

New Sanskrit Fragments of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra in the Schøyen Collection, Norway

Kazunobu Matsuda

AT the outset of the 20th century, chains of expeditions from various countries including those led or organized by Britain's Aurel Stein (1862–1943), France's Paul Pelliot (1878–1945), Germany's Albert Grünwedel (1856–1935) and Japan's Kozui Otani (1876–1948) vied in stepping into Central Asia, excavating ruins studded along the Silk Road, and bringing back numerous documents written in manifold languages which they had found. Apart from these expeditions, persons including Britain's Hamilton Bower (1858–1940), British Indologist A. F. R. Hoernle (1841–1918) and Russian consul general in Kashgar Nikolaj F. Petrovskij (1837–1908) acquired by purchase found documents provided by local inhabitants while they stayed at their places of appointment in India and Central Asia. These documents had a great impact on the development in Buddhist studies in later years, as the original (i.e., Sanskrit and Prakrit) texts of numerous important scriptures which were assumed to be lost appeared, though most of the discovered documents were fragments.

However, such discoveries have not continued to the present time. With the findings of approximately 3,000 folios of birch bark and some paper manuscripts at stupa ruins in Gilgit, Kashmir, in 1931, as the last major discoveries, the expedition boom has ended. In addition, due to changes in the world situation after the Second World War, large-scale discoveries of manuscripts no longer seem to be plausible, though a few manuscript findings have exceptionally been reported.

Nevertheless, the situation has dramatically changed in the last several years. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the subsequent incessant civil strife which still continues have produced the ironical consequence of a massive outflow of Afghan manuscripts in the world market of ancient scriptures, albeit at the cost of local devastation. Most of the scriptures appearing in the market have been taken over by European institutes and collectors as the final proprietors. Among them, more than 100 manuscripts in the Bactrian language were reported by Prof. Nicholas Sims-Williams of the University of London in an article

in a Japanese journal.¹ What Buddhist scholars such as the present writer should take note of are the Kharoṣṭhī birch-bark scrolls the British Library acquired, which have recently been referred to often, and Buddhist manuscripts belonging to the Schøyen Collection, the research project in which I am involved.

Kharoṣṭhī Birch-Bark Scrolls at the British Library

In June 1996, the British Library issued a press release in London and made public five clay pots and manuscripts found in one of them, assumed to be found at ruins near Haḍḍa, Afghanistan, which were acquired with the help of an anonymous benefactor.² The manuscripts are scrolls of birch bark, bearing Buddhist texts in Gāndhārī in the Kharoṣṭhī script, totalling 29 scrolls. It is astonishing that these scrolls are estimated to have been copied in the first century C.E. and that they are among the oldest Buddhist manuscripts, comparable to the Dead Sea Scrolls. Before the press announcement, the scrolls were carefully treated for preservation and restoration for several months, and cut into pieces and contained in 57 sets of glass plates. It was also announced that the initial research and publication of the scrolls was commissioned to a team centered around Prof. Richard Salomon of the University of Washington.

Since then, Professor Salomon has delivered lectures and papers in various parts of the world. According to them, identified documents so far include the *Samgītisūtra*, *Dharmapada*, *Anavataptaḡāthā* and *Ekoṭṭarikāgama* in Gāndhārī, and a Gāndhārī version of the *Kharaviṣāṇasūtra*, which comprises the Pāli *Suttanipāta*.³ But these just account for several percent of the whole. So it may be said that the task of deciphering and examination has just started. It seems that the 29 volumes of scrolls belong to the Dharmaguptaka school, one of the Buddhist orders which prospered then in Gandhāra. The first volume of the publication of the joint research into the scrolls by the British Library and the University of Washington will be issued in the very near future. It includes a comprehensive philological introduction by Professor Salomon and part of the facsimile edition, and deciphered texts and English translation will successively come out from the second volume onward.

