Manuscript Forgeries

Photograph taken of one of the forged manuscripts which Stein acquired on his 4th Central Asian expedition. The top manuscript, Domoko B4, contains text in two scripts, one thick and one thin, both resembling Brāhmi but without any meaning (see p. 8). The bottom two manuscripts, Domoko C and D are Chinese/Khotanese bilingual. The British Library, T.O.45 (Photo. 392/52/39).
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Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries

Forgery is a story with all the elements to grip the popular imagination: greed, large sums of money, deceit, sometime violence and, not least, the ability of the ordinary man to bamboozle the greatest expert or most lofty institution. The story of Central Asian Dunhuang manuscript forgeries contains all these elements and, despite almost nine decades having passed since the forgeries started to be produced, the story is yet to be concluded. Whether this is due more to curators’ complacency or the forgers’ skill is a matter of debate, but the fact remains that we still cannot say with any certainty whether there are large number of forgeries among the Dunhuang manuscripts now in collections world-wide, let alone give a foolproof method of detecting them or explain fully how and by whom they were made.

Some contributors to this collection argue that this is overly cautious, that they can distinguish forgery without any doubt, and that it is certain that most of the manuscripts collected after the early expeditions, namely those in St. Petersburg, Japan and a portion of the London collection, are forged. Other contributors argue, just as vociferously, that most of these manuscripts are genuine. The scientists would dismiss both claims as subjective and therefore unverifiable and turn to the need for ‘objective’ testing before proof can be claimed either way. These differences reveal just how little of the story has yet been told and how far there is to go. The purpose of the conference held in June 1997 and these resulting papers, therefore, is not to make decisions but simply to open the debate. For the conference was the first public discussion of this issue.

The Dispersal of the Dunhuang Manuscripts

Cave 17 at Dunhuang was probably discovered in June 1900. The self-appointed guardian of the caves, Wang Yuanhu, presented a few manuscripts and paintings to local officials. Stein and Pelliot acquired many more and, in 1909, Fu Baoshu, an official in the Ministry of Education, was dispatched to Dunhuang with the order to transport all the manuscripts left in cave 17 to the Ministry for safekeeping. They arrived in 1910. In the same year Fu Baoshu was arrested. Most scholars have accepted the version of these events given by Luo Zhenyu in 1927, in which he claimed that a famous bibliophile, Li Shengduo, and several others arranged to steal manuscripts while they were in transit. However, Rong Xinjiang challenges this and makes excellent use of contemporary historical sources in Peking University library to argue that the manuscripts reached Beijing intact. However, he continues, there is evidence to suggest that Li Shengduo arranged the theft later, when the manuscripts were already in the Ministry (Li Shengduo was a high official there) and after they had been seen by visiting Japanese scholars. The son of a friend of Li’s later wrote that Chen Yi’an, Li’s nephew, made copies of the manuscripts in his uncle’s collection to earn money.

Copying manuscripts and works of art has a long tradition in China. Monique Cohen enumerates the various methods in use, including copying from sight, tracing, tracing the outline and imitation. The aim was not to deceive – this was not a process of forgery – but to learn. The same method was also used in the western artistic tradition. But some artists, both eastern and western, seem to take special pleasure in fooling experts and others. A paradigm is the case of Zhang Daqian, a Chinese artist discussed in Roderick Whitfield’s paper. He spent time at Dunhuang with his students making copies of the wall paintings, but also, according to Whitfield, seems to have taken delight in making Dunhuang forgeries of silk paintings.

Cohen also enumerates Zhang Daqian’s talents as a forger, and places him in a long tradition of forgery masters in China. Copies were made from the fourth to fifth centuries but, as a number of other authors have pointed out, it is the development of an art market which acts as a catalyst for forging rather than copying. In China there was a market for calligraphy from the fifth century, for painting by the eighth, and for artefacts by the eleventh, but the Chinese collector came into his own in the sixteenth century. This was when connoisseurship became a high calling for the Confucian gentlemen. The Chinese word for connoisseurship is composed of two elements which mean, respectively, ‘to discriminate on the grounds of quality’ and ‘to distinguish true from false’. Chinese connoisseurs were therefore alert to the possibility of artistic forgeries: indeed, they were often the perpetrators.

Forging of texts is a more complex matter. There may be no monetary benefit for the forger of an historical text who wishes, for whatever reason, to create history, nor may there be any personal credit. Examples of this type of forgery abound in Chinese tradition, from the forging of ancient literary and philosophical texts probably as early as the latter part of the first millennium BC, to the creation of apocryphal sutra throughout the first millennium AD. The Dunhuang manuscripts, however, occupy an interesting position which is neither wholly akin to works of art nor to texts, but something of each. This ambivalence is apparent in their study. As Lancaster notes, early scholarship was interested only in the text so that microfilms were deemed sufficient. This is still the case for many scholars.

The attitude of textual scholars contrasts with paper historians and others who are only interested in the manuscript as an object and may not even be able to read the text. When it comes to looking at the manuscripts from the point of view of forgeries, however, it is apparent that they are treated very much as objects — as works of art (a situation very different from Indian manuscripts, as Lancaster points out). As far as we know, the texts of forged manuscripts are not unique or variant: they are simply reproductions of existing texts. The forgers were not concerned to create history — at least, not by producing variant textual sources — nor, it would appear, were they interested in displaying their personal skills. The majority of Dunhuang forgeries were probably made for one reason: money.

