

RUSSIAN ACADEMY
OF SCIENCES

Institute of Oriental
Manuscripts
(Asiatic Museum)

Founded in 2014
Issued biannually

Published with the support
of St. Petersburg State
University Alumni Association
and
Irina and Yuri Vasilyev
Foundation



Nauka
Vostochnaya Literatura
2017

WRITTEN MONUMENTS OF THE ORIENT

2017 (1)

Editors

Irina Popova, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg (Editor-in-Chief)
Svetlana Anikeeva, Vostochnaya Literatura Publisher,
Moscow
Tatiana Pang, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Elena Tanonova, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg

Editorial Board

Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Turfanforschung,
BBAW, Berlin
Michael Friedrich, Universität Hamburg
Yuly Ioannesyanyan, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Karashima Seishi, Soka University, Tokyo
Aliy Kolesnikov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Alexander Kudelin, Institute of World Literature,
RAS, Moscow
Karine Marandzhyan, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Nie Hongyin, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology,
CASS, Beijing
Georges-Jean Pinault, École Pratique des Hautes Études,
Paris
Stanislav Prozorov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Rong Xinjiang, Peking University
Nicholas Sims-Williams, University of London
Takata Tokio, Kyoto University
Stephen F. Teiser, Princeton University
Hartmut Walravens, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin
Nataliya Yakhontova, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
RAS, St. Petersburg
Peter Zieme, Freie Universität Berlin

IN THIS ISSUE

- Olga Chunakova, Federico Dragoni, Enrico Morano**
A forgotten Manichaean Sogdian bifolio in Sogdian script 3
- Adam Benkato**
Sogdian letter fragments in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
St. Petersburg 26
- Peter Zieme**
An Embryonic Saint. Interpretation of an Old Uighur Fragment in
the Serindia Collection at the IOM, RAS 40
- Alexander Zorin**
Fragments of Tibetan Texts Refound at the Dunhuang Collection Kept
at the IOM, RAS: Eleven Identified Fragments of Buddhist Canonical
Texts 49
- Hartmut Walravens**
Symbolism of sovereignty in the context of the Dzungar campaigns
of the Qianlong emperor 73
- Reviews**
- Joseph F. O'Callaghan. *The Last Crusade in the West: Castile and the
Conquest of Granada*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,
2014, by **Anastasia Stepanova** 91
- Catalogue of Japanese Manuscripts and Rare Books. Merete Pedersen.
The Royal Library, Copenhagen, Denmark. Catalogue of Oriental
Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc. in Danish Collections (COMDC),
by **Karine Marandjian** 95
- Anton Schiefner (1817–1879) und seine indologischen Freunde:
seine Briefe an die Indologen Albrecht Weber (1825–1901), Rudolf
Roth (1821–1895) und William D. Whitney (1827–1894) sowie den
Indogermanisten Adalbert Kuhn (1812–1881) / Hartmut Walravens,
Agnes Stache-Weiske [editors]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen
Akademie der Wissenschaften 2015. (Österreichische Akademie der
Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte,
868. Bd.; Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Nr. 89),
by **Alexander Zorin** 98*
-

REVIEWS

Joseph F. O’Callaghan. *The Last Crusade in the West: Castile and the Conquest of Granada.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014, 15.5×23.5 cm, 384 pp., 6 black-and-white figures and 2 maps. ISBN 9780812209358.

The recent decade was marked by the appearance of three volumes of the magisterial history by Joseph F. O’Callaghan, Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at Fordham University. One cannot doubt that few scholars know the history of late-medieval Castile better than he does. His *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), *The Gibraltar Crusade: Castile and the Battle for the Strait* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011) were published by the University of Pennsylvania Press, as well as the volume of our review which represents the third part of his ambitious trilogy — *The Last Crusade in the West: Castile and the Conquest of Granada* (2014). This volume describes the ebb and flow of the Reconquest, the conflict which was going on from the middle of the 15th c. until the fall of Granada, the last Islamic state on the Iberian Peninsula, under the blow of the expanding Christian kingdoms in 1492.

The Naşrids — the longest lasting Muslim dynasty in the Iberian Peninsula was established by Ibn al-Aḥmar in 1228, with the departure of the Almohad prince Idrīs, who left Iberia to take the Almohad leadership. The Naşrids aligned themselves with Ferdinand III of Castile after the conquest of Cordoba in 1236 in order to preserve their autonomy, so the emirate of Granada officially came into being (1238). It was a powerful and self-sufficient kingdom in its own right. By the end of the fourteenth century, Christian control of the Iberian Peninsula reached the borders of the emirate of Granada, whose Muslim rulers acknowledged Castilian suzerainty. The kings of Castile weren’t threatened by Moroccan incursions and were diverted by civil war and conflicts with neighboring kings instead of completing the Reconquest. The situation changed only at the end of the 15th c. On January 2, 1492, after a decade-long effort to subjugate Granada, the last Muslim ruler in Iberia, the emir Muhammad XII was made to surrender complete control of the Emirate to Ferdinand II and Isabella I, *Los Reyes Católicos*, the Catholic Monarchs, that marked the completion of centuries of armed struggle between the peninsula’s Christian kingdoms and the Islamic states of al-Andalus.

