

BRILL

Buddhism in Turkish Central Asia
Author(s): Hans-J. Klimkeit
Source: *Numen*, Vol. 37, Fasc. 1 (Jun., 1990), pp. 53-69
Published by: BRILL
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3269824
Accessed: 19/06/2010 14:16

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=bap.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Numen.*

http://www.jstor.org

Numen, Vol. XXXVII, Fasc. 1

BUDDHISM IN TURKISH CENTRAL ASIA

HANS-J. KLIMKEIT

In the middle of the 6th century, the Turks, coming probably from the area of the Altai mountains, made their appearance in the Central Asian steppes.[1] Their religion was marked by a cult of Heaven and Earth and the veneration of ancestors.[2] It was the Türküt Turks who established what is known as the first Turkish (Türküt) kingdom in a vast region reaching from northwestern China to the area east of Lake Aral. As was the fate of many a kingdom of the steppes, the realm was soon divided into two portions, an eastern and a western one. Bumïn Qaγan (d. 552) was regarded as the founder of the whole realm and first ruler of its eastern part, whereas his brother Istämi ruled the western extension. Although the names of Khans before Bumïn are known, the early Turks regarded him and his brother as the founding fathers of the Turkish state, projecting their rule to mythical *Urzeit*. Thus in the Kül Tigin inscription it says, "When the blue sky above and the reddish-brown earth below were created, between the two human beings were created. Over the human beings, my ancestors Bumïn Qaγan and Istämi Qaγan became rulers. After they had become rulers, they organized and ruled the state and institutions of the Turkish people."[3] The words are spoken by Bilgä Qaγan (716-734), one of the great rulers of the second Turkish empire, established after 680. He praises the wisdom and courage of the first Qaγans, mentioning their Chinese and Tibetan connections. But there is no indication of any Buddhist influence. Yet there must have been contacts to representatives of that religion, the situation being different in the western and the eastern part of the first kingdom.

It is very probable that the Western Turks of the first empire already came into contact with Buddhism, for that religion had by this time made inroads into the part of Central Asia they occupied. But we have no evidence of considerable conversions to Buddhism at this period. In so far as later Western Turks are concerned, we

do hear of Buddhist sanctuaries established by Turkish royalty in the area of Kapiśa (Begram).[4] When the Chinese Buddhist monk Wu-k'ung visited Gandhara between 759 and 764, he found here Buddhist temples, which, as he thinks, were built at the expense of the Turkish kings.[5] Hsüan-tsang, who passed through Central Asia in 629, does not make any mention of Buddhism among the Western Turks. The Turkish rulers he met adhered to other faiths. But this might be due to the fact that, as von Gabain notes, he was primarily interested in meeting Indian and Chinese Buddhists.[6] However, we do know that he also had contact with Buddhists belonging to other ethnic groups.

Turning back to the first Turkish kingdom and its western realm, we do not know exactly of its extention to the west and south. Spuler is of the opinion that the Oxus could have been the dividing line between the Western Turks and the Sassanian empire.[7] But it may also have included portions of what is now Afghanistan, where, as we know, Buddhism was firmly established by the 6th cent.

The Eastern Turks of the first Empire did have contact with Chinese Buddhism. According to Chinese sources, a certain Yü-wen T'ai, the commander-in-chief of the West Wei and the founder of the Northern Chou Dynasty (556-581), had various temples and monasteries erected in Ch'ang-an and other places, apparently for the use of Turks as well as Chinese. He also had a "Turkish Temple" built for the "Great Qaγan of the Turks", i.e. Mu-han (553-572), in Ch'ang-an.[8] The second successor to Yü-wen T'ai, Ming-ti (556-560), had an inscription made commemorating the founding of that temple. In this inscription there is first a praise of Buddhism as a power ordering the world, and then it says: "The Turk, the great I-ni Wen Mu-han, in summer, turned to the complete foundation [i.e. Buddhism]. That was wholly the work of Heaven."[9] The inscription then praises the military virtues of Mu-han, whose Turkish army had, indeed, helped the Chou. Finally, the inscription talks about the missionary zeal of Yü-wen T'ai. Whether Mu-han actually did embrace Buddhism, is very doubtful. Most probably this was more wishful thinking on the part of the Chinese. But the fact that a Buddhist temple for Turks was actually built in Ch'ang-an in the 6th cent. shows that a considerable number of

Turks—according to von Gabain about 6000—lived there at this time.

Mu-han's successor and younger brother, Tapar Qaγan (T'o-po: 572-581), was apparently even more open to Buddhism. Whether he actually embraced that religion we do not know. Probably he manifested interest in that faith without surrendering his own belief. He did have a Buddhist temple erected in his realm, and he did ask the ruler of Ts'i for Buddhist scriptures. This ruler had the *Nirvāṇa-Sūtra* translated into Turkish for him.[10] The translation was made by a high state official, Shi-Ts'ing. This first translation of a Buddhist text into Turkish must have had to cope with great difficulties, since the language of the Turks had no means of expressing the complicated terminology of Buddhism. Furthermore, the question is, in what script that text was written. It could have been the ancient Runic Turkish script as used in the Orkhon inscriptions, but it seems more possible that it was written in Sogdian script.[11]

Further evidence of Buddhist influence on the Eastern Turks of the first realm is the fact that a certain Buddhist monk, Jinagupta (ca. 528-605 ?), coming from Kapiśa (Begram in today's Afghanistan) and having spent some time in Ch'ang-an, passed through Turkish area on his way home, together with other monks from his native land. He was invited to stay at the Turkish court of Tapar Qaγan where he probably taught the *dharma.* When some Chinese monks, coming from India, arrived with 260 Buddhist scriptures and declined to stay because of the turmoil in Ts'i, their home, they studied and translated these documents into Chinese with Jinagupta.[12] In how far the presence of these monks and their work influenced people at the court, we do not know.

