Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. Volume 56 (2–4), 451–463 (2003)

REVIEW ARTICLES

New Publications on Uygur Texts Translated from Chinese*

The early Turkic literature was translated from Sogdian, Tocharian, Tibetan and Chinese. Out of these four languages Chinese played an important role. In the following I review a few new books which deal with Uygur texts translated from Chinese[1]. The Uygur-Turkic translations, from Chinese are important also for Sinology. They contain an early phase of the tradition of the Chinese original, which is not always accessible now. Further they are full of Chinese words, titles, proper names, etc., in Uygur transcription. This Uygur transcription preserved the pronunciation of the Chinese dialect used in the 9th–11th centuries in NW China.

*

RASCHMAN, SIMONE-CHRISTIANE: *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 5. Berliner Fragmente des Goldglanz-Sūtras. Teil 1. Vorworte und erstes bis drittes Buch*. Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag 2000. (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Bd. XIII,13), 260 pp., 89 Taf.

RASCHMAN, SIMONE-CHRISTIANE: *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 6. Berliner Fragmente des Goldglanz-Sūtras. Teil 2. Viertes und fünftes Buch.* Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag 2002. (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Bd. XIII,14), 218 pp., 50 Taf.

WILKENS, JENS: *Die drei Körper des Buddha (Trikāya). Das dritte Kapitel der uigurischen Fassung des Goldglanz-Sūtras (Altan Yaruk Sudur)*. Brepols, Turnhut 2001. (Berliner Turfantexte XXI), 315 pp., 9 Taf.

BARAT, KAHAR: *The Uygur-Turkic Biography of the Seventh-Century Chinese Buddhist Pilgrim Xuanzang. Ninth and Tenth Chapter*. Bloomington, Indiana 2000, 430 pp.

ÖLMEZ, MEHMET – RÖHRBORN, KLAUS: *Die Alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie III. Nach der Handschrift von Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie v. Gabain herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommen-*

* András Róna-Tas, H-1123 Budapest, Csörsz u. 1, Hungary, e-mail: aronatas2@axelero.hu
This paper is a part of a greater work carried out within the framework of the Reasearch Group for Turkic Linguistic History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences at the University of Szeged and was sponsored by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (No. OTKA-T034955) and the R and D project (No. NKFP 5/021).

[1] I would like to offer this review article to my former professor in Chinese, Barnabás Csongor, of whom I was not the best student, to characterise my performance mildly. His studies on the Uygur transcription of Chinese, quoted also in this review, remain after a half century, basic works for our scholarship.

0001–6446 /2003/ $ 20.00 © 2003 *Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest*

tiert. Wiesbaden 2001 (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 7), 188 pp.

The Buddhist sūtra on the Golden Light was not only one of the most popular books among the Buddhists of the Middle Ages, but it is also one of the most important books for those who work on the different aspects of the language and culture of Asia. Not all chapters of the Sanskrit original has been found yet. The text is present in several versions in the canonical libraries of the Tibetan, Chinese, Khotanese, Turkic and Mongolian collections. The breakthrough in its study has been done by Johannes Nobel, who published the extant Sanskrit parts and compared them with the Tibetan and Chinese versions (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Nach den Handschriften und mit Hilfe der tibetischen und chinesischen Übertragungen herausgegeben*. Leipzig 1937), then published the Tibetan texts (then the known two) (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die tibetische Übersetzungen mit einem Wörterbuch herausgegeben*. Leiden–Stuttgart 1944). This was followed by the publication of the Chinese translation and the third Tibetan version (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. I-tsing's chinesische Version und ihre tibetische Übersetzung. Bd. 1. I-tsing's chinesische Version übersetzt, eingeleitet, erläutert und mit einem photomechanischen Nachdruck des chinesischen Textes versehen*. Leiden 1958; *Bd. 2. Die tibetische Übersetzung mit kritischen Anmerkungen herausgegeben*. Leiden 1958). The basic Sanskrit text was dated by Nobel to the 5th century. Some parts of a version from the 4th century were identified in the so-called Mironov-Fragments.

