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Introduction to the Tibetan and Mongolian Inventories of Urga’s Temples

Abstract

In the present article are listed forty eight Mongolian and twenty one Tibetan inventories which are kept in the collections of the National Library and the National Archives of Mongolia. The inventories written in the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century give an account of the sacred objects of about thirty temples of Urga, the monastic capital city of Mongolia which existed until 1938. The author made an attempt to reveal the history and describe the general features of the inventories as well as to indicate their differences from the Tibetan *dkar chag* texts. It has appeared that from time to time the inventories were subject to revision and update, and the most prominent temples possessed both the Mongolian and Tibetan inventories. However, many questions regarding the authors and original location of the inventories remain still unanswered.

Keywords: Mongolian inventories, Buddhism, monasteries, Buddhist temples, Buddhist arts, Ulan Bator, Urga

When studying the religious life and special characteristics of a monastery, the research of its objects of worship has great significance. Since its first foundation in 1639, Urga or Örgöö, also known as Ikh Khüree, Daa Khüree, Ariin Khüree, Niislel Khüree, and Bogdiin Khüree, had been one of the main centres of Mongolian Buddhism being the residence of Öndör Gegeen Zanabazar (1635–1723) and his reincarnations, the lineage of the *Bogd gegeens* or *Javzandamba khutagts* (Tib. *rje btsun dam pa*).\(^1\) This monastic town became the official capital city of Mongolia in 1912 called Niislel Khüree, and existed until 1938 when it was almost completely demolished to give space to new buildings of Ulaanbaatar, now the capital of a state with a Soviet type non-religious ideology.

\(^1\) Cf. Bawden 1961, Pozdneev 1880.
Although not much remained for today from the splendour of Urga, a few buildings and several museum exhibits, old books, archival documents, and photographs keep its memories. Although the research of the history and exterior of Urga’s temples have already started,2 the study of the interior of the temples has not been the focus of interest until now. The aim of the present article is to list accessible sources for further study which can fill this gap. The handwritten inventories were written in the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century in order to register the statues and thangkas, stupas, and sutras, i.e. “the three receptacles” or “the three supports of worship” or “the three types of objects of worship” (gurvan shüteen, Tib. rten gsum), which were kept in certain temples of Urga. At the present state of research it seems that a total of 69 inventories survived the monastery demolitions; they give an account of the sacred objects of about 30 temples. Currently, the National Library of Mongolia and the National Archives of Mongolia enhouse these rare sources: 48 of them were written in Mongolian and 21 in Tibetan,3 and many of them are revisions of previous versions.

The present article is the first introduction to these inventories. First, the “three receptacles” will be defined in the frame of the Tibetan genre dkar chag. Then, the brief history of Urga and the foundation of the Sudar bichgiin khüreelen (‘Institute of Religious and Other Texts’), the predecessor of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences will be described, followed by the description of the only published Mongolian inventory and the characteristics of Urga’s Tibetan and Mongolian inventories concerning their formats, history, and contents. The titles of all Mongolian and Tibetan inventories will be listed at the end of the article. The present author came across these valuable sources when browsing the local catalogues of the National Archives and the National Library in 2012–2013 in search of Urga’s tangible and intangible heritage.4 The author accessed and thoroughly studied the texts of the Tibetan inventories, whereas only a handful of the Mongolian versions had been investigated. Therefore, further studies of both the Tibetan and the Mongolian inventories are required to obtain a complex picture of their history and special contents. Moreover, all catalogues of the Library and the Archives should be revised again with the direct aim of finding other inventories.5

3 Although the Tibetan titles are listed in the catalogues of the National Archives in Mongolian (Cyrillic), their original Tibetan titles are provided in the present article. All Mongolian inventories were written in Uygur Mongolian script. The catalogue cards of the National Library list them with their written Mongolian titles, whereas the catalogues of the National Archives list them with their Modern Mongolian forms in Cyrillic. These two different systems were kept in the present article for two reasons: 1. to ease their findings in the catalogues, 2. the author could access only handful of the Mongolian inventories, and thus could not check if the titles in the catalogues differ from the original titles.
4 The Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA PD 83465) supported the research project as well as the author’s participation (OTKA K 100613) in the 4th International Conference of Oriental Studies organized by the Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee of Oriental Studies, in 2014 in Warsaw, where the subject of the present article was first presented.
5 Since the search for the inventories was not the primary aim of the survey it is possible that some inventories escaped our notice. The catalogues of the main administrative unit of the Ikh jas (Kh–182) of the Main Assembly
1. The Genre of *dkar chag* and the ‘Three Receptacles’

The titles of Urga’s Tibetan inventories define their genres mostly as *dkar chag* (‘register, index’, usually translated as ‘table of content’), sometimes completed with the expressions of *tho* or *mtshan tho* (‘list, register’). However, the Mongolian inventories are not defined as *garchig*, the equivalent of the Tibetan *dkar chag*, but as inventory or register (*dans*), for instance *bürtgesen dans*, ‘inventory of what is registered’, *baitsaasan dans*, ‘revised inventory’, or *tovchlon temdeglesen devter* ‘booklet with short notes’.7

Dan Martin determines several topics that fit to the Tibetan *dkar chag* (*garchig*) genre.8 They are always in connection with sacred sites and objects of worship, such as monasteries, temples, stupas, Buddhist images, and Buddhist texts. The *dkar chag* genre developed in Tibet, and it also existed in the Mongol lands.9

The Tibetan titles of Urga’s inventories determine their subjects as the inventories of the “three receptacles” or the “three supports of worship” or “the three types of objects of worship” (Tib. *rten gsum*). Three classes of things are considered to be holy in Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhism: (1) statues and thangkas (including painted scrolls, appliqué and embroidery works), (2) stupas, and (3) holy books (sacred texts). These three represent the trinity of body, speech and mind (*gūṣintūg*, Tib. *sku gsung thugs*, Skr. *kāya, vāc, citta*), in which the images represent Buddha’s body, the sutras represent his speech, and the stupa represents his mind.10 These threefold representations of the Buddha are required to be in a Buddhist temple.11 The Mongolian titles of Urga’s inventories do not mention the expression of the “Three Receptacles” at all (*gurvan shüteen*), but statues and thangkas (*suumal khörög*) of Buddhas and deities (*burkhan*), and holy texts are mentioned separately (*nom sudar*). The inventories’ titles do not mention the stupas, the third “receptacle”, however, they are also listed in the inventories among other images. Additionally, other equipment (*kheregse*l), ritual and offering implements (*takhiliin kheregse*l), movable and immovable properties (*ed khogshil, khödlökh ba ül khödlökh khöröngö*) are mentioned.

Hall, and the Bogd Gegeen’s treasuries known as the *Gegeenii san* ‘Treasury of the Gegeen’ or the *Ikh san* ‘Great Treasury’ or *Dotood san* ‘Internal treasury’ (M–86, F–180, F–181) and others might list other inventories, too. It is also possible that some inventories of Urga’s temples and the inventories of rural monasteries have been lost during the stormy events of the 20th century. It is also possible that local monks, researchers or other people possess or heard about the inventories of the rural monasteries.