After the end of the first Turkish kingdom which was ushered in by the subjugation of the Eastern Turks to the Chinese, Chinese rule then extended far into Central Asia for about 30 years (650-682). But then the Turks started to reassert themselves. Politically, this reassertation manifested itself in the work of Eltäriš (reg. 682-691). This name is actually a title meaning "he who collected (the people) of the realm". According to Chinese sources, he must have had the name Qutluγ (Ku-to-lo). It was he who established a second East Turkish kingdom (682-745), the kingdom of the Kök-

Turks (Blue or Heavenly Turks).[13] This state was a nomadic one. Since 680, Turks living in towns and cities and influenced by Chinese culture, started to return to the former way of life. There was something like a national revival with anti-Chinese undertones, as we can see in the Orkhon inscriptions of this period. Especially Qutluγ Qaγan's minister, the "wise Tonyuquq", who was himself raised in China, warned the Turks about too close association with the Chinese, a warning echoed in the so-called Kül Tigin inscription where the Turks are exhorted to turn to their former way of life in the region of the Ötükän mountains of present Mongolia.[14] This warning might also have implied a disassociation from Chinese Buddhism and a return to the native religion with its veneration of Heaven and the Earth Mother Umay. In the Kök-Turkish inscriptions between 692 and 735 there is no trace of Buddhism, although the Turks had been exposed to that religion for several decades. Yet we will see that there must have been contact with Sogdian Buddhists at this time.

The Kök Turkish empire was to last up to the victorious rise of the Turkish Uighurs who became masters of the steppes around 745.[15]

The Uighur Empire was founded by a Kül Bilgä Qaγan (reg. 744-747) and it was to last to about 840 when it was overrun by the Kirghiz, causing the Uighurs to flee to the Kansu corridor on the one hand and the oasis towns of the northern Tarim basin on the other, Turfan being the seat of an Uighur kingdom from about 850 to about 1250.

Whereas the Old Turkish Orkhon inscriptions date to the time of the Kök-Turkish and the Uighur realm, the major portion of Turkish Buddhist literature we have stems from the Turfan area, but also from Hami, from Tun-huang and from the area of the "Yellow Turks", i.e. the Turks who had settled in the Kansu corridor. Some of these texts may go back to the time of the Uighur Empire, even though, in 762, Bögü Qaγan (Mo-yu), having come into contact with Manichaeism in China, adopted their faith and made it the official state religion.[16] Yet we have clues to the fact that Buddhism was also prevalent among the Turks of the Mongol steppes before their immigration to the regions mentioned. Firstly, in the Chinese text of the trilingual Karabalgassun inscription,

written in Chinese, Uighur and Sogdian, which informs us about the Uighurs adopting Manichaeism, there is a reference to "carved and painted images of demons" which were to be destroyed, and it cannot be excluded that some of these were Buddhist figures.[17] Secondly, Jens Peter Laut, in his work, *Der frühe türkische Buddhismus und seine literarischen Denkmäler*, has pointed out the role of the Sogdians in the propagation of Buddhism amongst the Turks of the steppes.[18]

The major evidence for an early Sogdian Buddhist influence is the inscription of Bugut.[19] It stems from the time of the first Turkish kingdom, to be precise from the early eighties of the 6th cent. The inscription, edited by S.G. Kljaštornyj and V.A. Livšic in 1972, is written on a stele. On three of its sides are Sogdian texts, whereas on the fourth side there is an inscription in Brāhmī letters, probably in the Sanskrit language. Unfortunately, this part is so badly damaged that a successful reading has not been possible up to now. But it is obviously a Buddhist text. In the Sogdian portion there is an admonition where it says: "Establish a great new Saṃgha".[20] The content does not make clear who is speaking and who is addressed. Maybe the order was issued by Tapar Qaγan himself. Whatever the solution is, noteworthy is the fact that we have here an exhortation to establish Buddhism ecclesiastically. The stele itself points to the significance of the Sogdians and their role in the spread of the Buddhist faith in the Mongolian steppes. As is well known, the Sogdians were traders along the silk route, having a whole string of trading posts between Samarkand and China. In the Orkhon inscriptions, we hear that there were also Sogdian colonies amongst the Turks,[21] a fact already pointed out by Pulleyblank.[22] Apparently, the Sogdian script was in use amongst the early Turks, as the inscription of Bugut would suggest. A further developed type of the Sogdian script was used by the Uighurs, the major portion of their literature being written in this script. The early use of Sogdian by the Turks is also substantiated by the Chinese annals of the Norther Ch'ou dynasty (556-581). Here it says: "The script of the T'u-küe is similar to that of the *hu* barbarians."[23] As Pulleyblank says, the term *hu* at this time refers to Iranian peoples, especially to the Sogdians.[24]

