

A Concise History of the Turfan Oasis and Its Exploration

Author(s): ZHANG GUANGDA and RONG XINJIANG

Source: *Asia Major*, THIRD SERIES, Vol. 11, No. 2 (1998), pp. 13-36

Published by: [Academia Sinica](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41645540>

Accessed: 10/06/2014 11:08

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

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



Academia Sinica is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Asia Major*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## A Concise History of the Turfan Oasis and Its Exploration

The extraordinary combination of documents, artifacts, and paintings found at Turfan (T'u-lu-fan 吐魯番) has made the oasis the subject of many specialized studies, often of individual items and events. An important oasis situated on the trade route along the northern edge of the Taklamakan Desert, Turfan was home to different peoples: the original inhabitants (whom the Chinese called Chü-shih 車師, or Ku-shih 姑師), the Chinese settlers who came in large numbers during the fifth and later centuries, the Sogdian traders who left Iran in the seventh and eighth centuries, the Uighurs who built their capital there in the ninth century, and the Mongols who conquered the oasis in the fourteenth century. Only two Chinese dynasties achieved direct rule over Turfan: the T'ang from 640 to 803 and the Ch'ing from 1756 to 1911. This article provides an overview of Turfan for those who are not familiar with either the broad outlines of its history or with the explorers who visited the oasis at the beginning of this century.

### GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING

The Turfan Depression is situated in the eastern part of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region of China. Encircled by the Kum-tagh, Chol-tagh, and other offshoots of the T'ien-shan Mountains, it covers an area of 50,147 square kilometers. Some of the depression lies more than 100 meters below sea-level, the lowest point at 154. Thus it is the second lowest depression in the world, after the Dead Sea. The climate is extremely dry, but its parching heat helps to yield fine crops. Fed by melting snow from the peaks of the T'ien-shan Mountains, the streams that run out of the valleys travel via an irrigation network to the oases. This irrigation system provides the fertile soil of this area

ORIGINALLY BASED on a short introduction to the history of Turfan by Rong Xinjiang 榮新江, this article incorporates subsequent scholarship: see Hu Chi [Hu Ji] 胡戟 et al., eds., *Tu-lu-fan te li-shih yü wen-hua* 吐魯番的歷史與文化 (Turfan: San-ch'in ch'u-pan-she, 1987), pp. 26-85. Interested readers will of course wish to consult the standard histories, many of which devote sections to Turfan. For example, see *Wei shu* 魏書 (Chung-hua shu-chü edn.) 120, pp. 2264-65; *Sui shu* 隋書 83, pp. 1846-48; *Chiu T'ang shu* 舊唐書 198, pp. 5293-96; *Hsin T'ang shu* 新唐書 221A, pp. 6220-23.

with plenty of water, a primary requisite for the cultures that have thrived there since ancient times. The underground canal system now in use seems to have been introduced in modern times.

Terminology, especially places names, can be confusing, because there are many variants of indigenous place names in Uighur and multiple transcriptions into Chinese characters. (A list of geographical and ethnic names is given above, in the Introduction to this volume.) Turfan can refer to a region (that covered by the depression), or the modern city situated in the center of the depression, which lies southwest of Urumchi. From 500 to 640 a single kingdom ruled the Turfan oasis, and, confusingly enough, it is referred to as the Kao-ch'ang 高昌 kingdom because its capital was located in the city of Kao-ch'ang, now a site some forty kilometers east of the modern city of Turfan. Under the T'ang dynasty the official name for the region, divided into five subprefectures, was Hsi-chou 西州. Towards the end of the eighth century the Chinese withdrew from this area. In the mid-ninth, when the Uighurs formally established themselves, it became customary to use the name Qocho (probably the local pronunciation of the Chinese "Kao-ch'ang") as a better-known alternative for both the name of the region and for the Uighur kingdom. In this essay we reserve the term Turfan for the region, and we refer to the historical capital city as Kao-ch'ang.

## HISTORICAL SURVEY

### *The Period of Chü-shih Rule*

According to accounts in the *Shih-chi* 史記 and *Han shu* 漢書, the original inhabitants east of the T'ien-shan range from prehistoric times to the beginning of the first millenium AD – the so-called Chü-shih – were a people who "lived in felt-tents, kept moving in pursuit of water and grass for grazing, and had a fair knowledge of farming."<sup>1</sup> Evidence from archeological finds confirms these written records.<sup>2</sup>

In the last years of the third century BC and continuing through the early years of the second century BC, the Western Han dynasty entered into a bitter rivalry with the Hsiung-nu. The Han court concentrated its efforts on gaining control of the eastern T'ien-shan area, where the Chü-shih lived. The two belligerents waged successive wars in what Chinese historians later referred to as the five military campaigns for the control over Chü-shih. By 60 BC, when the

<sup>1</sup> *Hou Han shu* 後漢書 (Chung-hua edn.) 88, pp. 2928–29.