Some fragments of the Sanskrit text were collected by the expedition led by Prince Kozui Otani during his three trips in the years 1902–1914 to Central Asia. It was the Russian scholar N. D. Mironov who made a preliminary classification of the Otani material. Mironov identified three fragments of the Sanskrit version of the Golden Sutra the transliteration of which he sent to Nobel. Further fragments were identified by Zhongxin Jiang and Seishi Karashima (see their forthcoming publication: Sanskrit Fragments of the Sutra of Golden Light from the Lüshun Museum Collection in: *Hualin* 3 (2003), announced in Seishi Karashima, Sanskrit Fragments of the Sutra of Golden Light, the Lotus Sutra, the *Āryaśrīmahādevīyākaraṇa* and the *Anantamukhanirhādharaṇī* in the Otani Collection, in: Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002, Tokyo 2003, pp. 183–196).

The Sanskrit work has been translated into Chinese already at the end of the 6th century and was finalised in the version of Yi-jing (I-tsing), published by Nobel and dated by him to 703.

The first Uygur text was identified by F. W. K. Müller in 1908 (*Uigurica I*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, No. 2, pp. 10–60). An almost complete Uygur translation of the work found in Ganzhou and kept in St. Petersburg has been published by W. Radloff and S. E. Malov (*Suvarṇaprabhāsa (sutra zolotogo bleska). Tekst ujgurskoj redakcii I–II,* Sanktpetersburg 1913) and from the posthumous papers of Radloff by Malov (*Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler. Materialien, nach dem Tode des Verfassers mit Ergänzungen von S. Malov herausgegeben*, Leningrad 1928). For a long time this version published with printed Uygur letters and not with facsimilia was cited as a xylograph and only recently have we learnt that it is a manuscript. The Petersburg copy which is from the end of the 17th century, was newly edited, using also materials from Germany, by Caval Kaya (*Uygurca Altun Yaruk. Giriş, metin ve dizin,* Ankara 1994). Fragments do exist also in China. Some pages from Bäzäklik are now, according to Barat, kept in the Museum of Turfan (*JA* 1990, pp. 155–166).

The history of the research and reconstruction of the fragments kept in Germany has been recently summarised by Raschmann (Aus den Vorarbeiten F. W. K. Müllers zum *Altun Yaruk Sudur*, in: Laut, J. P.– Ölmez, M.: *Bahşı Ögdisi.*

Klaus Röhrborn Armağanı, Freiburg–Istanbul 1998, pp. 295–304). The prefaces and the first book have been published by Peter Zieme (*Altan Yaruk Sudur. Vorworte und das erste Buch. Edition und Übersetzung der Alttürkischen Version des Goldglanzsūtra (Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra)*. (Berliner Turfantexte XVIII) Turnhut 1996.

All these preparatory works were of great importance, nevertheless the difficult work of the compilation of the catalogue of the Turkic Golden Light Sutra (*Altan Yaruk*) moved forward slowly. Though the decision to publish the catalogue of the Turkic material of the Turfan collection was made already in 1978 by the then editor of the series "Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland" Wolfgang Voigt, it was only in 1987 that the first volume appeared (G. Ehlers: *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 2 [!], Das Goldglanzsūtra und der buddhistische Legendezyklus Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā. Depositum der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin), Stuttgart 1987 [Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Band XIII.10]). The first part (*Teil 1*) was only published in 1996 by Dieter Maue (*Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 1. Dokumente in brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*, Stuttgart 1996 [Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Band XIII.9]). The delay of publishing the first volume was caused by the discovery of a great amount of new material by Maue, which he then edited in a masterful way.

The two catalogues compiled by Raschmann are the 5th and 6th part of the sub-series "Alttürkische Handschriften", thus the question arises which are the 3rd and the 4th. They have not yet been published, but are in preparation. They are foreseen as two volumes on the *Maitrisimit* texts and are prepared by J. P. Laut.

The first of the volumes reviewed here contains the description of all fragments of the prefaces and the first three volumes of the Uygur translation of the Sūtra of the Golden Light if they are not contained in the catalogue of Ehlers quoted above. The descriptions are based on former studies of F. W. K. Müller, Annemarie von Gabain, and Peter Zieme. The first catalogue contains 197 units. There were altogether 231 fragments identified. However many of the fragments could be put together and it was also possible that some fragments lost during the war could be included using the photos and transcription of F. W. K. Müller. From the prefaces there exist now 18 fragments, from the first book, chapter one fragments Nos 019–040, chapter two 040–066, from the second book, chapter three 067–101, chapter four 101–134, and from the third book Nos. 135–157.