The political influence of the Sogdians at the court of the Turkish

Qaγan in the Mongolian steppes was already highlighted by Pulleyblank who assumes that their influence extended into nomadic regions.[25] The presence of Sogdians among the Turks irritated the Chinese. In a Chinese document from the 7th cent., it says: "The T'u-küe [Turks] are actually simple and uncomplicated, and it is easy to lead them to discord; unfortunately, many *hu* live amongst them who are evil-minded and cunning and who teach and lead them."[26]

This teaching and leading does not necessarily refer to religious matters, yet it is probable that Sogdians were also influential in terms of religion. Hereby it must be stressed that they not only propagated Buddhism but also Manichaeism and perhaps also Christianity. Whether it was their influence that led an Uighur king prior to the establishment of the Uighur Empire to give himself a Buddhist name, P'u-sa (Bodhisattva) (reg. 661/3 - ?), we cannot know.[27]

The cultural influence of the Sogdians on the Turks is born out by the fact that a considerable number of loan words in Old Turkish are of Sogdian origin. This applies to the secular sphere as well as to the religious one.[28] As J.P. Laut has pointed out, there are, in the oldest stratum of Turkish literature, found at Turfan, an unusually high number of Sogdian loan words. Looking at these Buddhist documents closer, they not only show archaic features linguistically—they are written in what Laut calls "pre-classial" Turkish—, they are also close to the so-called ñ-dialect of Manichaean texts.[29] Some of these texts may go back to the time of the Uighur Empire (745 resp. 762-840). Remarkably enough, they also show, in content, Manichaean influence.[30] In early Turkish Buddhist texts, Manichaean phrases and Manichaean imagry are conspicuous.[31] When, for instance, these texts speak of the "pure law" (*arïγ nom*), this is a phrase not to be found in Indian Buddhism. There the usual expression is "walk the pure path" (*caratham brahmacāryam*). The term "pure law" is, rather, an originally Manichaean expression.[32] Manichaean imagery comes to the fore especially in an apocryphal Buddhist work, the *Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq Sūtra* ("The Sutra of the eightfold accumulation of light"), where sun and moon are referred to as "palaces" (*ordular*),[33] which is quite unusual for a Buddhist text. In Mani-

chaeism, however, the notion of sun and moon being palaces, and as such seats of certain redeeming gods, is part and parcel of the whole system.

Of the Turkish Buddhist texts published so far, a number show ancient linguistic featurs,[34] and to some extent also concepts reminiscent of Manichaeism:

1. The Old Turkish version of the Lotus Sūtra[35]
2. Buddhist narratives like the story of the good and the bad brother (Kalyānaṃkara and Pāpaṃkara)[36]
3. Fragments of the biography of the Buddha[37]
4. A Buddhist Catechism, written in Tibetan script[38]
5. The "London Scroll" of the apocryphal work *Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq Sutra*[39]
6. The text with the title *Maitrisimit*, "The encounter with Maitreya".[40]

This is certainly one of the most important works of Turkish Buddhism. It is the Uighur rendering of a Tocharian text, fragments of which have, indeed, been found. The colophones claim that the original was Indian (*änätkäk*), but no such Indian original has been discovered, neither in Sanskrit nor in any Prakrit language. Nor are there translations of this work in Tibetan or Chinese. It appears that the text was actually written in Central Asia, since there is a reference to the Tarim (Sita) river in it. It has been called "one of the most important literary creations of the Hīnayāna Turks of the northern Tarim area in pre-Islamic time".[41] The author or authors of this work, which is a drama preformed on New Year's day (*yangï kün*), were apparently aware of a wide range of classical Buddhist literature, since there are references especially to Jākata and Avadāna stories, only part of which are preserved in Turkish. An older text, found in Sängim near Turfan, stems probably from the 8th cent., whereas another manuscript, found in Hami, is to be dated to the 11th cent.

It may safely be assumed that many Turkish Buddhist monks were conversant with Sanskrit Buddhist literature, many texts of this category having been found in the Turfan area as well as in other places along the northern and southern silk route leading around the Tarim Basin. The number of texts translated from San-

skrit and Prākrit (not Pāli, however), furthermore from Kuchean (Tocharian A) and finally from Chinese must have been great. Especially from the 8th/9th cent. on, if not earlier, Buddhist texts were rendered in Turkish from Chinese.[42] One of the most celebrated translators was Šingqo Šäli Tutung who lived in the 10th cent. and whose various translations also include the biography of Hsüen-tsang.[43] There are also instance of translations from Tibetan.[44]

In the Turfan oasis which became one of the main centers of Turkish Buddhism, that religion must have been present in the 4th or 5th cent., if not even earlier. To some extent, it had been adopted by Chinese living here, as a Chinese-Buddhist temple inscription, probably from 469 A.D., shows.[45] It hails a ruler as Maitreya, and it includes Taoist and Confucian concepts.

