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Abstract: the paper presents eleven fragments of Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā identified during analysis of the Tibetan texts from Khara-khoto kept in the IOM, RAS. In 2019 as an intermediate result of a project ‘Compilation of the Catalogue of the Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto preserved at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS’ being done by researchers of the Institute thirty-three fragments that had been added to Khara-khoto collection by mistake, were transferred to a separate collection of Tibetan texts from Dunhuang. Although the edited fragments of Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā cannot be considered to be unique they are worth studying in terms of codicology.
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Being a part of the manuscript holdings of the Institute of Oriental manuscripts, RAS, Tibetan texts from Dunhuang are kept as a separate collection under call numbers Дх.Тиб. (abbreviation for ‘Dunhuang Tibetan’). The majority of the texts included in this collection are well-known thanks to the catalogue edited by L.S. Savitskii² and several publications made by M.I. Vorobiova-Desiatovskaja,³ A.V. Zorin⁴ and K. Iwao.⁵ Meanwhile, a new research project carried out by A. Zorin, A. Sizova and A. Turanskaya has revealed that
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¹ The study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Project No. 14-06-00460, “The Compilation of the Catalogue of the Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto preserved at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS”.
² Savitski 1991.
³ Vorobiova-Desiatovskaja 1995.
⁴ Zorin 2012a; Zorin 2012b; Zorin 2017; Zorin 2018.
⁵ Iwao 2011.
some Tibetan texts preserved in the Khara-khoto collection are of Dunhuang origin.⁶

This consumption is rather plausible concerning the fact that Tibetan texts found in the Big Mound hoard in the Tangut (Tib. Mi nyag, Chinese Xi xia 西夏) fortified town of Khara-khoto and kept in St. Petersburg have not been properly sorted and arranged until recently.⁷ It is known that the Tibetan books were transferred to the Asiatic Museum (now the IOM, RAS) on May 3 (April 20, according to the Gregorian Calendar), 1911. Dunhuang and other Central Asian collections were partly mixed up during the Soviet time, and in the late 1960s it was not an easy task to identify Tibetan texts from Khara-khoto when the separate collection was first formed. By 1970, 70 book fragments acquired code XT (abbreviation for “Хара-хото, Тибетский” (Khara-khoto, Tibetan). Later the collection of Tibetan texts was enlarged and, by 2018, included 194 call numbers.⁸ As a result of collection preliminary study in the framework of the above mentioned project, it became clear that thirty-three items from Dunhuang had been transferred to Khara-Khoto collection of Tibetan texts by mistake. In 2019 they were returned to the collection of Tibetan texts from Dunhuang and obtained new call numbers⁹:

| XT 2 → Дх. Тиб.222 | XT 31 → Дх. Тиб.233 | XT 70 → Дх. Тиб.244 |
| XT 4 → Дх. Тиб.223 | XT 32 → Дх. Тиб.234 | XT 77 → Дх. Тиб.245 |
| XT 11 → Дх. Тиб.224 | XT 33 → Дх. Тиб.235 | XT 80 → Дх. Тиб.246 |
| XT 12 → Дх. Тиб.225 | XT 34 → Дх. Тиб.236 | XT 81 → Дх. Тиб.247 |
| XT 13 → Дх. Тиб.226 | XT 35 → Дх. Тиб.237 | XT 82 → Дх. Тиб.248 |
| XT 14 → Дх. Тиб.227 | XT 39 → Дх. Тиб.238 | XT 83 → Дх. Тиб.249 |
| XT 15 → Дх. Тиб.228 | XT 46 → Дх. Тиб.239 | XT 84 → Дх. Тиб.250 |
| XT 17 → Дх. Тиб.229 | XT 50 → Дх. Тиб.240 | XT 85 → Дх. Тиб.251 |
| XT 24 → Дх. Тиб.230 | XT 52 → Дх. Тиб.241 | XT 86 → Дх. Тиб.252 |
| XT 29 → Дх. Тиб.231 | XT 56 → Дх. Тиб.242 | XT 92 → Дх. Тиб.253 |
| XT 30 → Дх. Тиб.232 | XT 57 → Дх. Тиб.243 | XT 97 → Дх. Тиб.254 |

⁶ Hypothetically speaking, these book fragments could be found in Khara-khoto as it is well-known that manuscripts produced in Dunhuang were distributed to other places (Iwao 2012, 104). However, as Dunhuang manuscript fragments are not found in the Stein’s collection of Tibetan books from Khara-khoto preserved in the British library, this speculation is rather unlikely.

