**1.3 THE REVIEW OF RECENT SCHOLARSHIP AND WHY MY THESIS IS IMPORTANT.**

Most of the excavated materials from the 6th-10th centuries in the Turfan area are either in Chinese[[1]](#footnote-2) or other languages such as Syriac, Sogdian and Uighur from Berlin Turfan collections.[[2]](#footnote-3) Most of those Chinese material is dominated by economic, social, and governmental documents. Buddhism stands alone in religious studies of these Chinese material, and other religions are hardly mentioned except by a few scholars who discuss the possibility of Zoroastrianism.

The reason for the dominance of Buddhist studies is that most Chinese and Japanese scholars have assumed that the Chinese word Si in excavated materials refer to Buddhist temples. This is a direct result of the fact that all studies of religion are centered around Buddhism. Even though they don't argue the religious identity of these *Si* one by one, they still assume that they are all Buddhist temples.

Turfan, as a big international city with multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multi-lingual people, regardless of the religious background of its inhabitants, would have been involved in the local political, social, and economic activities, leaving some historical materials behind. However, based on the assumption above, there are currently many academic studies on the political, social, and economic aspects of Buddhist temples and monks. However, for other religions in the Turpan region, there are very few studies in this area.

If one compares this situation with the latest research on the Christian Syriac, Sogdian and Uighur material in Berlin Turfan Collections. He will be surprised to find that, although all excavated materials come from the same area and almost the same period, the recent studies of Chinese materials are almost separate from those who studied in Syriac, Sogdian and Uighur materials.

It is unreasonable that the abundant of material of the Church of the East in Syriac, Sogdian and Uighur languages and dominant of Buddhism studies in Chinese languages are co-existed in the same area and period. This un-reasonability opens up a space for this thesis to make a correlation with Syriac, Sogdian and Uighur materials for the Church of the East (including its archeological sites), that is the possibility of the church buildings of the Si in the Chinese materials. In the following section, I will focus on the latest research by scholars on these excavated materials and evaluate their contributions as well as their shortcomings.

**1.3.1 The recent religious study in Chinese sources**

In *Gaochang* and early Tang period, most scholars have no questions about basic assumption that *Si* and *Seng* are linked Buddhism. Under this assumption, Yin Qing 殷晴[[3]](#footnote-4), Han guopan韩国槃[[4]](#footnote-5), Xie chongguang 谢重光[[5]](#footnote-6), Wuzhen 吴震, Chen liangwen 陈良文, Chen guocan 陈国灿 and Zhang chongzhou 张重洲[[6]](#footnote-7) are mainly focus on the economic activities of Buddhism temples.

About the structure and management of the Buddhism temple in Turfan area, Wang su 王素 talks about the three hierarchy mode of Buddhism temple[[7]](#footnote-8); Meng xianshi 孟宪实 suggests the registration of monks is directly from the household registration system and is a mean for the government to control the growth of religion[[8]](#footnote-9); Sun ning 孙宁also talks about the registration of the temples in Turfan area.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Perhaps the closest study of religious identity discernment comes from the following scholars. Yan yaozhong suggests all the temples in Gaochang should be Buddhism, however in his more recent study in 2019, he try to make sense of the name of these temples by contrasting other traditional Chines sources, and he try to make some space other religions;[[10]](#footnote-11) Yao chongxin try to offer Buddhism Beiliang period (443-460) to justify this assumption; he also introduce the Buddhism of *Gaochang* kingdom and secularization of Buddhism monks;[[11]](#footnote-12) Yang Jun specifically talks about the family *Si* in GaoChang period, however, his main point is more to the economic activities than to distinguish their religious identity.[[12]](#footnote-13)

The only question about the certain *Si* and *Seng*’s religious identity is Zoroastrianism. *Jiang boqin* 姜伯勤suggests that the Sogdians are live together, since there are Sogdian family Si call *Kang Si* 康寺and *Shi Si* 史寺. Although Guo pingliang 郭平梁[[13]](#footnote-14) suggests these Sogdian *Si* should be the temple of Zoroastrianism, but other scholars, based on the possibilities, just assume they are belong to Buddhism.[[14]](#footnote-15) Zhang guangda 张广达 keep the possibility of temple of Zoroastrianism in *Gaochang*, since there is the temple of Zoroastrianism in fifth and sixth century.[[15]](#footnote-16) However, I suggest that there are possibilities for certain *Si* and *Seng* belong to the Church of the East, especially when it come to the later six century and early seven century, as hunter suggested.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Their discussions about religious identity are broad discussions, presenting their own interpretations with individual examples; there is no discussion about these Si, systematically and specifically, one by one. Since they are all assumptions of Buddhists’ temple, and no scholar has done so, the religious identity of these Si is still unclear. This thesis will provide a new direction and possibility for future religious studies in Turfan in the perspective of the Church of the East.

**1.3.2 The recent religious study in Syriac, Sogidan and Uighur sources**

The Christian manuscripts from German expeditions have been studied systematically by following scholars: Nicholas Sims-Williams[[17]](#footnote-18) and Chiara Barbati[[18]](#footnote-19) focus on Sogdian Christian fragments, while Erica C.D. Hunter and Mark Dickens mainly studied the Syriac fragments[[19]](#footnote-20), and Peter Zieme the Uighur Christian fragments.[[20]](#footnote-21) As for the Syriac texts found recently in Dunhuang and Turfan, these have been studied by Duan Qing 段晴[[21]](#footnote-22) and Lin Lijuan 林丽娟[[22]](#footnote-23); The Syriac fragments collected by Count Kozui Otani and deposited in Kyoto, Japan are now being studied by Hidemi Takahashi.[[23]](#footnote-24) Yoshida Yutaka[[24]](#footnote-25) works on the Sogdian material comparing with Chinese recourses. Barakatullo Ashurov[[25]](#footnote-26) primarily focusses on the Christianity of symbolism (especially coins) and archaeological material in Central Asia.

Sims-Williams’s translations of Christian Sogdian texts from Berlin Turfan showing the Sogdian people in service, liturgical and ascetic life, tell the connections of the Church of the East between Turfan and Iranian realm. His translations make the “within” religion life of local communities much clearer than ever before.

*Biblical and other Christian Sogdian texts from the Turfan Collection*[[26]](#footnote-27) reflects the liturgical use of Sogdian texts in the Church through the Psalters, Gospel and Pauline letters and its connections with Syriac liturgical texts.

*An Ascetic Miscellany: The Christian Sogdian Manuscript E28* shows that there are not only monasteries but also Sogdian monks. These ascetic texts show the transmission of the the spirituality of the Church of the East from Persian to Central Asia and China.

*The Life of Serapion and other Christian Sogdian texts from the manuscripts E25 and E26*[[27]](#footnote-28) contains two hagiographies of John of Dailam which don’t have corresponding Syriac texts, one hagiographies of Serapion with corresponded Syriac texts, two unidentical homilies or letters, one of against Manicheism, and some texts from the Daniel tradition. It shows the hagiographic tradition in Turfan. The hagiographies are the example of Christian life, my project will take them as part of background studies.

*Turco-Sogdian Documents from 9-10th Century Dunhuang*[[28]](#footnote-29) contains many Sogdian contracts and letters, as well as personal and place names. “In the name of God”[[29]](#footnote-30) appears in the contracts. F = Or. 8212 [[30]](#footnote-31) is a priest Sergius’ letter to the monk David which may need further studies in this project. G = Or. 8212[[31]](#footnote-32) mentioned the monk and the leader of the Church of the East which possibly associated with the Long families 龍家. Compared to Sims-Williams’ translations of the Christian Sogdian texts, this work shows broader concern with the social, economic and political history of Turfan. My project may draw its interpretations or even reinterpret some of these through the mistaken identity perspective.

Erica Hunter’s work, *A Syriac Service-Book from Turfan : Museum Für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin MIK III 45*[[32]](#footnote-33) translates and commentaries the MIK III 45 liturgical texts. It includes the Rogation(1r-7r), the memorial of Mar Shir, Barshabba and Zarvandukt and other saints (7r-21r), the service for the new church buildings (21r-27v), the funeral services for all kinds of local communities (33r-52v), the *‘onyata* for ordinary days (27v-33r) and other service for earthquake and drought (54v-61v).[[33]](#footnote-34)

Hunter compared other liturgical resources from Persian, and discussed the possible connection with Merv. She argues that MIK III 45 indicates the Church in towns rather than in a monastery[[34]](#footnote-35). She locates the possible place of the writing of this Ms with Marv because it was a metropolitanate. Although it is hard to decide the identity of believers’ local and social aspects, MIK III 45 reveals many aspects of liturgical life of local communities.

Mark Dickens who works on the Berlin Turfan Syriac fragments talks about the Church of the East in Turfan from the perspective of Turkic aspects. For example, in the paper *Patriarch Timothy I and the Metropolitan of the Turks*[[35]](#footnote-36), Dickens argues that the Turkish tribe which was mentioned by Patriarch Timothy is the Karluks葛邏祿 tribe by combining the archaeological discoveries and Syriac, Arabic, Turkish and New Persian resources. Eventually, the Karluks tribe turned to Islam due to the political consideration. In a nutshell, Dickens’ papers show the ethnic, social and political aspect of the Church of the East through the lens of western languages (Syriac, Arabic, New Persian and Turkish). However, his arguments and interpretations will more stronger by combing with Chinese resources.

Peter Zieme’s *Altuigurische Texte Der Kirche Des Ostens Aus Zentralasien*[[36]](#footnote-37)analyzes the Christian Uighur manuscripts mainly in Berlin Turfan through the personal names and title of the Church of the East perspective. Unlike Sogdian texts which many of them are translations, the Uighur texts are homilies and non-religious texts dating mainly between 13-14 centuries.[[37]](#footnote-38) His work contains petitions[[38]](#footnote-39), the marriage blessing[[39]](#footnote-40), a document about a field of a certain “Jesus” (U 9316 (T II B 65)), monks as owners of a piece of land in the contract (U 9350)[[40]](#footnote-41), a sales deed showing that Christians also kept slaves and what business they transacted (SI 1925-1926 (P 181 5/1 and 5/2) = V SI 4511 (M 6))[[41]](#footnote-42), a fragment showing that a Christian was interested in Buddhism[[42]](#footnote-43), the prayers[[43]](#footnote-44), hagiographies[[44]](#footnote-45), prayer book as an amulet[[45]](#footnote-46)**.** In other words, Uighur texts bring lights to the social aspect of Christian life. In this project, I employed a similar approach by focusing on the specific corresponding works *Si* and *Seng*.

The studies of these scholars, which focus on linguistic translation and interpretation, have contributed immensely to our understanding of the liturgical and spiritual life of the communities of the Church of the East in the Turfan region. At the same time, they also have a great interest in the daily socio-economic life of the local Christian fellowship, which they have not mentioned. And this thesis seeks to fill this gap, that is, it will give the local Christian community a possibility of social, economic and political life by way of discerning the possibility of religious identity.

**1.3.3 The recent studies of Chinese texts of the Church of the East**

The primary source from *Dunhuang* and *Changan* are as follows[[46]](#footnote-47):

1. *Da Qin Jingjiao liuxing Zhongguo bei* 大秦景教流行中國碑 (‘Monument on the propagation of the Religion of the Light of Da Qin in China’)
2. *Xuting Mishisuo jing* 序聽迷詩所經 (‘Book of Jesus-Messiah’ or ‘Book of listen- ing to the Messiah’)
3. *Yishenlun* 一神論 (‘Discourse on the One God’, consisting of three treatises)
4. *Da Qin Jingjiao Sanwei mengdu zan* 大秦景教三威蒙度讚 (‘Hymn in adoration of the Holy Trinity’)
5. *Zunjing* 尊經 (‘Book of Honour’ or [list of] ‘Venerable books’)
6. *Zhixuan anle jing* 志玄安樂經 (‘Book on attaining profound peace and joy’)
7. *Beginning of Da Qin Jingjiao Xuanyuan zhiben jing* 大秦景教宣元至本經 (‘Book of proclamation of the highest origin of origins’)
8. *End of Da Qin Jingjiao Xuanyuan zhiben jing* from Luoyang Pillar 洛阳经幢
9. *Da Qin Jingjiao Dasheng tongzhen guifa zan* 大秦景教大聖通真歸法讚 (‘Hymn of praise for the Transfiguration of Our Lord’)

The acclaimed specialist *Lin Wushu* 林悟殊 focuses primarily on the Chinese texts of the Church of the East by combining other Chinese sources, However, his studies is less concerned the studies of those in Berlin Turfan collections.[[47]](#footnote-48) The recent scholars dedicating to the same area are Matteo Nicolini-Zani whose recent book *The Luminous Way to the East* brings together the results of current research on Chinese materials and provides up-to-date translations. In a broader sense, the author also refers to archaeological sites and excavated materials of the Church of the East on the Silk Road, and to the results of the Turfan studies of the Church of the East in Berlin, but the author does not mention the Chinese materials excavated in Turfan, neither the relationship between the Chinese materials of the Church of the East and its Syriac, Sogdian materials.[[48]](#footnote-49)

Max Deeg recent study focusing on the Xi’an Stele can’t be ignored. His commentary is richer to Matteo Nicolini-Zani’s, including a lot of recent studies about Xi’an Stele and other Buddhism and Daoism materials. [[49]](#footnote-50) However, his study focuses on the Xi'an Nestorian Stele and makes little mention of the study of material excavated in Turpan.

Thompson’s *Jingjiao The Earliest Christian Church in China[[50]](#footnote-51)* bring the most recent studies about the Chuch of the East with more focusing on the Tang period, especially the Chinese sources. Todd Godwin[[51]](#footnote-52) and Samuel N. C. Lieu also has studied the persons, titles and places in the Xi’an Stele.[[52]](#footnote-53)

Despite it is not normal from ecclesiastical perspective, Rong Xinjiang 榮新江 suggests that an officer in Tang Court is the same monk in the Monument, *Wenzhen* 文贞.[[53]](#footnote-54) For the correspondence of the words *Si* and *Seng* in multiple languages, Wang Ding[[54]](#footnote-55) and Yashida Yutaka[[55]](#footnote-56) on the Chinese names and titles with the corresponding Sogdian words. Hidemi Takahashi[[56]](#footnote-57) works on the Chinese and corresponding Syriac names and titles.

Scholars have centered their studies around Chinese materials of the Church of the East, and no scholar has yet brought these studies to bear on the excavated materials of Turfan (especially the excavated Chinese materials). This thesis attempts to compare the Chinese materials of the Church of the East with the excavated Chinese materials in Turfan to see if there was a connection between the Christian community in Chang'an and the Christian community in Turfan, or even the Buddhist community. This also provides a new direction of exploration for the study of the Church of the East in Chinese.

**1.3.4 The Possible of earlier dating of Berlin Turfan collections**

There are 500 Syriac fragments, 550 Sogdian, 1 Middle Persian, 3 New Persian and 52 Old Uighur fragments in Syriac script found in the archeological sites East of *Xipang* 西旁.[[57]](#footnote-58) About the dating of these fragments, Hunter says,

The fragments are tentatively dated, on palaeographic grounds, between the 9 th –13 th centuries, with a possible 14 th century terminusad quem. The origins and the circumstances surrounding the monastery’s foundation still remain unknown; it may have been founded in the 8 th or 9 th centuries, at the time of the Uighur kingdom whose capital was at Qocho in the Turfan oasis. it could have been founded even earlier, given that Syriac Christianity travelled along the Silk Route to the Tang imperial capital at Xian, where Alopen was received at court in 635.[[58]](#footnote-59)

Hunter’s suggestion is right, according to Carbon-14 detection of Xipan site, the archeologists Liu Wensuo saying,

The current excavation results and carbon dating data have not revealed any remains from the 7th century, and the earliest dating data is from the mid-8th century. More carbon dating will have to be done later. It cannot be ruled out that it may have been built in the 7th century, but the earlier the archaeological remains, the more difficult it is to preserve them. [[59]](#footnote-60)

The church is the place where the liturgy is celebrated, and the two are inextricably linked. It can be said that where there is a church, there will be a liturgical text. If Carbon 14 detects that the church was founded at least in the mid-8th century,[[60]](#footnote-61) then it is entirely reasonable to suggest that liturgical texts were available in Turfan during the same period.

Furthermore,I do not ignore the Chinese religious texts of the Church of the East as if they had nothing to do with the Turfan region. While most scholars believe that the origin of these writings is the Dunhuang and Changan areas, there are already scholars who believe that perhaps some of these works may have come from the Turfan area. For example, according Tan Dawei’s arguments, the *Yishen Lun* 一神論 (the discourse of One God) may be wrote in Gaochang even before 7 century.[[61]](#footnote-62) This is clearly possible, Since the Christian texts in Berlin Tufan clearly shows the copy and translating tradition in the Xipang site, even with scribe name John and Solomon.[[62]](#footnote-63)

For Buddhism, since the Northern Liang period (443-460), the Turfan area has been an important town for writing and translating sutras. For example, during the Northern Liang period, there were as many as eight major sutras written and two types of sutra translation.[[63]](#footnote-64) This situation should have been maintained during the Gaochang period as well (460-640). If Buddhism had this tradition of copying and translating sutras in the Gaochang region, then the Church of the East should have had it as well, meaning that the Berlin Turfan collections may also fall into this category.

In short, my argument is that the Chinese materials of the Church of the East, as well as the Syriac and Sogdian materials excavated in Turfan, are connected and related to the Chinese materials excavated in Turfan, both in terms of time, place, and logic. The Christian communities in Turfan should not have come into existence in the 7th century just like by airplane, but at least (I would strongly suggest) they should have had Christian communities, that is to say, the churches buildings in there as early as the end of 6th century, which is precisely the space I want to open up in this thesis.

1. The majority Chinese sources are scattered in Britian, Berlin, Russian, Japan and China (especially found in after 1970). I will discuss the primary source later. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. I will subsequently describe the process of discovery of these excavated materials as well as the primary materials, and will attempt to do an overview of the secondary materials here first. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Yin Qing 1997. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Han guopan 1986. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Xie chongguang 1987. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Zhang Chongzhou 2021. His study is the most recent one where one can know the general introduction about the these studies (pp.3-12) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Wang Su 1985. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Meng Xianshi 2007, 2009a, 2009b. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Sun Ning 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Yan Yaozhong 1992, 2019. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Yao Chongxin 1999, 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Yang Jun 2002. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Guo Pingliang 1988. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Rong xinjiang 2001, p.43. Rong suggests that they are more possible belong the temple of Buddhism rather than Zorostrianism. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Zhang guangda 1999, p.6. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Hunter 2017, p.78. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Nearly all Sogdian fragments in Berlin Turfan were published. see: Sims-Williams 1976, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1988, 1989, 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, 1994, 2012, 2014, 2015, 2017, 2019 and 2021. Sims-Williams and Halen 1980. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Barbati 2015, 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Hunter 1992, 1996, 2002, 1009a, 2009b, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2017, 2020. Hunter and Coakley 2017. Hunter and Dickens 2014. Dickens 2009a, 2009b, 2010, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c, 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c, 2020d, 2021. Dickens and Sims-Williams 2012; Dickens and Zieme 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Zieme 1974, 1981, 1992, 2009, 2013, 2015a, 2015b. Zieme and Yang Fuxue 2000. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Duan Qing 2001. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Lin Lijuan 2020, 2021a, 2021b, 2021c, 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Takahashi 2008, 2014, 2019, 2020, 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. Yoshida 1996, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2020a, 2020b, 2022. Yoshida and Etsuko 2005. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Ashurov 2013, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2018, 2019. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Sims-Williams 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Sims-Williams 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Sims-Williams and Hamilton 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Ibid, p.27. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Ibid, pp.86-88. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Ibid, p.89. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Hunter and Coakley 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Ibid, pp.1-2. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. *Ibid*, p.13. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. Dickens 2010 [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Zieme 2015a. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. Ibid, p.15. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. Ibid, pp.88-90. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
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42. Ibid, p.39. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. Ibid, pp.64-8. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. Ibid, pp.93-106. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. Ibid, pp.97-60. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. For more details about these sources, see: Nicolini-Zani 2022, pp.117-189. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. Lin Wushu is an important scholar in this area, See: Liu Wushu 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2000d, 2000e, 2000f, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2001d, 2003, 2004, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2007, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2011e, 2014. The represented one is Lin Wushu 2003. Also see: Lin Wushu and Rong Xinjiang 1992, 1996; Lin Wushu and Yin Xiaoping 2008, 2009 and 2021. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. Nicolini-Zani 2021, 2022. The represented one is Nicolini-Zani 2022, the recent Chinese edition see: Wang Lanping 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. Deeg 2004, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2007, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2018, 2020a and 2020b. The represented one is Deeg 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
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57. Liu Wensuo 2022, p.78. For the details of discovery in early 20 century, see: Le Coq 1928 and Boyce 1960, pp.ix-xxvii. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. Hunter 2017, p.78. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
59. The personal chat message in Wechat with Liu wensuo at 1 Feb. 2024. Here is the original Chinese: 目前发掘结果和碳十四测年数据，尚未发现7世纪的遗存，测年数据最早者是8世纪中叶。后续还要再做更多的碳十四测年。不排除可能始建于7世纪，但考古遗存越早期的越难保存下来。 [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
60. Liu Wensuo, Wang Zexiang and Wang Long 2024, p.431. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
61. Tan Dawei 2021, p.189. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
62. See: Sims-Williams 2012. Sims-Williams 2015, p.51 and Sim-Williams 2019, pp.106-107. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
63. Yao Chongxin 1996, pp.69-72. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)