I should add the following episode. Three months after the British Library's announcement, Prof. Akira Sadakata of Tokai University, Japan, published an interesting report. It was an inquiry on the photographs of several pots and scrolls contained therein, which Mr. Isao Kurita, president of the antiquarian dealing company, SOFRACOM,

Tokyo, had taken in Peshawar, Pakistan, four years earlier.⁴ Though Professor Sadakata doesn't note this in the article, these are exactly the same pots and scrolls which have later settled down at the British Library after passing through many hands. Actually, however, the photographs taken by Mr. Kurita were to have significance afterward, while Professor Sadakata's report seems to be partially insufficient due to the lack of the press announcement of the British Library. The five pots bear the inscriptions of "Dharmaguptaka" or "Sarvāstivādin" in Gāndhārī in the Kharoṣṭhī script respectively. Nevertheless, when they were acquired at the British Library, the scrolls had been taken out from the pots, so it became impossible to identify which pot each scroll had been contained in. However, thanks to Mr. Kurita's photographs it was proved that a total of 29 scrolls had been contained in a pot inscribed "Dharmaguptaka." Many Japanese viewers may also remember the matter as these scrolls were referred to in an NHK (Japan Broadcasting Corporation) TV program series, "Budda—ōinaru tabiji" (Buddha: a Great Journey).⁵

This news caused a sensation in the academic world. I remember that items on this topic appeared many times on internet mailing lists concerning Indology. Not only researchers but the world's manuscript collectors paid attention to the news. Among them was a Norwegian, who promptly responded through dealers in London and built up an amazing collection in just one year's time.

Norway's Schøyen Collection

About 40 kilometers from Oslo, capital of Norway, is a small town called Spikkestad, which is not shown in maps available in Japan. Going further into its outer suburb in an out-of-the-way hilly area, where a Norwegian, Mr. Martin Schøyen, lives quietly with his wife. Though his main occupation is as the chairman of a Norwegian conglomerate, he appears to dedicate most of his life to gathering scriptures from all ages and places of the world. Around that time, I received *Manuscripts from the Himalayas and the Indian Subcontinent*, Catalogue 17, from Sam Fogg Rare Books, a London old book dealer, which includes a section concerning 108 leaves and fragments of Buddhist manuscripts.⁶ All are from Afghanistan and the photographs represent fragments which are written in the Gupta script and Gilgit/Bāmiyan script. Mr. Schøyen purchased these manuscripts. He successfully purchased almost all the Buddhist manuscripts of this kind in antiquarian book markets in Europe.

In January 1997, having learned this news, I joined Prof. Jens

Braarvig, University of Oslo, Prof. Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Humboldt University of Berlin (since autumn semester in 1999, University of Munich), and Dr. Lore Sander, curator at the Museum für indische Kunst in Berlin (presently retired), in forming a team in order to negotiate with Mr. Schøyen. Fortunately, as a result of negotiations through Professor Braarvig as our representative, we acquired Mr. Schøyen's permission for research and publication concerning all of his manuscripts, and four members of the team respectively concluded an agreement with Mr. Schøyen.

Upon receiving permission, our team visited Mr. Schøyen's villa in the suburbs of Spikkestad in November 1997 and 1998 to conduct on-the-spot research. Ranging from fragments in Kharoṣṭhī, which probably date back to the second century C.E., to manuscripts in the Gilgit/Bāmiyan script in the seventh–eighth century, it is no exaggeration to say that the Buddhist manuscripts we saw contain documents written in all the Indian scripts used for several centuries. On the occasion of our visit in November 1997, the total of the fragments in the collection was approximately 6,000, and it expanded to 10,000 one year later. The number must continue to increase even as I am writing this report. However, I have to add that this is the total Mr. Schøyen alleges, and is not our count. We must note that three-fourths of the manuscripts are fragments of several centimeters around. The total of 10,000 includes many small portions bearing one legible character. Though it might be a rough estimation from the amount of their characters, I had an impression that the Norwegian collection is larger than the Stein/Hoernle collection of the British Library which I have once run through, although it falls far short of the volume of the Turfan manuscript collection in Berlin brought by German expeditions.⁷

In November 1997, we shuttled between Oslo and Mr. Schøyen's villa for one week and carried out our research, in which we classified to file all the fragments according to the chronological type of scripts systematized by our colleague Dr. Sander, who is a leading Indian paleographer. Broadly speaking, the fragments fall into six kinds of script: Kharoṣṭhī, Kṣāṇa, Northeastern Gupta type, Northwestern Gupta type, Gilgit/Bāmiyan types I and II. (The last one is the same as the Siddham transmitted to Japan.) Manuscript materials are palm leaf, birch bark and vellum; there are no paper manuscripts. Buddhist documents on leather are very rare. It was the first time for the present writer to view them at first hand.