---

6 *Garchig*, however, means ‘table of content’ in modern Mongolian.
7 In the present article both *dkar chag* and *dans* are translated as ‘inventory’.
10 Tib. *sku’i rten rtags rgyas kyi gzugs, gsung gi rten chos kyi dpe cha, thugs kyi rten mchod rten.*
11 Martin 1996:504. As its obvious from the inventories, not only the Buddha can be represented in this threefold way, but also other Buddhist deities and eminent monks.
Several *dkar chags* of the objects of Tibetan culture have already been identified, translated or are available in different collections. The ‘White Chrystal Mirror’ (*Tib. Shel dkar me long*) written by the Fifth Dalai Lama in 1645, reports about the history and sacred objects of the Jokhang temple and other temples in Lhasa, the religious geography of Sakya Monastery, and the four main Gelukpa temples and two tantric colleges, the religious history of Kumbum Monastery, and Labrang Monastery are mentioned too. The most recent publication discussing the frequented pilgrimage site of nomads, Wutaishan in China, also mentions guidebooks and objects of worship. Similarly to the above mentioned Tibetan inventories, Mongolian monks wrote *dkar chags*, as well as other texts in Tibetan which were related to holy sites and objects of worship, as for instance Urga’s famous head abbot, Agvaankhaidav (1779–1838), and the eminent Tibetan polymath of Urga, Zava lam Damdin (1867–1937). The *dkar chags* they wrote are similar to the ones written in Tibet, they describe the history and traditional customs related to given temples or stupas. These lists of sacred objects are as a rule parts of longer stories about sacred sites and describe the history of the objects, whereas the inventories of Urga’s temples in many cases are individual texts which list only the objects themselves, and neglect their historical background. Maybe that is the reason why the Mongolian inventories are referred simply as *dans*.

---

13 Waddel 1895, Grünwedel 1919.
20 Zava lam Damdin, also known as Luvsandamdin or Luvsandanayan wrote the following texts among others: 1. *gDan sa kha ral chen mo’i chos grwa nub ma’i ’byung kunghs dang ’brel ba’i gnam gyi phreng ba kinnara’i kh ‘dbyangs zhes bya ba bzhugs so* / ‘Song of Kinnara: Rosary of stories related to the origin of the Western philosophical college of Urga’ (21 pages, 1674/97); 2. *Dri med bshad sgrub bstan pa’i ’byung gnas dga’ ldan theg chen gling gi bsgags pa mdo tsam brjod pa bung ba gzhon nu nyos pa’i gli snyan zhes bya ba bzhugs so* / ‘Sweet Song of the Demented Young Bee: Short Praise of Gandantegchenlin, the source of teaching the immaculate explanations and practice’ (4 pages, 1681/97); 3. *bKra shis thos bsam gling gi ’byung kunghs thur tsam bzhugs so* / ‘Short History of Dashtoisamlin aimag’ (5 pages, 1677/97).
21 Such an inventory was published by O. Batsaikhan in 2011, which lists the properties and assets of the Bogd Gegeen and the Ikh Shav’, their administration, revenue sources, and expenditure in the socialist period, before being confiscated and dismantled. Unfortunately, this source was not accessible for the author during the reseach.
2. Urga and its Documents

Urga was first established as the residence (örgöö) of the First Bogd Gegeen or the First Jetsundampa (Javzandamba), Öndör Gegeen Zanabazar in 1639 in what is now Övörkhangai Province. After having changed its seat more than twenty times, this monastic camp came near the River Selbe in 1778, then moved to the nearby Tolgoit for a while in 1839, and finally settled down on the bank of the River Selbe again in 1855.\footnote{Cf. Pürev 1990: 12. This is the present area of Ulaanbaatar.} At the beginning of the 20th century the monastic town had the following parts with different temples and residences:

1. The Eastern monastic district called Khüree or Züün Khüree with the Yellow Palace of the Bogd, the main assembly hall (Tsogchin dugan, Tib. tshogs chen 'du khang), some monastic colleges (datsan, Tib. grwa tshang),\footnote{Urga had ten datsans including colleges and other temples with bestowed privileges. There were three philosophical colleges, a medical college, a tantric college, an astrologic college, a yogic college, and a college where the gradual path was tought; as well as the Avalokiteśvara Temple and the Maitreya Temple housing monumental statues which were also called datsans.} and 30 “districts” (or branches, aimag, Tib. khang tshan) with the monks’ dwellings (yurts and buildings in courtyards).

2. The Gandan hill (Gandantegchenlin, Tib. dga’ ldan theg chen gling) with strict regulations, a palace, philosophical colleges and other temples, and also 30 districts.

3. The palaces of the Bogd Gegeen on the bank of the River Tuul (the White Palace, the Green Palace, and Pandelin).

4. The palaces of the Choijin Lama and his teacher, Baldanchoimbel yonzon khamba (Tib. yongs ’dzin mkhan po), and the quarters where representatives, nobles, traders, and the lay population lived (khoroo).

5. The Chinese quarters and the hill of the Russian Consulate inhabited mainly by foreigners.

6. The three monasteries in the North which belonged to the Ikh shav’ area directly subordinated to the Bogd Gegeen.\footnote{Cf. Sereeter 1999, Pürev 2004, Teleki 2012.}

During the three-hundred-year history of Urga numerous written materials were produced. As Tibetan is the sacred language of Mongolian Buddhism, the sacred texts were written primarily in the Tibetan language and in the Tibetan script and printed on different kinds of paper in the printing house (barkhan, Tib. par khang) in Züün Khüree called the Sümbümiinkh (‘that of [printing] sümbüm’, i.e. Tib. gsung ’bum, ‘collected works’ of an eminent monk), or in some colleges (Tib. grwa tshang) and aimags (Tib. khang tshan). The language of the temples’ administration was Mongolian; various reports of the livestock and other moveable and immovable properties, incomes, expenses, ceremonial costs, donations and other issues were recorded by hand in Mongolian language and Mongolian script.\footnote{Few documents written in Mongolian language with the use of Tibetan letters indicate that some monks in the administration were not familiar with the Mongolian script.} Apart from the typical form of Buddhist texts (sudar) which were
written on different types of paper and other materials in “palm-leaf” or *pustaka* format, two basic types of documents existed: *dans* (Mong. *dangsa*, Ch. *dangzi*) which was a type of book in Western sense, a Chinese type fascicle\textsuperscript{26} used mainly for registers, and *nugalbar*, which was a long sheet of greyish, coarse *muutuu* (Ch. *maotou*) “hairy” paper in concertina format. Apart from Chinese paper, Russian, Tibetan, and Mongolian paper was also in use.