⁷ This fact was indicated in Vorobiova-Desiatovskaja 1995, 46; Takeuchi 2016, 323; Zorin, Sizova 2019.

⁸ History of the collection is provided in Zorin, Sizova 2019.

These items are variegated in terms of writing style and contents and include:

- canonical (i.e. found in the Bka’ ’gyur (Prajñāpāramitā cycle Дх. Тиб.222; Дх. Тиб.224; Дх. Тиб.236; Дх. Тиб.225; Дх. Тиб.226; Дх. Тиб.227; Дх. Тиб.229; Дх. Тиб.239; Дх. Тиб.248; Дх. Тиб.251; Дх. Тиб.252 and other texts Дх. Тиб.230; Дх. Тиб.235; Дх. Тиб.238; Дх. Тиб.247) and Bstan ’gyur (Дх. Тиб.249; Дх. Тиб.250),
- other Buddhist texts (Дх. Тиб.231; Дх. Тиб.233; Дх. Тиб.237; Дх. Тиб.241; Дх. Тиб.243; Дх. Тиб.244; Дх. Тиб.253; Дх. Тиб.254; Дх. Тиб.232),
- several fragments of documents (Дх. Тиб.223; Дх. Тиб.228; Дх. Тиб.245; Дх. Тиб.246) and glegs tshas covers (Дх. Тиб.234; Дх. Тиб.240; Дх. Тиб.242).

The present article deals with eleven fragments of the canonical text Śataśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā kept under call numbers Дх. Тиб.222, Дх. Тиб.224, Дх. Тиб.236, Дх. Тиб.225, Дх. Тиб.226, Дх. Тиб.227, Дх. Тиб.239, Дх. Тиб.248, Дх. Тиб.251 and Дх. Тиб.252.

It is well known that the established scriptorium in Tibetan-ruled Dunhuang (786–848) was engaged in the ambiguous project of copying various Buddhist texts in both Tibetan and Chinese languages on behalf of the Tibetan emperor. According to numerous previous studies, Śataśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā was vastly copied during the reign of the Tibetan king Khri gtsug lde btsan (815–841). According to S. van Schaik, about 14,000 sheets of Śataśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra in pothī format are preserved nowadays in world manuscript holdings. The roll-type copies are not rare either. Thus, the above-mentioned fragments of Śataśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra do not seem much promising for the researchers of Tibetan history and culture. However, their edition and further study can be useful in codicological and paleographical aspects.

---

10 The edition of the fragment is presented in TAKEUCHI 1995.
11 The fragment is mentioned in TAKEUCHI 2013, 103.
12 IWAO 2013, 111.
14 This term is used to indicate a variation of a scroll, oriented horizontally IWAO 2013; DOTSON, HELMAN-WAZNY 2016, 36.
The fragments are parts of nine different rolls. Full dimensions and completeness of the latter remain unknown as fragments are too small to speculate. However, the textual collation gives enough evidence to suppose that the text columns and, thus, paper panels which were attached together with adhesive, differed in length.15

The writing style of these Tibetan fragments is dbu can that contains several features of Old Tibetan writing such as reverse gi gu, da drag, ma ya btags, medial ’a (e.g. bka’s), ’a rten (e.g. pa’), which are common for Dunhuang manuscripts. Particles ’i and ’o (with the letter ’a chung) are quite often separated from the preceding syllables with the tsheg sign (e.g. bcu ’i, bya ’o, etc.). A special ligature for the combination sp- (as in spyod or spong, etc.) is used, it is similar to the one used in dbu med script.

The ductus of all fragments is alike (except for Дх. Тиб.227, Дх. Тиб.239) and renders so-called ‘sutra style’16 with minor specific features that allows to suppose that the manuscripts were produced in the same scriptorium.17 Дх. Тиб.227, Дх. Тиб.239 are more likely to be written in ‘square style’.18 Paleographical features clearly indicate that the Tibetan manuscripts were carefully prepared and written. The handwritings are neat and legible while corrections and corrector’s interpolations into the main text are minor. They are inserted into the texts by ‘+’ sign.

The codicological description and edition of the fragments are presented below. The fragments are identified with relevant places in the later canonical Derge edition (D), thanks to the search tool available at the web site of the Buddhist Digital Research Center (BDRC). The Derge edition was also used to fill the lacunae found in the fragments although the original texts must have had certain differences.

---

15 Each paper panel has two or three columns, in which Tibetan text is written horizontally. The roll-type Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā sūtras from Dunhuang are produced on panels which are ca. 27.5 cm high and have 15 to 19 lines per column (DOTSON, HELMAN-WAZNY 2016, 63).