The Uighurs who settled in Turfan in the 9th cent., also turned, increasingly, to the religion of the Buddha, after giving up their ancient faith, although a number of Manichaean kings and their subjects adhered to Manichaeism. Unfortunately we do not know which kings these were. It seems that Manichaeism and Buddhism flourished side by side for a number of centuries, but it is clear that Buddhism increasingly dominated the scene[46] up to the conversion of the ruler of Turfan to Islam at the end of the 15th cent. At the end of the 10th cent., a Chinese envoy, Wang yen-tê, found in Kocho (Kao-ch'ang) only one Manichaean temple left, but a flourishing Buddhist culture with some fifty Buddhist convents and a library of Chinese Buddhists texts.[47]

In Tun-huang, there must have been a number of Uighur monks, as is evident from the Uighur literature found in the walled-up library. Finally, Buddhism must have remained alive among the "Yellow Uighurs" of Kansu, where Buddhist texts like the "Sūtra of Golden Light" (*Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra*), stemming from the 17th cent., were found. Some Uighur texts were also found near Lake Etsen-Gol.[48]

The script used to write Turkish Buddhist texts was primarily the Uighur cursive script, developed from the Sogdian. Sometimes, the Uighur text is accompanied by Brāhmī glosses or by Chinese characters. The Uighur script was used both for writing and printing. In a few instances, Tibetan script was employed as in the case of the aformentioned Buddhist catechism.

In so far as Turkish Buddhist literature is concerned, a very general survey was given by W. Scharlipp in 1980.[49] Since then, however, various other texts have also been edited.[50] Scharlipp points out that the 10th, 13th and 14th cent. were the times when Turkish Buddhism flourished most. Of the various works in Turkish, some must have been copious, for in same cases sheets have been found bearing a page number above 100 or even 300.

In the following, we do not intend to give an exhaustive survey of Buddhist literature in Uighur (Old Turkish). Rather, we want to point out the general types of literature that are represented.

In so far as *Vinaya* texts are concerned, their lack is conspicuous. Apparently, the Vinaya texts were studied in Sanskrit.[51] With regard to *Abhidharma* literature, we mention first the *Abhidharmakośa*, portions of which are preserved. In Tun-huang, an Uighur translation of *Sthiramati's Commentary on the Abhidharmakośa* was found. It was translated from Chinese, but the Chinese version is no longer extant. It encompases about 600 memorial verses and is accompanied by a detailed explication of the teaching of the Sarvāstivādins.[52]

Of Hīnayāna texts, preserved only in Uighur (and partially in Tocharian), we mentioned the *Maitrisimit.* Of the classical Mahāyāna Sūtras, we have already referred to the "Lotos Sūtra", (*Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-Sūtra*), a few leaves of which are preserved. The "Sūtra of Golden Light" (*Suvarṇaprabhāsa-Sūtra*) is one of the major texts preserved in Uighur.[53] It was probably translated from I-Tsing's Chinese version by Šingqo Šäli Tutung in the 10th cent., as a number of leaves would suggest.[54] A manuscript of the whole text, found in Kansu, and stemming from the 17th cent., makes it quite clear that a Tibetan version was consulted for the introduction. The Uighur text contains many explanations, showing how popular it was.[55] There are also colophon types of passages not only appended to but included in the text itself. One of the striking aspect about the Uighur version is that it reflects a more personal type of religiosity. Thus, when the Chinese text makes reference to the Buddha or the Buddhas, the Uighur version refers to "our father, the Buddha", or "our fathers, the Buddhas".[56]

Of the works relating to *Prajñāpāramitā*-literature, we have the Diamond Sūtra (*Vajracchedika-Sūtra*) preserved in an Uighur transla-

tion of a Chinese version of the text.[57] Up to now, fragments from 8 different manuscripts have been found. The oldest Central Asian text stems from the year 905 A.D., i.e. 500 years after Kumārajīva's translation of the Vajracchedika into Chinese. Close to the *Prajñāpāramitā*-literature is the famous *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-Sūtra* which seems to have been as popular among the Turkish as the Chinese Buddhists.[58] Also in connection with the *Prajñāpāramitā*-literature is a doctrinal letter of Nāgārjuna, the *Suḥrllekha* (Letter to a Friend), fragments of which are also preserved in Uighur.[59]

Of the classical Mahāyāna texts, we mention further documents connected with the Amitābha cult. Thus there are manuscripts of a work entitles *Abitaki* ("Amitābha-Sūtra").[60] This is not, however, a translation of one of the well known texts of Amitābha religiosity, but rather the translation of a Chinese work connected, as the title shows, with the "Society of the White Lotus Flower". The Uighur text describes various meditational practices and contains an abundance of quotations from the well-known texts of the Amitābha cult.

The next category of Buddhist Turkish literature to be mentioned is that of apocryphal sūtras. To this group belongs the aforementioned *Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq Sūtra*. It is a work connected with *Yogacāra* philosophy, although there probably never was an Indian original. The text seems to have been first written in China. We also know of Tibetan and Mongolian versions. A large number of fragments and text portions from various manuscripts have been found, and virtually the whole text is preserved in a London scroll. Of the many other apocryphal works, translated from Chinese, we mention here the Sūtra "Seeing the body and the mind (*citta*)", as the Uighur version is called. It was also translated by Šingqo Šäli Tutung in the 10th cent.[61]

A further group of texts consists of commentaries to the larger and more important sūtras. Of the commentaries to the "Sūtra of Golden Light", for instance, a text is preserved explaining the tenfold significance of faith. It was translated from Chinese.[62] Suffice it to point out that fragments of other commentaries, also translated from Chinese, do exist.