Lancaster discusses this and makes the salient point that, despite China becoming a print culture at a very early stage, the skills for creating manuscripts did not die out. Calligraphy remained a high art and manuscript copies of texts were needed for production of the woodblock for carving. Nevertheless, as a number of authors stress, the skills necessary for producing a good copy of a Dunhuang manuscript were in fairly limited supply. Fang Guangchang, in his paper, suggests that the forger required considerable experience in handling genuine Dunhuang manuscripts and to have researched their form and content; ...a detailed knowledge of classical Chinese history; ...well-grounded brushwork skills; ...a solid understanding of mounting techniques;

---

1. This is a condensation of Dr Susan Whitfield’s introduction to Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries (The British Library, 2002; see p. 11).
敦煌寫卷中的偽作研究

偽作因其多種原因而為眾所關注：食偽、巨款、欺詐，有時甚至是暴力，至少，一個平常人之所為往往能夠迷惑大專家或高級機構。中亞敦煌寫卷作為包含上述各種因素，尤其是作偽至今已經過去九十多年了，但這種行為仍然沒有停止。不知道這是由於管理者的自滿，還是作偽者天衣無縫的技能。世界各地收藏寫卷中存在大量的偽卷，更談不上有一種萬全的方法識別它們或充分解釋它們是由誰如何作的。我們仍然無法肯定。

本文中部分作者認為這樣做有點過分謹慎，可以毫無疑問地識別出偽卷，早期探險者之後的收藏，即那些收藏在各種地方，不論是在納古、日本、以及倫敦部分寫卷都是偽卷。作者作者大聲疾呼，這些寫本絕大部分是真品。科學家一般認為這兩種觀點都缺乏客觀因而無可厚非，轉而尋找“客觀”的檢驗方法；在此討論誰是誰非。這些差異表明辨別真偽才開了頭，人後還有很長的路要走。

1997年6月舉行的這次會議以及這些結集的論文的最主要的目的是，不是做出決定而僅僅是拉開討論的序幕。因為這是首次公開討論這個問題的會議。

敦煌寫本的流布
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and, finally, a good knowledge of Buddhism.’

In the case of Dunhuang manuscripts, the text is not a major issue since most of the forgeries appear to be of canonical Buddhist works. Even if the forgers did not have genuine manuscripts to copy from, they had copies of the Buddhist canon dating almost as far back as the manuscripts, and whether, therefore, a good knowledge of Buddhism was strictly necessary is a moot point: a scribe should be able to copy anything, whether or not he understands it. However, the importance of the text should not be entirely disregarded. Vetch’s paper is a model of historical research based on a forensic examination of the text, and shows us how far a well-trained scholar can proceed using these traditional research methods. In her paper, Scherrer-Schaub also uses historical analysis of Tibetan Buddhist texts for dating, but reinforces it with philological, palaeographical, and codicological investigation. Systematic philological analysis of Chinese Buddhist texts is still to be done and, as Lancaster says, ‘Buddhist scholars have given almost all their attention to the printed versions and the lack of comparable attempts to study the stemma of readings from Buddhist Chinese manuscripts means it will take many years to establish this.’

Unfortunately, the early development of printing has resulted in a comparative lack of development in another discipline concerning both Chinese and Tibetan manuscripts which, in the west, is an important tool in the discovery of forgeries: palaeography. Another factor in this, as both Drege and Lancaster note, is that the study of handwriting was approached through calligraphy, that is, as an artistic rather than a scribal tradition.

When Were Forgeries Made?

To return to the matter of if, when, and how Dunhuang forgeries were made, few would dispute that some were produced between 1920 and 1949 when the value of the manuscripts was realized by a new class of collectors and there were still few enough manuscripts in circulation for the forger’s work to escape detection. Fang Guangchang argues that the market ended after 1949 because the price of manuscripts was state controlled and, consequently, low. However, this is to underestimate the ingenuity of man. Although required to sell important historical artefacts, such as Dunhuang manuscripts, to the state, this does not mean that everyone did so. There was a ready market among Japanese and US collectors. There is also the possibility that forgeries continued to be made outside China. But the main issue here concerns earlier forgeries and there are several questions remaining unanswered: whether forgeries were made locally to Dunhuang and, if so, when, in what numbers and by whom?

Cohen argues that it is difficult to imagine forgeries being produced before 1909 because, up to then the manuscripts were not worth a great deal and, in any case, there was a ready supply. However, some Japanese scholars, led by the doubts of Fujieda, have challenged the authenticity of all manuscripts acquired locally to Dunhuang after the cave was cleared in 1910. This would include all the Russian collection, all the Japanese Otani manuscripts, and those 600-odd scrolls acquired by Stein on his third expedition and his second visit to Dunhuang in 1913. Ishizuka uses an afterword in his conference paper to deny the suggestion that any manuscripts acquired before then are forged, and overwhelmingly scholars have accepted that the bulk of the Stein collection and the entire Pelliot collection, along with the original Beijing collection (not including manuscripts acquired after 1910), are indubitably genuine and can be used as a baseline. But to be consistently rigorous, even this assumption needs to be re-

examined, especially as it is the foundation on which all knowledge of the genuine manuscripts is built.

The question after this is whether some forgeries started to be made before 1909. Cohen’s arguments – lack of a market and lack of skills – are persuasive but not final. The finds were known about by local officials and scholars: the presentation of paintings from the cave to local officials shows that they were considered to have value. Moreover, locals were well aware of the interest of foreign archaeologists in manuscripts. And the ready supply was only ‘ready’ to Wang Yuanlu, so that anyone else wishing to trade in these manuscripts would have to produce their own. Although the probabilities are against forgeries being made at this time, it cannot, I would argue, be entirely dismissed.

The Expert’s Eye versus Science

In their paper Fields and Seddon accept the importance of the expert’s ‘eye’ and other subjective evidence, but point out that such evidence is ‘never without distortion by personal feelings and prejudices’ and that ‘for a true scientific analysis … we must rely most heavily on objective evidence.’ Outnumbered in the conference, their passionate justification of the primacy of science is perhaps understandable, but it must be remembered that science can be a false friend. Firstly, of course, there is the fact that there is good and bad science, and the difference between them depends on the scientists.