It is interesting to learn how many different manuscripts and xylographs can be distinguished. P. Zieme could distinguish in his above cited edition 20 different manuscripts and xylographs. After the cataloguing of the fragments pertaining to Books Two and Three, the number of the different manuscripts and xylographs grew to 69, out of which only one is a xylograph.

The catalogue gives the following details: current number, sigla and old sigla, short description of the fragment, paper, number of lines, the manuscript to which it belongs with numbers as B1, etc., the measures, the sigla of the place of origin (if present), location in the Altan Yaruk, beginnings of the first and last lines of both recto and verso.

The second volume of the catalogue of Raschmann contains 202 items which pertain to the fourth and fifth book of the Sūtra of the Golden Light and which have not been included in the catalogue of Ehlers. We read with regret: "Im Falle des vorliegenden 2. Teilbandes der alttürkischen Handschriften des Goldglanz-Sūtras musste auf die zeitaufwendige Bestimmung der Handschriftenzugehörigkeit verzichtet werden" (p. 7). Though in a footnote we learn: "In eindeutigen Fällen wird jedoch in einer Anmerkung auf die Handschriftenzugehörigkeit hingewiesen". The technique of the description is the same as in the former volume.

Both volumes have tables of concordances. The first is organised according to the numbers of the catalogue and the sigla of the collection and the sigla of the place of origin are given with addition of the manuscript to which the fragment pertains. The second table of concordance

is given according to the sigla of the collection (Standortsignatur), the third according to the sigla of the place of origin (Fundsigla). This system has been changed in volume two. The first table of concordance is ordered according to books and chapters (though practically almost identical with the current number), the second according to the place in the collection, the third according to the place of origin. In both volumes we also find lists of A. von Gabain's temporary numeration. The two volumes contain the photos which are of very good quality.

While the two volumes of Raschmann are catalogues of good scholarly quality and let us look into the very difficult daily work of identifying and describing fragments, the work of Jens Wilkens is the edition of the third chapter of Altan Yaruk.

The book is a dissertation which has was written under the leadership of Professor Klaus Röhrborn and the author had the possibility to use the then yet unpublished material of the two volumes of Raschmann.

The introduction deals with the text tradition. It has perplexed many scholars that though the Uygur version follows the Chinese text of Yi-jing there are three types of discrepancies. Some parts are basically different, and there are some parts which are absent from the Chinese original. There are also parts present in the Chinese original, but absent in the Uygur translation.

According to Wilkens (p. 24) the additions point to a Chinese version which contained these parts as well. There are however some data which reflect a style used in commentaries, and this may point to the fact that the translator used not only the canonical text but also commentaries. It can further be supposed that the translator or translators used not only the Chinese version but also one of the Tibetan versions. The text tradition is further complicated by the fact that Wilkens found a part in the third book (ll. 1028ff) which is not present in the Chinese original at that place but is present in the fifth book, however in an Uygur translation different from the one which can be found in the Uygur version of book five. Now according to Wilkens the original of the insertion into the third book goes back to a Tibetan original, namely to Tibetan II. His argumentation in favour of a Tibetan source is convincing. Further Wilkens points out that the Uygur text is not a slavish translation of the Tibetan, though it contains some of the typical errors of the Tibetan text where the Tibetan misunderstood the Sanskrit. The Uygur translator utilised the possibility of the Turkic grammar to distinguish the speakers in the text where the Tibetan was or could have been ambiguous. At other places the Uygur text follows the Chinese original, but not everything is translated, some parts of the Chinese originals are omitted.