In so far as Tantric texts are concerned, a number of works of this category was translated from Tibetan in the Mongol period

(13./14. cent.). Thus we have a Tantric ritual text explaining the creation of and meditation of a *maṇḍala*, to mention only one example.[63] In this connection, magical texts of different kinds are also to be referred to.[64]

A text in a category of its own is the *Insadi Sūtra*.[65] It probably stems from the 13th or 14th cent. The copy we have is of the 17th or 18th cent. The text deals with the origin of and the course of events in the Pravāraṇa-ceremony, which concluded the rainy period in India. The document is Mahāyānistic in character, since it mentions various Mahāyāna texts. Yet this is a text written, originally, in Turkish. It stems from a time when Islam was making inroads into East Turkestan. The hope for the appearance of Maitreya is voiced and figures of West Asian religions, like "Mother Mary" and Mohammed, are mentioned critically.

Further classical and secondary sūtras are mentioned by A. von Gabain in her survey of 1964.[66] Since that time, a number of further texts of his category as well as of Buddhist Āgamas have been published.[67] This also applies to the Buddhist stories and narratives enumerated by her.[68]

A noteworthy category of Turkish literature consists of confessions of sins.[69] A major text of this type, translated from Chinese, is the *Kšanti qïlγuluq nom* ("Sūtra of Confession").[70] By reciting this text, one acted as a Bodhisattva, taking influence on the fate of "suffering beings" in *saṃsāra*, which due to their own bad *karma*, could not attain salvation by themselves. When the Uighur translation of this text was made from Chinese, we do not know. Beside this text, a number of confessional formulae exist in Uighur. Some of them partly agree with Manichaean confessional formulae.[71] There seems to have been mutual influence, since confessional texts for laymen, as we have them here, were not known in India. A characteristic feature of these Uighur texts is that on the one hand they are formalized, whereas on the other hand names of laymen are inserted, i.e. names of people who gave donations for having such texts copied. The question arises why confessional formulae have such a big significance in Turkish Buddhism. It seems to me that this is not only a matter of foreign influence. Rather, the notion of sinfulness expressed here reflects a feeling of helplessness over against the outward powers of nature and history. In the oasis

towns of Central Asia, ever endangered by nomad and foreign powers, there was a feeling of being not the subject, but the object of events. This expressed itself religiously in terms of sinfulness.

Having regarded in general the main categories of Turkish Buddhist literature, it becomes obvious that this literature is, to a great extent, translated. As pointed out, translations were made from Indian languages (Sanskrit, Prākrit) but also from Tocharian and increasingly from Chinese. In Mongol times, Tibetan literature was also translated into Uighur. What, then, is specifically Turkish? Beside a text like the *Insadi Sūtra* and the range of confessional texts, are there indigenous Turkish works?

The question is to be answered in the affirmative. Mainly two fields are to be mentioned in this connection. Firstly, there is a considerable poetic literature in Turkish.[72] Certainly many of the poems give to a classical content a new form. Thus the text on the expiation of sins in Chapt. V of the "Sūtra of Golden Light" is rendered in verses.[73] But there are also poems composed independent of classical texts, including many praises. Other poems deal with different aspects of religious and secular life. In the poetical texts edited and translated by P. Zieme, the subjects are most varied. Thus there is a poem exhorting laymen to give alms, one on death and intransiency, several on Buddhist philosophical issues, ect.[74]

Furthermore there are the colophones, sometimes written in vers form.[75] They reflect indigenous Turkish Buddhism as no other literary genre. These colophons are often extensive. Since they stem, to a great extent, from lay donors, they express, in the main, a popular type of religiosity. In this Buddhistic folk belief, various notions, clearly distinguished by "theologians", could be identified. Thus Nirvāṇa, the "realm of the gods" (*tängri yiri*), the Western Paradise of Amitābha and the encounter with Maitreya were all regarded as images of salvation that were freely interchangeable.[76] The most striking feature of the colophones is, of course, their personal character. They reflect a religiosity in which general Buddhist notions gained meaning for the individual.

As only a small portion of Turkish Buddhist literature has been preserved, and since even this is often in a fragmentary state, the basis for our assessment is narrow. Yet, what we have points to the

fact that Turkish Buddhist literature must have been encompassing. What is preserved points to the fact that the Turks of Central Asia did have a contribution to make to Buddhist literature.[77]

Universität Bonn, Hans-J. KLIMKEIT
Religionswissensch. Seminar

[1] For the appearance and the history of the Turks in Central Asia cf. B. Spuler, "Geschichte Mittelasiens seit dem Auftreten der Türken", *HO* I, 5,5 (Leiden-Köln, 1966), pp. 123-310.

[2] For a sketch of the early religion of the Turks cf. A. von Gabain, "Inhalt und magische Bedeutung der alttürkischen Inschriften", *Anthropos* 48 (1953), pp. 537-556; J.-P. Roux, "Les religions dans les sociétés Turko-Mongoles", *Revue de l'histoire des religions* CCI (1984), pp. 393-420; J.-P. Roux, *La religion des Turcs et des Mongols.* (Paris 1984). (Bibliothèque Historique, Collection d'Histoire des Religions). J.-P. Roux, "Turkic Religions", in: *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. M. Eliade. Vol. 15. (New York-London, 1987), pp. 87-94.