Second, science can be used to deceive as well as elucidate and we must never be blind to its limitations. In the nineteenth century when photography was developed it was really believed that it could not lie; it was a scientific procedure producing objective results. The photographs of fairies at the bottom of the garden soon showed the paucity of this argument. Objective tests in common use today, such as thermoluminescence, are also open to the forger’s ingenuity. In the case of the manuscripts, given that monasteries and other institutions in China often kept supplies of old paper, it is possible (although unlikely given the age and therefore the value of such paper) that some of the forged manuscripts were written on original paper and that radiocarbon testing would give a plausible date for the manuscript being original. A negative test, of course, would prove it to be a fake.

Whereas science is concerned, many of the methods being developed will be of great use in helping us understand better genuine manuscripts. Some tests, however, will always be more focused on authentication, such as radiocarbon dating. This is both destructive and comparatively expensive - at least for public institutions where most manuscripts are held. Like thermoluminescence, it is easy to see it becoming a test used by collectors in the marketplace to verify their products once the forgery issue becomes common currency and the conspiracy of silence, so long dominant in this field, is broken, but it is another matter whether public institutions will ever be able to justify widespread radiocarbon dating. It is more probable that it will be used for random testing to corroborate other evidence.

But this is still a long way off. The papers in this collection, as mentioned previously, open the debate and pose questions. Now that this issue is in the public sphere and all those involved - the curators, conservators, scholars and scientists - have recognized the need to corroborate on further research, it is to be hoped that the advance in scholarship will be rapid. A full understanding of the historical circumstances of the discovery and dispersal of the manuscripts and a clarification of the provenance of all those manuscripts previously labelled as from Dunhuang is long overdue, and this should be the first aim of future research.
獻斷代，但強調結合語言學、古書法學、手稿學的調查。對中國佛經進行系統的語言分析是另一必須做的工作，正如蘭卡斯所說：“佛經學者把注意力幾乎都放到印本上，很少有人根據中文寫本佛經進行比較研究版本系統，這意味着需要很多年來建立起來。”

遺憾的是，印刷術的發明導致中文和梵文寫本學研究古文字學的發展，在西方，這仍然是揭示偽卷的一個重要工具。另一個要素，如同法國羅浮宮博物館戴仁（J.P.Dreger）和蘭卡斯所指出的，研究筆跡的出發點是作為藝術的書法而不是抄寫慣例。

作偽開始的時間

言歸正傳，敦煌偽卷是什麼時候偽造的，又是怎樣偽造的，很少人懷疑偽卷產生於1920-1949年之間，這時收藏家認識到寫卷的存在，而當時的偽造者有流通，作偽者的市場不容易被發現。方廣錫認為偽卷的市場在1949年後結束，因為寫本的價格由國家操縱，因此非常低。可是，這也低估了人的能力。政府需要把像敦煌寫本一樣的重要歷史文物賣給國外，這在當時並不為人所接受。日本和美國收藏家是現成的市場。此外，也有可能在中國境外作偽，但是涉及早期偽造的一系列問題仍然沒有解決。首先，偽卷是否在敦煌當地偽造的，如果是這樣，是誰偽造的，偽造了多少？

方廣錫認為，很難想象作僞產生於1909年之前，因為當時寫本不值錢，而且容易獲得。可是，這讓人懷疑作僞者是一些日本學者，對1909年以後從藏經洞獲得的寫卷的可靠性提出質疑。這部分包括俄羅斯所有藏品、所有大谷文書、1913年斯坦因第二次探險第三次到敦煌所獲得的600多件文書。日本北海道大學石塚晴通教授在會議論文討論中否認此之前所獲得的敦煌寫卷屬偽卷，學者普遍認為斯坦因收集品中絕大部分寫卷，伯希和所有收集品及北京初版藏品（不包括1910年以後獲得的）毋庸置疑是真品，可以作為基礎，但是為了更嚴密，這個推論尚需再論證，因為它們要被當作寫本真品所具有的架構基礎。

還有一個問題是，是否在1909年之前開始作僞。方廣錫的觀點是缺乏市場和技術，這很有說服力，但不是定論。當地官員、學者知道這些文獻文物，藏經洞中的藏書作為禮物送給當地官員顯示人們知道它們的存在。再者，當地人意識到外國考學者對寫卷感興趣。所謂容易得到只是對於王圓箓，因此其他人要交易只能自己偽造。我認為此時偽卷的可能性不大，但也不能完全排除。

專家的眼力與科學

英國貝爾法斯特女王大學的Ken Seddon教授和John Field博士在我們的論文中承認專家的“眼力”和其他主觀證據的必要性，但是指出這樣的證據“總是受到個人感情和偏見的扭曲”，“從科學的角度分析……我們必須強調依靠客觀證據。”方廣錫多次代表對強調科學證明的首要地位是可以理解的，但是必須記住科學也可能是虛僞的朋友的前因。當然事實上真僞科學之間的差異主要取決於科學家。

其次，科學既可以因過去的資料也可以因現在的資料。我們不能因它們的缺陷而忽視它們的存在。十九世紀末有攝影術，人們相信它不會製造假，它是科學程序複製客觀事物的結果。中國的小冊子畫像使這個論點模糊不清。今天普通使用的客觀測量方法，例如熱發光，作僞者也能做到。就寫本來說，如果中國的寺廟和其他機構提供古紙（儘管這些紙的年代和價值靠不住），寫在這種紙上的偽卷用放射性碳測試結果有可能寫卷是真的。當然負檢驗會證明是偽卷。

就科學而言，許多方法的發展有助於我們更好地認識寫卷。然而，有些檢測集中於證明真僞，像放射性碳年代法，既無用又差不多兩倍。至於對藏有絕大部分寫卷的公共機構來說是這樣的，像熱發光，一般適用於收藏家在科學協議被撕毀的假貨會在物質上鑑別真僞。但是，公共機構是否能普遍地運用放射性碳測試日期則是另一回事。最有可能是用自動化檢測來證實其它方式。