Why did the Uygur version use two originals, the Chinese and the Tibetan? Here I would quote Wilkens:

"Eine Möglichkeit diese Frage zu beantworten, ist vorderhand die, daß ein Übersetzerkollektiv bereits in früher Zeit (note 170: D.h. zu Zeiten von Šıŋko Šäli Tutuŋ) aus zwei Ausgangssprachen in die Zielsprache, nämlich das Uigurische, übersetzt hat und dann die verschiedenen Fassungen miteinander abgeglichen hat. Da der aus dem Tibetischen übersetzte Passus aber nur in der Petersburger Handschrift nachzuweisen ist, wird man nicht fehlgehen, besser von zwei voneinander ganz unabhängigen Übersetzungen auszugehen, die zu verschiedenen Zeiten entsanden sind" (p. 34).

After the investigation of a short insertion into the text which is absent from the Chinese version and is a clear translation from the Tibetan, Wilkens comes to the result that those passages of the Uygur text of St. Petersburg which have been translated from the Tibetan or the translation of which is based on the Tibetan text, reflect a late phase of the history of the Uygur text. These parts of the Uygur Altan Yaruk may have been translated in the time of the Yuan dynasty, that is they are from the Middle Turkic period. This means that Altan Yaruk contains passages which were later translated and from Tibetan and these passages replaced the translation of the Chinese original of Yi-jing.

Do we have, independently of the facts quoted above, to suppose the existence of two

different translations from Chinese? After a thorough investigation of passages different in the text of St. Petersburg and their comparison with texts kept in Germany, Wilkens comes to the conclusion that there did exist at least two Uygur translations from the Chinese original. What is the relationship of the two translations? According to Wilkins during the long tradition of the Altan Yaruk some passages faded or were lost in the earlier version of the copy of St. Petersburg. At one time these passages were translated for the second time from a Chinese original and the text was completed by these new parts. The fragments kept in Germany point to the original, first translation.

I think the work of Wilkens is a great step forward on the still long way of the research into the tradition and history of the Uygur Sūtra of the Golden Light. There can be no doubt that the basic translation of Šıŋko Šäli Tutuŋ was completed in the late years of the 10th or the early years of the 11th century. The name, the person and its date has been the subject of many papers (to mention only the most important publications see: Ş. Tekin, Der heutige Zustand der Turcica der Turfan-Sammlung in Mainz: Trudy dvacat'pjatogo meždunarodnogo kongressa vostokovedov, III, Moskva, 1963, pp. 319–321, Ş. Tekin: Uygur bilgini Singku Seli Tutung'un bilinmeyen yeni bir çevirsi üzerine, *TDAYB* 66, pp. 29–33, P. Zieme: Sïngqu säli Tutung – Übersetzer buddhistischer Schriften ins Uigurische: *Tractata Altaica. Denis Sinor sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata*. Wiesbaden 1976, pp. 767–775, P. Zieme: Zu den legenden im Uigurischen Goldglanzsūtra, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 1 (1977), pp. 149–156, J. Hamilton, Les titres *šäli* et *tutung* in ouïgour, *JA* 271 (1984), pp. 425–437, P. Zieme: Die Vorrede zum alttürkischen Goldglanz-Sūtra von 1022, *TUBA* 13 (1989), pp. 237–243, K. Barat: Šïnqo Šäli Tutung traducteur du Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq Nom?, *JA* 278 (1990), pp. 155–166, K. Barat: *The Uygur Turkic Biography of the Seventh-Century Chinese Pilgrim Xuanzang. Ninth and Tenth Chapters*. Bloomington, 2000, pp. XI–XVII), and we have a version of the Altan Yaruk which is dated to 1022. There can also be no doubt that Šıŋko Šäli Tutuŋ who lived in Bešbalik (Bei-ting, North of Turfan), that is in the Western Uygur Empire, was the leader of a group of people who translated several Buddhist texts, among them the Biography of Xuanzang. K. Röhborn in the Introduction to the edition of the VIIIth book of the Xuanzang biography (pp. 2–5, see below) offers convincing arguments that in Bešbalik a full team worked on the translations. Šıŋko Šäli Tutuŋ is a Chinese name, it is the Uygur transcription of *Sheng-guang she-li dou-tong* (see Hamilton 1984). The title *she-li* is an abbreviated form of the Chinese transcription of the Indian title *acarya,* and *dou-tong,* the title born by the head of the Buddhist hierarchy during the 9th and 10th century. From the linguistic point of view it is remarkable that while the syllables *sheng* and *tong* preserved in the name their final /*-ŋ*/ this is not the case with *guang,* further that the initial is transcribed by Q, that is we have SYNKQW. The disappearence of the final Chinese *-ŋ* in the underlying Chinese dialect is normal, we have a lot of similar cases. The rule has been established by Csongor (see 1952, pp. 93–97, 1955, pp. 254–255 and this review p. 458). As has been demonstrated by Hamilton (Nasales instables en turc khotanais du X^{e} siècle, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 40 (1977), pp. 508–521) we find a similar change in the Turkic material. Though the change *-ŋ > -ɣ > -0* is more general in Old Turkic and seems to work under different conditions than the Chinese one, it may be an areal feature in the region affecting both Chinese and Uygur.

The parallel material quoted by Csongor also makes sure that we have to read *-qo* and not *-qu*.

Was Šıŋko Šäli Tutuŋ an Uygur or a Chinese? According to Hamilton (*JA* 271 (1984), p. 431) he was a "Chinois ou métis de Chinois et d'Ouïgour, natif de Beš-baliq". In any case he got a deep Chinese education and this could happen only in China.

These works were *basically* translated from Chinese into Uygur (*tabgač tilintin türk uyġur tilinčä*), but the group of translators may have used other materials as well. Among the mate-

rials at their disposal there had been Tibetan texts and even glossaries, among them Sanskrit glossaries. The first version then has been copied many times until the end of the 17th century. During this long time copyists complemented the text in case of need.

For the historian of the Turkic languages it seems to be clear that the original Old Uygur text has been *basically* preserved, but many parts have been refurbished, old words, expressions and parts of the text have been omitted, altered, changed or added. The usage introduced by Annemarie von Gabain to call the text of the Altan Yaruk "*alttürkisch*" can be preserved if and only if we know that not everything in the extant text(s) is Old Turkic.

On the long way to distinguish the later additions from the original, a great step forward are the works reviewed here and especially that of J. Wilkens.

For the sake of comparison, and in some respect, also as a help for the translation, Wilkens used two Mongolian versions. After Finch (R. Finch, Chapters XVI and XVII from the Uighur *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-Sūtra* (Altan Yaruq), *Journal of Turkish Studies* 17 (1993), pp. 37–116) Wilkens considered as representative two Mongolian versions which he calls Mong III. (Ligeti, L.: *Catalogue du Kanǰur mongol imprimé*. Budapest 1942–1944, for unknown reasons not in Wilkens bibliography, No. 176), and Mong II (Ligeti No. 177).

According to G. Kara (Az Aranyfényszutra. *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtrendrarāja*. Yon-tan Bzaṅ-po szövege I–II. [Sutra of Golden Light. Text of Yon-tan Bzaṅ-po] Budapest 1968) the longest version is No. 176, with 31 chapters (on p. 5, 21 is a misprint), wich was translated from the Tibetan, itself translated from Chinese, the shorter is No. 178, which was based on the Tibetan, itself translated from the Sanskrit. No. 177 is the most popular Mongolian version with many variants, it consists of 29 chapters and basically follows the longer version No. 176, but has two additional chapters. Kara edited the variant with 29 chapters. It is the transcription of the copy Mong No. 77 kept in the Oriental Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Wilkens cites the work of Kara in his bibliography, but quotes the Mongolian texts according to the edition of Lokesh Chandra (*Mongolian Kanǰur*, vol. 13, New Delhi 1974). The Budapest copy was brought from the Kharchin Banner by L. Ligeti. This copy is now described in G. Kara's catalogue (*The Mongol and Manchu manuscripts and blockprints in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*, Budapest 2000) on pp. 102–107. In the same catalogue we find two other variants of the 29-chapter-long version, under the numbers Mong 80 and Mong 123. See further the paper of Damdinsüren on the colophons of the Mongolian Golden Sutra (Two Mongolian colophons to the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra. Acta Orientalia Hung*. 33 (1979), pp. 39–58, and G. Kara's remarks to this paper (*Qaradaš*. Translator's note to Professor Damdinsüren's Two Mongolian Colophons. *Acta Orientalia Hung*. 33 (1979), pp. 59–63).

On pp. 10–12 of the book under review, Wilkens brings arguments that the Mongolian versions were translated from Tibetan and not from Chinese. The arguments are mainly based on ambiguities of the Tibetan text, where the Mongolian followed one of the two possible meanings of Tibetan and the Chinese text has an other rendering. Wilken's arguments are convincing, however the fact that all three Mongolian versions have been translated from the Tibetan has already been stressed by Aalto (P. Aalto: Notes on the Altan Gerel (The Mongolian version of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*). *Studia Orientalia [Fennica]* XIV, 1950, pp. 1–26) and Kara (1968, pp. 5–6), the latter unfortunately only in Hungarian.

Damdinsüren also identified the translators. The 31-chapter Mongolian version was translated by Mati badra sagara (Blo-bzang rgya-mtso?) in the early 17th century with the aid of Kun-dga' od-zer, one of the editors of the Mongolian Kanjur during the reign of Ligdan kan. The 29-chapter version was translated from Tibetan, but with the use of the Uyghur version by Shes-rab seng-ge at the beginning of the 14th century (*Šakyaliġ-ud-un toyin Širab Sengge Töbedčin Uyiġur-čin bičig-üd-eče monggolčilan orčiġulǰu*, see the colophon quoted by Damdin-

süren, 1979, p. 40). The third version exists in two Mongolian translations. One of them is based on the 29-chapter variant of Shes-rab seng-ge. The other is a translation by Jaya pandita Nam-mkha'-rgya-mtsho in the middle of the 16th century. This has been published in the Oyrat alphabet, the so-called "clear letters" (*todu üsüg*) (see Damdinsüren 1979, pp. 39–40). Damdinsüren published two different colophons of the Mongolian Golden Sutra. G. Kara wrote rich notes to the colophons of the Mongolian Golden Sutra where he stated: "In spite of the presumably and relatively late date (Altan qaγan's time?) of this colophon in the given form, the language of both the sūtra and its colophon is rich in Middle Mongolian peculiarities with regard to the grammar, vocabulary, style and the orthography" (Kara 1979, p. 59).

All the work done on the Mongolian Golden Light Sutra is at its very beginning, and for the further studies the book of Wilkens, as also of course that of Zieme, will be of great importance. It is clear that the Mongolian translators used at first hand the Tibetan originals, however the terminology is, if not Mongolian, of Uygur origin. The question how far the Mongolian translators used the Uygur original as a help remains to be answered.

***

While the Sūtra of the Golden Light was one of the most popular books in Central Asia and has been distributed in numerous copies, this cannot be said of the Old Turkic translation of the biography of the Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang (lived 602–664), containing the description of his life, his journey to India (629–646) and his correspondence. Even the circumstances of the discovery of the manuscript are obscure. Apparently the manuscript was in the possesion of a family in Turkestan. They did not reveal the place of the discovery and sold parts of the manuscript to different people. What is more, they tore the manuscript and sold it in a way that neither of the purchasers should have full parts. We know that some of the parts were sold in Urumchi and resold to the Library of Beijing, other parts were offered in Berlin, but later sold in Paris. Today there are 240 folios in the Beijing Library, 123 folios in the Musée Guimet, Paris, and 94 folios in the Asian Institute of St. Petersburg. In addition there are eight folios which J. Hackin purchased in Turkestan, and gave to Gabain.

In 1932 Annemarie von Gabain copied the folios in Beijing, and in 1933 those kept in Paris. The Beijing folios were transferred to Berlin for restoration and were sent back to Beijing in 1946 together with the eight folios donated by Hackin. Some smaller fragments somehow got into a shoebox in Berlin, and were rediscovered only later. K. Kudara and P. Zieme discovered small fragments of five different copies of the Old Turkic original (see P. Zieme: Xuanzangs Biographie und das Xiyuji in alttürkischer Überlieferung, in: Laut, J. P.– Röhrborn, K. (eds): *Buddhistische Erzählliteratur und Hagiographie in türkischer Überlieferung*. Wiesbaden 1990, pp. 85–107, Abb. 8–34, Kudara, K.– Zieme, P.: Fragmente zweier unbekannte Handschriften der uigurischen Xuanzang-Biographie. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 11 (1984), pp. 136–148). The transcripts made by Gabain are of great value because during the restoration work in Paris and Berlin some parts of the original became unreadable and would have been lost to the research if they had not been fixed by Gabain.

The folios kept in St. Petersburg have been studied and published by L. Ju. Tuguševa (Ujgurskaja versija biografii Sjuan'-czana: fragmenti iz gl. X. *Pis'mennye pamjatniki Vostoka* 1971, pp. 253–259; 1974, pp. 556–569; *Fragmenty ujgurskoj versii biografii Sjuan'-czana*, Moskva 1980; *Ujgurskaja versija biografii Sjuan-czana: fragmenty iz Leningradskogo rukopisnogo sobranija Instituta vostokovedenija AN SSSR*. Moskva 1991).

After his return from his journey Xuanzang wrote in 646 a report to the court which consisted of 12 chapters, and had the title *Datang Xiyuji*. Later he also wrote an autobiography, the *Da Ciensi Sanzan Fashizhuan*. His disciple Huili wrote the first biography of his master soon after his death in 664. This biography was completed by the monk Yacong in 688. The

earliest known copy of the biography is dated to 1071 and is kept in Japan. The biography is in many cases based on the Report and the Autobiography, and it quotes longer passages from both works. However the two original works of Xuanzang seem to be lost. It seems that the Uygur translator Šïnqo Šäli Tutung could have access to the two works.

An earlier version of the first part of the work of Barat was his dissertation which he defended in 1993 at Harvard University (*The Uygur Xuanzang Biography.* Volume IX. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University 1993).

The Introduction of the book of Barat under review contains chapters on the manuscript, on the translation of the manuscript, on the author Šïnqo Šäli Tutung, on the nature of the Uygur translation, on the transcription system and on the Uygur–Chinese transcription.

The Introduction of the book of Ölmez – Röhrborn contains chapters on the description of the present localisation of the parts of the text (Fundumstände), the description of the manuscript, the history of the research, the earlier works on the 3rd chapter of the Biography, the content of the 3rd chapter and on the technique of the edition.

One has the impression that Barat worked on the general parts of his introduction to the edition of chapters IX and X, independently of his German colleagues. This can be seen in what has been published by Ölmez – Röhrborn in their introduction to volume III. Many details of the adventurous history of the manuscript can be reconstructed only with the help of letters from A. von Gabain, from other German sources on the one hand and from information from Urumchi and Beijing on the other. Thus the general parts of the two publications concerning the history of the manuscript have to be used simultaneously.

Barat published his edition of book III in 1992 (The Uighur Xuanzang biography, volume III. *Journal of Turkish Studies – Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 16, pp. 5–65). It is clear that, e.g., Barat had information about the dissertation of Toalster (Toalster, J. P. C.: *Die Uigurische Xuan-Zang-Biographie, 4. Kapitel mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Ph. D. dissertation, Universität Gießen 1977, see J. Hamilton's review in *BSOAS* 41 (1978), pp. 616–617), but since this was never published he could not use it. Neither did he use the parallel text of lines 822–861 which were published by P. Zieme in 1990 (see above). Ölmez and Röhrborn had the advantage of being the second in publishing the Uygur version of book III. They took this advantage and corrected misreadings and mistakes made by Barat.

It was D. Sinor who first called attention to the Biography as a source of reconstructing Middle Chinese (A propos de la biographie uïgoure de Hiuan-tsang. *JA* 231 (1939), pp. 543–590). Barat offers a relatively long study on the Uygur transcription of Middle Chinese, as reflected in the Biography. His deliberations complement the earlier researches of B. Csongor (Chinese in the Uighur Script of the T'ang-Period. *AOH* 2 (1952), pp. 74–118; Some more Chinese Glosses in Uighur Script. *AOH* 4 (1955), pp. 251–257). The material is of great importance for Sinology because it reflects one of the north-western Chinese dialects of the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century.

The technique of the Ölmez – Röhrborn edition of the text follows the one used by Röhrborn in his edition of chapter VII (Röhrborn, K.: *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VII. Nach der Handschrift von Leningrad, Paris und Peking sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie v. Gabain herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*, Wiesbaden 1991 [Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 3] and that of Chapter VIII (*Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VIII. Nach der Handschrift von Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie v. Gabain herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden 1996 [Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 5]). The transcription and the transliteration runs on the upper part of the pages and below the German translation.

Barat uses a different layout. In the left column of both of the double pages, the Uygur texts runs in transliteration and below it in transcription, in the manner accepted now in this

type of text editions. On the left (even) page, right column upper side, the Chinese text is printed, with the English translation below it. On the right (odd) page, right column, the facsimile of the Uygur text is reprinted. Further under the transcription of the Uygur text those Chinese characters are inserted which Barat considers to be the originals of the Uygur translation. This complicated layout enables the reader to follow the technique of translation.

Röhrborn decided to go another way. He is working together with Sinologists. Alexander Leonhard Mayer published his monograph on Xuanzang (*Xuanzang, Übersetzer und Heiliger*. Wiesbaden 1992 [Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 1]), after having published book VII (*Cien-Biographie VII, Übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden 1991 [Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 2]). Book VIII was published by Uwe Frankenhauser (*Cien-Biographie VIII, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden 1995 [Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 4]). We have now also the edition of the Chinese book VI (Mayer, A. L.: *Cien-Biographie VI*, Wiesbaden 2001 [Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 34, Teil 6]).

Three further works have to be mentioned here to which I have not yet had access. Anthony T. Arlotto defended a dissertation in 1966 under the title *The Uighur text of Hsüan Tsang's Biography*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. Semih Tezcan defended a dissertation on chapter 10 (*Eski Uygurca Hsüan Tsang Biyografisi, X. Bölüm (Doçentlik tezi)*. Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, 1975). There does exist a recent English translation of the Chinese text by Li Rongxi published in 1995 (*A Biography of the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great C'ien Monastery of the Great Tang Dynasty*, Berkeley 1995).

Both Barat and Ölmez–Röhrborn have ample commentaries to the Uygur translation, but only Barat added an index of Uygur words, because Röhrborn will surely add the lexical material to his masterful *Uigurisches Wörterbuch,* but until then we are hampered by the lack of an index.

For the historian of the Turkic languages the Uygur translation of the biography of Xuanzang is of utmost importance. The Turkic language, beyond any doubt, reflects an Old Turkic phase of the Uygur literary language of Bešbalik. The text is from the same decades as the Turkic–Khotanese wordlist written in Khotanese Brāhmi script (see Emmerick, R. E.– Róna-Tas, A.: The Turkish–Khotanese Wordlist revisited. *Central Asiatic Journal* 36 (1992), pp. 199–241). It is only a few decades older then the original of the Dīvān of Mahmūd al-Kāšgarī written in Arabic script (see Dankoff, R.– Kelly, J.: *Maḥmūd al Kāšġārī Compendium of the Turkic Dialects I–III*. Harvard 1982, on the date of the extant unique manuscript see my review in *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 40 (1986), pp. 335–339) or the original of the Qutadgu Bilig also written in Arabic (Rahmeti Arat: *Kutadgu bilig* I, Ankara 1947, Dankoff, R.: *Yūsuf Khaṣṣ Hājib, Wisdom of Royal Glory (Kutadgu Bilig). A Turko-Islamic Mirror of Princes*. Chicago–London 1983). Bešbalik, Khotan, Balasagun and Kashgar were four centres of the Turkic culture in the 10th–11th centuries, the first two under Buddhist, the second two already under Islamic influence, using three different types of writing. But all four had close ties with China. The study of the high culture of these places is also important for Sinology.

The world-wide work on these fascinating texts shows the great interest of the scholarly world. We all have to be grateful to the authors of the books reviewed for their endeavour.

András Róna-Tas

CHI, PANG-YUAN – WANG, DAVID DER-WEI (eds): *Chinese Literature in the Second Half of a Modern Century: A Critical Survey*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2000. xliii + 332 pages, ISBN 0 253 33710 0.

Since China has been divided into distinct geopolitical units, scholars of Chinese literature have always met with difficulties when discussing the history of modern Chinese literature on the