[3] T. Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic.* (The Hague, 1968). (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 69), p. 232 (Turkish text) and 263 (English trans.). For the early history of the Turks cf. Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 127ff. and K.-H. Golzio, *Kings, Khans and other Rulers of Early Central Asia.* (Köln, 1984). (Arbeitsmaterialien zur Religionsgeschichte 11), pp. 60f. Golzio names four rulers before Bumïn.

[4] A. von Gabain, "Buddhistische Türkenmission", *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller.* Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern. (Leipzig, 1954), p. 166.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 4), p. 167.

[7] Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

[8] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, p. 162f.

[9] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[10] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[11] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, pp. 164f. The role of the Sogdians in early Turkish Buddhism is pointed out by J.P. Laut, *Der frühe türkische Buddhismus und seine literarischen Denkmäler.* (Wiesbaden, 1986). (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 21), pp. 1ff.

[12] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

[13] Cf. Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 136ff.

[14] T. Tekin, *op. cit.*, pp. 216f. and 285. Cf. also Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 139ff.

[15] For the rise of the Uighurs cf. Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 148ff.

[16] Cf. S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. A Historical Survey.* (Manchester, 1985), p. 193.

[17] Cf. G. Schlegel, *Die chinesische Inschrift auf dem uigurischen Denkmal in Kara Balgassun.* (Helingfors, 1896). (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne IX), p. 61. Cf. p. 58: "Wiederholt bedauerten wir dass ihr früher unwissend wart und die Geister Götter [lit. Buddhas] nanntet."

[18] Cf. Laut, *op. cit.*, (n. 11).

[19] S.G. Kljaštornyj and V.A. Livšic, "The Sogdian Inscription of Bugut Revised", *AOH* 26 (1972), pp. 69-102. The significance of this inscription is pointed out by Laut, *op. cit.*, pp. 3ff.

[20] Kljaštornyj/Livšic, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[21] Cf. T. Tekin, *op. cit.*, (n. 3), pp. 273 and 275.

[22] E.G. Pulleyblank, "A Sogdian Colony in Inner Mongolia", *T'oung Pao* 41 (1952), pp. 317-356. Cf. also S.G. Kljaštornyj, "Sur les colonies sogdiennes de la Haute Asie", *UAJb* 33 (1961), pp. 95-97.

[23] Liu, Mau-Tsai, *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe).* Vol. I. (Wiesbaden, 1958). (Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 10), p. 10.

[24] Pulleyblank, *op. cit.*, pp. 318f.

[25] Pulleyblank, *op. cit.*, pp. 317f.

[26] Liu, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[27] Liu, *op. cit.*, p. 351; Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

[28] Cf. K. Röhrborn, "Zum Wanderweg des altindischen Lehngutes im Alttürkischen", *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Vorderen Orients.* Festschrift für Bertold Spuler zum siebzigsten Geburtstag. (Leiden, 1981), pp. 337-343. Of course, beside the Sogdian and Tocharian as well as Indian influence on Turkish Buddhist terminology there is, increasingly, a Chinese one. Cf. K. Röhrborn, "Zur Terminologie der buddhistischen Sekundär-Überlieferung in Zentralasien", *ZDMG* 133 (1983), pp. 273-296; K. Röhrborn, "Zur Rezeption der chinesisch-buddhistischen Terminologie im Alttürkischen", *WZKS* XXX (1986), pp. 179-187.

[29] Laut, *op. cit.*, pp. 9f.

[30] Cf. H.-J. Klimkeit, *Die Begegnung von Christentum, Gnosis und Buddhismus an der Seidenstraße.* (Opladen, 1986). (Rheinisch-Westf. Akad. d. Wiss., Vorträge G 283). For Buddhist influence on Manichaean texts cf. H.-J. Klimkeit, "Buddhistische Übernahmen im iranischen und türkischen Manichäismus", W. Heissig and H.-J. Klimkeit (ed.), *Synkretismus in den Religionen Zentralasiens.* (Wiesbaden, 1987), pp. 58-75.

[31] Cf. for references Klimkeit, *op. cit.*, (n. 30), (1986), pp. 46ff.

[32] Cf. UigWb, s.v. arıg. Prof. Schmithausen makes me aware of the Indian term mentioned. The term "pure law" is reminiscent of the Psalms. In Ps. 12,7 we read, in Luther's translation, "Die Worte des Herrn sind lauter wie Silber" (The English Revised Standard Version has (Ps. 12,6), "The promises of the Lord are promises that are pure..."). Cf. also Ps. 18,31 which reads, according to Luther, "die Worte des Herrn sind durchläutert". (Revised Standard Version (18,31): "...the promise of the Lord proves true").

[33] W. Bang, A. von Gabain and G. R. Rachmati, "Türkische Turfantexte VI: Das buddhistische Sūtra *Säkiz yükmäk*". (Berlin, 1934). (SPAW 1934), pp. 93-192. Cf. pp. 125f.

[34] Cf. Laut, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[35] D. Maue and K. Röhrborn, "Zur alttürkischen Version des Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-Sūtra", *CAJ* 24 (1980), pp. 251-273.