The volume consists of introduction, nine chapters, and wide bibliography, notes and a special note on monetary system, a list of abbreviations, and genealogical tables that facilitate comprehensible perception of the crucial historical turning points.

The introduction traces the codependent relationship of the King of Castile with his Muslim client kingdom. The role of Granada at that time was not considerable. The “War of the Two Pedros” (*La Guerra de los Dos Pedros*) — the conflict between the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, between Pedro of Castile and Pedro IV of Aragon — was of paramount importance.

The first five chapters are devoted to the reigns of Pedro I (1350–1369), Enrique II (1369–1379), Juan I (1379–1390), Enrique III (1390–1406), Juan II (1406–1454), and Enrique IV (1454–1474), wherein the author traces the course of negotiations along the Castilian frontier and examines diplomatic and military exchanges between Christians and Muslims. In 1248, after the fall of Seville, the Castilian monarchs tried to consolidate their conquest and to dominate the Guadalquivir River valley to its mouth, trying to wrest control of Algeciras, Gibraltar, and Tarifa. Moroccan intervention was ended by the Alfonso XI’s victory in 1340. Four years later he conquered Algeciras and besieged Gibraltar, but died in 1350. The crusade was brought to a halt, since the Castilians felt no need to attack Muslims. Therefore, the Reconquest has been suspended. No longer worried about a possible Moroccan invasion, Pedro I focused on the war with Aragon and the opposition of Enrique of Trastámara. This time the Trastámara monarchs arranged a series of armistices with the Naṣrids, prolonged till the early 15th c. Juan II later defeated the Naṣrids at La Higuera in 1431, but the quarrels with the nobility disturbed his long reign and he failed to gain more territories. There were series of campaigns against the Muslim kingdom, but at the same time it was a period of increasing integration of the Naṣrid and Trastámara realms through some treaties and truces. Later Enrique IV, son of Juan II, ravaged Granada, but didn’t manage to subjugate the emirate once more for the reason of increasing discord with the nobility and a dispute over the succession which thwarted his efforts. The Christian kingdom itself descended into a persistent state of civil war. To understand the steps of the Castilian conquest it’s crucial to follow these intermittent crusading efforts, so precisely and scrupulously drawn by O’Callaghan. He stressed that ever since the invasion of Muslims of the Peninsula the Christians had fought to expel them.

Chapters six and seven investigate the final stages of the warfare under Isabel I (1474–1504), Enrique IV’s half-sister, and Fernando II, then king of Sicily and later of Aragon, who made the conquest their priority. That time the prestige of the monarchy had been restored, the fractious nobility was consolidated, and the royal couple managed to provide the outlet for the war against the Muslims. The Naṣrid dynasty, riven by internal conflict and led by a very young emir Abū ‘Abdallāh, did itself no favors in the struggle. The King and Queen had been persisting with their task for ten years, and after the capitulation of Granada in 1491, they entered the city in 1492. The Reconquest was over.

In these chapters the author examines military organization, camping financing, methods of military campaigns' operations, with emphasis on the crown's negotiations with the papacy under Sixtus IV (1471–1484) and Innocent VIII (1484–1492) over the Church's financial contributions to the war effort. The relations of the Holy See with the sovereigns and peoples of Europe were affected in no small degree by its fiscal policy, getting a great profit of crusade bulls and ecclesiastical revenues. Furthermore, O'Callaghan investigates thoroughly diplomatic and military back and forth of the Catholic Castilians and Muslims in Granada, the last bastion of Islamic rule in Spain.

With this the narration ends and the author turns to a number of related subjects. Two last chapters may be called analytical. In the eighth chapter the previous issues acquired an increased focus when the author describes a set of related questions. One of them is the incorporation of thousands and thousands of Muslims into the Crown of Castile that was a hard task, as a political entity of Islamic Spain existed no more. Furthermore, O'Callaghan thoroughly examines the military organization of Castile and Naşrid forces, the elements the army was composed of. He describes the course of pitched battles, the role of the naval forces and artillery, the siege warfare. At the end of the chapter we learn about substantial support derived from the Church — *tercias, decima, crusada* — in addition to loans from wealthy individuals and communities.

In the last chapter O'Callaghan examines the crusading ideology and religious conflict that, according to the author's point of view were the fundamental motivating force of warfare in Iberia, so to say "a conflict between two societies, one permeated by Christianity, the other by Islam." O'Callaghan provides a detailed overview of a crusading ideology, the one that gave an impulse and a genuine force in history. Acknowledging that the war against the Moors was of interest to Christendom, successive popes offered participants of the relevant events the crusading indulgence or remission of sins, and various personal and proprietary legal protections. The Religious motives extended, inspired, and sustained the development of crusading movement within the Iberian campaigns. What's more the author was extremely attentive to the language that reflects the religion dimension of the struggle.