According to the same account provided by dealers, most of these manuscripts appear to have been brought from a cave in the Bāmiyan

valley, Afghanistan, but the accurate location is unknown. It is a natural cave with one entrance, inside of which it splits into three chambers. On the innermost part in one of the chambers is enshrined an image of the Buddha, around which voluminous manuscripts were scattered. The manuscripts changed hands repeatedly, from local residents and dealers, and flowed into the European market. But this account solely refers to most of the manuscripts purchased by Mr. Schøyen. According to the present writer and his colleagues' observations, the recently-appeared scriptures seem to contain manuscripts found in other places in Afghanistan or in Pakistan including Gilgit, though this is not based on firm grounds. Although the fact that the places of discovery are unclear is unfortunate, it might be very fortunate that such voluminous ancient scriptures have been collected from war-torn Afghanistan. In particular, compared with the world's Central Asian manuscript collections so far known, the significance of the Schøyen Collection is the fact that it is the first large-scale Buddhist manuscript assemblage discovered in the proper area of the Indian culture, i.e., Gandhāra. As a matter of course, Gilgit manuscripts include the same kind of scriptures, but the new collection has a large number of manuscripts far more ancient than that. It is amazing that nearly 200 Kharoṣṭhī palm-leaf fragments were found. Kharoṣṭhī documents so far known are birch bark or wood, so the discovery of Kharoṣṭhī palm-leaf manuscripts is the first in the world.

After the first research, it was decided that three copies of all the manuscripts would be made by Mr. Schøyen himself for experts in Oslo, Berlin and Japan. As promised, portions of the copy for myself began to reach me one after another through Professor Braarvig in April 1998, and on the occasion of the second research in November 1998 I received the rest, except ones being treated for restoration. All portions of this were reproduced from the originals by the Canon digital-color copying machine at Mr. Schøyen's villa. Expected fading is a little bit worrying, but the beautiful copy in natural size facilitates working.

Newly Found Documents

Through two rounds of on-the-spot sessions and examinations of the manuscripts' color reproductions we received, we came to the process of deciphering and identifying the documents in the Schøyen Collection. To chronologically describe the documents identified at this moment, the first should be several fragments of the Gāndhārī *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Āgama version), which was identified by Prof. Richard Salomon of the University of Washington, who is kindly cooperating with us in taking charge of the deciphering and publishing of the

Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts. According to the texts Professor Salomon transliterated and presented to us, the manuscripts include fragments corresponding to the last portion of the *Mahāsudarśanasūtra* incorporated in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, but the text is not identical with extant versions of *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* in Pāli, Sanskrit and Chinese. The text might be in the closest proximity of the *Youxing jing* (*Youhsing-ching*; Pilgrim Sutra) belonging to the Chinese *Chang ehan* (*Ch'ang-ê-han*; Long Āgama) attributed to the Dharmaguptaka. However, the text accordance between them seems to be nearly half. It may be another version transmitted by other group. According to my personal inquiry, Professor Salomon said that the Gāndhārī in the text is not genuine but retains strong Sanskrit influence in declension. He surmised that the text might be chronologically newer than the scriptures at the British Library.

Next, Dr. Sander and Professor Braarvig found some 40 folio fragments of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* among palm-leaf manuscripts in Kuṣāṇa script. Dr. Sander infers that these fragments date back to the second century. The language in the text is a kind of Buddhist Sanskrit, a dialect similar to that of the *Mahāvastu*. For example, “evam vutte” represents “evam ukte.” The second century is not far from the date when the text of *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras has been established, and now actual evidence has appeared. It proves the fact that the earliest *Prajñāpāramitā* was not completed as a genuine Sanskrit text from the beginning, but that fairly vulgar Prakrit versions of the sūtra existed in India preceding the Sanscritized texts. To say the least, these are the earliest Mahāyāna texts which are extant today and written in the beautiful Kuṣāṇa script.

I subsequently found several folios of the *Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanādanirdeśasūtra*, including three complete palm leaves, while Professor Hartmann discovered more than 20 fragments of the *Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra* (Ajatashatru's Remorse-Dispelling Sutra) which belongs to the same set along with previous one I found. It is also confirmed that there are many fragments from the *Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśasūtra* in this set of texts. All of these are important documents which had not been confirmed as original texts in Sanskrit except for their appearance as citations in other documents. Written in the Northwestern Gupta type script, they are thought to have been copied in the first half of the fourth century. If it is true, this set should also be regarded as particular manuscripts with a remarkable copy date. Though each is written in Sanskrit in the broader sense, verb irregularity is extremely notable. There are many forms in which aorist and present are mixed.

The latest copies in the collection are manuscripts written in Gilgit/Bāmiyan scripts nos. I and II. Among birch-bark manuscripts in the script no. I, I found several fragments of the *Dharmapada* attached with *nidāna* stories. When I made comparison with the Chinese translations including the *Faju piyu jing*, the fragments' text does not accord with them. It is probable that the fragments are part of a different version of the *Dharmapada* including *nidāna* stories. According to the fact that the text includes peculiar expressions like "etasmin" and "vastusmin," it might be the *Dharmapada* of the Mahāsāṃghika.

In addition, the collection includes two leather manuscript fragments in the Bactrian language. The deciphering of the Bactrian text is being carried out by Professor Sims-Williams, and I have viewed a tentative deciphered text prepared by him, based on which these fragments are definitely part of Buddhist and Mahāyāna inscriptions. Interestingly, the text enumerates various names of Buddhas, which are common to the diverse denominations appearing in the *Sukhāvātīvyūha*.

Furthermore, the titles of scriptures confirmed so far include the *Candrottarādārikāparipṛcchā*, *Ratnaketuparivarta*, *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya*, *Varṇārhavarṇastotra*, *Jātakamālā*, *Aśokāvadāna*, *Caṅgīsūtra* and other fragments of Sanskrit āgama and vinaya documents, not to mention the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. Not a few abhidharma fragments are found, although not a single folio has so far been identified. The *Caṅgīsūtra*, which corresponds to the *Caṅkīsutta*, MN 95, in the Pāli canon, is not included in the Chinese āgama sūtras. Written on palm leaf in the Northeastern Gupta script, which has few documentary examples, pieces of the *Caṅgīsūtra* text including several almost-complete folios are preserved in the collection. The text has the phrase, "dharmanidhyānakṣānti," which is well-known to readers of documents of the Yogācāra school. The phrase appears several times in these fragments.

As mentioned above, the manuscript fragments referred to here are only several percent of the whole volume of the Schøyen collection. Deciphering efforts have just commenced, as is the case with the scriptures at the British Library.

Lotus Sutra Fragments Found

It was just a few months ago (i.e. late 1998) that fragments of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* were found in the Schøyen collection. They were found by myself and Dr. Klaus Wille, who is participating in this team in cooperation with the present writer and Professor Hartmann. At this stage, just seven fragments have been confirmed, but there is a good possibility that additional fragments will be found. Of these, one

piece (our reference number: MS 2381-40) is a birch-bark small fragment copied in the script Gilgit/Bāmiyan type I, the text of which corresponds to that of chapter 3 of the Lotus Sutra. The other six are palm leaves, two of which (MS 2381-2, MS 2382-271) have textual portions corresponding to chapter 3, and four (MS 2381-1a, -1b, -20, 82) to chapter 22, respectively.

It is certain that these six fragments belong to one manuscript according to the fact that they all are five-line folios as well as their content and script. The script basically belongs to Gilgit/Bāmiyan type I, but it is not completely identical with the script used in Gilgit manuscripts. For example, while “ṣ” in Gilgit manuscripts resembles “s,” “ṣ” appearing in this fragment retains the shape of the Gupta script, Indian type, so there is no confusion between the two letters in this copy. It may chronologically predate the standard Gilgit/Bāmiyan type I. Though the size of the folio cannot avoid conjecture as a complete folio has not been obtained yet, it might be a not-so-big oblong palm leaf, possibly, $40 \times 3-3.5$ cm.

With the permission of my colleagues, I handed a copy from duplication of these manuscripts to Prof. Hirofumi Toda of the University of Tokushima, a world-renowned authority in *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* text studies. According to his suggestion, the fragments contain unique readings which no other copies have, so they belong to a manuscript in an independent lineage. The four members of the team hope that these *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* fragments will be deciphered and made public by Professor Toda. As is mentioned here, the Lotus Sutra fragments so far found are confined to those written in Gilgit/Bāmiyan type I. It is unfortunate that copies in more-ancient, genuine Gupta script have not been found yet. However, the number of manuscript fragments is immense. I think that our role should be an effort to find as many additional fragments as possible.

Leaving an extensive study and publication about this to Professor Toda, here for readers' reference I will print a romanized text on the recto of a folio (MS 2382-271) as an example of the fragments. This text corresponds to that from p. 76, line 2, to p. 77, line 2, of Kern-Nanjio's edition. Due to breaks on both ends, the folio number is unclear.

- 1 /// .. kumārakāḥ sarve cintayitavyā na viṣamam aham api
(ba)hukośakoṣṭhāgāraḥ sarvasatvānām apy aham imāny evaṃ-
rūpāṇi [ma] ///
- 2 /// (hai)va tasya puruṣasya mṛṣāvādadoṣaḥ syāt* yena teṣāṃ
dā(ra)kānāṃ pūrvam trīṇi yānāny upadarśayitvā paścāt sarveṣāṃ
eva mahāyā ///

- 3 /// dī bhavet* yat tena puruṣeṇopāyakaśalyene te kumārakā
tasmād ādīptā grhā niṣkāsitā jivitenācchādītā tat kasya hetoḥ
[ā] ///
- 4 /// na da[dyā]t tathā[pi] tāvad bhagavan sa puruṣo na mṛṣāvādī
syāt* tat kasya hetoḥ tathā hi bhagava .. tena puruṣeṇa pūrvām
evaitad a[nu] ///
- 5 /// [na mṛṣāvāda] bhavati / kaḥ punar vādo 'nyena puruṣeṇa
prabhūtam .. [ko]śakoṣṭhāgāram astīti kṛtvā putrapṛyatām eva
manyamānenā ///

Related Information

Taking this opportunity, I would also like to note in a random manner the following miscellaneous information I received over the last year concerning the Schøyen collection and manuscripts found in Afghanistan and Pakistan which have some relation to the collection.

(1) Thanks to the good offices of Professor Braarvig, it has been decided that our research on the Schøyen collection will be funded by the University of Oslo and the Norwegian Research Council, becoming a formal research project in Norway. Further, as it is desirable that the task be a regular project at each institution to which the team members are affiliated, I managed to adopt this study as a subject from the new academic year at the university institute to which I belong. In that case, I am considering a possibility that scholars in my country will kindly share the tasks for additional texts with which the four members cannot deal.

(2) The results of the manuscript studies will be published in a series under the title *The Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, the first volume of which is scheduled to appear in the near future. In that, I am in charge of the *Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanādanirdeśasūtra*. As a harbinger of the publication, Professor Hartmann has just published a study on a fragment of the *Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra* with Prof. Paul Harrison of the University of Canterbury as coeditor, and I recommend the readers' reference to it.⁸ In addition, the present writer has so far published three articles on the Schøyen collection.⁹

(3) The annual meeting of the American Oriental Society, Western Branch, was held for three days from October 30, 1998, at the University of Washington, Seattle. A panel on Kharoṣṭhī manuscript research was held, and Professor Salomon and his colleagues participated. I also attended this session, entitled "Buddhist Texts in Transit and Transition: Sanskrit, Pāli, Gāndhārī and Chinese," in which 10 scholars lectured and debated. Professor Salomon himself presented his paper titled

“Newly Discovered Fragments of a Gāndhārī Version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*” which dealt with Kharoṣṭhī palm-leaf manuscript fragments of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* found in the Schøyen collection.

(4) In the autumn of 1997, a pot filled with Kharoṣṭhī scrolls reappeared in London’s antiquarian market. According to the sources, the volume of the scrolls seems to be larger than those at the British Library, and the pot bears an inscription containing the year of copying. These scrolls were purchased by a collector living in western England and brought to the British Library for restoration. As the scrolls’ condition was very serious and the library’s Oriental and India Office Collections were hectic in moving to the new location, the pots and scrolls were returned for the time being. There is no further information about this.

(5) In November 1998, on returning from the second round of research, I stopped in London and visited Sam Fogg, one of the dealers who mediated Mr. Schøyen’s acquisition of the manuscripts. The dealer told me that he had received more manuscripts several days earlier, and let me view them. To the best of my memory, they are large batches of birch-bark manuscripts approximately 10 cm in length and 60 cm in width; the set of the scriptures consists of three bundles with more than a dozen folios each, totalling about 50 folios. It seemed that the scriptures were not in such serious condition that they could not be separated into each folio for restoration and preservation. The script was Gilgit/Bāmiyan type II. After taking several photos, I read through the folios for some time and confirmed the *Mahāgovindasūtra* among them. In copies of my photographs, Dr. Wille in Göttingen found the *Māyājālasūtra* and others. These scriptures are without doubt birch-bark manuscript bundles containing the Dīrgha-āgama of the Sarvāstivādins.

(6) One month since returning home after viewing the Dīrgha-āgama scriptures in London, a new report by Prof. Akira Sadakata appeared in the January 1999 issue of the *Daihōrin (Great Dharma Wheel)*.¹⁰ The article was based on one photograph of the top folio of a bundle of the manuscript which Mr. Kurita of SOFRACOM had acquired from Pakistan. In it Professor Sadakata independently identified the photograph as the *Mahāgovindasūtra* and presented a transliterated text and a Japanese translation. I was presented a copy by Professor Sadakata. When I saw it, I was astonished. It was exactly the same manuscript I had seen one month earlier at Sam Fogg in London. I contacted Mr. Kurita for inquiry. He tried to obtain the scripture from Pakistan so as

to mediate it for some one. However, the scripture presently remains in London. It is unclear where it will settle. Judging from Mr. Kurita's information, the manuscript was found not in Afghanistan but somewhere near Gilgit, Pakistan, by a local bee hunter. Be that as it may, I hope that it will settle somewhere soon.

(7) The *Chugai Nippo* carried an article in the issue dated January 28, 1999, attached with photographs of a pot Mr. Kurita took at a dealer's home in Dubayy and the text of the inscription written on the pot which was deciphered by Professor Sadakata based on the photos. The inscription on the pot is copied not in Kharoṣṭhī but in Gupta script. Though bearing the name of Dharmaguptaka, the pot has no content, which seems to have already been resold. On the other hand, Mr. Schøyen purchased another pot, which bears a Kharoṣṭhī inscription describing the name of the Dharmaguptaka. Inside the pot were several manuscripts which were charred like chocolate.

(8) At the beginning of last month, Professor Sadakata once again published another report utilizing Mr. Kurita's photographs of a bundle of a birch-bark manuscript of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* in Gilgit-Bāmiyan script type I.¹¹ It is said that the scripture has been obtained by Mr. Kurita. I heard the news that an anonymous Japanese, whose name cannot be referred to here, purchased a similar kind of scripture bundles. At a certain place, I looked at some photographs of them and they seemed to be a counterpart of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā*, the other part of which Mr. Kurita procured.

How can one describe the situation I have mentioned? What I have traced so far are just a portion of manuscripts moving in the world market. While manuscripts obtained by Mr. Schøyen will be taken care of by our team, how about the treatment of scriptures which may come out one after another? I earnestly desire that such manuscripts will be made accessible to researchers without being held in secrecy by collectors. We experts do not need the originals, but are satisfied with photographs.

April 5, 1999

Notes

¹ Nicholas Sims-Williams, "Kodai afuganisutan niokeru shinhakken—hindūkushu hokubu shutsudo no bakutoriago bunsho o chūshin ni" (New Findings in Ancient Afghanistan—the Bactrian documents discovered from the Northern Hindu-Kush), *Oriente* (newsletter), no. 16, Tokyo: Ancient Orient Museum, 1997, pp. 3–17. English version is accessible at <http://www.gengo.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~hkum/bactrian.html>.