但是這卻是在很遙遠的事。這本文集的論文，正如上面所提到的，只是提出問題，拉開討論的序幕。現在這個問題已經公開於眾，相關的管理者、保護者、學者、科學家已經意識到需要進一步的合作研究，促進學術研究快速發展。完全理解藏經洞發現在的歷史環境、寫本的流散、把標明為敦煌的寫卷真正出處搞清楚是學界期待已久的工作，也是將來研究的主要目標。
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Islam Akhun’s Forgeries, 1895–7

Hoernle’s first major publication of the manuscripts in what he called the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia was in 1897. This was a description of three collections acquired in 1895 and 1896. Besides giving detailed descriptions of the manuscripts themselves, Hoernle identified them mostly as being in Sanskrit and a ‘non-Sanskrit’ (i.e. Khotanese) language in Brāhmī script, and gave transcriptions of them. However sets 2–6 of the last collection (Macartney I) were:

written in characters which are either quite unknown to me, or with which I am too imperfectly acquainted to attempt a ready reading in the scanty leisure that my regular official duties allow me ... My hope is that among those of my fellow-labourers who have made the languages of Central Asia their speciality, there may be some who may be able to recognize and identify the characters and language of these curious documents.²

By 1899, the British Collection possessed in addition 45 block-books which had been purchased on behalf of the Govt. of India by George Macartney, at the time Special Assistant for Chinese affairs at Kashgar, and Capt. Godfrey, Assistant to the Resident at Kashmir, and Joint-Commissioner at Ladak.³

Because of their resemblance to known scripts, Hoernle sent samples of the blockprints to other scholars. On 21 July 1899, for example, he sent Dr. E. West six which seemed to imitate Pahlavi writing.⁴ West wrote, in July 1901:

I find that the Pahlavi words I have collected form one-twelfth of your large MS., contain 13, out of 15, Pahlavi characters, and represent 27 out of the 33 known Pahlavi sounds. So that a twelfth part of the MS. has supplied five-sixths of the Pahlavi alphabet and sounds. But it has not supplied a single intelligible clause of a sentence.⁵

At various time Hoernle questioned the authenticity of the blockprints, quoting a lengthy correspondence with Rev. Magnus Bäcklund, the Swedish Missionary in Kashgar, who had written to him on 29 June 1898, describing an incident earlier in the year when Islam Akhun had offered him three books. Islam Akhun had appeared uneasy while the books were being examined, and accepted half of his original price without haggling. After he had left, one of the servants said, as reported by Bäcklund:

Sāhib, I want to tell you that these books are not so old as they are pretended to be. As I know how they are prepared, I wish to inform you of it. When I lived in Khotan, I wished very much to enter the business, but was always shut out and could even get no information about the books. At last I consulted my mother about it, and she advised me to try and find out of a boy with whom I was on very intimate terms, and who was the son of the headman of this business. So, one day I asked him, how they got these books, and he plainly told me that his father had the blocks prepared by a cotton-printer.⁶

However, taking other considerations into account, in 1899 Hoernle believed that the manuscripts were genuine, as were most, if not all, of the block-prins. If any were forgeries, he argued, they could only be duplicates of genuine ones.

By 1901, when he wrote part II of his report, Hoernle had changed his mind. During his first Central Asian expedition (1900–01), Stein had tried unsuccessfully to locate all the sites described in detail as find-places by Islam Akhun. At the end of his visit, he confronted him in Khotan and obtained a full confession and account of how the forgeries were made.⁷ All the manuscripts in ‘unknown characters’ and all the blockprints were

---

2 Hoernle, 1897, p. 250.
4 Hoernle 1897, plates xi–xx.
5 Hoernle 1899, pp. 64–110.
6 Hoernle’s Central Asian Register (IOR/MSS EUR. F 302), no. 90.
8 Hoernle 1899, pp. 57–8.
9 For a detailed account, see Stein’s Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan (1903), pp 447–59, and Ancient Khotan (1907).
modern fabrications of İslam Akhün and his colleagues. Some attempts had also been made at forging pottery and other antiques.\(^{10}\)

The manuscript production had begun early in 1895 but was abandoned in favour of blockprints about two years later. Sheets of modern paper had been dyed yellow or light brown, and when dry were written or printed on. They were then aged by being smoked and were bound. The finished volumes were sprinkled with sand to make them look as if they had been dug up from the desert.

The early manuscripts had been written carefully, but the blockprints were done comparatively carelessly. Hoernle himself, comparing a word from a blockprint with one in a genuine Brāhmī manuscript, re-examined it in a mirror and recognised it immediately as the reverse image. The whole document had evidently been cut on wood copying some genuine and some false letters, without the realisation that when printed it would appear in reverse!

**Brāhmī forgeries from Stein’s 4th Expedition 1930–31**

Considering that Stein was one of those most suspicious of the manuscripts and books in ‘unknown characters’ in the British Collection, it is surprising that several of the documents he acquired on his fourth expedition to Central Asia were themselves forgeries.

Stein’s fourth expedition was beset with difficulties from start to finish,\(^{11}\) but he eventually reached Kashgar early in October 1930.\(^{12}\) Between mid-November and February 1931 he visited Khotan, Domoko and Niya where he was able to carry out some archaeological work. On reaching Charchan in February 1931, he was ordered to return to India immediately, and went back to Kashgar along the northern side of the Taklamakan Desert, collecting data on hydrographical changes in the area and establishing exact longitudes round the Tarim Basin.

During the Southern part of his journey Stein purchased 2 Khorosti woodslips, 3 packets of paper manuscript fragments in Indian script, 1 packet of paper manuscript fragments in Indian and Tibetan scripts, and a packet of small manuscript fragments (Indian) with beads and wood carving. At Niya he found 46 Khorosti and 27 Chinese woodslips on or near the surface.\(^{13}\)

On his return to Kashgar in April Stein arranged with Capt. George Sherríff\(^{14}\) to take photographs of the manuscripts, in case he was prevented from taking the finds themselves to London for further examination. In the event, the antiquities were handed over to the Kashgar Taojin, on 21 Nov. 1931 by Sherríff’s successor, N Fitzmaurice.\(^{15}\)

Stein had several sets made of the photographs. One set of prints and negatives are preserved in the British Library.\(^{16}\) Another set of the Brāhmī prints is preserved in the late Professor Sir Harold Bailey’s papers preserved at the Ancient India and Iran Trust, Cambridge.

**Professor Bailey’s Work on the Brāhmī Photographs**

The history of the decipherment and publication of the Khotanese documents among the Stein photographs is described in Wang Juijing’s article, but some additional material has come to light in Sir Harold Bailey’s papers. When he returned to England, Stein wrote from Oxford on 27 April 1931 to Dr. L. D. Barnett, at the British Museum enclosing prints from photographs taken at Kashgar in May 1931:

> of Brāhmī MS. Fragments I had been able to acquire in the preceding autumn on my passage through Domoko, Achma and Keriya in the Khotan region. The originals which in all probability had been dug up at late Buddhist period ruins of these tracts had to be left at the Consulate General Kashgar. They are likely to have since been sold ... or destroyed during the Muhammadan rising in Chinese Turkestan.

He adds that the negatives of all the photographs were available ‘at the collection of my finds, 1932–4, now in the Ceramic Basement under Andrews’ care.’ He asked Barnett to submit the material to Mr. Bailey or any other interested scholars, mentioning that duplicate prints 7 from MS. remains obtained at Achma; 9 from Domoko; I from Keriya ... are available at Mrs. Allen’s house where I write this.’

Stein himself sent samples of the prints to Prof. Sten Konow in Oslo in 1931 inviting him to work on them. In a letter discovered by Prof. P.O. Skjærvø\(^{17}\) at the Institute for Indian and Iran Studies (Indoiranisk Institutt), University in Oslo, dated 4 November 1931 (c/o Messrs Thomas Cook & Sons, Bombay) written on his way to Lahore Stein wrote:

> I am very grateful for your willingness to take up the study of those manuscript remains I collected but had to leave behind at Kashgar. I hope to secure improved imprints from the Photographic Department of the Thomason Civil Engineering College, Roorkee,\(^{18}\) They have been rather successful with negatives of Chinese documents, I fully appreciate the difficulties besetting interpretation of such documents. But some pieces seem to contain Buddhist text fragments.

---

10 Hoernle 1901, pp. 1-5.
11 See S. B. Brysac, 'Last of the "Foreign Devils"': Sir Aurel Stein’s fourth foray into China was a humiliating failure. Who conspired to undermine the expedition and why?', *Archaeology*, Nov./Dec. 1997, pp. 53-9.
12 Cutting from *The Times*, July 1931, enclosed in IOR/L/PS/10/1218, file P.Z. 4100/31.
17 See the introduction to P.O. Skjærvø, *The Khotanese manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library: a complete catalogue with texts and translations*, to be published later in 2002.
18 See Falconer (quoted above).
Kow apparently never produced any results, so on 29 April 1935 Barnett wrote, enclosing prints, asking Bailey to describe their contents. Stein independently wrote to Bailey with the same request on 6 Dec. 1937.19 Bailey replied the next day explaining that Dr. Barnett had already sent him prints over a year ago. ‘Three or four are official documents but several are in a variety of brahmi script not yet read with certainty.’

Bailey worked on the photographs between 1945–49 when he was preparing volume II of Khotanese Texts. (Cambridge, 1954). There, on pp. 62–3, he published the Khotanese text of five of the documents, and photographs of them, plates XCV and XCVI, in vol IV of Saka Documents (London, 1967). They were:

Achma (Photo 392/57 T.O. 20)
Domoko (Dumaqu) A (Photo 392/57 T.O. 34)
Domoko (Dumaqu) C (Photo 392/57 T.O. 45 (see p. 1))
Domoko (Dumaqu) D (Photo 392/57 T.O. 45 (see p. 1))
Domoko (Dumaqu) F (Photo 392/57 T.O. 46)

However, his dated notes on the other texts show that he was only able to read occasional letters.

The Forgeries

The other Brahmī documents are:
Achma 1, 3 (Photo 392/57 T.O. 35–36)
Achma 4 (Photo 392/57 T.O. 32–33)
Achma 5 (Photo 392/57 T.O. 44)
Achma 6 (Photo 392/57 T.O. 40)
Domoko A.1–3 (Photo 392/57 T.O. 29–31)
Domoko B1–4 (Photo 392/57 T.O. 41–43, 45 (see p.1))
(no site no) (Photo 392/57 T.O. 39)

The Achma documents are written in a very thin spidery script, and the Domoko ones are ‘bilingual’ with lines in the same script alternating with a second thicker ‘formal’ type script. The unnumbered one, perhaps from Keriya,20 is of the formal type. According to Professor Skjærvø, who recently re-examined the prints during his work on the Khotanese catalogue (see below), the thicker script may have been intended to imitate the ‘literary’ Brahmī script of the sutra fragments. The thinner one copies that of the documents. The mixed texts do not really have any models, unless it is the Chinese-Khotanese bilinguals (Dom C).

The thicker script contains signs that recall genuine Brahmī, but any attempt at reading them fails at once. The thinner script contains letters that are very similar to genuine ones, but the scribe did not recognise the characteristic features of each akshara. For instance, he did not realize that they are all aligned according to a base/top line, with some parts above it and some below; with the result that the tops of the vowel signs are aligned in a nonsensical way with the tops of letters without any vowel signs. Ursula Sims-Williams is curator of the India Office Persian material at the British Library.

19 Stein's original is in the Bailey papers. Stein also kept a copy (Bodleian Library, MS. Stein 64, f. 157) quoted by Wang Jiqing (see above).
20 Wang, op. cit., p. 39 (Bodleian Library, MS. Stein 64, ff. 158–9)
21 Keriya is mentioned in Stein's letter of 27th April 1931 to Dr. L. D. Barnett, but none of the photos is labelled as being from there, and this is the only one without any site attribution.

Two ‘New’ ‘Islām Ākhūn Forgeries

Two forged manuscript/blockprints have recently been rediscovered among Rudolf Hoernle’s papers. They were in an envelope labelled by Hoernle ‘Central Asian MSS. found by Lt. Col. Miles in his office.’ Lt-Colonel P. J. Miles, was Special Assistant for Chinese Affairs at Kashgar during Macartney’s leave, 1902–3, and they probably date from about that time. They were brought to the India Office in December 1918, by the librarian, F.W. Thomas, with other manuscripts and papers from Hoernle’s house in Oxford, after his death on 12 Nov. 1918.

Both are in very bad condition, and the writing is barely legible, but the first seems to contain repeated blocks of text in characters resembling Brāhmī. It has been sewn with thread and is similar to many of Hoernle’s other 45 blockprints now in the British Library ‘forgery’ section, as Stein called it.1 (Or. 13873/1–94). The second has been ‘sewn’ with two twists of paper and is even more difficult to make out. Each page contains a circle divided into eight sections containing writing, with a central rectangle. The pages that are legible do not seem to be identical.

1 Sand-buried ruins of Khotan, p. 477

Forgeries Today

A series of suspected forgeries of both manuscripts and artefacts have recently come on to the open market. Thought by some to be produced in or near Quetta and then passed off as finds from archaeological sites in N.W. Pakistan one, at least, has fooled experts in the field. Radiocarbon dating of the bark manuscript shown above (and 3 others), offered by a dealer as a genuine manuscript in something resembling the IndusValley or proto-Elamite script, showed the bark to be of recent date. The same dealer was responsible for the ‘Persian’ mummy find, the subject of a recent UK television programme (and found to be dated ca. 1999), and various other manuscript collections which have been bought by collectors in Europe. Not all of these, however, are believed to be forgeries.

One of the problems with these manuscripts is that they are being offered as unique, from periods for which there are few provenanced — and indubitably genuine — finds. Thus buyers have little with which to compare them. This is exactly the situation which Islām Ākhūn and the early forgers of Dunhuang manuscripts exploited in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
More Stein News

By a happy coincidence, Brigadier Barney White-Spunner, a member of the Sino-British Cross Taklamakan Expedition and publisher of Stein’s *Sand Buried Ruins of Khotan*, was posted to Kabul in January and was able to locate Stein’s grave. Its condition was similar to that shown in the photographs in *IDP News* 18 taken by Victoria Finlay over 10 years ago. Brigadier White-Spunner has organised repairs and his photographs and a short report are given below.

The three year project to catalogue the Stein papers and photographs in the library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences came to a successful completion with publication of the catalogue and a very well-attended study day on Stein held at the British Museum. The success of the project was due in large part to the energy of its two instigators, Helen Wang of the British Museum, and Eva Apor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Helen Wang has also found time to publish another book on Stein. Details of these publications are given on p.11.

Stein’s Grave

Aurel Stein’s grave in the Gora Kabar (which literally means ‘white graveyard’) in Kabul has survived the recent fighting quite well. A group of Muhajedin removed the trees in the graveyard for firewood, but otherwise there has been little deliberate damage. When British troops arrived in January we discovered that the cross above the grave lost its top corner and the memorial stone was cracked, but this looked more like frost shattering than vandalism. This damage has now been repaired by a local stone mason and the grave polished. It is shown here following repair (right).

The graveyard has been cared for by the same Chowkidar, Rahimullah, for a long time. He was unpaid for nearly twenty years during the various recent wars, and protected the graves during the worst excesses of the Taliban. Recompense has now been made by the Army and the British Embassy have salaried him again, in conjunction with other embassies in Kabul as people from many different countries are buried there.

The Gora Kabar lies at the northwestern corner of the Bimarz Heights in Kabul. It also contains 158 graves of British soldiers and their families dating back to the First and Second Afghan Wars, although many of their headstones have been lost. A severe frost in 1978 damaged the few remaining ones and those that could be rescued were placed in a line along the southern wall. We have renovated these and held a service of re-dedication in February. We have also dug a new well and put in an electric pump so that Rahimullah, who is now quite old, can restore the garden; built up the walls, to stop locals throwing rubbish over; diverted two domestic drains that seemed to empty on the southern side and had new gates made. With the Spring about to break, the graveyard looks as good as it has done for two decades.

A facsimile of the original 1903 edition of Stein’s popular account of his first Central Asian expedition, *Sand Buried Ruins of Khotan*, has been published by Books for Travel in a limited edition of 500 copies, with photographs and maps and bound in the red cover of the original. For details contact: http://www.booksfortravel.org.uk or email: maria@booksfortravel.org.uk.

The UK-Hungarian Stein Project

This joint project came to a very successful completion this spring with the publication of the catalogue (see p.11) and the Stein Day at the British Museum.

Speakers at the Stein Day included the Project organiser — Helen Wang of the BM who spoke about her new publication, *Sir Aurel Stein in The Times*, and Éva Apor, Head of the Oriental Collection, Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, who spoke of Stein’s Hungarian background. Other speakers who were members of the project included Lilla Russell-Smith (BM), John Falconer (British Library) and Ágnes Kelecsényi (Budapest), the latter bringing along a recording made by Hungarian radio on New Year’s Eve, 1937 of Stein talking about Alexander Csoma de Körös who set out to find the cradle of the Hungarian people in Central Asia.

Other contributions to the very well-attended Stein Day came from Vesta Curtis (BM: Stein on old routes of Western Iran), Annabel Walker (biographer of Stein) and Shareen Blair-Bryscen (on Stein’s 4th expedition and Milton Bramlette). A small exhibition of photographs by Stein was organised by John Falconer.

The project gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the British Academy, the British Council (Hungary), the British Museum, the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, the Hungarian Scholarship Board, and the Komatsu Chiko Foundation (Japan).
Conferences

From this issue of IDP News, details of conferences organised in China will be given in the IDP Chinese news-sheet. If you wish to be added to the mailing list to receive this additional publication please tell IDP (contact details p. 12).

The World of Central Asia
To commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Institute of Mongolian, Buddhist and Tibetan Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Siberian Branch)
Ulan-Ude, Mongolia
13-16 June, 2002
For details contact:
Dr. Buravea Olga Vladimirovna
IMBTS, Russian Academy of Sciences
Sakhyanova St., 6,
Ulan-Ude, 670047, Mongolia
tel: 3012 330318
email: imb@bsc.buryatia.ru

Silk Road Art and Culture
The 6th Asian Studies Conference
Japan
Sophia University, Ichigaya Campus,
Tokyo, Japan
22-23 June, 2002
For details contact:
Dr. Zsuzsanna Gulaci
Department of Comparative Culture
Sophia University, Ichigaya Campus
4 Yonban-cho, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 102-0081, Japan
tel: (81) (3) 3238-4039
fax: (81) (3) 3238-4076
email: zgulaci@sophia.ac.jp
http://www.meijigakuen.ac.jp/~kokusai/asc/

45th Meeting of the permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC)
Budapest
23-28 June, 2002
For details contact:
Secretary General PIAC
Goodbody Hall 157, Indiana University
1011 E. Third St., Bloomington, Indiana
47405-7005, USA
tel: +1 812 855 7500
email: sinordi@indiana.edu

Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research Into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road
Berlin, Germany
8-15 September, 2002
This conference will coincide with a major international exhibition at the Museum of Indian Art in Berlin-Dahlem.

For details contact:
Professor Dr Werner Sundermann
Akademievorhaben Turfanforschung
Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Unter den Linden 6
D-10117 Berlin, Germany
tel: +49 30 20370 472
fax: +49 30 20370 467
email: sundermann@bbaw.de

The Central Asian Studies Society
3rd Annual Conference
University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
17-20 October, 2002
For details contact:
Center for Russia, East Europe, and Central Asia
University of Wisconsin, 210 Ingraham Hall
Madison, WI 53706
USA
tel: +1 608 262 3379
fax: +1 608 265 3062
email: crecca@nmr-institute.wisc.edu
http://www.wisc.edu/crecca/
Additional information about past and forthcoming CESS Annual Conferences is available at the CESS website:
http://www.fas.harvard.edu/cess/

Conservation of Ancient Sites on the Silk Road:
2nd International Conference on the Conservation of Grotto Sites
Dunhuang, Gansu Province, China
August 25-29, 2003
For details contact:
Kathleen Louw
The Getty Conservation Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90049
USA
tel: 1-310-440 6216
email: k louw@getty.edu
http://www.getty.edu/conservation/

Cultures of the Silk Road and Modern Science
Conference in commemoration of the Otani Mission to Central Asia
Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan
September 8-13, 2003
This conference will comprise symposia concentrating on different aspects of the theme, as below. The opening day, 8 September, is when the first Otani expedition organised the caravan at Osb in 1902. 9th: 'Buddhist Society on the Northern Silk Route'
10th: 'Buddhist Arts in Kucha'
11th: 'The Southern Route and the Niya Ruins'
12th: 'Analysis and Preservation of Central Asian Finds (IDP Conference)'
For details contact:
Professor Kudara Kogi
Dept. of Buddhist Studies, Faculty of Letters
Ryukoku University, Shichijo Omiya
Kyoto 600-8268, Japan
tel: +81 75 343 3311
fax: +81 75 343 3319
email: saitiki@jet.ryukoku.ac.jp

Fieldwork Opportunities

Khazar fortress in the Lower Don region
Details of a new fieldwork opportunity — the excavations of the Khazar fortress in the Lower Don region — can be found on a special page:
This is part of the newly-mounted web-site of the journal, Domskaya Arheologiya, http://www.da.aaanet.ru (in Russian and English).

Study Project in Mongolia
The Cultural Restoration Tourism Project (CRTP) is a non-profit organization established to restore and preserve culturally significant buildings and artefacts around the world.
Our current project is the restoration of a Buddhist temple at the Mongolian monastery of Baldan Baraiyn. The restoration will include building restoration, infrastructure and community building. CRTP is planning to use the latest techniques in sustainable development to rebuild a community that can support itself with limited impact on the environment. During the restoration process we will be looking for volunteers to donate time to the project. Scholarships are available for interested students.
In addition to our tour packages, CRTP will be offering three full-summer internships to individuals. There are no area-of-study requirements for the internships.
For details contact:
Mark A. Hintze, Director
Cultural Restoration Tourism Project
email: crtp@earthlink.net
http://www.crtp.net
From Nisa to Nyia: New Discoveries and Studies in Central and Inner Asian Art and Archaeology
Madhuvanti Ghose, Lilla Russell-Smith and Burzine Waghmar (edd.)
Saffron Books, London 2002
ISBN: 1 872843 30 1

This is the first volume of the new Circle of Inner Asian Art (CIAA) series taken from lectures hosted by CIAA.
For details contact:
Saffron Books, Eastern Art Publishing,
PO Box 13666, London SW14 8WF
tel: +44-[0]20-8392-1122.
fax: +44-[0]20-8392-1422.
e-mail saffron@eapgroup.com

La Séridine, Terre d'Échanges: Art, religion, commerce du 1er au Xe siècle
Actes du colloque international
Galeries nationale de Grand Palais
13-15 février 1996
November 2001,
ISBN 2-11-004281-8, 69.64 Euros

For details contact:
La Documentation francaise
29-31 quai Voltaire, 75344 Paris, France
tel: +33-1-40-15-70-00
fax: +33-1-40-15-72-30
http://www.ladocfrancaise.gouv.fr

Publications

Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries
British Library Studies in Conservation Science: 3
Susan Whitfield (ed.)
The British Library, London 2002
352 pp., 105 b/w, 12 col. ill.