[36] J. R. Hamilton, *Le Conte Bouddhique du Bon et du Mauvais Prince en Version Ouïgoure, Manuscrits ouïgours de Touen-Houang.* (Paris, 1971). (Mission Paul Pelliot, Documents conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale 3).

[37] F.W.K. Müller, *Uigurica* II. (Berlin, 1911). (APAW 1910, Nr. 3), pp. 4-7; J. P. Laut, "Ein Bruchstück einer alttürkischen Buddhabiographie", *UAJb*, N.F. 3 (1983), pp. 88-101.

[38] D. Maue and K. Röhrborn, "Ein 'buddhistischer Katechismus' in alttürkischer Sprache und tibetischer Schrift". Teil I: *ZDMG* 134 (1984), pp. 286-313; Teil II: *ZDMG* 135 (1985), pp. 68-91.

[39] Bang, von Gabain and Rachmati, *op. cit.*, (no. 33).

[40] Ş. Tekin, *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule.* 2. Vols. (Berlin, 1980). (Berliner Turfantexte IX); Geng Shimin and H.-J. Klimkeit, in collaboration with H. Eimer and J. P. Laut, *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit.* (Wiesbaden, 1988). (Asiatische Forschungen 103). Cf. also: Geng Shimin/H.-J. Klimkeit/J. P. Laut, " 'Der Herabstieg des Bodhisattva Maitreya vom Tuṣita-Götterland zur Erde.' Das 10. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit*", in: *AoF* 14 (1987), pp. 350-376; Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, " 'Das Erscheinen des Bodhisattva.' Das 11. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit*", in: *AoF* 15 (1988), pp. 315-366.

[41] Ş. Tekin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 7.

[42] The Nirvāṇa-Sūtra, named above, was already translated in the 6th cent.

[43] Cf. P. Zieme, "Singqu Säli Tutung - Übersetzer buddhistischer Schriften ins Uigurische", *Tractata Altaica. Denis Sinor sexagenario ... dedicata.* Ed. W. Heissig et al. (Wiesbaden, 1976), pp. 767-773. Cf. also: P. Zieme, "Xuangzangs Biographie und das *Xiyuji* in alttürkischer Überlieferung", in: J. P. Laut and K. Röhrborn (edd.), *Buddhistische Erzählliteratur und Hagiographie in türkischer Überlieferung.* Wiesbaden 1990. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Vol. 27), pp. 75-107.

[44] This pertains mainly to Tantric texts translated in Yüan times, e.g. G. Kara and P. Zieme, *Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung.* (Berlin, 1976). (Berliner Turfantexte VII). However, some Mahāyāna texts were translated from Tibetan earlier, e.g. the introduction of the "Sūtra of Golden Light". Cf. von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 4), p. 171.

[45] O. Franke, *Eine chinesische Tempelinschrift aud Idiqutšahri bei Turfan. (Turkistan).* (Berlin, 1907). (APAW 1907, Anhang: Abhandlungen nicht zur Akademie gehöriger Gelehrter: Philosophische und historische Abhandlungen), pp. 1-92.

[46] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 4), pp. 169ff.

[47] Cf. M.A. Stein, *Innermost Asia.* Vol. II. (Oxford, 1926, repr. Delhi, 1981), pp. 582ff.

[48] Cf. J.R. Hamilton, *Manuscrits Ouïgours du IX^e-X^e siècle de Touen-Houang.* Vol. I. (Pairs, 1986). (Fondation Singer-Polignac), pp. ix-xxiii.

[49] W. Scharlipp, "Kurzer Überblick über die buddhistische Literatur der Türken", *Materialia Turcica* 6 (1980), pp. 37-53; cf. also the following surveys by A. von Gabain: "Der Buddhismus in Zentralasien", *HO* I,8,2 (Leiden-Köln, 1961), pp. 496-514; "Zentralasiatische türkische Literaturen I: Nichtislamische alttürkische Literatur", *HO* I,5,1 (Leiden-Köln, 1963), pp. 207-228 (repr. Leiden-Köln, 1982, pp. 207-228 with a supplement pp. 469-471); "Die alttürkische Literatur", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* II, ed. P.N. Boratav. (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 211-243.

[50] Cf. bibliographies in P. Zieme, *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren.* (Berlin, 1985). (Berliner Turfantexte XIII), pp. 14-21, in Laut, *op. cit.*, (n. 11), pp. 213-228, and in UigWb.

[51] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 49), (1963), p. 221.

[52] Cf. Scharlipp, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[53] W. Radloff and S.E. Malov, *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (St. Petersburg, 1913-1917). (Bibliotheca Buddhica 17). German trans. (up to beginning of chapt. 14): W.

Radloff, *Suvarnaprabhāsa (Das Goldglanz-Sūtra)*, ed. S. Malov. (Leningrad, 1930). (Bibliotheca Buddhica 27). Cf. also K. Kudara and K. Röhrborn, "Zwei verirrte Blätter des uigurischen Goldglanz-Sūtras im Etnografiska Museum, Stockholm", *ZDMG* 132 (1982), pp. 336-347.