Skilled clerks used to write in Mongolian the commands and the regulations of the Bogd Gegeen and the Ministry of the Ecclesiastical Affairs (*Erdene shanzodviin yaam*, Tib. *phyag mdzod pa*), which handled not only Urga’s administration but also that of the *Ikh Shav’* areas, as well as the correspondences with rural monasteries and the Manchu court. Manchu and Chinese documents also have survived as Mongolia was under Manchu overlordship from 1691–1911. Many Chinese as well as some Russian and other foreign traders lived in Urga, which was not only an important centre of Mongolian Buddhism, but also a centre of the Manchu governance (until 1911) and foreign trade. Urga became the capital city of the independent Mongolia in 1912, and after the theocratic reign of the Eighth Bogd Gegeen, also known as the Bogd Khaan (1911–1921), and the Soviet-supported revolution in 1921, the city was renamed as Ulaanbaatar in 1924. The buildings of the old city (Urga) and the new city (Ulaanbaatar) existed in parallel until 1938, when due to the Soviet influence the temples and other buildings of Urga were almost completely demolished, and many sacred texts were burnt.\textsuperscript{27}

In parallel with the gradual suppression of religion, a positive effect of the Soviet influence was that new scholarly institutions came into existence. The first such institute, the *Sudar bichgiin khüreelen* was established in 1921 in order to collect and preserve the most valuable books, Buddhist texts and other documents of the country. This institute was the origin of the present-day Mongolian Academy of Sciences, the National Library, the National Archives, and several museums.\textsuperscript{28} The collection of the Institute increased gradually. After the passing away of the Bogd Khaan in 1924, his library was transferred to the Institute, and in 1926 the first museum was opened in the winter palace of the Bogd Khaan under the supervision of the Institute.\textsuperscript{29} In the 1920s–1930s and especially at the time of the monastery demolitions, the Institute received several Buddhist texts, historical books, administrative documents, and also artefacts from the confiscated property of nobles, monks, and monasteries.\textsuperscript{30} When Urga’s temples were being pulled down in 1937–1938, the management and the experts of the Institute, which was renamed as the Institute of Sciences in 1930 (*Shinjlekh ukhaanii khüreelen*), managed to save some imposing temple buildings of Urga, many precious objects of worship as well as several Buddhist texts, books, and administrative documents. When the Institute grew out as well as its buildings and stores, the collection was divided: the artefacts were transferred to

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Kara 2005: 231.
\textsuperscript{27} For the surviving temples see www.mongoliantemples.org.
\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Chuluun 2011.
\textsuperscript{29} Chuluun 2011, Altannavch 2001: 7.
\textsuperscript{30} Chuluun 2011.
different museums, the administrative documents formed the Archives, whereas Buddhist texts, historical books, and other texts formed the Library. In the case of duplications of documents, both the library and the archives got pieces of samples. This happened with the inventories of Urga as well, which currently enrich two collections: the National Library and the National Archives.

3. The Published Inventory of the Gandantegchenlin Temple

B. Rinchen drew attention to the inventories of monasteries in 1959, when he published and transcribed a Mongolian inventory kept in the National Library. It is entitled ‘Inventory of the Statues and Images of the Gandantegchenlin Temple and the Eastern and Western Stūpas, Revised and Renewed in the Twelfth Year of Tongzhi [emperor, Qing Dynasty, r. 1861–1875]’ (Mong. Бүрэнтүү жасаычын арбан койдуу на-ду: Гандангтегченлин дүүнкхан:31 жүүн бараңун субуран-у саяымал хороң буран-у байычаяжу синдегкенсендебтер, 31 pages).32 The inventory was written in vermilion in 1872, in the 12th year of the reigning period of the Manchu emperor, Tongzhi (Muzong, 1861–1875),33 in order to list the statues and thangkas of the Gandantegchenlin Temple [Tib. dga’ ldan theg chen gling] built from 1838–1839, the relics temple of the Fifth Bogd Gegeen built in 1840–1841, and the relics temple of the Seventh Bogd Gegeen built in 1869.34 Rinchen claims that every monastery in Mongolia had such an inventory of its most precious statues and thangkas, and from time to time these inventories were verified.35 This statement cannot be confirmed at the present state of research, but definitely many temples had such inventories in Urga.

4. Characteristics of Urga’s Mongolian and Tibetan Inventories

During the survey 48 Mongolian and 21 Tibetan inventories were found: 33 Mongolian inventories are scattered in the individual catalogues of Urga’s temples in the National Archives,36 and 15 Mongolian inventories in the catalogue of the National Library.37 Fifteen

31 A dot in the Mongolian text indicates that it is a foreign expression with an original “kh” and not a Mongolian “γ”. Tib. ‘du khang. Some Mongolian inventories indicate foreign words. For instance, k, kh, or g in Tibetan words are marked with a dot. Cf. Poppe 1974: 26.
32 Rinchen 1959: 15–58.
34 This inventory does not list the Buddhist texts of the temples. All the three temples survived and they are known at present as Gandantegchenlin Temple, Vajradhara Temple (Ochirdariin søm) and Jovo Temple (Zuugiin søm).
Tibetan inventories enrich the National Archives, and six the archival collection of the National Library. The studied inventories are of different length and different content: most of them define all the three receptacles, whereas others detail only Buddhist texts or images sometimes completing each other. Many of them were revised (baitsaakh) and renewed (shinetgekh, Tib. gsar du bris), and some of them were copied or divided into parts (statues and books separately). The most important temples have both the Mongolian and Tibetan inventories. It is uncertain at the present state of research whether the very first inventory of a given temple was used as a base of later inventories written in both languages or not. In other words, it is uncertain whether the authors of the Tibetan inventories used Mongolian parallels, and vice versa.

4.1. Formats

The studied Mongolian inventories have the characteristics of general registers (booklets, in Western sense) called dans. They were written on Chinese paper in black ink, and sometimes in vermillion which made the text more special. The Tibetan inventories were written in the second half of the 19th century and the early 20th century on Russian paper. They possess more artistic value in the sense that they look like Buddhist texts (sudar): they were written horizontally, as a rule on pages of format about 32 x 22 cm and were folded on the top, and are turned like the pages of Buddhist texts in pustaka format. The Tibetan documents usually have yellow silken covers with their titles in a frame. The word “main assembly hall” appears on some of the covers. There is also a frame on their first pages similarly to Buddhist texts. Both black and red ink were used for writing, with red ink used for enhancement. The texts are of different length: some of them consist of six pages, whereas others include 100 or 200 pages, especially the detailed tables of contents of eminent polymaths’ collected works.

4.2. Contents

Generally, the inventories list the statues first: the statues and stupas of the altars (güngarvaa, Tib. kun dga’ ra ba) are followed by other statues and the contents of cases or boxes (avdar, Tib. sgam). The statues are listed with the names of the represented deities, mostly together with the statues’ materials and/or styles and sizes. Some of them had amulet boxes (guu, Tib. ga’u). Secondly, the thangkas (khörög, Tib. thang sku, sku thang, thang ka) including painted scrolls, appliquéd (zeegt naamal), and embroidery works

---

38 Catalogue M–224 lists the few Tibetan texts preserved in the National Archives.
39 I am grateful to T. Bayarlahk, research fellow in the Tibetan Collection of the National Library, who showed me these documents as parallels of the findings in the National Archives. They are kept in the archival collection of the Library and are not mentioned in any catalogues.
40 Cf. Rinchen 1959.
41 Cases are numbered by the letters of the Tibetan alphabet (Ka, Kha, Ga, Nga, etc.) in the Tibetan texts, whereas the Mongolian texts bear Mongolian numeration (first, second, etc.).
(khatgamal)⁴² hanging in the temples are listed, followed by the ones which were kept in cases (with the name of the deity, size, and the material of the slat and the rod in the majority of cases). Finally, the sacred texts or books are listed beginning with the most precious texts written in gold or other (semi-)precious stones and other holy texts, such as the sets of the Kanjur and the Tanjur. Then, the collected works of eminent monks including xylographs and manuscripts follow, and also individual texts and ritual texts are listed sometimes on dozens of pages. Completing the “three receptacles” especially the Mongolian inventories list ritual objects and other implements, for instance golden and silver plates, mandalas used at rituals, musical instruments, offering bowls, seats, mirrors, and other shrine objects. These occur sometimes in the Tibetan inventories, too, as notes written in smaller Tibetan letters or in Mongolian. The texts of revisions often include notes (e.g. informing that such and such statue has been sold) or determine the objects more precisely, for instance adding that the statue was made in Tibetan or Chinese style, or was a copper cast. Here is a sample of a Tibetan text (M–224, D–1, 64, 18v):

- Guhyasamāja, Tibetan cast, 7 inches;
- The Eight bodhisattvas, Chinese style, 1 cubit each;
- Cakrasaṃvara, Tibetan style, 7 inches;
- Tsongkhapa, Tibetan style, 6 inches;
- The Fifth Dalai Lama, Mongolian style, 5 inches;
- The Fourth Panchen Lama, Mongolian style, 5 inches;
- The Green Tārā, Mongolian style, 5 inches.