In the work of O'Callaghan we look at the Reconquest in the light of the crusades' context in the Middle East, so the conquest of Granada is reframed as the "last great crusade in Western Europe". The drive for power, profit, and the territory was hidden under the cover of religious conviction. Sometimes it may seem that the controversy between Muslim and Christian societies might be somewhat exaggerated. One could not argue that Crusade is an important part of the history of Muslim-Christian relations, but the fact that religion is often used as a justification for conflict doesn't mean that it is the cause of conflicts. Sometimes even the war between Christians and Muslims was not a war between Christianity and Islam. Such an approach represents only one of many ways to analyze and understand the history of Castile and the kingdom's relations with its Muslim neighbors. However, the fundamentally religious character of this last stage of conflict can't be doubted.

Joseph O'Callaghan made use of much more sources for medieval Iberian history than any other contemporary scholar. Among them Christian, Muslim narrative sources (however, mostly in translation), documentary, rich corpus of historical ballads, since many episodes described in annals were retold in poetic form as ballads or romances. He carefully analyses Castilian and Portuguese chronicle accounts, papal and royal documents, fiscal records, diplomatic correspondence to provide his research with an impressive array of evidence.

Christian narrative and documentary sources are examined much fuller than previously. The chronicles and histories of individual monarchs by the laymen holding prominent positions in the royal court are of greater value. For example the chronicles by Pedro López de Ayala (1332–1406), a soldier, diplomat, and a statesman, of the reigns of Pedro I, Enrique II, Juan I, and Enrique III, whom he loyally served. The chief falconer Pedro Carrillo de Huete wrote the history of the reign of Juan II from 1420 to 1450, used many chancery documents. Historical works relating to Enrique IV vividly describe the political situation of that period. Alonso de Palencia, named the royal chronicler, spoke about the time from the end of Juan II's reign to 1481. Also he was the one of the few authors who recorded the reign of Fernando and Isabel ("*Guerra de Granada*").

Moreover, O'Callaghan uses not only narratives written by Christians and showing Christian opinions on the Moors, but also sources from the other side, although narratives by Muslim authors are scant. Their typical specimen is the work by Hernando de Baeza, Interpreter and Messenger, "*Las cosas que pasaron entre los reyes de Granada...*" (Events That Occurred Among the Kings of Granada) (1505) which represents a unique source of information concerning intrigue in the Naşrid court. De Baeza resided in Granada during the last years of the Naşrid rule, being on good terms with Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad XII, the last Naşrid monarch.

Two works in Arabic should be mentioned as well. "*Ŷannat al-riḏā fī'l-taslīm ilā mā qaddara-llāh wa-qaḏā*" (The Book of the Leafy Garden) by Ibn 'Āsim, related to the turbulent reign of Muḥammad IX, whom he served in various positions, and the anonymous "*Kitāb Nubḏat al-'aşr fī aḥbār mulūk Banī Naşr aw taslīm Ġarnāta wa-nuzūl al-Andalusiyīn ilā'l-Maġrib*" (Contemporary extract of Relations of the Age Containing News of the Naşrid Kings or the Capitulation), chronicle of the reigns of the last Naşrids.

To sum up we should say that *The Last Crusade in the West* is the book composed with skill and erudition, that traces the story of Castilian diplomacy, military operations, Crusade movement of the last centuries of the Reconquest. For people interested in the Iberian history of that epoch, Muslim-Christian relations in the Middle Ages, for students and researchers this judicious, balanced, thorough, and reasonably comprehensive study would be of considerable benefit.

Anastasia Stepanova
Post-graduate student,
Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
Russian Academy of Sciences

Catalogue of Japanese Manuscripts and Rare Books. Merete Pedersen.

The Royal Library, Copenhagen, Denmark. Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc. in Danish Collections (COMDC). Vol. 10.1. — Nordic Institute of Asian Studies. — 446 p. ISBN: 978-87-7694-147-5

The largest in the Nordic countries Royal Library in Denmark has released the tenth volume of the series *Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc. in Danish Collections*— the **Catalogue of Japanese Manuscripts and Rare Books** prepared by the research librarian Merete Pedersen. The luxurious album-format volume with excellent full-page illustrations and detailed information about each of 152 titles represented in this edition gives an impression of a reputable research work answering the most sophisticated demands.

The majority of the early Japanese books from the Collection dates back to the Tokugawa era (1603–1867) or speaking more precisely to the second half of the 18th — the middle of 19th cc. The editions before 1603 are represented solely by some fragments of the Buddhist sutras. At the same time the library has many publications printed after 1868, but the catalogue introduces only a series of woodblock prints, traditional block-printed books, photo albums and few books made with the use of movable metal type. As the compiler of the catalogue points out, it was made to “illustrate the gradual development and transformation of traditional Japanese book printing and binding into modern book printing” (p. XI).

The most part of the collection was acquired at the end of 19th — beginning of 20th cc. (which is proved by the ex-libris) — the period when the traditional Japanese books have invaded the international market. Many books were purchased through the French dealer. At the same time, the catalogue as well enlists the editions bought or received as a gift in the last decades.

The detailed Introduction contains information about the collection, the history of its forming, its genre variety. And here one can see the first distinctive feature of the book: unlike another catalogues the author chooses the way of covering first all possible types and genres of books (and not only those that are introduced in the catalogue!) accentuating what types and genes are present in the collection and which ones are not. However, inside the catalogue entries this principle is less important as all attention is centered on each concrete title. And still there is a good reason that the

author underlines the importance of the process of the Japanese book evolution or to be more precise its format. The catalogue makes a special emphasize upon the book design which was dictated by the peculiarities of the text and its genre style.

The Introduction covers all genres that represent the range and wealth of the book culture while inside the catalogue the entries are given in accord with genre classification used in the already classic catalogue of *Early Japanese Books in Cambridge University Library* by Hayashi Nozomu and Peter F. Kornicki.¹

The rubrics are given in such an order: Encyclopedias, Shinto and Kokugaku, Christianity, Language, Literature, Music and Drama, History, Geography, Politics and Law, Education, Science, Medicine, Art, Sinology, Japanese Sinology.

M. Pedersen in her introduction clearly specifies the parameters used in the description of each entry. All terms are given in Japanese thus directing the readers towards Japanese approach to book description. For the readers who do not attain the advanced level of Japanese the catalogue is supplied with glossary that gives English language explanation of special terms. Besides, the catalogue contains the table of Nengo dates and what is especially useful! — the table of traditional book sizes (in centimeters) alongside with their names. Besides, the description of each entry is supplied with internet reference address where one can find the electronic copy of the edition and the data about the libraries and institutions it is preserved in as well as the catalogues with contain records about it. Moreover, in case of rare book the author specifies in what foreign countries one can find its virtual copy (for example, see No. 38). Anyone who opens the catalogue for the first time gets at his disposal an excellent instrument that enables him to freely navigate in the space of the Japanese book culture.

M. Pedersen demonstrates a profound or better say perfect knowledge of the material which in my opinion is one of the most important advantages of the catalogue. Excellent reference tools make the book a kind of encyclopedia for all those who are interested in the history of traditional Japanese book. The detailed bibliography, the great number of online resources, the list of online catalogues and image databases, web-based articles and blogs distinguish the catalogue from another catalogues of that type. The tremendous work done by the author provokes our professional admiration and deep respect.

Nevertheless, the doubtless merits of the catalogue some times could turn into its shortcoming when the desire to provide the reader with maximum of information leads to opposite results and the necessary data remains on the periphery. For example, the description in the rubric “Imprint” contains so much information about all editions of the concrete work that at the end it becomes difficult to understand when was published the concrete volume from the catalogue entry. Such confusion occurs not once forcing one to read the description several times in order to get a clear understanding of the definite publication date of the volume introduced in the index.

¹ Hayashi Nozomu and Peter F. Kornicki. 1991. *Early Japanese Books in Cambridge University Library: a Catalogue of the Aston, Satow and von Siebold Collections*. Cambridge [England]; Cambridge University Press.

There are some more shortcomings. For instance, in the entries related to the New Testament translations made by missionary B. Bettelheim (No. 8–13) the author indicates different dates of Bettelheim’s life — either 1811–1869 or 1811–1870. And what is more, once both versions of his life dates are met at the same page! It is also unclear why the “The Holy Gospel of Luke” which in Japanese transcription stands for “Roka den fukuinsho” (and it is given in the catalogue!) should be read as “Ruka den fukuinsho” (pp. 20, 24, 28). Besides, it is obscure why “The Epistle to the Romans” and “The Acts of the Apostles” are placed under the title “The Holy Gospel of the Luke”.

It is a pity not all Japanese titles have their English language equivalents, some English titles are given in the rubric “Contents”, some do not exist at all. There are several printing errors — by the irony of fate, the first misprint is in the title of the first entry where the last character has somehow disappeared...

However the few shortcomings do not spoil the general impression of the highly professional catalogue and don’t prevent it to fulfill its main task as it is formulated in the Preface — “to introduce to the world the collection of rare Japanese books from the Royal Library after many years of oblivion”. No doubt, this objective has been successfully accomplished.

Karine Genrikhovna Marandjian
Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
Russian Academy of Sciences

Anton Schiefner (1817–1879) und seine indologischen Freunde: seine Briefe an die Indologen Albrecht Weber (1825–1901), Rudolf Roth (1821–1895) und William D. Whitney (1827–1894) sowie den Indogermanisten Adalbert Kuhn (1812–1881). Hartmut Walravens, Agnes Stache-Weiske [editors]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2015. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 868. Bd.; Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Nr. 89). 455 pages: portraits (black and white). ISBN: 9783700177999 (paperback)

This book, prepared by Hartmut Walravens and Agnes Stache-Weiske, well-known German experts in the history of European Oriental Studies, contains a large corpus of letters of the eminent 19th c. scholar Frantz Anton (Anton Antonovich) Schiefner, a member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, that present him as an prominent Orientalist of his time who belonged to the narrow circle of professional Indologists involved in one of the most famous projects ever realized by the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, namely the great Sanskrit-German Dictionary compiled by O. von Böhtlingk, R. Roth and A. Weber in 1853–1875.¹ About ninety letters from Schiefner to Weber comprise the major part of the edition. They are supplemented with 9 letters to Roth and 5 letters to W.D. Whitney, the American Indologist who contributed to the dictionary, too. Moreover, the book contains 22 letters to the German linguist A. Kuhn who shared Schiefner's interest in European and Asian folktales and myths. This broader perspective of Schiefner's academic interests is supported with republication of some of his less known papers including his German translation of a Mongolian tale, two papers on Finnish epic tales, etc. The letters included into the book are kept now in various German libraries. The main details of Schiefner's life and works are presented in the general introduction while each of the four groups of letters are prefaced with data on their addressees. Their and Schiefner's portraits are also provided.²

In 2008, some fragments of the letters to Weber had been published by H. Walravens in his paper *Letters of A. Schiefner about V.P. Vasil'ev*.³ They give us

¹ In 2013, another corpus of his letters was edited by H. Walravens — *St. Petersburg und Livland — und die Entwicklung der estnischen Literatur. Anton Schiefner (1817–1879) und Friedrich Reinhold Kreutzwald (1803–1882) im Briefwechsel (1853–1879)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2013. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen 22).

² There is also a photo of Schiefner's grave taken recently at the Smolenskoye Lutheran Cemetery in St. Petersburg.

³ WALRAVENS H. *Letters of A. Schiefner about V.P. Vasil'ev*, in "Written Monuments of the Orient", No. 1(8), 2008, pp. 251–264.

an insight into what exactly happened between the two important St. Petersburg Orientalists who started as good colleagues, if not friends, but then, rather abruptly, broke any contacts with each other.

Vasiliev who mastered Chinese, Manchu, Mongolian and Tibetan during his long stay in Peking as a member of the Russian Orthodox Christian Mission, was unable to use German or French to make his papers available for the European colleagues, and Schiefner was eager to promote Vasilyev's works abroad, seeing him as a man of great knowledge and competence. This cooperation went on smoothly until Schiefner decided to publish the German translation of the famous Tibetan author Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism in India* as his own translation without referring to Vasiliev as the original Russian translator of the text. The Russian and German translations were published almost simultaneously, in 1869, but Vasiliev could use the German text to improve his own as Schiefner *did* translate from Tibetan although widely using Vasiliev's translation so that he even repeated some of Vasiliev's mistakes.⁴ Moreover, Schiefner published an addition to his German translation where he explained the great role of Vasiliev in this matter. But Vasiliev, notorious for his volcanic temper and obviously instigated by some nationalistic sentiments against the Academy of Sciences as a place with German predominance, published an article where he accused Schiefner in plagiarism.

The situation could never be seen before with Schiefner's eyes, it could only be judged from the outside, by a few newspaper articles written by Vasiliev and critical responses written by Schiefner's friends. Such a fair observant as V.M. Alekseev, one of the latest students of Vasiliev in sinology, claimed in a much later talk about Vasiliev and his legacy (dated from 1950s, first published in 1982) that "Vasilyev's articles against Schiefner and Germans at the Academy, published in 1869, make a bad impression (*производят тяжелое впечатление*)".⁵ This is exactly what can be felt from Schiefner's letters to Weber, and it is no surprise that he eventually stopped thinking about any reconciliation with Vasilyev and just crossed him out of his life. As Walravens pointed out in his paper (p. 264), it meant no more professional translations of Vasilyev's papers into German or French to be secured by Schiefner for him.

It is interesting though that Schiefner really seems to have been assured in his actual right to treat his German translation as an independent piece of work.⁶ One of his acquaintances described him as a person who was always ready to help other people at the cost of his own time (p. 318), and his letters do show that he generously provided colleagues with any useful information needed, tirelessly edited academic works, tried to fasten contacts between scholars in St. Petersburg and Europe. Perhaps, it was his openness to be involved in others' projects that led him to the highly controversial situation with Vasilyev he obviously suffered much from.

⁴ VOSTRIKOV A.I. *S.F. Oldenburg i izuchenie Tibeta*, in "Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya Akademii Nauk", Vol. IV. Moscow-Leningrad 1935, pp. 59–81. See p. 68.

⁵ ALEKSEEV V.M. *Shkola Vasilyeva*, in "Nauka o Vostoke". Moscow, GRVL Nauka, pp. 64–67. See p. 66.

⁶ Thus, he writes to Whitney — *Ich beendige in diesen Tagen den Druck des tibetischen Textes von Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien <...> Dann beginnt der Druck der deutschen Übersetzung* (p. 310), without even mentioning Vasilyev. In one of his letters to Kuhn we find — *Meine Tāranātha-Uebersetzung* (p. 369). In another letter, though, both Russian and German translations are mentioned together (p. 376).

While some of the first pages of Schiefner's correspondence with Weber tell us about Vasilyev's case, the final letters are stamped with sadness about another unpleasant story connected, again, with an important Russian scholar, this time the great Indologist I.P. Minaev whose direct disciples S.F. Oldenburg and Th.I. Stcherbatsky would create the famous St. Petersburg–Leningrad Buddhological School, so ruthlessly destroyed by the Stalinist regime in the second half of the 1930s.

The name of Ivan Minaev is one of a few most frequently mentioned names in Schiefner's letters to Weber. We can see how the older scholar's opinion on the promising colleague changed over time, from a somewhat restrained interest to rather a high appreciation from both scholarly and personal points of view (pp. 98, 137, 232). Nevertheless, in 1878, he supported the candidature of another Indologist, of German origin, Leopold von Schröder, to become a member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. This attempt led to a new scandal tinged with nationalistic feelings⁷ and eventually failed. It seems Schiefner had not expected that his and his colleagues' choice would be unpleasant for Minaev and was sorry about it (p. 280).⁸ Basically, he found the entire situation as a new signal that German scholars, usually connected with the University of Dorpat (now Tartu, Estonia), were not very welcome anymore (pp. 276–277). Schiefner provided Weber with a long list of the names of St. Petersburg academicians with the German background (p. 277).

However, I suppose the main issue was not simply about their “non-Russian” origin, *Russianness* itself being a complicated issue. In the early 20th c., we still find many scholars with the German names in St. Petersburg, it suffices to mention here such brilliant Buddhologists as S.F. Oldenburg, O.O. Rosenberg, A. von Stael-Holstein, and E.E. Obermiller. Like their predecessors from the 19th c., they used freely various European languages. Still, there is a distinct difference. It seems the early 20th c. generation was already a much more organic part of the Russian society, deeply involved in its life. Schiefner had to witness the beginning of changes but his early death that followed soon after the incident with the scandalous elections⁹ did not allow him to see it in progress.¹⁰

⁷ In 1879, a well-known scholar and Russophile V.L. Lamansky published a newspaper article with severe critics on the Academy and its members of the German origin, in particular Schiefner and the Sanskrit Dictionary project. He stressed that the cost of the dictionary was about 100,000 rubles, Schiefner thought the sum was about 60,000 and it was not too much for the work that lasted for 23 years (pp. 278–279). See also the chapter on the Sanskrit dictionary in the book: A. Vigasin. *Izucheniye Indii v Rossii (ocherki i materialy)*. Moscow 2008. According to Vigasin, the annual spending on all the editions of the Academy's Department of Russian language and literature was just 4,000 rubles (p. 134, n. 93). By the way, in his letters to Weber Schiefner provided a very interesting account of the financial situation at the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences (pp. 140–146).

⁸ It seems possible that Minaev preferred to let his valuable collection of Indian texts be passed, after his death, to the Imperial Public Library and not to the Academy's Asiatic Museum (that would have been rather natural) because of his tensions with the Academy (I thank my colleague T.V. Ermakova for this comment).

⁹ The fact that Schiefner died very soon after the scandal needs some explanation that is not found in the book.

¹⁰ His own son Meinhard must have been a good example of this change. He became a Russian general, took part in the World War I and was even awarded with the Order of

Schiefner's letters tell us surprisingly little about St. Petersburg, the city he lived in for so many years¹¹, to say nothing about Russia on the whole. Meanwhile, the years covered with this correspondence, mostly from early 1860s up to 1878, were one of the most promising and interesting periods in the history of Russia. The emancipation reform of 1861 was followed with a series of other important liberal reforms. At the same time, the revolutionary movement developed very fast and, in 1882, a radical socialist group made a successful attack at the Emperor Alexander II — he was murdered in the very center of St. Petersburg. Dostoevsky's novel *The Devils* (1871–1872) presented a sharp satirical portrait of the revolutionary circles, two other major novels of his, *Crime and Punishment* (1866) and *The Idiot* (1868), as well as Leo Tolstoy's crucial novels, *War and Peace* (1869) and *Anna Karenina* (1877), also belonged to this period, just to mention a few of its political and cultural landmarks. No trace of the moderately liberal or revolutionary hopes, social tensions or cultural achievements of the Russian society can be found in the highly scholarly letters that could be sent, judging by their contents, from almost any European city with academic traditions.¹²

The only important political event he reflected on was the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71. His remarks found in several letters to Weber show him as a deeply peaceful person who hated any militarism and wild nationalism of the crowds that always stand against Knowledge (pp. 87, 90, 93). Being a catholic, he did not write much about his beliefs, one of the rare cases of this kind being his remark that he was anti-Darwin (p. 117).

While this book of the letters present little interest for the general audience, it is undoubtedly a great source of information on the history of Oriental Studies in Europe and, surely, on the life and works of Anton Schiefner himself. He knew and was in contact with a great number of eminent European (and some American¹³) scholars and their names and some remarks connected with them appear here and there in his letters. O. von Böhtlingk, M. Müller, the brothers Schlagintweit, K.S. Veselovsky, W. Radloff, J.A. Nauck, J.F. von Brandt, A. Harkawy, F. Wiedemann, B. Dorn are only a few of

St. George, the highest military decoration of the Russian Empire. He and one of his sons were executed by the bolsheviks in 1918. Another one of his sons, Anton Meingardovich Shiefner-Markevich, was a Russian general, too, and an eminent participant of the white movement during the civil war in Russia, he died from wounds in 1921. See: KISLOV V. *Gatchinskije ofitseri — geroi Velikoi voiny — A.M. Schiefner-Markevich*, <http://kraeved-gatchina.de/data/documents/GATChINA-I-GATChINCY-V-VELIKOY-VOYNE-40.pdf> [03.06.2016].

¹¹ We learn from his letters about some curious events in the life of the Russian capital such as the theft of books from the Imperial Public Library (p. 105) or the opening of the monument to Catherine the Great (p. 153).

¹² In one of his latest letters, though, he called himself *Ein petersburger* (p. 314) so he must have had some feelings to this particular city. Of course, Schiefner could be reluctant to talk about political issues in his letters to foreign countries because of censorship but he could exchange opinions in conversations with friends (I thank H. Walravens for this comment in an e-mail from 05.06.2016). Schiefner's casual mentioning of P.N. Rybnikov (p. 212), a political prisoner who became an eminent Russian ethnographer while being in exile, may hint at such conversations.

¹³ In spite of his general sceptic opinion on the Americans he could appreciate some representatives of this nation (pp. 209, 211).

these scholars. Moreover, Schiefner left interesting remarks on some great scholarly events such as the International Congresses of Orientalists (pp. 150, 185–186, 202, 207). His personal meetings with colleagues and friends are often described with warm feelings of true friendship. It is no surprise that his rather early death was commented upon by his acquaintances with words of sincere sadness (e.g., p. 318).¹⁴

It *may be* a surprise then that his personal and academic legacy was not studied enough in St. Petersburg or elsewhere. I would argue with H. Walravens who claimed (in the Russian abstract of his above-mentioned paper, p. 264) that Schiefner's name was silenced down (*замалчивалось*) in literature on the history of Russian Oriental Studies because of his conflict with Vasiliev. As an expert in Tibetan, Mongolian and Indian fields of philological research he took the place of his great predecessor I.J. Schmidt and this status is always stressed in relevant papers¹⁵. It is true that his minor works in this field were not often called for but I doubt it can be caused by any prejudice, there seems to be no witness that would support such a hypothesis.¹⁶ As for his major Tibetological work, the German translation of Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism*, it was of no interest for the Russian reader that had Vasiliev's translation.¹⁷ As a Buddhologist, Schiefner was certainly just overshadowed by his opponent whose highly controversial, tragic and astonishing figure attracted attention of anybody who talked about this field of studies in Russia, starting from S.F. Oldenburg.¹⁸ Nevertheless, even Vasiliev's life has not been studied properly, and, generally speaking, very few Russian Orientalists have been honored with detailed biographical accounts.

Schiefner's case is especially complicated because his archives are not found so far. In this sense, the edition of his letters¹⁹ gives us a precious key to understanding his person and reconstructing his life.

Alexander Zorin,
Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
Russian Academy of Sciences

¹⁴ E.g., Whitney wrote to Weber: *Schiefner's acquaintance is one of the pleasantest memories that I brought back from Europe, and the persons are not very many whose loss I should more deeply deplore* (p. 308).

¹⁵ E.g., VOROBOVA-DESIATOVSKAYA M.I., SAVITSKII L.S. *Tibetovedenie*. In "Aziatskiy muzei — Leningradskoe otdelenie Instituta vostokovedeniya AN SSSR". Moscow: Nauka, 1972, pp. 149–176; see pp. 153–154 (general account of Schiefner's contribution to Tibetology); ZORIN A. Tibetskiy fond Instituta vostochnykh rukopisei RAN: iz istorii formirovaniya i katalogizatsii (1720–1917 gg.), in *The New Historical Bulletin*, No. 3(33), 2012, pp. 37–53; see p. 45 (on Schiefner's work with the Tibetan collection kept at the Asiatic museum).

¹⁶ I cannot judge his place in the history of the study of Finnish and Estonian folk tales and epic songs where his contribution was significant.

¹⁷ Both translations are outdated, there is a good English translation from Tibetan — *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*, Tr. by Lama Chimpa, Alaka Chatopadhyaya. Ed. by D. Chatopadhyaya. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1970.

¹⁸ E.g., Oldenburg S.F. *Pamyati Vasiliya Pavlovicha Vasilyeva i o ego trudakh po buddizmu. 1818–1918*, in "Izvestiya Rossiyskoi Akademii Nauk, Ser. VI [Vol. XII]. 1918, No. 7, pp. 531–548.

¹⁹ Schiefner's handwriting is often rather difficult to read so the editors are worth a separate praise for their success in this regard.

Guidelines to the authors of the Journal “Written Monuments of Orient”

- All papers are to be submitted in electronic form in both formats, WORD and PDF.
- The paper should not exceed more than 10 000 words, the fonts used are to be submitted along with the article.
- The layout of the article should be as follows:
 1. Title, author’s full name, abstract, key words.
 2. All references are given in foot notes in abridged form: author’s name in small caps, year, page — IVANOV 2004, 15; POPOVA 2013, 56; UMEMURA, SHOGAITO, YOSHIDA, YAKUP 2002, 143.
 3. List of abbreviations.
 4. References:

— for monographs:

CLAUSON, Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MASPERO, Henry 1953: *Les Documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie Centrale*. Ed. by H. Maspero. London: The Trustees of the British Museum.

Translation of Russian titles is given in square brackets; name of the series is at the end in round brackets:

Kitaiskie dokumenty iz Dun’khuana. Vyp. 1. Faksimile. Izdanie tekstov, perevod s kitaiskogo, issledovaniia i prilozheniia L.I. Chu-guevskogo [Chinese documents from Dunhuang], Part 1. Faksimile. Publication, translation, research and appendix by L.I. Chu-guevskii. Moscow: Glavnaia Redaktsiia Vostochnoi Literatury, 1983 (Pamiatniki pis’mennosti Vostoka [Written monuments of the Oriental scripts series] LVII, 1)

The references to Oriental publications should be as follows: title in italics in transliteration, original title, English translation in square brackets:

NIE Xiaohong 乜小紅 2009: *E cang Dunhuang qiye wenshu yanjiu* 俄藏敦煌契約文書研究 [A study of the Dunhuang texts of contracts from the Russian Collection]. Shanghai: Guji chubanshe.

Dunhuang yanjiu lunzhu mulu 2006: 敦煌研究論著目錄 [A bibliography of works in Dunhuang studies]. 1998–2005. Ed. by Cheng A-tsai 鄭阿財 and Chu Feng-yu 朱鳳玉. Comp. by Tsai Chung-Lin 蔡忠霖, Chou Hsi-po 周西波. Taipei: Lexue shuju.

References to articles:

MALOV S.E. 1932: “Uigurskie rukopisnye dokumenty ekspeditsii S.F. Oldenburga” [Uighur manuscript documents from S.F. Oldenburg’s expedition]. *Zapiski Instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR*

[*Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*], vol. 1. Moscow-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 129–149.

LAUT, Jens Peter 2009: “Neues aus der Katalogisierung der *Maitrisimit*”. In *Studies in Turkic Philology. Festschrift in Honour of the 80th Birthday of Professor Geng Shimin*. Ed. by Zhang Dingjing and Abdurishid Yakup. Beijing: China Minzu University Press, 332–338.

ZIEME, Peter 2000: “Fragments of the Old Turkic *Maitrisimit nom bitig* in the Otani Collection”. *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū* [*Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*], 15 (2000), 123–134.

- The article should be accompanied by the information about the author: full name and affiliation.
- The Russian titles should be given in transliteration and English translation using the following system: я – ia, е – e, ю – iu, й – i, ы – y, х – kh, ц – ts, ч – ch, ш – sh, щ – shch, ж – zh
- The Oriental titles should be given in transliteration and original script, followed by English translation.
- Pictures are accepted, but the author must safeguard that no rights are violated and/or declare that he/she has obtained permission for the reproduction.

© Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS, 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Editorial Office address: Institute of Oriental Manuscripts,
Dvortsovaya emb., 18, Saint Petersburg 191186, Russia
Tel. 7 812 3158728, Fax 7 812 3121465
www.orientalstudies.ru
email: ppv@orientalstudies.ru

Vostochnaya Literatura Publisher: Nauka Publishers, Maronovsky line, 26,
Moscow 119049, Russia
www.vostlit.ru
email: vostlit@gmail.com

Print Subscription/Distribution: Please send all inquiries relating to subscriptions to:
Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Dvortsovaya emb., 18, Saint Petersburg 191186, Russia
Журнал «Письменные памятники Востока», № 1, 2017 (на английском языке)
PPE Nauka Printing House
Shubinsky per., 6, Moscow 121099, Russia