16 This style is rather typical for Dunhuang documents and was used by scribes to write Buddhist texts at some speed while retaining legibility. A more detailed description is found in VAN SCHAIK 2013, 122–123; VAN SCHAIK 2014, 309–312.

17 For the ductus of the five fragments a reduction of strokes and pen-lifts is typical. The head of ga and kha is triangle in shape; ba is triangle with flat head stroke; ’a in the majority of cases is written without ’tail-stroke’ on the bottom right.

18 The square style appears in several documents from the library cave at Dunhuang and is often dated back to the late eighth and mid-ninth centuries (VAN SCHAIK 2014, 309). The preserved text of the fragment includes all specifications typical for this style: ta shows similarity with Brāhmī ṭa; diagonal line extends across the whole letter pha, from right top tip to bottom left corner; ba in square shape; la has long flat “head” on right vertical.
The edition uses a system developed by A. Zorin for the project.\textsuperscript{19} Texts of the fragments are given in bold type, the lacunae being put in the angle brackets and marked with italics. Crossed syllables are put in quotation marks "". Interpolations that could be considered scribe’s or corrector’s corrections are given in curly brackets. Special Tibetan letters and signs used for rendering of Sanskrit words and syllables are transliterated with use of diacritics — ą, ĭ, m, ť, etc. The reverse gi gu sign is marked with a capital I.

The · and : signs render tsheg and double tsheg signs\textsuperscript{20} correspondingly. Intervals between words and shad (|) signs are rendered with underscores. Marked margins are indicated by sign ¦.

1.  Độ. Tu6.222 (XT 2)\textsuperscript{21}

Fragment. 17.2\times 16.8 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, medium thick paper of light brownish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines by drypoint (1.5 cm).
Tears, creases, holes, surface grim.
D: ‘bum, nga, 335a/3–335a/6.

\begin{verbatim}
<bya‘bar‘g>na‘s‘par‘myi‘bya‘o|__dmyigs‘pa‘l‘tshul‘gyis‘thog‘ma‘dang‘
tha‘<ma> [2]
bar‘gua‘<s par> [3]
<pa‘stong pa> [4]
<nyid m>‘thsan‘ma‘yod‘ces‘bya‘ba‘dang‘|mtshan‘ma‘myed‘ces‘bya‘
bar‘gn‘<s par‘myi> [5]
pa‘nyi|\textsuperscript{d} [6]
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{19} It will be used for the edition of the catalogue of the Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto preserved at the IOM, RAS. Its aim is to render all textual aspects of the fragments, including orthographical peculiarities, gaps, various auxiliary signs, etc.

\textsuperscript{20} The double tsheg is a rare form found only in early inscriptions, some legal, administrative, ritual documents, and sutras (\textit{Dotson, Helman-Wazny} 2016, 83).

\textsuperscript{21} The fragment was edited by A. Sizova.

\textsuperscript{22} Interpolation res (?) between lines 4 and 5.

\textsuperscript{23} Cross sign between lines 5 and 6.
2. Дх. Тиб.224 (XT 11), Дх. Тиб.236 (XT 34)
Joint fragments.\(^{25}\) 23.8×25.9, 15.9×25.3 cm.
`Woven`, one-layered, thin, even paper of light brown-yellowish colour.
Verso is blank. Guidelines in ink (line spacing 1.5 cm). Margins are marked out in ink.
Cut paper edges.

\[^{24}\] Paper perforation between nya and da.

\(^{25}\) The fragments will probably be pasted together after conservation procedures. Text of Дх.Тиб. 236 is marked by dash line in transliteration.
pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·bsam·gtan·kyi·pha·rol|__[7]__
d·u·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad|__[8]__

<myed·pa'1·phyir>y<r|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·nang·stong·pa·nyid·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi|__[9]__

rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·phya·stong·pa·nyid·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad|__[10]__
tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad|__[11]__

myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·phyi·nang·stong·pa·nyid·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·stong|__[12]__

pa·nyid·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·chen·pa·stong·pa·nyid|__[13]__
tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·don·dam·pa·stong·pa·nyid|__[14]__
tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·

don·dam|"dus·byas·stong·pa·nyid·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes|__[15]__

|rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do|sha"e" ra·dwa·ti'i·bu·

\[\text{dus·ma·byas·stong·pa·nyid·tshad·myed·pa'1·phyir|shes rab}\]__

\[\text{she\textless rav·kyi pha rol tu phyin pa tshad myed do|sha\textgreater ra dwa ti'i bu dor\textgreater ba myed pa stong pa nyid tshad myed pa'1 phyir|shes rab}\]__[3]__

| kyi| __[4]__

\[\text{rol tu phyin pa tshad myed do|sha\textgreater ra dwa ti'i bu rang bzhi n stong pa nyid tshad myed pa'1 phyir|shes rab\}__

\[\text{kyi|__[5]__}

\[\text{du phyin|__[6]__}

\[\text{pa|__[7]__}

\[\text{du phyIn|__[8]__}

\[\text{pa|__[9]__}

\[\text{pa|__[10]__}

\[\text{pa|__[11]__}

\[\text{pa|__[12]__}

\[\text{pa|__[13]__}

\[\text{pa|__[14]__}

\[\text{pa|__[15]__}

26.\[\text{First two lines (kiye pha rol tu phyin pa tshad myed do|sha\textgreater ra dwa ti'i bu mtha' l\textgreater das pa stong pa nyid tshad myed pa'1 phyir|shes rab kyi|__[1]__ pha rol tu phyin pa tshad my ed do|sha\textgreater ra dwa ti'i bu thog ma dang tha ma myed pa stong pa nyid tshad myed pa'1 phyir\}__ are absent.}
3. Дх. Тиб.225 (XT 12)
Fragment. 10.1×10.1 cm.
Laid (4 laid lines/cm), double-layered, medium thick paper of light brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in ink (line spacing 1.5 cm).
Cut paper edges.
D: 'bum, nya, 65a/1–65a/3

27 The precise lines separation is impossible.
4. *Дх. Тиб.226* (XT 13)

Fragment. 12.9 x 14.3 cm.
Laid (4 laid lines/cm), double-layered, medium thick paper of light brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5 cm).
Cut paper edges.
*D: ‘bum, nga, 326b/1–326b/4*

<myi sto>ng ’zhes ’bya ’bar ’g<nas par’myi bya’o|dmyigs pa’i tshul gyis|> [1]

__mye’i’kham mtshan ma’yod ces ’bya ’ba’ dang mtshan<mar myed ces ’bya bar gnas> [2]
__par’myl ’bya’o| dmyigs pa’i tshul gyis “mye’i’kham<|s>” smon pa [3]

__pa’myed ces ’bya ’bar ’gna’as par’myl ’bya’o| dmyi<gs pa’i tshul gyis| rlung> [4]

__gi’kham rtag ces ’bya ’ba’ dang| myi’rtag ces ’bya ’bar<|gnas par’myi’ bya’o> [5]

__dmyigs pa’i tshul gyis’rlung gi’kham bde’zhes<’bya ba dang| sbug’ bsang’ zhes> [6]

__’bya’bar’gna’as par’myl ’bya’o| dmyigs pa’i tshul<gyis| rlung gi kham’ bdag ces> [7]

__bya’ba’ dang’bdag’myed ces ’bya’ bar’gna’as par’myl<bya’o| dmyigs ’pa’i tshul> [8]

__gyis’rlung gi’kham sdbg ces ’bya’ ba’ dang’myl’sdug<ces ’bya’ bar’ gnas par’myi bya’o|> [9]

5. *Дх. Тиб.227* (XT 14)

Fragment. 7.0 x 9.5 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, thin, even paper of light yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.3–1.5 cm)
Cut paper edges, tears.
*D: ‘bum, kha, 59a/6–59b/2*

<becom ldan’ das’ gal te’ byang’ chub’ sens dpas’ sens dpas>”chep’posh’<es: rab kyi pha’ rol tu phyin’ pa’ la’ spyod pa’ai” [1]

---

28 The precise lines separation is impossible.
6. Дх. Тиб.239 (XT 46)

Two fragments of the same manuscript of the same size. 8.7×8.6 cm.
Laid (4/cm), multi-layered, medium thick, even paper of light yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5 cm)
Cut paper edges, creases.
Fragment no. 1
D: 'bum, nya, 326b/4–327a/4

<s>shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe|<shes shes shes shes shes</s><br>
<shes shes shes shes shes</shes>
chos phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|chos dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe_mig gi rna|mar|par|shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|myig gi rnam par|shes pa dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe_rna ba'i rnam par|shes pa sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par|shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par|shes pa dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe|reg|pa sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|reg pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|reg pa dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe_tshor ba sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|tsor|ba phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|sred pa sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|sred pa dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe len|pa sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|len pa dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab gyl pha rol du phyi|< pa la spyod pa'i tshe|srid pa sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|srid pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|srid pa dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe skye ba phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|skye ba dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe_rga shi sngon gyl mthar myi dnyigs so|_|rga shi phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_|rga shi dbus su myi dnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la spyod pa'i tshe shyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa sngon gyi mthar myi dnyigs so|_|shyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dnyigs so|_}
7. Дх. Тиб.248 (XT 82)
Fragment. 26.5×17 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, medium thick, uneven paper of brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5 cm)
Cut paper edges, tears, holes. Traces of adhesive on the left side of the paper panel.
D: ‘bum, ja, 177b/5–178a/4

'dgos·po·myed·pa'i·ngo·bo·nyid·stong·pa·nyid·yongs·su·dag·pa·_dgos·po·myed·<pa'i·ngo·bo·nyid·stong·pa·nyid·> [1]
yongs·su·dag·pa·byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·te·|_de·ltar·na·byed·pa·po·yo·ngs·su·dag·pa·_dgos·po·myed·pa'i·ngos·bo·nyid·yongs·su·dag·pa·dl·la·gnyis·su·myed·de·g·nyis·su·byar·myed·so·so·ma·yin·tha·myi·<dad·do>·byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·<su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [2]
drang·ba·nye·bar·ghag·pa"yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [3]
drang·ba·nye·bar·ghag·pa"yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [4]
drang·ba·nye·bar·ghag·pa"yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [5]
drang·ba·nye·bar·ghag·pa"yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [6]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [7]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [8]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [9]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [10]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [11]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [12]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [13]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [14]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [15]
'yongs·su·dag·pas·yang·dag·pa·spong·ba·yongs·su·dag·pas·<byed·pa·po·yongs·su·dag·pas·di·ltar> [16]
8. Дх. Тиб.251 (XT 85)

Fragment. 10.7×9.2 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, thin, even paper of light yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5–2 cm)
Cut paper edges, surface abrasion.
D: ‘bum, ja, 260a/7–260b/4

<leč'i·′dus·te·reg pa'i·rkyen·kyis·tshor·ba·rnam·par·dag·pa·dang·_[rnam·pa·thams·cad·mKh]·y<en·pa·nyid·rnam·pa·
<dag·pa·′di·la·gnys·su·myed·de·gnys·su·byar·myed·so·so·ma·yin·tha·myi·
\[1\] da·d·do\_[myi·dmyigs·pa·stong·pa·nyid·\]
<rnam·par·dag·pas\_[rus·ki·′dus·te·reg·pa·rnam·par·dag·pas\_[rnyid·pa·[2\] te·reg·pa·rnam·par·dag·;

<pas\_[rnam·pa·thams·cad·mKh·y·pa·nyid·rnam·par·dag·pa·ste\_[de·lta>
\[4\] r·nā·myi·dmyigs·pa·stong·pa·nyid·rnam\]
<br·dag·pa·dang\_[rus·ki·′dus·te·reg·pa·rnam·par·dag·pas\_[rnyid·pa·[5\] thams·cad·mKh·y·pa·nyid·
\[6\] <rnam·par·dag·pa·′di·la·gnys·su·myed·de·gnys·su·byar·myed·so·so·ma·yin·
tha·myi·d·do\_[myi·dmyigs·pa·stong·;]

9. Дх. Тиб.252 (XT 86)\[29\]

Fragment. 16.2×13.3 cm.
Laid (4/cm), multi-layered, medium thick, even paper of brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5–1.7 cm)
Severely damaged: cut paper edges, tears, creases, surface abrasion.
D: ‘bum, nga, 107a/7–107b/3

<nyid·nyon·mons·pa·myed·<pa·ste\_gang·dang·yang·bral·bas·ma·yin·
\[1\] no\_[tshe·dang\>
<ldan·pa·sha·ra·dwa·ti'i·bu\_[dran·ba·nye·bar·g<zhag·pa·rnams·nyon·
mongs·pa·myed·[/2\>]
<pa·ste\_gang·da\_ng·yang·bral·bas·ma·yin·no\_[yang·dag·pa<r·spong·
\[3\] ba·rnams·nyon\>
<mongs·pa·myed·pa·ste\_<ang·dang·yang·>bral·bas·ma\_[yin·no\_[rdzu·
\[4\] ′phrul·kyi·rkang

\[29\] This call number includes two additional fragments of the same manuscript. The text does not corresopond to Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā and it probably part of the colophon (F.1: <...>su·bul·ba·las\_[chad·pa<...>; F.2: <...>i·chad·yig·dkar·ca<...>).
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