

Postscript

In December 2004, I was on my way to St. Petersburg at the invitation of Dr. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences via London, when upon arriving in London, I learnt that Margarita had become seriously ill and therefore, I had to abandon my trip to Russia. Instead, however, I visited the British Library. At that time, I thought that most of the interesting Central Asian manuscript fragments, preserved there, had already been studied and made public. However, it turned out to be not true. During my one week's stay in London, I examined many boxes of the Stein Collection and was able to identify more than one hundred fragments, which had been at least for me yet unknown, with the help of a computer database, consisting of Sanskrit and Tibetan texts as well as the Taishō Tripiṭaka — as I well know, my brain is empty, though my computer is full of data. While investigating a manuscript consisting of more than fifty fragments, the repeated occurrence of two words, namely *Mañjuśrī* and *dharmadhātu*, attracted my attention. I, then, searched for Chinese parallels in the Taishō Tripiṭaka. Although the two words are quite common in Buddhist texts, scriptures where both of them occur are very limited and therefore, I was immediately able to find the Chinese translations, which paralleled the manuscript. I was excited and told Dr. Sam van Schaik of my identification; he, then, kindly showed me A. F. R. Hoernle's notebook, containing a transliteration of all the manuscript fragments. Hoernle, without knowing their sequence or the title of the text, had transcribed every one. When I returned to Japan, I realised that this manuscript was a Central Asian version of the text, namely *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvataṛajñānālokālaṃkāra*, of which another manuscript was found in July 1999 at the Potala Palace in Lhasa, together with the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* by the research group from The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism at Taishō University. Several weeks after my identification, Klaus Wille also independently identified them, by comparing his transliterations of the manuscript with the just released publication of the romanised text of the Lhasa manuscript. Later, I learnt that Kaikyoku Watanabe (1872-1933) had looked at the photos of a folio, printed in Stein's *Ancient Khotan* (1907), and had been able to identify the text already in 1907, while in what was called Straßburg at that time, studying under Prof. Ernst Leumann. He subsequently published its transliteration together with its Chinese parallel in his review of *Ancient Khotan* in a Japanese journal. In 1978, Jikidō Takasaki transcribed the same folio anew in his *Nyoraizō Shisō no Keisei (Formation of the Tathāgatagarbha Theory)*, Tokyo, pp. 618-619, which was further quoted in the Preface, written in Japanese, to the edited text of the

Lhasa manuscript by the Taishō University group, published 2004. I had thought it a pity that, although Watanabe had already identified a folio of the Central Asian manuscript already in 1907, he, Takasaki and the Taishō University group were unaware that there were some fifty additional fragments belonging to the same manuscript, and also that, Hoernle had transcribed all the fragments in the same year as Watanabe's identification, namely in 1907, without knowing of the latter's identification which had been made public in Japanese. Then, when I was reading another article by Watanabe, I realised that I was wrong in my aforementioned assumptions. To my surprise, Watanabe *had* investigated all the fragments and placed them in the correct order by comparing them with the Chinese translations. Therefore, it was neither Wille nor I, who first identified the manuscript, but Watanabe, by the beginning of 1908. According to Watanabe, after Leumann had looked at *Ancient Khotan* soon after its publication in 1907, he wrote letters to Hoernle in London and S. F. Oldenburg in St. Petersburg, asking them to send any unidentified fragments to Straßburg, and to their amazement, in two weeks, piles of more than a hundred original manuscript fragments arrived from those two places. Thus, using his brain, full of data of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, Watanabe was able to identify many of these Sanskrit and Khotanese fragments (cf. pp. 4-6 in the present volume). He praised the generosity of both Hoernle and Oldenburg, while criticising Count Ōtani for neglecting Leumann's request to allow them to study his acquisitions. Thinking of the present situation of manuscript research, I feel great regret.

When I visited the British Library last summer, Ursula Sims-Williams kindly showed me Watanabe's unpublished paper, consisting of 57 pages, entitled "Preliminary Report of the Studies on Khotan Fragments collected by Dr. Stein and Dr. Hoernle" (cf. p. 23 in the present volume), which Hoernle had received in June 1909. In this paper, Watanabe reported his identifications and made comparisons of the fragments with other versions. Many of these identified fragments were edited by Hoernle in his *Manuscript Remains*, though there are still more than ten texts, which remained unpublished and unknown until quite recently — one of them is the above-mentioned *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatāra-jñānālokālamkāra* (cf. pp. 191ff. in this volume). Judging from its Preface and Acknowledgments, Watanabe must have prepared it for publication. At the sight of this faded report, which is here and there crossed out with red pencil and cut with scissors — most probably done by Hoernle, when he used those parts for the publication of his *Manuscript Remains* — I was shocked and could hardly hold back my tears, thinking of Watanabe's great achievements and his probable deep disappointment.

After his return to Japan in 1910, Watanabe, who later organised and edited the Taishō Tripiṭaka (1924-1934), seems to have spent much more time working for society as a priest and writing essays — both of these activities he was very successful in — as opposed to philological studies of manuscripts. Especially after losing the manuscripts of his studies on the *Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī* and the *Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā* which

were ready for publication together with his library in the Great Kantō Earthquake in 1923, he hardly published any further philological works. This is indeed a great pity as if he had continued studying Sanskrit manuscript fragments from Central Asia in collaboration with Western scholars, we would not have remained at the stage of where we are today.

There must be many manuscripts, which remain unpublished, unstudied and are gradually decaying in museums, libraries and in the hands of private collectors and scholars. Here, therefore, I should like to encourage scholars to exchange information more openly and not to retain manuscripts or photos in their desks unstudied for many years. We should emulate the generosity, which Hoernle and Oldenburg showed one hundred years ago.

In this spirit, the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (IRIAB), Soka University, to which I belong, and the British Library (BL) agreed to digitise the entire collection of the Sanskrit manuscript fragments from Central Asia, consisting of more than 4500 items in all. We have also decided to put these digitised images, along with preliminary identifications, transcriptions and information about the fragments on both the International Dunhuang Project (IDP) Interactive Web Database and the IRIAB website, six months after IRIAB receives them. In this way, we plan to make this invaluable heritage accessible to all scholars and students throughout the entire world. This project — I shall call it BLSF (The British Library Sanskrit Fragments) Project — has been mainly financed by the Open Research Centre Project 2004-2008 — “Research Centre for Buddhist Philology” by name, based at IRIAB and subsidised by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan. Mr. Tatsushi Tamai, a Japanese specialist of the Tocharian language, who advised me to undertake this project, has also generously supported this financially.

In order to carry out the said project effectively, I broadly invited any colleagues in Japan and abroad to join the international team, which I set up for this purpose. Many scholars welcomed this project and expressed their willingness to contribute to it. Amongst them, Dr. Klaus Wille, who has long been working on the Central Asian manuscript fragments, preserved in the British Library along with those in Germany and other places in Europe, immediately sent me his transliterations of hundreds of fragments in the Hoernle Collection as well as those of the above-mentioned *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvātāraññānālokālaṃkāra*, both of which are published in the present volume. As well as this, he has played an important role as one of the editors-in-chief of this series, by checking transliterations prepared by other contributors.

Apart from inviting experienced experts from abroad, I have started the Brāhmī Club, which convenes once every two weeks for the purpose of reading Central Asian Sanskrit fragments together and thus, training the younger generation.

This volume is the first fruit of the endeavours of those scholars and students,

who sympathise with the ideal of fairness in studying manuscript fragments as well as with the importance of publishing them swiftly. I hope this BLSF series, which will cover all the important Sanskrit manuscript fragments in the British Library collections, will become what Watanabe Kaikyoku dreamt of one hundred years ago.

I should like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Michael O'Keefe, Susan Whitfield, Ursula Sims-Williams and Sam van Schaik of the British Library, with all of whom I have been discussing the project since 2004, for their readiness to make materials available for our research and showing the same generosity as their predecessor, A. F. R. Hoernle, did one hundred years ago. Sims-Williams also contributed an article concerning Hoernle's achievements to the present volume. I should like to extend my gratitude to Lore Sander for her valuable advice on paleographical questions. I am also indebted to all the participants of the Brāhmī Club who read the prepared manuscripts and made a number of useful suggestions. Tatsushi Tamai has contributed much to this project not only financially but also by checking transliterations prepared by others and adjusting digitised images for publication as well as contributing an article to the present volume on the Tocharian fragments. His contribution is greatly appreciated, as are those of Jundō Nagashima, Jirō Hirabayashi, Kōji Matsumoto (all from Taishō University), Noriyuki Kudō, Kenzō Kawasaki, Hayashi Hisako (all of IRIAB), Chou Hsiu-Li, Nobue Hanzawa (both of Soka University), all of whom assisted Tamai during the final stage of preparing the plates. Without their help, the present volume would not have been made available for publication in such a short time. Thanks are due as well to Jan Nattier, Nobue Hanzawa and Peter Lait for correcting my English. I should also like to express my gratitude to Soka University Board of Trustees Chair, Yasunori Tashiro, and IRIAB Director, Hiroshi Kanno, for their encouragement and their generous support for this project. Without the unselfish endeavours and generosity of all these people, this volume could not have been possible.

Seishi Karashima

Hachiōji, 13th. June 2006