<sup>2</sup> Wang Binghua, "New Finds in Turfan Archaeology," *Orientalism* 30.4 (April 1999), pp. 58–64, provides color photographs of artifacts from recently excavated Chü-shih graves.

Hsiung-nu were further weakened by internal strife, the Chü-shih submitted to the Han court. Following the policy of "divide and rule," the Han split their territory into a total of eight tiny states. The Turfan Depression became the Former Chü-shih kingdom, with Chiao-ho 交河 (Yarkhoto) as its capital from 60 BC to AD 450. A Han garrison was stationed here, coupled with a military colony which was shortly thereafter put under the command of a colonel of the Wu-chi rank.<sup>3</sup> During both the reign of Wang Mang 王莽 (r. 9–23 AD) and the Eastern Han dynasty (25–220 AD), the Turfan Depression changed hands from time to time, frequently falling under Hsiung-nu control, but for the most part it remained under the control of the Wu-chi colonel's command, as established by the Eastern Han and Wei (220–265) dynasties.

*The Kao-ch'ang Commandery (327–442)*

The Ho-hsi corridor, the region in modern Kansu that is west of the first bend of the Yellow River, gained independence when the administration in central China broke down after the fall of the Western Chin dynasty (265–316), which succumbed to a wave of incursions by various nomadic peoples. By 324, Chang Shih 張寔, the founder of the Former Liang (317–376) in Ho-hsi 河西, sent an expeditionary force to the "Western Regions" and reestablished the office of chief administrator of the Western Regions. The forces sent by the Former Liang captured Chao Chen 趙貞, then acting as the Wu-chi colonel in the Turfan region, occupied the city of Kao-ch'ang, and established for the first time a commandery with its center in Kao-ch'ang in 327. Kao-ch'ang was then governed as a commandery by, in succession, a number of short-lived dynasties including the Former Liang (317–376), the Former Ch'in (350–394), the Later Liang (386–403), the Western Liang (400–421), and the Northern Liang (397–439).

The most influential political rulership for the people of Turfan was the Northern Liang, which was founded in the Ho-hsi corridor by Chü-ch'ü Menghsün 沮渠蒙遜, because this family moved to Turfan after its defeat by the Northern Wei in 439 (discussed below). The reign titles appearing on documents excavated from Kao-ch'ang commandery allow us to piece together the periods of dependency and subordination to either Chinese or steppe rulers. A few chronological problems, however, still remain unresolved and frequently generate discussion.

Although the military system and political institutions during the Kao-

<sup>3</sup> For more information about the Wu-chi colonel, see H. H. Dubs, *History of the Former Han Dynasty* (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1944) 2, p. 331; Yü Ying-shih, *Trade and Expansion in Han China* (Berkeley: U. of California P., 1967), pp. 142–43.

ch'ang commandery era resembled those of the Han and Wei dynasties, most of its institutions were modeled directly on those of the Chin (265-420) and Sung (420-479) dynasties. The Kao-ch'ang authorities fully realized the vital importance of the irrigation networks and devoted much attention to their maintenance. One of the distinctive features of the local culture, as revealed by burial customs in graves, was that the inhabitants retained their traditional beliefs and were little affected by Buddhism.

*The Period of the Great Liang (Ta Liang) and Domination by the K'an, Chang, and Ma Families (442-502)*

In 439, when the Northern Wei dynasty conquered the Northern Liang kingdom in the Ho-hsi corridor, the fugitives from the Northern Liang migrated westwards first to Shan-shan 鄯善, an oasis state lying on the southern route around the Taklamakan Desert, and afterwards settled in the Turfan area. The massive influx caused a shortage of food and eventually resulted in famine. From this time on, Chinese immigrants formed an increasingly large proportion of the local population, and historical records say less and less about the indigenous peoples of Turfan, who were gradually absorbed by the immigrants. Chinese cultural influences grew strong, and Buddhism in particular developed and prospered in the Turfan area.

In 442, Chü-ch'ü Wu-hui 沮渠無諱, a member of the royal family of the Northern Liang, began an offensive against K'an Shuang 闕爽, the prefect of Kao-ch'ang commandery, and defeated him, putting an end to the Kao-ch'ang commandery period of Turfan history. The Chü-ch'ü family were a non-Chinese family whose ancestral home was in the Lu River 盧水 basin (in modern Kansu province). Chü-ch'ü Wu-hui changed his reign title to Ch'eng-p'ing in the next year and named his newly founded state the Great Liang. When he died in the second year of Cheng-p'ing (444), he was succeeded by his brother Chü-ch'ü An-chou 沮渠安周, who stormed and captured Yarkhoto in 450, bringing to an end the rule of the Former Chü-shih. (The Later Chü-shih refers to the successor regime based in Karashahr, an oasis due west of Turfan.)