For details contact:
email: turpin@turpin.com
In US: utbooks@utpress.utoronto.ca

Catalogue of the Collections of Sir Aurel Stein in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
British Museum and Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Budapest 2002
This is the first catalogue of the very important collections of Stein’s photographs, correspondence, documents, articles, offprints and miscellaneous paper which are kept in the Library in Budapest.
For details contact:
Helen Wang
Dept of Coins and Medals, British Museum
London WC1B 3DG, UK
email: hwang@thebritishmuseum.ac.uk

Sir Aurel Stein in the Times: a collection of over 100 references to Sir Aurel Stein and his extraordinary expeditions to Chinese Central Asia, India, Iran, Iraq and Jordan in The Times newspaper 1901-43
Helen Wang (ed.)
Saffron Books, London 2002
164 pp., 19 ill. and maps
ISBN 1 872843 29 8
£19.50 (inc. p&p to UK address)
£22.50/US$32 (to non-UK address)

For details contact:
Saffron Books, Eastern Art Publishing,
PO Box 13666, London SW14 8WF
tel: +44-[0]20-8392-1122.
fax: +44-[0]20-8392-1422.
e-mail saffron@eapgroup.com

History and Palaeography of the Kharosti Script
Professor C.S. Upasak
Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies
fax: 91 542 585150
email: cihst@hotmail.com, cihst@yahoo.com
http://www.cihst.ac.in

The Complete Collection of Dunhuang Grottoes
Dunhuang Research Institute
The Commercial Press, Hong Kong
pp. 240-272; format: 210 x 285 mm; hardcover with case

As a subscriber to IDP News you can order single copies of this series at 10% discount; mini-sets of 3 or 4 copies at 15% or the full set of 11 copies published to date at 20% discount. IDP will receive 15% of the order value from the publishers.
For details contact:
e-mail: sales@commercialpress.com.uk quoting ‘IDP Offer’.

Central Eurasian Studies Review
No. 1 (Winter 2001)

This is the first issue of a scholarly review of research, resources, events, publications and developments in scholarship and teaching on Central Eurasia. It will appear three times annually and is distributed free of charge to dues paying members of the Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS). Institutions may subscribe at a rate of US$50 per year.

The Review is also available to all interested readers via the web. http://www.fas.harvard.edu/cess/CESS_Review.html.

Fayuan (Source of Dharma)
No. 19 (Dec. 2001)

Contributions to this issue include:
Yang Zengwen, 'Study on the Formless Precepts of the Dunhuang Text of the Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch' Ma De, 'Social Significances of Inscriptions of Dunhuang Manuscripts' Da Zhao, 'Study on the Dunhuang Text P2039v: Ode to the Diamond Sutra'
For details contact:
Zhongguo Faxueyuan
7 Fayuans Qianniu, Xuanwu District
Beijing 100052
tel. & fax: +86 10 83517182
email: Fayuanshijianjie@263.net
People

Colin Chinnery (right), Project Manager with IDP, left for a new life in China at the end of February. We were very sad to see him leave but wish him well in the future.

Colin started with the International Dunhuang Project in January 1998 on a three-year grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund to set up the digitisation programme, which he did very successfully. In 2001 he was promoted to become IDP Project Manager with responsibility for China and other collaborations with institutions in the UK and abroad, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England.

During his time with IDP, Colin designed and wrote the very popular and informative bookbinding web pages and also designed and implemented the map interface for the web database. In addition, he worked on a new GIS interface for IDP and the British Library.

IDP is currently recruiting for a replacement and details of the new member of the team will be given in the next issue.

Sam van Schaik received a promotion to become IDP Project Manager responsible for the Digitisation Studio and Tibetan material. His post is funded by a three-year Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB) grant and he will be concentrating on cataloguing the Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang and supervising their digitisation and entry onto the database.

The AHRB project is a collaborative project based at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). Jacob Dalton was appointed by SOAS as a Research Fellow to work together with Dr van Schaik on the cataloguing.

Virginia Lladó-Buisán and Barbara Borghese joined the IDP team in March to work full-time on conservation of manuscripts to be digitised as part of the Mellon programme. The Mellon Foundation generously provided a grant for their work for three years.

Yoriko Chudo, a conservator from Japan, is currently working on Tibetan illustrated material from Dunhuang and will come back to the Library in July as a research fellow to work on the Tibetan material from Dunhuang.

Kate Hampson and Colin Chinnery met with staff at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in January to discuss possible collaboration on the digitisation programme.

Visitors

The new Chinese Cultural Counsellor to London, Yan Shixun, his wife, Pu Jubaow (First Secretary (Cultural)), and Huang Peibin (Third Secretary), visited the International Dunhuang Project at the British Library on 30 January. After a tour of the Library and an introduction to the IDP Digitisation programme they had tea with the Chief Executive, Lynne Brindley.

5th Conference

The Fifth Conference on the Preservation of Central Asian Material is being held under the auspices of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities with the National Museum of Ethnography/the Sven Hedin Foundation in Stockholm, 17-19 October, 2002. It will concentrate on practical workshops on paper and textile conservation, with some general reports and scientific papers. Participation is limited firstly to invited people and it is hoped that the papers may be published. Professor Hakan Wahlquist and Anna-Grethe Rischel came to London to discuss the conference in March.

China Office

An update on the IDP Project in China is given in the Chinese news-sheet.

Joint Promotion

Commercial Press (Hong Kong) and IDP have agreed a joint promotion for the Dunhuang caves series. (see p. 11) A flyer was sent with the previous newsletter. The series are offered at a special discount to IDP members and IDP receives 15% of all sales. Readers are encouraged, therefore, to take advantage of the discount and to help to support IDP.

Next Issue

The next issue of the newsletter will be devoted to the Swedish expeditions to Central Asia led by Sven Hedin, in preparation for the 5th conference to be held in Stockholm.