rnying ma Collected Works, New texts list of Tibet, number 95, sign number 037.
 6. R. Byambaa, *The Bibliographical Guide of Mongolian Writers in the Tibetan Language and the Mongolian Translators*, vol. VI 2011.
 7. M. Lalou, *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Pelliot tibétain) nos 1–849*, I.
 8. M. Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke*, Teil 1–4.
 9. E. Pander, *Manuscript list of Pander collection* (HB C15), Orientalabteilung, Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

References to other catalogues are given below an entry of the main part of our catalogue, just after the colophon (if there is one). We attempted to find every text of the Pander collection in other catalogues we examined. If after a given Pander entry there is no reference at all or only some of the catalogues are mentioned, it means we were unable to locate a given text in rest of the catalogues. Line of dots in the colophon means we skipped some part of words or lines there. Question mark (?) indicates that the text was not legible. When brackets are used in the transliteration of Tibetan text, for example: *s(r)dzogs*, it means that *sdzogs* is written in the text instead of *rdzogs* or *m̄la* (i.e. *bla ma*) means, that originally *m̄la* is written (in *dbu med* script) for *bla ma*.

Several issues concerning referring to these catalogues need to be clarified here. As for the TBRC electronic catalogue, first we checked the title of each text and if it was found we provided its serial number as well as the volume number at the end, after the colophon. When it was not found by title and a given author had his collected works specified in TBRC, we provided the serial number of those collected works, as we were not authorized to obtain details of the works found in the TBRC catalogue. With the scanned catalogues of *Shes bya'i gter mdzod*, *Gsung 'bum dkar chag*, *Rnying ma'i gsung 'bum dkar chag* and *The Bibliographical Guide of Mongolian Writers in Tibetan Language and the Mongolian Translators* we were able to check in detail all the collected works and authors mentioned in those texts. Yet because of the huge amount of texts we did not check their titles in these four mentioned catalogues. Sometimes, although the collected works of a given author were mentioned in the above catalogues, we were unable to find a particular text listed in their register. Thus, it might be possible that without specifying a particular text may be included under a broader title, such as “Thog yig khag

cig,” “Gsungs sna tshogs” or “Gsung thor bu sna tshogs” etc. Also, the life story, prayer of Tsongkhapa and his several short biographies found in the Ka section of Tsongkhapa’s collected works were in fact composed by his closest disciple (Dngos slob) Mkhas grub dge legs dpal bzang. For technical reasons while in Dharamsala we were unable to compare part of Pander A from 325 to 369 and part of Pander B with LTWA collection.

As for the catalogue of Manfred Taube, again each entry from Pander’s collection was checked in the register of titles Taube provides at the end of the last volume of his catalogue. If a given text was found on this list, it was mentioned below the Jagiellonian Library entries in the following way: entry number, page number, volume (Ger. Teil) number. Occasionally, if the title slightly varied, yet denoted the same text, the title as it is transcribed in Taube was given as well.

The catalogue of Touen-houang manuscripts, prepared by M. Lalou, has been consulted as well, but not a single item matching the Cracow collection has been found there.

There is the manuscript list of the Pander collection prepared by Pander himself and kept at the Oriental Department of the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (accession number HB C15). We may assume that Pander prepared this list while in China, with the help of a person who knew Tibetan language well, probably a Tibetan. The list is also available on the website of Staatsbibliothek. We compared the hand list with the catalogue we were working on. As a result we can confirm that there are no differences between the two concerning basic information, such as the sequence of texts and their accession numbers. In the Berlin manuscript list of the Pander collection we could find only two pieces of information, namely the title in Tibetan and transliteration of the title in Latin script with the number of folios. Titles in Tibetan were written in brief, omitting middle parts of the titles. This occasionally created a problem in recognizing texts. The system of Tibetan transliteration used in the hand list is not Wylie which is most popular among Tibetologists. One thing obviously missing in the hand list is the enumeration of separate texts registered under one title, as it happens in several cases. For example, acc. 181 contains three separate prayers, yet on the Berlin list we may find only the title of the first one. Another obvious difference between the two lists is the number of folios. It appears that Pander often provided in his register one folio less than we can find in the actual collection. In several cases it happens vice versa. Occasionally the difference in folio numbers between the two exceeds ten or more.

In the Pander collection kept in the Jagiellonian Library texts listed under acc. 338, 339 and 340 are missing and we were previously unable to tell what they were. Fortunately the titles are provided in the handwritten list kept at Staatsbibliothek. They are as follows: