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Leaves from a Buddhist Manuscript of the
Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Text. Part A: India,
Bihar, Nālandā, ca. 1073; Part B: probably India, Bihar
(?), ca. mid-twelfth century.
Details, Buddhist Manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Text.
Part A: India, Bihar, Nālandā, ca. 1073.
58c.
Details, Buddhist Manuscript of the *Āstasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Text.
Part B: probably India, Bihar (?), ca. mid-twelfth century.
These paintings, rendered in a very skillful yet free and uninhibited manner, convey the sense of a folk art tradition rather than the work of a highly trained artist of the highest rank. The long, lanky figures of the two Buddhas and the monkeys and the happy facial expressions provide a sense of charm and humor, even though this might not have been the conscious intent of the artist. The draftsmanship is characterized by a slight unevenness of the line, and the coloration lacks the subtlety seen in the finest Pāla paintings. Charming, direct, and visually exciting, these paintings document the breadth of the Pāla painters’ art.
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1. This practice continues to the present day. It is unknown whether there was a Pāla period precedent for the practice.

2. Regrettably, most of the manuscripts that have reached the art market have not been kept intact. Illustrated leaves, which normally command high prices, are generally sold, while the less lucrative, but historically invaluable, leaves of text are often simply destroyed. This tragic situation has resulted in the loss of important historical and religious information and has led to the inaccurate perception of these paintings as decorative, rather than sacred, objects.


4. The second leaf from this manuscript is also in the collection of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, but could not be included in the exhibition. At one time, apparently four leaves from this manuscript were known. See Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, The Arts of India and Nepal: The Nasli and Alice Heeramanick Collection (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1966), 106, no. 112. In addition to the two leaves now in the Los Angeles collection, one more was illustrated and another was unillustrated. The present location of the latter two leaves is unknown.

5. Published in the Bengali script by Sarasi Kumar Sarasvati in Pāljug Chitrakāla [Painting of the Pāla Age] (Calcutta: Ananda Publishers, 1978), 143, and transliterated into Devanāgarī script in Pal, “A Forgotten Monastery of Ancient Bihar,” 83. Modifications to Pal’s transliteration have been made to conform to standard practices.

6. Published in the Bengali script by Sarasi Kumar Sarasvati in Pāljug Chitrakāla [Painting of the Pāla Age] (Calcutta: Ananda Publishers, 1978), 143, and transliterated into Devanāgarī script in Pal, “A Forgotten Monastery of Ancient Bihar,” 84. The Āpanaka monastery is also mentioned in inscriptions on four metal images from Kurkiār. See S. Huntington, The “Pāla-Śena” Schools of Sculpture, 211, nos. 10a, 215-216, nos. 12-23. The image inscriptions record the name as Āpanaka, while the manuscript spelling is Āpanaka, but the variation in the n or ṇ ligature probably reflects variations in orthography rather than a reference to two different institutions. Pal suggests that Āpanaka (Āpanaka) was located at Kurkiār.

7. The methodology applied in S. Huntington, The “Pāla-Śena” Schools of Sculpture, to define the schools of stone and metal sculpture was based on significant numbers of examples in similar styles found at specific sites or in limited regions. Stylistic definitions must be based on statistically significant numbers in order to determine trends and distinctions among various schools. A few surviving examples from one site cannot provide the breadth necessary for the identification of schools.

8. For some discussion of this complex problem, see D. C. Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, 2nd ed. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971), 243-244, 325; S. M. Ali, The Geography of the Paramas (New Delhi: People’s Publishing House, 1966), 179-181. Ali discusses the possibility that Malaya may refer to one of the dvīpas (islands) that supposedly protrude into the “southern ocean” off of India; however, he discounts the idea that it is an island and concludes that it is a reference to the southern tip of India itself. However, the suggestion that it is an island, or at least a land in the “southern ocean,” cannot be dismissed completely in light of the possibility that Malaya, like others of the six dvīpas in the list, might be located outside of India proper, for example, in Southeast Asia. The relationship between the name Malaya and the Malay Peninsula may be only coincidental; Ali identifies Anāga dvīpa as the Malay Peninsula (p. 179).

9. The subjects of the paintings on the third illustrated leaf are unknown.

10. It seems clear that the scene shown here is a pre-pardinivāna scene rather than the actual death. According to the Mahāpāravīrāna-sūtra, several teachings took place while Sākyamuni was on his death-bed. In Southeast Asia and Sri Lanka, distinctions are made between the actual death of the Buddha and representations of him while alive but reclining on the couch.

11. He is green in the taming of Nālāgiri scene in this same manuscript, thus suggesting that Ananda is specifically green in this particular manuscript.

12. This is also the case in the depictions of the descent from Trayastrīśa and the taming of Nālāgiri on the leaf that is not in the exhibition.
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LEAVES FROM A BUDDHIST MANUSCRIPT OF THE AŚTASĀHASRİKĀ PRAJĀPĀRAKITĀ TEXT

Part A (upper two illustrated leaves and leaf of text): India, Bihar, Nālandā
Ca. late eleventh century, Pāla period (colophon records date in fifteenth regnal year of King Vighrahapāla [III?], ca. 1073)
By the calligrapher bhāṇaka Ānanda of Nālandā

Part B (lower two illustrated leaves): India, Bihar (?) Ca. mid-twelfth century, Pāla period (colophon records a rededication in the eighth regnal year of King Gopāla [III?], ca. 1151)
Both parts: Water-based pigments on talipot palm leaf Each leaf approximately 2 3/8" by 22 1/4"
The Asia Society, New York, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller 3rd Collection (1987.1)
Illustrated in color

More than simply written sources of religious information, Buddhist manuscripts were revered as sacred objects in their own right (see cat. no. 57). Like other consecrated objects, manuscripts were not routinely discarded when they were damaged or partially destroyed. Instead, they were either stored away or repaired for continued use. Not only was it more expedient to replace missing or damaged folios than to recopy the text anew, but the spiritual power residing in the physical object was thereby preserved. Manuscripts that had been in the possession of revered teachers were considered to be especially
empowering. Restored, conserved, and ultimately passed on to disciples, such manuscripts were cherished as part of the physical legacy and religious authority of distinguished individuals.

The palm leaf manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, or Perfection of Transcendent Wisdom in Eight Thousand Verses, scripture to which these leaves belong is an example of just such a treasured object. Apparently renewed at some point in its history by the addition of replacement pages, the manuscript was the personal possession of such renowned individuals as Śākyamuni and Bu ston. The historical, cultural, and religious value of this manuscript is therefore immeasurable. Further, because it circulated in Tibet, particularly in the gTsang District, it may have been a specific instrument by which the Pāla style was disseminated in gTsang, making it a significant art historical document as well. Presently consisting of about one hundred leaves, of which four bear illustrations, the manuscript reveals its remarkable history through the style of its paintings and the information contained in its colophon inscriptions.

Although the paintings on the four illustrated folios form a complete iconographic group, they are executed in two distinct styles that are recognized easily by their differences in treatment of line, coloration, and other elements. The leaves of the first style, herewith designated Part A, are the two upper leaves as mounted for display and illustrated here. The two illustrated leaves beneath them are herewith designated Part B. While a difference in style might indicate that more than one artist helped to create the original manuscript, in this case it is more likely that the two styles reflect different phases of work, that is, the initial creation of the manuscript and a subsequent restoration. As will be discussed below, at some point in its history damage apparently occurred to this manuscript and new pages were inserted to replace lost or damaged leaves.

The fifth leaf included in the exhibition (mounted and illustrated as the lowermost leaf) bears inscriptions that help unravel the mystery of the two distinct artistic styles. Unillustrated itself except for two floral motifs, this leaf was the final text page of the original manuscript and bears a Sanskrit inscription recording the original dedication, a second Sanskrit inscription noting a later rededication, and three Tibetan inscriptions that reveal the history of the manuscript through about the fourteenth century.

The earliest Sanskrit inscription records the donation of the manuscript by an individual who is identified as a great Mahāyāna follower named Nāe Suta Śohā Śita. Written in the same script as the majority of the manuscript, this inscription appears to be contemporaneous with the Part A illustrated leaves. The offering was made on the second day of the dark half of the month of Phāṅgun in the fifteenth regnal year of King Vigrahapāla, who is identified in the inscription as the son of Nayapāla. The only father and son pair with these names in the Pāla lineage are King Nayapāla (reigned ca. 1042-1058) and his son King Vigrahapāla III (reigned ca. 1058-1085). The fifteenth year of Vigrahapāla's reign occurred around 1073, thus providing an approximate date for the creation of the original portion of the manuscript. The non-Sanskrit name of the donor suggests that the donor may have been a foreign visitor to India. The inscription further states that the scribe (bḥaṅka) was Ananda of Śrī Nālandā (monastery). Although it is not mentioned explicitly, it is likely that Ananda's work was carried out at Nālandā. The name of the painter is not given, but it may be inferred that the artist was also associated with Nālandā. The fact that the name of the painter is not mentioned suggests that in the culture of the time it was the copying of the sacred text that constituted the most important achievement. Ironically, today it is generally the illustrations that are most highly prized in western cultures. Perhaps the least important part of the manuscripts to their creators, the paintings are often preserved while the texts are discarded due to their perceived minimal monetary value.

The second Sanskrit inscription is in ligatures that are almost identical to those of the previous inscription, although minor differences in the hands are visible. It records a dedication of the manuscript that took place during the eighth year of the reign of King Gopāla. Although there are three kings named Gopāla in the Pāla lineage, only one of them, King Gopāla III, lived after the father and son pair Nayapāla and Vigrahapāla, which is named in the first inscription. The eighth regnal year of King Gopāla III (reigned ca. 1143-1158) occurred around 1151.

The three Tibetan inscriptions record information about the subsequent history of the manuscript through about the fourteenth century. The presence of these three inscriptions, as well as their contents, makes it clear that it was brought to Tibet for Tibetan use, thereby serving as an extremely important document of the transmission of Pāla period Buddhism and Buddhist art to Tibet.

The first Tibetan inscription immediately follows the two Sanskrit inscriptions and is essentially a rerecording of the information about the original scribe that is found in the first Sanskrit inscription. Consisting of an extremely carefully written line of Tibetan dbus med (pronounced rimay), or "headless," script, this record states that the Buddhist scholar Kun dga' (Ananda), who was a resident of Śrī Nālandā (monastery), wrote/drew (bris) [this manuscript]. This confirmation and reiteration of the first Sanskrit colophon translates this important information into Tibetan for the benefit of those who could not read the Sanskrit. The Tibetan word bris does not distinguish between writing and drawing; however, the Sanskrit term
is specific and makes it clear that Ānanda was the scribe. 
Judging from the form of the letters, the inscription is not 
later than the thirteenth century. It is significant that of the 
information contained in the earliest Sanskrit inscription 
only the section pertaining to the scribe and his monastic 
affiliation is included. The information about the Pala 
lineage, the date, and the name of the donor are not 
recorded. To the Tibetans for whom this inscription was 
made, it was the name of the scribe and the fact that he was 
associated with Nalanda that were of the greatest interest. 
The association with the renowned Nalanda monastery 
probably was especially important in establishing the 
pedigree and authoritative of the manuscript.

The second and third Tibetan inscriptions, which are 
also written in the headless *dbus med* script, occur on the 
reverse of the same leaf. The second inscription describes 
the lineage of ownership of the manuscript among Tibetan 
teachers up to the time that it came into the hands of an 
individual named sTang (or, more likely, sTong), who 
apparently either wrote the lineage or had it inscribed on 
the leaf. The record of ownership from the time of the 
creation of the first part of the manuscript in the late 
eleventh century until it came into the possession of the 
first individual named is not provided. The third inscription 
notes a dedication of the book for the benefit of a deceased 
individual. The second inscription is written in a very 
tight scholar’s hand, while the third is executed in a large, 
loose running hand more like popular correspondence 
than a Buddhist scholar’s writing.

The second Tibetan inscription has been translated 
as follows:

“This volume was the precious possession of the Great 
Pandit Śākyā Śrī. Then it was the precious possession of the translator 
Byams pa dpal. Then it was the precious possession of the teacher 
bZhang rings. Then it was the precious possession of Bu ston Big 
Mouth. Then it was the precious possession of the Great Abbot 
Chos dpal bzang po. Then it was the precious possession of mkhas grub 
bLo gros brtan pa. Now this volume is mine—sTang (sTong?) the 
translator.”

The lineage of ownership may be interpreted further: 1) 
1) Mahāpandita Śākyā Śrī (1127-1225) was an Indian 
from Kashmir who was active in Tibet from 1204 to 
1213. He is also known as the Kha che Paṅ chen 
great *pandita* of Kashmir). One of the great 
proselytizers of Indic Buddhism in Tibet, he was 
very active in both gTsang and dBus districts, 
travelling extensively and frequently teaching and 
commenting on the *Aṣṭaśāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, 
preumably from this very book. Śākyā Śrī’s early 
biography is not well recorded (the *Blue Annals* 
being concerned primarily with his sojourn in Tibet). 
It is unknown whether he ever visited the Pala 
lands, and therefore it cannot be determined if the 
manuscript came into his possession there or if it 
had already been transported from the Pala lands to 
another place before it came into his possession. 
Śākyā Śrī was ordained in 1149, two years before 
the date of the second Sanskrit inscription, 4 and it 
is therefore possible that he was the owner of the 
manuscript from around that time, later carrying it 
with him to Tibet.

2) Byams pa dpal (Khro phu Tshul khrims shes rabs 
byams pa dpal) (1172-1220). The third holder of the 
seat of Khro phu, he went to Nepal and India in 1204 
by way of sKyid rong and invited Śākyā Śrī to Tibet. 
He became the chief disciple of Śākyā Śrī. 5 In 1212 
he dedicated the Khro phu Byams pa, a gigantic 
image of Maitreya that became a famous site of 
pilgrimage in the area. Although the exact location of Khro phu is difficult to pinpoint, it is in the 
immediate vicinity of Phun tshogs (see following).

3) bZhang⁶ rings was active in the late thirteenth and 
early fourteenth century and taught at Khro phu. 

4) Bu ston (1290-1364) was the well-known compiler of 
the first great Tibetan canon, which was housed at 
Zhwa lu monastery. He belonged to the mahāmudrā 
lineage as taught by bZhang rings, ⁷ but it is not clear 
whether he was a direct disciple. He was also a 
master of the Kālacakra tantric system. ⁸

5) Chos dpal bzang po is unknown, but undoubtedly 
lived during the fourteenth century. His name is 
probably a short form of the name of one of Bu 
ston’s disciples, who passed the book on to dPang 
Lo tsa ba.

6) mkhas grub bLo gros brtan pa, or as he is more 
properly known, dPang Lo tsa ba bLo gros brtan pa 
(1276-1342), was a renowned translator and master of 
the Kālacakra. He and his brother Shong ston rdo 
rje rgyal mtshan are the founders of the discipline of 
philology in Tibet. He is known to have travelled to 
Nepal seven times in search of texts and training. 
He taught at Sa skya. ⁹

7) sTang⁰ Lo tsa ba is unknown, but probably lived 
during the fourteenth century.

The third inscription is a dedication of the book for 
the benefit of an unknown nobleman. It reads:

“This Indian book has been offered as a means for 
fulfilling the funeral rites of Kun dga’ dge legs dbang 
phyug and in order to gain merit for Kun dga’ dpal byor
dbang phyug and his entourage and is given to the powerful, perfect Chos kyi rgyal po from Jang phun tshogs (Phun tshogs). May all obtain happiness and attain the rank of the mind."

Phun tshogs is on the gTsang po River just north of Lha rtse (see Map 3 at back of catalogue showing dBu sugs and gTsang districts), and the individuals mentioned are unknown but were probably local rulers. The sphere of activities of several of the individuals who possessed the manuscript and the location of Phun tshogs suggest that this manuscript was directly instrumental in creating the early Pala-based style in gTsang District in Tibet. Specifically, Khrö phu Tshul khrims shes rabs byams pa dpal was active at Khrö phu, it is known that Bu ston was active at Zhwa lu, dBang Lo tsab ba taught at Sa skya, and the manuscript later was dedicated at Phun tshogs. The relationship between this manuscript and these four locations in Tibet, either at or within a fifty-mile radius of Sa skya, one of the great artistic centers of early Tibet, is extremely important in helping to trace Pala artistic influence in the region.

The text of the Tibetan inscription that provides the lineage of owners is essentially a validation and documentation of what would normally have been an oral tradition associated with a manuscript. For whatever reason, sTang (sTong?) Lo tsab ba wrote down this lineage. Although other manuscripts may have had equally interesting histories, their stories are not known to us. It is possible that the manuscript was about to pass out of the hands of clerics who would have been trained to remember such lineages and into the hands of laymen who, while probably suitably impressed by its auspicious pedigree, might not have remembered its details. This event immediately may have preceded its rededication on behalf of the deceased Kun dga’ dge legs dbang phyug.

Although the hundred or so pages of the manuscript have not been studied to determine how many of them belonged to the original manuscript dedicated during the reign of King Vigrahapala, it is likely that at least the Part B illustrated leaves are replacements. A probable time for such a repair would have been when the manuscript was rededicated during the reign of Gopala III, for rededication is a common practice when an image or other religious object has been restored.

Another possibility for the occasion of the restoration is suggested by a passage in the Blue Annals. A section discussing Sākya Śrī, the first owner named in the second Tibetan inscription of the manuscript, describes his sojourn in Tibet. Apparently, once, while preaching a commentary on the Pañcavinīśatisāhasrikā (Prajñāpāramitā) at sNar (thang), portions of Sākya Śrī’s book of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā were taken away by “ターā.” Referring to both a raven and the Buddhist deity, the term Tarā has been interpreted to mean that a manifestation of Tarā in the form of a raven snatched away some of the pages of the book during the recitation. The leaves stolen by the bird later were discovered at sPo khang, where they were preserved. But in the meantime, the great paṇḍita was left with only part of a manuscript, which, though the Blue Annals does not report, may have been supplemented with new pages to replace those that had been lost.

However, tempting as it might be to relate this manuscript to the incident recorded in the Blue Annals, the arguments against this possibility cannot be ignored. First, the reason for the rededication of the manuscript during the reign of Gopala III would need to be explained by something other than a restoration. Further, if this were the very manuscript that had been seized by the raven, it is curious that this incident would not be recorded in the second Tibetan inscription, which gives the pedigree of the lineage of owners. The style of the paintings on the Part B leaves is also of great importance in determining the date of the restoration; however, until more is known about the schools of Pala painting and the early Pala-based styles in Tibet it is difficult to be certain whether the Part B leaves were executed in India during the reign of Gopala III or were done in Tibet by artists replicating the Pala style. It is also possible that the paintings were done by a Pala artist who had travelled to Tibet.

The four illustrated leaves are in the typical Pala format, which consists of three paintings per page. The central composition on each leaf shows a Buddhist deity, while the two side illustrations depict life events of Śākyamuni Buddha. The eight events are the standard aṣṭamahāprātiḥārya set. The iconography may be diagrammed as follows (Buddha life events are numbered in sequence):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Part B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Birth of Gotama</td>
<td>Prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) First Sermon</td>
<td>Mañjuśrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Descent from</td>
<td>Avalokiteśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Gift of Honey</td>
<td>Śyāma Tārā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Māravijaya</td>
<td>sTong at śravasti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Miracle of Nālāgiri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Taming of Nālāgiri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Parinirvāna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for Prajñāpāramitā and Mañjuśrī, who are personifications of the text, the illustrations of the eight life events, Avalokiteśvara, and Śyāma Tārā do not directly correlate with the text. It may be suggested that these subjects, along with the book itself, express three of the major aspirations of the layperson: to gain merit (causing the book to be made), to attain rebirth in a heavenly realm (the production of the aṣṭamahāprātiḥārya scenes), and to receive safe passage through one's present life (the depictions of Avalokiteśvara and Śyāma Tārā, who are
renowned as protective deities).

The illustrations in Part A relate very closely to many of the well-known Pāla paintings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in terms of palette, draftsmanship, use of color, composition, and figural style. Displaying the full richness of Pāla painting at its best, the illustrations are exquisitely drawn, finely detailed, and beautifully colored. The skin tones of the green figures attending the Buddha in the first sermon scene, the female upon whom Queen Maya leans in the birth scene, and the two females attending Prajñāpāramitā are especially subtly rendered, giving the impression that their skin glows. The refinement of the facial features, the precision with which the hands are drawn, and the rich detailing of elements such as textiles and foliage all reflect the highest level of craftsmanship that flourished at Nalanda, where the paintings presumably were created, during the apogee of its influence and power.

In contrast, the illustrations of Part B are executed in a radically different hand that is far less skilled and sophisticated. Schematically rendered in comparison with the Part A paintings, some of the compositions even seem to be unfinished. For example, in the representation of Śyāma Tārā some details, such as the lotus pedestal or the figure to her right, only seem to have been sketched out but not completed. The style of the figures in this composition seem to reflect the attempt to capture the rich coloration of the green skin tones of various green figures in Part A, but in an abbreviated, shorthand manner. In particular, the harsh black outline around the figure of Śyāma Tārā contrasts with the subtle renderings of the green figures in Part A.

Another feature that distinguishes the two sets of leaves is the use of a white sky or white background in all but one of the Part B compositions. This feature, which increases the unfinished appearance of the paintings, is highly unusual in the known corpus of Pāla manuscript paintings.16

Just as those things that had been used or touched by the Buddha were venerated as paribhogika objects, this manuscript—associated with a series of important individuals—was imbued with spiritual power beyond the religious message of the words it recorded. A vehicle by which a distinguished line of individuals transmitted the Buddhist teachings, this manuscript is a powerful reminder that religious objects are made for religious purposes. Establishing historical information about the creation of a work, such as its date and the names of its artists and patrons, is only the preface to its story. The subsequent history of the work and its service in fulfillment of the purposes for which it was made is the story itself. Tragically, such information too often is lost, casually discarded, or even purposely destroyed.
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Susan L. Huntington and John C. Huntington, "Leaves from the Bodhi Tree: The Art of Pāla India (8th-12th Centuries) and Its International Legacy," Orientations 20, no. 10 (Oct. 1989), 35, fig. 11.

1. The inscriptions originally were read by an expert whose name we do not know. The information was supplied to the Asia Society at the time the manuscript was purchased and given to us by the Asia Society for our study of the manuscript. We would like to acknowledge the work of this anonymous individual, to whom we are greatly indebted.

2. Translation by an anonymous translator, provided by the Asia Society. Tibetan spellings have been changed to the Wylie system of transliteration.


4. The date of ca. 1151 for the second redaction is subject to future revisions of Pāla chronology that might alter the presumed date of Gopāla III's eighth regnal year.

5. Blue Annals, 708-711.

6. Spelled bZhan in the inscription.

7. Blue Annals, 335.

8. Blue Annals, 786-787.

9. Blue Annals, 634.

10. Vowel uncertain because of damage to leaf. The anonymous translator has read it as sTong, but it could also be sTang. The name means "the translator from sTang (or sTong)," and there are a number of individuals who used either of these regional designations. The term is therefore not specific enough to allow an identification.

11. Following the anonymous translator with substitution of Wylie system of transliteration.

12. Phun tshogs is famous for the Jo nang monastery, which is renowned because it was the home institution of Tsan tana (1575-1631), author of the famous Rgya gar chos 'byung (literally, "History of the Dharma in India," but usually translated as "History of Buddhism in India"). The Jo nang became an important subsect of Tibetan Buddhism and had as its major monastery the rTag brtan phun tshogs gling, which maintained a major printing establishment. It is quite possible that this copy of the Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā served as the consecrating text for one of the monasteries in the area.


14. In order to determine whether this manuscript could be the very one described in the Blue Annals it would be necessary to study the complete text to determine whether some pages are missing and how many might be replacements. Considering the historical importance of this manuscript, this would be a worthwhile project.

15. See Appendix I.

16. It is interesting that some fragments of a palm leaf manuscript presently housed at the site museum in Pagan, Myanmar (Burma), also bear this distinctive feature. It is unknown whether this fragmentary manuscript was produced by a Pāla artist or one elsewhere, perhaps in Myanmar.