[54] Cf. A. von Gabain, "Die alttürkische Literatur", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* II, ed. L. Bazin et al. Wiesbaden 1964 (211-243), pp. 225f.; P. Zieme, *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung.* ["Dissertation", i.e. Habilitationsschrift Berlin 1983]. In the press (to appear 1990), Ch. I B 14 (MS p. 36).

[55] Cf. J. Nobel, *Suvarṇaprābhāsottama-Sūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra* ... Vol. I. (Leiden, 1958), p. xxxiv.

[56] H.-J. Klimkeit, "Buddha als Vater", *Fernöstliche Weisheit und christlicher Glaube.* Festgabe für Heinrich Dumoulin SJ zur Vollendung des 80. Lebensjahres. (Mainz, 1985), pp. 240ff.

[57] G. Hazai and P. Zieme, *Fragmente der uigurischen Version des "Jin'gangjing mit den Gāthās des Meister Fu".* (Berlin, 1971). (Berliner Turfantexte I).

[58] Scharlipp, *op. cit.*, (n. 49), p. 45.

[59] Scharlipp, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

[60] A. Temir, K. Kudara and K. Röhrborn, "Die alttürkischen Abitaki-Fragmente des Etnografya Müzesi, Ankara", *Turcica* XVI (1984), pp. 13-28. O. Sertkaya and K. Röhrborn, "Bruchstücke der alttürkischen Amitābha-Literatur aus Istanbul", UAJb N.F. 4 (1984), pp. 97-117.

[61] G. Hazai, "Fragmente eines uigurischen Blockdruck-Faltbuches", *AoF* III (1975), pp. 91-108.

[62] W. Bang and A. von Gabain, "Türkische Turfan-Texte V. Aus buddhistischen Schriften". (Berlin, 1931). (SPAW 1931), pp. 340-356 (Text B).

[63] Kara and Zieme, *op. cit.*, (n. 44).

[64] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 49), (1964), pp. 228-230.

[65] S. Tezcan, *Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra.* (Berlin, 1974). (Berliner Turfantexte III).

[66] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 49), (1964), pp. 225-227.

[67] Cf. bibliographies referred to above (n. 50), furthermore J.P. Laut and K. Röhrborn, *Der türkische Buddhismus in der japanischen Forschung* (Wiesbaden, 1988). (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 23), where Röhrborn gives a survey of Turkish Buddhist studies in Japan.

[68] von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 49), (1964), pp. 221-228.

[69] Cf. von Gabain, *op. cit.*, (n. 49), (1964), pp. 227-228.

[70] K. Röhrborn, *Eine uigurische Totenmesse.* (Berlin, 1971). (Berliner Turfantexte II); I. Warnke, *Eine buddhistische Lehrschrift über das Bekennen der Sünden.* (Unpublished thesis, Berlin (GDR), 1978).

[71] Cf. H.-J. Klimkeit, "Manichäische und buddhistische Beichtformeln aus Turfan. Beobachtungen zur Beziehung zwischen Gnosis und Mahāyāna", *ZRGG* 29 (1977), pp. 193-228.

[72] Zieme, *op. cit.*, (n. 50); P. Zieme, *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung.* The so-called "*vyākaraṇa*-poems", expressing the promise of future Buddhahood, also belong to the poetic literature of the Uighur Buddhists. Cf. J. P. Laut/P. Zieme, "Ein zweisprachiger Lobpreis auf den Bäg von Kočo und seine Gemahlin", in: J. P. Laut and K. Röhrborn (edd.), *Buddhistische Erzählliteratur und Hagiographie in türkischer Überlieferung.* Wiesbaden 1990, pp. 15-36.

[73] Zieme, *op. cit.*, (n. 50), pp. 86ff.
[74] Zieme, *op. cit.*, (n. 50), pp. 106ff.
[75] Zieme, *op. cit.*, (n. 50), pp. 155ff.
[76] H.-J. Klimkeit, "Der Stifter im Lande der Seidenstraßen. Bemerkungen zur buddhistischen Laienfrömmigkeit", *ZRGG* 35 (1983), pp. 289-308.
[77] Thus, for instance, accounts of the Buddha's life, the foundings of the order of nuns, etc. can be presented in quite an indigenous manner. Cf. H.-J. Klimkeit, *Der Buddha. Leben und Lehre.* Stuttgart 1990, pp. 55f., 77, 83f.; J. P. Laut, "Die Gründung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens in der alttürkischen Überlieferung", in the press (to appear 1990).

Additional note:

After completing the above manuscript, the following article came to my notices: P. Zieme, "Das *Pravāraṇa-Sūtra* in alttürkischer Überlieferung", in: A Green Leaf. Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen. Leiden 1988 (Homages et Opera Minora, Vol. XII)., pp. 445-453. Here the author shows that the *Pravāraṇa-Sūtra* is quoted in the above-mentioned *Insadi Sūtra.*

I thank Dr. J. P. Laut, Marburg, for making me aware of some new publications.

Abbreviations

AoF	Altorientalische Forschungen
AOH	Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
APAW	Abhandlungen der (Königlich) Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin
CAJ	Central Asiatic Journal
HO	Handbuch der Orientalistik, ed. B. Spuler
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der (Königlich) Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Phil.-hist. Klasse), Berlin
UAJb	Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher
UigWb	Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien. Lieferung 1-4. Wiesbaden 1977-1988
WZKS	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZRGG	Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte