

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 Chinese¹. 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

* 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 Research 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.

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, Turnhout 2001. (Berliner Turfan-texte 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-*

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 *Anantamukhanirhādharanī* 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 uigurskoj 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 Uyghur 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 Bāzāklīk 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 Öğdisi*.

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 Sūtra (*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 Uyghur 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 been 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur translation different from the one which can be found in the Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur text follows the Chinese original, but not everything is translated, some parts of the Chinese originals are omitted.

Why did the Uyghur 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 entsandt 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur text. These parts of the Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur Sūtra of the Golden Light. There can be no doubt that the basic translation of Šıŋko Šāli 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: Š. Tekin, *Der heutige Zustand der Turcica der Turfan-Sammlung in Mainz: Trudy dvacat'pjatogo meždunarodnogo kongressa vostokovedov*, III, Moskva, 1963, pp. 319–321, Š. Tekin: Uyghur bilgini Singku Seli Tutuŋ'un bilinmeyen yeni bir çevirisi üzerine, *TDAYB* 66, pp. 29–33, P. Zieme: Šıŋqu sāli Tutuŋ – 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 šāli et tutuŋ 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: Šıŋko Šāli Tutuŋ traducteur du Säkiz Yükmäk Yaruq Nom?, *JA* 278 (1990), pp. 155–166, K. Barat: *The Uyghur 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 Šāli Tutuŋ who lived in Bešbalik (Bei-ting, North of Turfan), that is in the Western Uyghur Empire, was the leader of a group of people who translated several Buddhist texts, among them the Biography of Xuanzang. K. Röhrborn 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 Šāli Tutuŋ is a Chinese name, it is the Uyghur 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 disappearance 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 Uyghur.

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

Was Šıŋko Šāli Tutuŋ an Uyghur 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 Uyghur (*tabgač tilintin türk uyğur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur *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 Kanjur 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 Bzañ-po szövege I–II. [Sutra of Golden Light. Text of Yon-tan Bzañ-po] Budapest 1968) the longest version is No. 176, with 31 chapters (on p. 5, 21 is a misprint), which 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 Kanjur*, 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 (*Šakyaliḡ-ud-un toyin Širab Sengge Töbedčin Uyıǵur-čin bičig-üd-eče mongǵolčılan orčıǵulju*, 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" (*to-du 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 qayan'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 possession 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: fragmenty 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 Uyghur translator Šinqo 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 Uyghur 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 Šinqo Šäli Tutung, on the nature of the Uyghur translation, on the transcription system and on the Uyghur–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 Uyghur 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 Überset-

zung 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur 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 Uyghur text is reprinted. Further under the transcription of the Uyghur text those Chinese characters are inserted which Barat considers to be the originals of the Uyghur 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 Uyğurca 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 Uyghur translation, but only Barat added an index of Uyghur 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 Uyghur translation of the biography of Xuanzang is of utmost importance. The Turkic language, beyond any doubt, reflects an Old Turkic phase of the Uyghur 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 than the original of the *Dīvān* of Mahmūd al-Kāšgārī written in Arabic script (see Dankoff, R. – Kelly, J.: *Mahmūd al Kāšgārī 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

basis of integrated principles. The latest volumes dedicated to the subject admittedly deal only with the writings of one particular region (McDougall-Loui), or treat the literature of China, Hong Kong and Taiwan very briefly and separately (Idema-Haft). Western criticism before the 1980s focused mainly on the literature from Taiwan, later the attention turned to Mainland China. Recently, the number of specialised monographs drawing on the literature of Greater China with a comparative approach is increasing. This volume has set to continue this trend on the level of a more general survey, including entries on the literature of China, Taiwan and Hong Kong in the second half of the twentieth century.

The editors of the volume, Pang-yuan Chi and David Wang, renowned scholars of modern Chinese literature themselves as well, inspired by a 1993 international conference held in Taipei on the same subject, have collected 15 papers, six of which were originally presented at the conference. The volume opens with an essay-worth introduction by David Wang. He gives a brief review of the main tendencies and aspects that characterised Chinese literature in the second half of the 20th century. And in the light of this, he expounds the methodological basis for the editing of the book and proposes some coordinates for the analysis of the different aspects of modern Chinese literature. As he holds "... a critical method must derive its authenticity less by appropriating ready-made, familiar mappings and applying them to China than by rethinking the topology of all modern (Chinese) history". While recognising the political and historical facts that separate(d) the body politic of Chinese literature, they have tried to link up the different productions, give cross-analysis, and show that literary creation in the different regions has never been fully divided, influenced each other and often have the same spiritual source.

Since the volume consists of individual contributions mostly dedicated to special aspects of Chinese literature, the book does not aim at providing a traditional, linear literary history. Rather, it is meant to be a critical survey offer-

ing an insight into the main trends and discourses, regardless of geopolitical boundaries, so as to depict the richness and complexity of modern Chinese literature. In the first part we find three articles on general topics. Zaifu Liu examines the state of Chinese literary theory on the mainland from the 1980s until 1990, and its struggle to liberate itself from old "shadows", like alien borrowings and dogmatism. Liu maintains that Chinese literary theory has to renew itself and has to find an independent existence. He examines three ways this struggle was conducted: the proposition of literary subjectivity, the return to the literary language, and the search for a spiritual homeland. Pang-yuan Chi offers a short, succinct overview of literature in Taiwan during the period between 1945 and 1999. She emphasises the Taiwanese experiment (rooted in the traditional Chinese culture imported by flows of immigrants over centuries, and in the development of the Taiwanese society), and states that all literary work of Taiwan bear "an indigenous Taiwanese touch". Similarly, William Tay, in his article about the fifty years of Hong Kong literature, stresses the unique nature of Hong Kong literature which was the result of the relatively free space for Chinese literary creation in Hong Kong. He treats Hong Kong literature in the triple context of colonialism (Hong Kong's status as a colony always differed from that of the others), the impact of the Cold War (Hong Kong profited largely from the Cold War era: gained political stabilisation and economic development) and in the context of marginal status (and since it was the battleground between different ideologies, there is a contradiction between the neglected peripheral status and the extreme popularity of his popular culture in the centre).

The second part of the book contains two essays dealing with the ideological writings, and the impact of the politics on literature of the 1950s and 1960s. David Wang demonstrates how on both sides of the Taiwan Straits writers tried to reinvent a national history through their narratives. He shows that, in spite of their different attitudes (Communist and anti-Communist), the means, the aims and the very nature of

these narratives are basically the same. One of those means was the creation of a “scar” discourse describing the sufferings of the Chinese people tormented by history and politics. But through the concrete examples we can see that the repeated writing of the scars does not help healing them, in fact, it just trivialises the crimes. This anticipates the stalling of the “scar literature” in the mainland at the end of the 1970s.

Socialist realism is the subject of Su Wei’s essay. It deals with the evolution of the socialist realist rhetoric after 1949, until 1966, when the Summary of the Symposium on Armed Forces Cultural Workers introduced the new slogan of “creating a new era in proletarian art”. In the centre of this rhetoric were the hospital as the symbol of the destruction of everything old and ill, and the school as the symbol of the restoring of the social hygiene and the indoctrination of people with the new thoughts.

The third part of the book summarises the various reactions Chinese writers undertook facing modernisation. The process began in Taiwan as early as 1953 with the foundation of the *Modern poetry quarterly*. Ko Ch’i-ming examines the literature of Taiwan in the 1960s, and asserts that the gap between “modernist fiction” and “nativist fiction” is not as deep as is usually thought to be. The central experience of the era common to all writers was the feeling of upheaval. The creational strategies to treat this feeling might be different: writers mix the “vertical inheritance” (the native Chinese tradition) and the “horizontal impact” (the Western literary theories). But they do interpret the same present of Taiwan from the *point de vue* of Taiwan. Yang Chao investigates the development and evolution of nativist literature in Taiwan from a more traditional point of view. He maintains that nativism can be fully understood only in the context of the historical and political background. E.g., during the heated nativist literature debate at the end of the 1970s, there were almost no debates about the very nature of the literature between the opposing sides, the conflict originated from the different political and economical views. After 1980 the force of nativism has faded, which is attested by the success of

such mainstream novels as *A Thousand Moons on a Thousand Rivers* by Xiao Lihong (1980), where nativism is no more than a decor to the story. In what follows the author concentrates on the non-mainstream realism during the 1980s.

The next three essays are all dedicated to the modernism of Mainland China. Modernisation began much later in Mainland China than in Taiwan and Hong Kong, the background and its realisation were completely different; but what emerged (root-seeking and avant-garde fiction) shared some common features with the literary creation in the other parts of the Chinese realm. Li Qingxi concentrates on the “root-seeking” movement. The main goals of the root-seeking movement were the search of a mode of expression for the self in the spirit of one’s native culture, and to find the means to break through the existing literary norms. Analysing the movement from the point of view of self-seeking, fictional aesthetic and value system, Li concludes that the spiritual quest for roots “is an anticultural return”. It is a return to origins with the goal of searching the human character and the conditions where it can freely express himself.

Wu Liang studies the mainland avant-garde literature of the 1980s; he examines the emergence and the phases of its evolution. In the middle of the 1980s young “separatist” writers showed a reluctant attitude towards the officially approved, socially oriented mainstream. They avoided dealing with social issues directly. Instead, they engaged in individual experiments and put emphasis on individual emotion and psychological issues. This first generation of avant-garde writers shocked the public with their new concepts and discourse. But after 1987, as Wu argues, the avant-garde movement lost its positions, the new generation of writers gradually disconnected themselves from their environment. As a result of their enclosure and the change of external conditions, the avant-garde movement almost fully disappeared after one decade of existence.

Li Tuo views Chinese modernity from the point of view of criticism in his article. He notices that modernity almost never was the ob-

ject of literary criticism, one of the main reasons for this lay in the danger of confronting the official ideology of Four Modernisations. After the advent of non-mainstream trends in literary creation from the middle of the 1980s, it is remarkable that most of the new writers adopted an attitude of resistance towards modernisation. Li states that in spite of this, these texts can also be interpreted in terms of a critique of modernity.

The fourth part of the book approaches Chinese literature from the point of view of the postmodern turn, and the challenges it posed to established norms. The first three essays explore the subject of female writing. Chung Ling deals with the feminist writing in Taiwan, while Jingyuan Zhang discusses the female literature in Mainland China. They both assert that female writing is an essential critique of the prevailing narratives and the male-dominated literary politics. Chung Ling analyses three central topics in Taiwanese feminist writing during the last three decades: the traditional role of Chinese women and its reinterpretation, the marital plight of urban women, and the battle between male and female. Although the topology of worldwide feminist writing is much richer than this, the task of Taiwanese female writing is not to reflect the whole situation of women, but to truly interpret the status of Taiwanese women. And the best writings reach this standard. In China during the last two decades, female writing has become extremely popular. Jingyuan Zhang holds that until the late 1980s the feminist writing, with a few exceptions, consisted almost always of socialist-realist narratives about urban working women encountering gender problems at work and at home, but they could address larger social issues as well. However, this scheme changed radically during the 1990s. Under the loosening official control, woman writers could address much broader and sensible topics in more subjective ways than before. Zhang explores three aspects of this new female writing: the interpretation of male–female relations, the apparition of the topic of same-sex relations, and the attention to subjectivity. The analysis shows the Chinese women in a

difficult situation at the end of the twentieth century, and attest, to the existence of highly sensible and sophisticated female writing in China.

The third article treating feminist writing is a case study on an individual woman author from Hong Kong. Stephen K. C. Chan sees the work of Xi Xi not really as eminent feminist writing but as an elaborated postmodernist narrative of urban life. He investigates the aesthetic perception of urban spaces, the rendition of everyday life and the cultural memory of city dwellers in three of Xi Xi's novels. He argues that Xi Xi was able to fully explore the narrative possibilities so that the genre of novel offers to provide the reader with a new, deeper and richer perception of the subject.

In his essay, Xiaobing Yang approaches the literature of the 1980s from a postmodernist point of view and tries to answer the question: what is Chinese postmodernism/post-Mao-Dengism? In his analysis the writings of that era (labelled by other critics as experimental, avant-garde, etc.) do not constitute a movement but only a trend and show postmodernist features. His opinion is based on the argument that "[...] Chinese postmodernism, like its Western counterpart, is to be read as a deconstruction of representational totality and unity, as a fragmentation and problematisation of the linear, teleological history". He defines literary postmodernism in China "as both a psychic reaction to the discourses of modernity in Mao-Deng political culture and a rhetorical reaction to the 'modern' paradigm of literary culture". The last essay of the fourth part is a study from Michelle Yeh on the motif of (real and imaginary) death of the poet in Chinese poetry at the end of the twentieth century. Drawing examples both from China and Taiwan, she concludes that the motif is equally common in both places, just like the marginalisation of poetry, but the impact of the different socio-cultural milieus results in different interpretations. Taiwanese authors tend to reflect on urban culture and attest to a spiritual death caused not only by external evils but internal defects as well. In China the (official) cult of the poetry was much stronger than in

Taiwan. But political and economical repression also caused the emerging avant-garde poets in the 1970s and 1980s to suffer from a deep feeling of alienation.

The book ends with an overview of Western criticism on literature from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, by Jeffrey C. Kinkley. In fact, this is an annotated bibliography of the most important works in the form of an essay. It is very useful and informative. The volume also comes with a glossary of Chinese expressions and an index.

According to the introduction, one of the main merits of the papers resides in their lack of affiliation with any single methodology. Indeed, this can help to make authoritative critical judgments. But the defects of a volume consisting of such papers are evident, too: the aims and the standards of the individual essays may seem somewhat uneven. Some of them appear to be a bit out-dated. It is quite interesting and edifying to see how critics and scholars from different parts of the world treat the same subject (e.g., the experimental literature of the 1980s of the mainland). But these essays do not add much new information to our knowledge on the subject, rather, they provide clues about what theoretical and critical stance these scholars adopt. The essays dealing with the recent trends, with a few exceptions, do not extend their scope beyond 1992–93. Also, no reference is

made to the latest developments in the second half of the 1990s. Since the volume claims to be a survey of the second half of the twentieth century, it should include those as well.

The main problem with the volume is that most of the essays are unable to put the methodological principles drawn up by David Wang into practice. With the exception of two contributions, the essays concentrate on some special aspects of the literature of one single area and do not put the subject into a wider perspective. The realisation of Wang's proposals can only be seen at the level of the whole volume: in the selection of the contributors (Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and the overseas are represented) and in the grouping of the essays (more general surveys on the literature of a single area, effects of politisation of the literature, the pursuit of modernity, the postmodern turn). Only put together and grouped systematically can the essays provide cross-reference and demonstrate the diversity and richness of Chinese literary production in the last half century.

With these shortcomings in mind, for those interested in modern Chinese literature the book is a good introduction and offers useful information. For those studying Chinese literature, its method and principles can provide further inspiration, and a new point of view.

Kornélia Major