² "British Library acquires oldest Buddhist manuscripts known," *The Japan Times*,

June 28, 1996; “Scrolls Offer a Glimpse into Buddhism’s Past,” *National Geographic*, vol. 191, no. 3 (March 1997), the second page of Geographica; “Buddhism Unrolled?,” *OIOC Newsletter*, no. 53/54, London: The British Library, 1997, pp. 2–5.

³ Richard Salomon, “A Preliminary Survey of Some Early Buddhist Manuscripts Recently Acquired by the British Library,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 117-2, April/June 1997, pp. 353–358.

⁴ Akira Sadakata, “Seihoku indo no hōzobu” (The Dharmaguptaka Branch in North-western India), *Shunjū* (Spring and Autumn), Tokyo: Shunjūsha, October 1996, pp. 20–23. Later, Professor Sadakata published the French version of this article. A. Sadakata, “Inscriptions Kharoṣṭhī provenant du marché aux antiquités de Peshawar,” *Journal Asiatique*, tome 284, numéro 2, 1996, pp. 301–324.

⁵ This program has been published in a book form: *Budda—ōinaru tabiji* (1) rinesuru daichi, bukkyō tanjō (Buddha: a Great Journey 1 Land of Transmigration, the Birth of Buddhism) NHK Shuppan. This volume carries a commentary by Fumio Enomoto, associate professor at Osaka University: “Saikono butten—nendaiga tokutei dekuru saiko no bukkyō shahon” (The most Ancient Buddhist Scriptures: the Oldest Buddhist Manuscripts with Identifiable Copy Dates), pp. 63–68. I felt strange when the camera in the NHK TV program was tracing the Kharoṣṭhī scriptures from left to right as the script actually reads from right to left as is the case in the Arabic.

⁶ Sam Fogg, “Manuscript Remains of a Library probably from the Buddhist School of the Mahasangika-Lokottaravadin” (108 leaves and fragments), *Manuscripts from the Himalayas and the Indian Subcontinent Catalogue 17*, London, 1996, pp. 46–49, item no. 39.

⁷ Mr. Schøyen published a catalog including his collection. (M. Schøyen, *The Schøyen Collection—Checklist of Manuscripts 1–2393*, Oslo, 1997.) We were each presented by the author a copy of the catalog’s September 1997 issue. The section of Afghan manuscripts refers to a total of 400 scripture folios and 3,300 fragments. Thereafter, the number has increased dramatically. This catalog has been printed just in scores of copies, so it is not obtainable.

⁸ Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Paul Harrison, “A Sanskrit Fragment of the Ajātaśatrukaukṛtya-vinodanā-sūtra,” *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Indica et Tibetica 35, Swisttal-Odendorf, 1998, pp. 67–86.

⁹ “Afuganisutan kara noruwē e” (From Afghanistan to Norway), *Bukkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyūsho hō* (Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyo University), no. 13, Kyoto: Research Institute of Bukkyo University, December 1997, pp. 24–28; “Noruwē ni arawareta afuganisutan shutsudo bukkyō shahon—Martin Schøyen korekushon o tazunete” (Buddhist Manuscripts from Afghanistan Appearing in Norway: A Visit to the Martin Schøyen Collection), *Gekkan Shinika* (Monthly Sinica), Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten, July 1998, pp. 83–88; “Shiatoru, soshite futatabi osuro to rondon e” (Seattle, and Again to Oslo and London), *Bukkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyūsho hō*, no. 15, December 1998, pp. 14–16.

¹⁰ Akira Sadakata, “Girugitto shahon—‘tensonkyō’ danpen no kaisetsu” (A Gilgit Manuscript: An Explanation of *Mahāgovindasūtra* Fragments), *Daihōrin* (Great Dharma Wheel), Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku, January 1999, pp. 30–35. Photos are printed in the frontispiece of the magazine (pp. 18–19).

¹¹ Akira Sadakata, “Girugitto shahon—ichiman hassenju hannyakyo” (A Gilgit Manuscript: *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*), *Shunjū*, February/March 1999, pp. 22–24.