Interestingly, the Chinese measures chi and cun are used in the Mongolian texts for sizes, instead of their Mongolian equivalents (tokhoi, ‘cubit’, khoroo, ‘finger’, etc.), which indicates that the Chinese measures were in use officially at that time.⁴³ In the Tibetan texts sizes are given with the use of the Tibetan terms “cubit” (Tib. khru) and “inch” (Tib. tshon).

4.3. Dates of Origin and Purposes

The titles of the inventories refer to the dates of their origin as well.⁴⁴ The inventories were written in three different periods of Mongolian history: 1. the Manchu overlordship (lasted until 1911) when dates were determined in accordance with the reigning periods of the Manchu emperors, 2. the reigning period of the Bogd Khaan (1911–1921), when dates were usually determined starting from his reign in 1911, and 3. beginning of socialism (from 1921 onwards), when dates were still determined starting with 1911 (or sometimes according to the Western calendar). The Mongolian inventories⁴² define the two last ones as tshems grub ma, tshem drub ma or tshem gyis grub pa.

1 1 chi = 33.33 cm = 10 cun = 10 fen. These Chinese measures had been changing during the history, for instance around 1915 one chi was 32 cm. I express my thanks to Mátyás Balogh, assistant associate professor at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, for sharing this information with me.

⁴³ The titles do not mention the dates in many cases. Therefore, the colophons of the texts should be studied in detail in the future.
documents follow these systems. However, the Tibetan inventories follow the traditional
Mongolian calendar which is based on the Tibetan calendar of the 60–year cycle with the
12 animal signs.

The first Mongolian inventories were written during the reigning period of Daoguang
(Xuanzong, Man. Doro eldengge, Mong. Törö gereltü, 1821–1850), but their appearance
might have been rather connected with the activity of the Fifth Bogd Gegeen (1815–
1841) who made great efforts to develop the monastic life in Urga, together with Urga’s
head abbot, *khamba nomon khan* Agvaankhaidav (Tib. ngag dbang mkhas grub, 1779–
1838). The Maitreya Temple was built in 1834, the Bogd Gegeen founded anew two
philosophical colleges in 1837 giving the names Dashchoimbel Datsan (Tib. *bkra shis
chos ’phel grwa tshang*) and Güngaachoilin Datsan (Tib. *kun dga’ chos gling grwa
tshang*) to them, built the Gandantegchenlin Temple in 1838, a palace at Gandan hill
in 1840, and also the Güngaadejidlin (Tib. *kun dga’ bde skyid gling*, the White Palace)
and the Pandelin palaces (Tib. *phan bde gling*) on the bank of the River Tuul. He
established Shaddüvlin (Tib. *bshad sgrub gling*) hermitage North of Urga.45 The Khüree
was moved to Tolgoit, west of Gandan hill in 1839, and the Bogd Gegeen himself moved
to the new palace at Gandan. The main assembly hall46 and other temples and monks’
districts were moved there, as well.47 The Fifth Bogd Gegeen might have ordered the
documentation of the objects of worship and ceremonies of the most prominent or newly
built temples in 1840 after the moving, since the earliest documents were written in
that very year.48 Several Mongolian inventories which are kept in the National Archives
were written in the 20th century, which indicates that temple properties were documented
during the Bogd Khaan’s reigning period (1911–1921), and also during the socialist
period (since 1921).

The oldest surviving Tibetan inventory was written in the second half of the 19th
century, whilst many others were written or revised in 1906 and in 1909. The main
purpose of the production of these inventories in Tibetan is uncertain, although numerous
projects which aimed at accumulation of Buddhist merits took place in the turn of the
20th century due to the activity of the Eighth Bogd Gegeen (1870–1924), the head
abbots of Urga,49 eminent monks (e.g. Zava lam Damdin, 1867–1937), artists, pious
nobles and devotees.50

45 Lokesh Chandra: 1964: 117r–120r.
46 The *Tsogchin* temple was renewed there in 1839 (Dashnyam 1999: 251).
47 All of these establishments moved back to the Züün Khüree area, east of the Gandan hill in 1855.
48 These oldest inventories are kept in the National Library. Moreover, many other documents written in 1840
are preserved in the collections of the National Library as well as in the National Archives. Interestingly, one of
the texts indicates that *Ribogejigandanshaddüvlin* was founded in 1840 (158 pages, size: 22x27 cm; No. 1990/96.
4538. 9 (517.3) P–49. 915 (7.3), whereas another text which is available is concerned with the ceremonies and
ritual texts, rules, and offerings in the temples of *Ribogejigandanshaddüvlin* (M–85, D–1, 171).
49 Baldancheimbel, Tib. *dPal ldan chos ’phel*, bearing the head abbot title from 1865–1899, Luvsanpuntsog,
50 For instance, the Urga Kanjur was completed and printed from 1908–1910, and the *Tsam* masks and garments
were also renewed in the turn of the 20th century.
Apart from their religious contents, the inventories can also be treated as administrative documents. Starting in the Manchu period, the officials (daamal) or storekeepers (nyarav, Tib. gnyer pa) of the temples often wrote registers or reports to properly handle the incomes and expenditures of the temples. Therefore, it seems that the oldest inventories were written with religious purposes, especially the Tibetan ones, but the last inventories might have been written to register the properties of temples.

4.4. Authors

B. Rinchen claims that a Mongol scribe who wrote Gandantegchenlin’s inventory knew neither Tibetan, nor he had a sufficient knowledge of Mongolian orthography, since he gave the names of deities only in the spoken Mongolian form. Related to this statement we have to consider two facts: 1. Though most monks knew the Tibetan letters better than the Uygur script or did not know the Uygur script at all, the several thousands of administrative documents kept in the National Archives signify that administrative documents in Urga were always written in Uygur script, whereas Tibetan was the language of sacred texts. The scribes of the documents might have been official clerks. 2. The translated names of Buddhist deities were not widespread in Mongolia at all. The Tibetan names of the Buddhist deities in their Mongolian pronunciation (e.g. Jigjid for Tib. 'Jigs byed, Gombo for Tib. mGon po, Gongor for Tib. mGon dkar, etc.) were (and are) in use in the everyday communication of monks. These pronounced names appear in the Mongolian inventories in Uygur script.

Presumably, the Mongolian inventories were written by clerks or officials such as the storekeepers (nyarav, Tib. gnyer pa) who were familiar with the Mongolian script, and who belonged to the administrative and financial units (jas, Tib. spyi sa) of the given temple. Or perhaps, the Bogd Gegeen gave the command for the registration and nominated scribes from his court. Completing an inventory might have been a project such as the census (toollogo) in Mongolia nowadays: more participants (monks) were required to move the objects from the altars and the cases, to identify them, to measure them, to determine their styles and materials, and to write these data down. The Tibetan inventories were definitely written by monk(s) in literary Tibetan, who knew Tibetan excellently. The Tibetan orthography of the texts is precise and the inventories are tidy.

51 Numerous reports and registers of the livestock and other properties have remained from the temples of Urga which indicate that Mongolian officials were precise in registration.
52 Some deities’ names are of Sanskrit origin, such as Ayuush, Skr. Amitāyus, Avid, Skr. Amitābha, etc.
53 These disfigured names cause difficulties in reading out and identification.
54 The storekeeper, the donir (Tib. dgon gnyer, custodian of temple property), the disciplinary master (gesgüi, Tib. dge bskyos) or another eminent monk who could identify the deities, and the preparers of offerings (takhilch) and shrine keepers (duganch) might participate in the work. At present, Gandantegchenlin Monastery’s inventory is being completed, and Züün Khüree Dashcholin Monastery also has an inventory, which indicates that recording the properties of temples is a live practice even today.
The author(s) might have been monk(s) or clerk(s) who were fluent in Tibetan. The handwriting of the inventories should be compared in the future as many of them were written or rewritten in the same years, probably by the same person.

4.5. Described Temples

The National Library possesses fifteen Mongolian inventories related to the centre of Züün Khüree: the surrounding temples of the main assembly hall and the Yellow Palace, and the temples situated in the enclosure of the Yellow Palace, such as the Vajradhara Temple (Ochirdar iiin süm, Tib. rdDo rje 'dzin pa), which housed the most precious object of Urga crafted by Zanabazar, the Kālacakra Temple (Dechingalaviin süm or Dün khor datsan, Tib. bDe chen bskal pa, dus 'khor grwa tshang), which was the principle temple of the Bogd Gegeen, the Tārā Temple (Dar’ ekhiin süm, Tib. sGrol ma’i ’du khang), the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas (Rigsüm gombiin süm, Tib. Rigs gsum mgon po’i ’du khang), the Vajra Palace (Dorj povran, Tib. rdDo rje pho brang), and others.

The National Archives contain about 33 Mongolian inventories. They list the holy objects of the Vajradhara Temple, the Maitreya Temple (Maidariin datsan, 2 texts), Shüteenii aimag, Jadariin aimag (2), Makhamayaagiin aimag, Jasiin aimag (2), Sangain aimag, Mergen nomon khaanii aimag, Erkhem toinii aimag, Vangain aimag (2), Ekh dagiiin aimag, and Bargiin aimag in Züün Khüree;55 Güngaachoilin datsan, Idgaachoinzinlin datsan and the Avalokiteśvara Temple (2) at Gandan; Sharavpeljeelin or the Green Palace of the Bogd; Choijn dechindévshisümbrilin temple (3)56 situated in the south-western lay population quarter; Dashsamdanaлин datsan, Dagdanlin aimag and Dejidlen aimag in the area of the Chinese merchant town (Maimaachen); and Shaddüvlin hermitage (4 texts) situated in the North of Urga. Although only one of the 28 texts refer to the Yellow Palace (the inventory of Vajradhara Temple), inventories of aimag temples and datsans, of a few temples in the Chinese merchant town (Maimaachen) and of the biggest temple in the lay population quarter are all available.57

The Tibetan inventories of at least ten significant temples of Urga are at the researchers’ disposal. Almost all of them were situated in the enclosure of the Yellow Palace: the Vajra Palace, the Vajradhara Temple, which according to one of the inventories preserved Zanabazar’s collected works, the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas, the Tārā Temple, the Yurt Temple of Worship (Shüteenii örgöö), and the Yurt Temple with the Tall Victory

55 Related to the original names and meanings of the aimag see Teleki 2012.
56 In other sources the name of this temple is Jagarmolomin khural or Dechinchoilintawshisümbrilin (Tib. bde chen chos dbyings thabs shes zung ’brel gling, ‘Island of the union of means and knowledge of the ultimate sphere with great bliss’). Cf. Teleki 2012.
57 The updated inventories of Shaddüvlin hermitage encourage researchers to browse the catalogues of the Bogd Gegeen’s treasuries and the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs where the monasteries that belonged to the Ikh Shav’ area might be available.
Flag (Jantsantonbo). The inventory of the nearby temple of Khüükhen Noyon, who was Zanabazar’s muse, is also available. Besides, the Tibetan inventory of Gandantegchenlin’s objects of worship requires further studies because it is more detailed than the Mongolian version published by B. Rinchen. Two almost similar inventories written on the same day in 1909 list the objects of worship of Güngaadejidlin, the White Palace.

To summarize the above-mentioned data, the following sites have both Tibetan and Mongolian inventories: the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas (Rigsümgombiin süm, Tibetan texts written in 1869/1929, 1895, 1906, 1909, and part of the Mongolian text), the Tārā Temple (Dar’ ekhiin süm, a Mongolian text written in 1841 and a Tibetan text), the Vajradhara Temple (Ochirdariin süm, Mongolian texts written in 1842, 1917, 1929, 1931 and four Tibetan texts from which two were written in 1909), the Vajra Palace (Dorjpovran, a Mongolian text written in 1854 and four Tibetan texts written in 1894, 1906, and two in 1909), the Gandantegchenlin Temple (a Mongolian text written in 1872 and a Tibetan text without date), the White Palace (Güngaadejidlin süm, one Mongolian text without date and two Tibetan texts written in 1909). Moreover, three sites have individual Tibetan inventories, though their descriptions form only parts of the Mongolian inventories: the Yurt Temple with the Tall Victory Flag (1909), the temple that housed Khüükhen Noyon’s object of worship (1909), and the Yurt Temple of Worship (Shüteenii örgöö) which also might have Mongolian parallel.

The following sites have only Mongolian inventories: the Western Yurt Palace (Baruun örgöö) written in 1903, the Green Palace, Sharaveljeelin (two texts without date), Güngaachoilin datsan (1895), the Avalokiteśvara Temple (1913, 1924), the Maitreya Temple (1921 and a text without date), Idgaachoinzinlin datsan (two texts written in 1922), Shüteenii aimag (1867), Jadariin aimag (1908, 1926), Makhamayaagiin aimag (1914), Jasiin aimag (two texts in 1915), Vangain aimag (1916, 1921), Sangain aimag (1931), Mergen nonom khaniir aimag (1924), Ekh daginii aimag (1926), Erkhem toinii aimag (1930), Bagüin aimag (without date); Dashchöinkhorlin Monastery in the North (1897, 1904, 1909, and two without dates), Dagdanlin aimag (1916), Dejidlin aimag (1916) and Dashsamanlin datsan (1854) in the area of Maimaachen, and Choijidechindashsümbrellin (1913, two texts in 1914), Red Stream Temple situated in the lay population quarter.

Some inventories describe also nearby temples, even those which are not mentioned in the inventory titles.

---

58 The author of the present article did not find the inventory of the Kālacakra Temple, though it was one of the main temples in the courtyard of the Yellow Palace.
59 It mentions the Kālacakra Temple, too.
60 These texts might be rather about implements than listing of statues and thangkas.
61 Interestingly, the temple is mentioned as datsan in the text.
62 For instance the Blue yurt temple is mentioned in the Tibetan text of Jantsantonbo.
4.6. Locations

The original location of the inventories and their ways of inclusion into the current collections are debatable, and require further research of archival materials related to the history of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, the National Library, and the National Archives.

The National Archives possess more inventories, but the National Library preserves the older and more unique ones. The collections of both the Library and the Archives trace back to the Institute of Sciences, i.e. *Sudar bichgiin khüreelen* as presumably, the inventories were saved and transferred to the Institute (Academy) of Sciences (1930–1957).63

Supposedly, the inventories of the Yellow Palace and other particular sites such as the White Palace and the Gandantegchenlin Temple were not kept in the given temples originally, but in the library or the treasury of the Bogd Geegen (*Gegeenii san*), or in the financial unit of the Main Assembly Hall, the main “treasury” of Urga (*Ikh jas*). This assumption is relevant mainly for the Tibetan inventories. The covers of a few Tibetan inventories bear the word *Tshogs chen* (‘main assembly (hall’), which might prove this assumption. Supposedly, the Tibetan inventories were all possessed by the Sudar Bichgiin Khüreelen or the Institute of Sciences (1930–1957) for a while, and later some of them were transferred to the National Library, and others to the National Archives to be available in both places.64 Some inventories that are currently in the National Library were sealed: *Mongol arad ulus-un küriyeleng-un nom-un sang-un temdeg* (‘Seal of the Library of the Institute of the Mongolian People’s State).

The history of the Mongolian inventories can be different. The ones describing the Yellow Palace and other important sites (*datsans*) might have been preserved in the same places as the Tibetan ones. However, their assortment into the individual catalogues of the given *aimags*, *datsans*, and other temples in the National Archives indicate that the administrative office of the given temples or *aimag* temples or the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs stored these documents.65 If they were possessed by the *aimags* or temples indeed, they were confiscated in 1937 or 1938, and stored in the surviving Avalokiteśvara Temple in the 1940’s together with all other administrative documents. The Avalokiteśvara Temple functioned as the archives of the Institute of Sciences until the 1950s.66

---

63 Although the use of some palaces stopped with the passing away of the Bogd Khaan in 1924, the majority of the temples of Urga operated until 1938. The majority of holy texts and other religious items were burnt in 1937–1938.

64 It is a usual practice in Mongolia to distribute certain groups of items to different collections. For instance the statues created by Zanabazar are housed at present in three different museums in Ulaanbaatar.

65 Its activity stopped in 1924.

66 Although more and more publications clarify the history of the late 1930s, and the history of the *Sudar bichgiin khüreelen* and other scientific institutes, still many questions related to the present-day collections remain unanswered.
5. List of Mongolian Inventories Kept in the National Library

The following inventories of Urga’s temples are available in the National Library (listed in chronological order as they are cited in the catalogue, with the texts without date at the end):

- *Alaγbayiba, Emčinar, Ėruqai, Gangjuur-yin, Gürim-yin, Solγ-a-yin, Keüken noyan-u sitügen, Barayun Gangjuur, Şümüμčen, Namsarai-yin, Barayun Ayusi-yin, Ėcub, Ėcęnyeniba (*?), e-ne olan jül-i darayalan bıçıgsen debter dangsa. Törö gereltü-yin goriduyar on. ‘Inventory booklet of the items of Alagbaiv,67 the Medical College, the Astrological College, the Kanjur Temple, the Temple for Religious Services, the Temple of Dharmapala Petition Offerings, the Temple of the Object of Worship of the Khüükhen Noyon, the Western Temple of the Kanjur, the Printing House, the Kubera Temple, the Western Temple of Amitāyus, Temple for Long Life Practices, and Tšedennyiba,68 written in the 20th year of the reigning period of Daoguang Emperor.’ 1840. 204 pages. Size of the pages: 27 x 22 cm. No. 5323. 4644 v 4544. 294:9, A45. 5323/96.


- *Törü gereltü-yin qorin gɔyaðuγar on Vačir dar-a burqan-u sayumal körög burqan terigüten-i baiγčaγ(s)an dangsa. ‘Revised inventory of the statues of Buddhas and deities, thangkas and other objects of the Vajradhara Temple, written in the 22nd year of Daoguang Emperor’s reigning period.’ 1842. 100 pages. Size: 27 x 27 cm. No. 3375/96. 4591. 294. T-892.


- *Dar-a eke-yin Rigsunyombo-yin Labring Kalba-yin Jangčangdongbo-yin bügüde sayumal körög burqan nuyud-i büridekgsen dangsa. Bürintü jasayči-yin 11-düger on. ‘Inventory registering the statues and thangkas of Buddhas and deities of the Tārā Temple, the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas, the (Vajra) Palace, the Kālacakra Temple, and the Temple with the Tall Victory Flag. [Written] in the 11th year of

---

67 Alagbaiv is another name of Baruun örgöö, the Yurt Palace in the West of the Yellow Palace, which refers to the Yurt Palace of Abatai Khan (1534–1589).

68 This name cannot be identified at the present state of research.

69 To have a complete picture about the temples and their objects of worship we have to consider the movings of the temples in 1839 and 1855, and the fact that the Kālacakra Temple and the Tārā Temple burnt down in 1892 but were rebuilt soon, which might have had impact on their properties.

- **Tangdantegčingling dukhang jegün barayun suburyan-u sayumal körög burqan-nuyud dangsa:** Bürintü jasayči-yin arban qoyaduyar on. ‘Inventory of the statues and images of Buddhas and deities of the Gandantegchenlin Temple and in the Eastern and Western Stūpas, written in the 12th year of Tongzhi Emperor’s reigning period.’ 1872. 31 pages. 26 x 26 cm. No. 3487/96. 4595. 294. G–19. 296.70

- **Barayun örgügen-ü burqan nom alibā yawum-a-(n)u dangsa:** Badarayultu törö-yin 29-du ger on. ‘Inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and other objects of the Western Yurt Palace. [Written] in the 29th year of Xuantong Emperor’s reigning period.’ 1903. 9 pages. Size: 25 x 26 cm. No. 5041/96. 4546. 294: 33C7. 5. B–266. 296.


- **Mongol ulus-un 19 on namur čay-tu Vačirdar-a Dečingkalba-yin bui büküi yawum-a-nu dangsa:** ‘Inventory of all items of the Vajradhara Temple and the Kālacakra Temple [written] in autumn, in the 19th year of the Mongolian State.’ Presumably 1929. 76 pages. Size: 26 x 26 cm. No. 1342/96. 4620. 902 (517.3). O–605.


- **Dedeği örgüge-yin dangsa:** ‘Inventory of the Upper Yurt Palace’. Without date. 8 pages. No. 8208/96 or 2208/96. 4618. 902. D–966. 902.91. 26 x 25 cm.71

- **Naimaduyar dūr-i-yin Boyda gegegen ten-ü lüngden-ayer bayiγulγyusγan Sirabpelyeγleng sum-e-yin takily-i-nar ba alban-γ/kümüγ/n-γ/n tysiγl-un dotoγrako kideγ alba kereγleγ jüil-iγen todoγqavlan bič/k ergüγγen dangsa:** ‘Tasks and properties handled by the offering preparers and the staff [officials] of Sharavpeljeelin süm, founded by the order of the Eighth Bogd Gegeen [the Green Palace].’ Without date. 30 pages. No 3755/96. 25 x 24 cm. 3755/96.

- **Duyan-γ Şaddubgimbil jangčubling-yin burqan nom eldeγ kereγsel-i bayiγčγγyusγan dangsa:** ‘Revised inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and other

---

70 The titles of the documents and their titles in the catalogues are not the same in many cases. Cf. Rinchen 1959. Bürintü jasayči-yin arban qoyaduyar on-du: Tangdantegčingling dukhang: jegün barayun suburyan-u sayumal körög burqan-ud-i bayiγčγγyusγi sinedkgesen debeγ.

71 Deed örgöö is another name for the Green Palace, however, the text requires further studies.
equipment of Shaddüvgempel Janchüvlin hermitage.’ Without date. 75 pages. 3419/96. 25 x 25.5 cm.

- Dayan-u Šaddubgimbil ğangčubling-yin burqan nom eldeb keregset-i bayičaywysan dangsa. ‘Revised inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and other equipment of Shaddüvgempel Janchüvlin hermitage.’ 96 pages. 3416/91. 25 x 26.5 cm.

6. List of Mongolian Inventories Kept in the National Archives

The National Archives possess the following relevant texts [with Modern Mongolian titles in chronological order]:

- Tus datsangiin [ Dashsamdanlin datsan ] burkhan nom zereg eldev yumiig bürtgen temdeglesen dans. ‘Inventory registering the images of Buddhas and deities, books and other items of Dashsamdanlin datsan.’ 1854. M–97, D–1, 1. 9 pages.
- Tus gazriin [ Dayanii Shaddüvlingiin khiid ] burkhan nom eldev khreglelii shalgan üzsen dans. ‘Revised inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books, and other implements of Shaddüvlin hermitage.’ 1897. M–137, D–1, 2. 36 pages.

---

72 This text might be very similar to the previous one.
73 This inventory was written after the foundation of the temple.
• **Choijindechindevshsümbürilen datsangiin burkhan shüteen, nom sudar, dugan jasiin ed khereglegiig todorkhoilson dans.** ‘Inventory [made after] clarification of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and implements of the temple building and financial unit of Choijindechindevshsümbürilen datsan.’ 1913. A–77, D–1, 1. 6 pages.

• **Choijindechindevshsümbürilen datsangiin burkhan shüteen, nom sudar, dugan jasiin ed khereglegiig todorkhoilson dans.** ‘Inventory [made after] clarification of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and the implements of Choijindechindevshsümbürilen datsan.’ 1914. A–77, D–1, 2. 6 pages.

• **Choijindechindevshsümbürilen datsangiin burkhan shüteen, nom sudar, dugan jasiin ed khereglegiig todorkhoilson dans.** ‘Inventory [made after] clarification of the images of Buddhas and deities, books, and the implements of Choijindechindevshsümbürilen datsan.’ 1914. A–77, D–1, 3. 6 pages.

• **Tus aimgiin [Makhamayaagiin aimag] burkhan shüteen, nom sudar busad khreglel, ed khogshlii dans.** ‘Inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and other implements, properties of Makhamayaa aimag.’ 1914. A–96, D–1, 1. 42 pages.

• **Tus aimgiin [Jasiin aimag] nom burkhan, chimeg khereglegel, bügd ed khogshil tergüütii dans.** ‘Inventory of the books, images of Buddhas and deities, decorations, and all other properties of Jasiin aimag.’ 1915. A–97, D–1, 1. 31 pages.


• **Tus aimgiin [Vangain aimag] burkhan nom, eldev khereglegel, ed khogshlii dans.** ‘Inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books, various implements and properties of Vangain aimag. 1916. A–109, D–1, 4. 48 pages.

• **Tus aimgiin burkhan nom, jasiin ed khogshlii dans [Dagdanlin aimag, Maimaa khot].** ‘Inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books, and properties of the financial unit of Dagdanlin aimag situated in the Chinese merchant town.’ 1916. A–116, D–1, 4. 33 pages.


• **[Maidar] Datsangiin altan, möngön khereglegiin tukhai bichig.** ‘Document about the golden and silver implements of the Maitreya Temple’. 1921. SKh–190, D–1, 3. 1 page.

• **[Vangain aimgiin] burkhan nominiin edlel khereglegel zergiig bürtgej todorkhoilson dans.** ‘Inventory [made after] registration and clarification of the images of Buddhas and deities, books, implements and other items of Vangain aimag’. 1921. Kh–200, D–1, 1. 52 pages.

---

74 Different names of this temple are known, e.g. Choijidechindashsümbrellin.
- [Idgaachoinzinlin] Datsangiin burkhan ba tüümi khereglel ed khogshil zergiin bürtgel dans. ‘Inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, implements, and properties of Idgaachoinzinlin College.’ 1922. SKh–189, D–1, 12. 20 pages.
- [Mergen nonom khanni aimgiin] Burkhan nom, takhiliin kheregleliin züüliig shinechlen bichsen dans. ‘Written anew inventory of the images of Buddhas and deities, books and offering implements of Mergen nonom khanni aimag’. 1924. SKh–219, D–1, 11. 18 pages.
- Burkhan nomiin ba busad ed khogshlii kholbogdoltoi bürtgel. ‘Register related to the images of Buddhas and deities, books, and properties’. 1938. SKh–179, D–1, 525. 16 pages.\footnote{This text is part of the catalogue of the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs. Further research is required to determine which temples it registered.}
- [Maidar] Datsangiin shine khuuchin burkhanii ba ed khogshlii bürtgel dans. ‘Inventory registering the old and new images of Buddhas and deities, and properties of the Maitreya Temple’. Without date. SKh–190, D–1, 32. 5 pages.
7. List of the Tibetan Inventories

The first inventory of the Vajra Palace was written in 1894. It was updated after twelve years in 1906, together with the completed inventory of the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas which was originally written in 1895. In 1909 many texts were revised or newly written. The Tibetan inventories kept in the National Archives and the National Library are as follows (in presumed chronological order):

- **rRyal ba rdo rje 'chang gi lha khang gi rten gsum gyi dkar chag/ ‘Inventory of the Three Receptacles of the Vajradhara Temple’. Without date. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 65. 1r–16r.**

- **Rigs gsum lha khang gi phyag dpe’i dkar chag/ sa mo sbrul lo’i hor zla drug pa’i tshes bco lnga’i nyin/ ‘Inventory of the Scriptures kept in the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas, written on the 15th of the 6th lunar month of the Female Earth–Snake year.’ Presumably 1869 (or 1929). National Archives. M–224, D–1, 70. 1r–50r.**

- **mDo sngags bang mdzod e wam dga’ ’khyil rdo rje pho brang du bzhugs su gsol ba’i rten tho dkar chag/ rab byung bco lnga’i rgyal pa ces pa shing pho rta lo’i hor zla bzhi ba’i tshes gcig pa’i nyin/ ‘Inventory of the Objects of Worship Kept in the Treasury of Sutras and Mantras, the E-Wam Dga’-’khyil Vajra Palace written on the 1st day of the 4th lunar month of the Male Wood–Horse year called rgyal pa (for ba) of the 15th cycle.’ 1894. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 71. 1r–6r.**

- **Rigs gsum mgon po’i lha khang g(y)yi rten gsum gyi dkar chag/ rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi myos byed ces bya ba shing mo lug lo’i hor zla bdun pa’i tshes bzang nyin la legs par bsgrigs pa bzhin du bris so/ ‘Inventory of the Three Receptacles of the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas properly written on an auspicious day of the 7th lunar month of the Female Wood–Sheep year, called myos byed of the 15th cycle.’ 1895. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 72. 1r–5v.**

- **mDo sngags bang mdzod e wam dga’ ’khyil rdo rje pho brang du bzhugs su gsol ba’i rten tho dkar chag/ rab byung bco lnga’i zil gnon ces pa me pho rta lo’i sa ga zla bar gsar du bris so/ ‘Inventory of the Objects of Worship Kept in the Treasury of Sutras and Mantras, E-Wam Dga’-’khyil Vajra Palace Renewed at the Lunar New**

---


77 It might be the first Tibetan inventory of this temple.

78 It should be the first Tibetan inventory of this temple. It was first updated in 1906.
Year of the Male Fire–Horse year called *zil gnon* of the 15th cycle.’ 1906. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 58. 1r–8v.

- Rigs gsum mgon po’i lha khang g(y)i rten gsum gyi dkar chag/ rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi zil gnon ces bya ba’i me pho rta lo’i sa ga zla ba’i bzang nyin la gsar du legs par bris so/ ‘Inventory of the Three Receptacles of the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas corrected and renewed at the beginning of the Lunar New Year of the Male Fire–Horse year called *zil gnon* of the 15th cycle.’ 1906. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 59. 1r–20v.

- Rigs gsum mgon po’i lha khang g(y)i rten gsum gyi dkar chag/ rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi zhi ba ces bya ba’i sa mo bya lo’i sa ga zla ba’i tshes bco lnga’i nyin langs gsar du legs par bris/ ‘Inventory of the Three Receptacles of the Temple of the Three Bodhisattvas corrected and renewed on the 15th day of the Lunar New Year of the Female Earth–Hen year called *zhi ba* of the 15th cycle.’ 1909. National Library. 294 pages.

- *rGyal mtshan mthon po’i phyag dpe’i dkar chag/ rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi zhi ba ces bya ba’i sa mo bya lo’i sa ga zla ba’i tshes bco lnga’i nyin la gsar du leg par bris/ ‘Inventory of Books of the [Yurt Temple] with the Tall Victory Flag, revised and renewed on the 15th day of the new, Female Earth–Hen year called *zhi ba* of the 15th cycle.’ 1909. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 65. 1r–11v.


- *mDo sngags bang mdzod e wam dga’ ’khyil rdo rje pho brang du bzhugs su gsol pa’i rten tho dkar chag rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi zhi ba zhes bya ba sa mo bya lo’i hor zla lnga pa’i yar ngo’i tshes drug gi nyin la gsar du bris pa lags/ ‘Inventory of the Objects of Worship Kept in the Treasury of Sutras and Mantras, E-Wam Dga’-’khyil Vajra Palace renewed on the 6th day of the waxing moon of the 5th lunar month of the Female Earth–Hen year called *zhi ba* of the 15th cycle.’ 1909. National Library. 32 pages.

- *rGyal ba rdo rje ’chang gi drung du rten gsum gyi mtshan tho/ rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi zhi ba zhes bya ba sa mo bya lo’i hor zla lnga pa’i yar ngo’i tshes drug gi nyin la gsar du bris pa lags/ ‘List of the Three Receptacles surrounding [the statue

---

79 The original text written in 1894 was updated in 1906.
80 This long text describes the table of contents of books of the temple and updates the previous versions. It was written on the same day as the next text.
81 This text was written on the same day as the previous text. The original version of this text is not available at the present state of research.
82 This text was written on the same day as the previous and the next texts.


• Ri bo dge rgyas dga’ ldan bshad sgrub gling gi rten gyi gtso bo rgyal ba rdo rje ’chang gi nye ’khor rten gsbum bzhugs su gsal ba’i dkar chag rab byung bco lnga’i nang gi zhi ba zhes bya ba sa mo bya lo’i hor zla lnga ba’i yar ngo’i tshes drug gi nyin la gsar du bris pa lags/ ‘Inventory of the Three Receptacles surrounding Vajradhara, the principal object of worship of Urga, renewed on the 6th day of the waxing moon of the 5th lunar month of the Female Earth–Hen year called zhi ba of the 15th cycle.’ National Archives. M–224, D–1, 64. 17r–28v.


• Khe’u kheng no yon gyi rten gsrum gyi mtshan tho bkod pa’i/ rab byung bco lnga nang tshan zhi ba zhes bya ba sa mo bya lo’i hor zla brgyad pa’i tshes brgyad la bris pa’i phyag dpe dkar chag ni/ ‘Inventory Book of the Three Receptable of the [Temple of the] Khüükhen Noyon; written on the 8th day of the 8th month of the Female Earth–Hen year called zhi ba of the 15th cycle.’ 1909. National Archives. M–224, D–1, 61. 1r–8r.


83 This name refers here not to the main assembly hall but to the Yellow Palace and whole Urga.
84 This text might be the continuation of the text mentioned below.
85 This text and the following one were written on the same day. They are almost similar.
86 It is the first inventory of this temple.
87 It is a detailed table of contents of the books of the temple.
Conclusion

Although the majority of the Buddhist images, ritual texts and other documents existed once in Urga had been burnt during the monastery demolitions in 1937–1938, still much more remained from Urga’s written culture than the written materials of rural monasteries. Rinchen’s statement related to the inventories of monasteries is confirmed in the case of Urga: many of its inventories have survived, and the inventories of the most significant temples were updated from time to time.

It seems that the *dkar chags* written in Tibet were much more detailed than the inventories written in Urga: in Tibet the lists of the holy objects were mostly parts of detailed descriptions of holy sites which documented the history behind the “receptacles.” However, the studied inventories of Urga do not contain such stories, but were written as very precise registers listing the sacred statues, thangkas and religious texts of the temples, as well as other properties in many cases.

In different periods of Mongolian history (Manchu period, Bogd Khaan’s reign, socialism) inventories might have been written for different purposes. Although both the Mongolian and the Tibetan texts should be considered as inventories of the Three Receptacles and can be used for the identification of the internal appearance and furniture of the temples, the Tibetan inventories can be regarded “different” than the Mongolian ones due to their special format, special ink, special letters, Russian paper, and content. The shape of Tibetan inventories recall Buddhist texts, which means that they might have been written for religious purposes. Mongolian inventories might have been used as bases for the Tibetan ones, but confirmation of this possibility requires further research. The reason for completing the inventories might have been in connection with the Manchu emperors or the Bogd Gegeens’ orders, with the foundation or moving of temples or financial purposes or simply registration of the *jas* properties. Supposedly, many monks

---

88 It might have been written in 1909, but should be compared with other inventories of this temple to determine its date.
89 This is the Tibetan transcription of Shüteenii örgöö.
90 The outer appearance of this document differs from the others.
worked together in the identification and measuring of the objects, and a scribe or the storekeepers of the temples’ treasury wrote the inventories.

The original place of the inventories in Urga and their later assortment are also debatable questions: they might have been preserved in the temples or financial units of the given temples until 1937, or the most special ones in the treasury of the Bogd Gegeen, or in the library of the Main Assembly Hall, and possessed by the Institute of Sciences after the monastery demolitions.

The inventories illustrate the richness of Urga’s temples and may help scholars to ascertain which items were actually available. They can also serve as a basis for comparison with the photos of monasteries, reminders of old monks and museum exhibits that remained from Urga. The thorough study of the content of the inventories could authenticate the dates and chain of possession of famous sculptures and thangkas, for instance the masterpieces of Zanabazar. Meanwhile, the inventories illustrate temple properties in the fields of art and economic history of Urga, and also contain the special vocabulary of Buddhist art.
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