The ancient city of Kao-ch'ang is situated about forty kilometers east of the modern city of Turfan and emerged as an administrative center from the beginning of the fifth century. It was first the capital of the Great Liang (442-460), then the capital of the Ch'ü-family 麹氏 kings (500-640), the seat of Hsi-chou prefecture under the T'ang dynasty from 640 to 793, and finally the capital of the Uighur Qocho kingdom (866-1283). (Between 803 and 866 Turfan was ruled by the Uighur khanate based in Mongolia.)

Chü-ch'ü An-chou commissioned the construction of a Buddhist monas-

tery in the capital and set up the famous stele with the inscription dedicated to “the Great Chü-ch’ü An-chou, king of Liang, for his charitable merits and virtues of constructing the monastery,” which was found by the German expedition to Turfan in 1902–1903.<sup>4</sup>

Chü-ch’ü An-chou’s rule lasted for eighteen years. In 460 the Jou-jan 柔然 (also called the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 (or Jui-jui 芮芮), a nomad confederacy on the vast steppe north of the Gobi Desert, and identified by some scholars with a people bearing the name of Abar or Avar in Western literature,<sup>5</sup> overthrew An-chou and set up K’an Po-chou 闕伯周 as king in Kao-ch’ang. This change may help to explain why the Kao-ch’ang kingdom adopted Yung-k’ang 永康, a reign title of the Jou-jan, as its own reign title in local documents. In 485 the Kao-chü 高車, another confederation of nomad tribes ethnically related to the T’u-chüeh 突厥 (Turks), rose in revolt against the Jou-jan. With the disintegration of the Jou-jan, the Kao-chü confederation emerged as an independent power on the steppe in 487. Having killed K’an Shou-kuei 闕首歸 and his brother in 491, the Kao-chü named Chang Meng-ming 張孟明 king of Kao-ch’ang. After a few years, the natives of Kao-ch’ang killed Chang, and set up Ma Ju 馬儒 as king. In 497 he sent envoys to the imperial court of the Northern Wei (386–534), requesting that the entire population of the kingdom be allowed to migrate to the interior of China, a motion that aroused indignation among the indigenous inhabitants of Kao-ch’ang. Shortly afterwards Ma was murdered, and Ch’ü Chia 麴嘉 became king of Kao-ch’ang in 502, founding a dynasty of nine generations that was to rule the Turfan area for 140 years.

#### *The Kingdom of Kao-ch’ang under the Rule of the Ch’ü Family (500–640)*

Plagued by incursions of the Jou-jan and Kao-chü during his reign, Ch’ü Chia also tried to get permission from the authorities at the Chinese court to move inland, but his attempt failed. In 552 the Turks crushed the Jou-jan confederacy and assumed a dominant position in the vast area north of the Gobi Desert in the mid-sixth century. The rulers of Kao-ch’ang then acknowledged allegiance to the Turks. But in the period 581–583 the Turk qaghanate split into two halves – Eastern and Western qaghanates. In the beginning of the seventh century, the Western Turks faced the massive revolts of the Turkic Tiele and other tribal confederations. At the same time, weakened domestically, the Eastern Turks were obliged to stay on good terms with the Sui dynasty

<sup>4</sup> Ikeda On 池田溫, “Kōshō sanbi ryakkō” 高昌三碑略考, in *Mikami Tsugio Hakushi kiju kinen ronbunshū rekishihen* 三上次男博士喜壽記念論文集歴史編 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1985), pp. 102–20.

<sup>5</sup> See Roman Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites* (Le Caire: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1948).

(581–618). The measures introducing Chinese ways enacted by the Eastern Turks further created resentment. In such difficult times, the ruler of Kao-ch'ang, Ch'ü Po-ya 麴伯雅, was uncertain with whom to ally, although he leaned toward the side of the Western Turks.

Although no detailed sources survive, we can piece together the following events. Ch'ü Po-ya, the king of Kao-ch'ang, was overthrown in a coup at the end of the I-ho 義和 reign period (614–619), but was later restored to his throne. In 624, he was succeeded by his son Ch'ü Wen-t'ai 麴文泰, who devoted himself to enacting institutional reforms. It was during his reign, in 629, that the famous Buddhist pilgrim Hsüan-tsang 玄奘 paid his visit to Kao-ch'ang. This was also the time when the T'ang dynasty consolidated its position, defeated the Eastern Turks in 630, and made its influence more strongly felt by its frontier neighbors. Alert to the potential menace from the T'ang, Ch'ü Wen-t'ai was increasingly intent on allying himself with the Western Turks, but the Chinese forces proved superior to his in 640, and Kao-ch'ang city and its surrounding subprefectures fell to the T'ang.

The central bureaucracy of the kingdom of Kao-ch'ang was modeled on that of the traditional Chinese state, with a local administration divided into prefectures and counties. It is unclear which of the two land systems – *chün-t'ien* 均田, an equalized land-allocation system, or *chan-t'ien* 占田, a quota land-holding system – was in fact put into operation in the Kao-ch'ang kingdom. We are more certain that tenancy was widespread. The government collected a number of taxes and impositions on such items as land, wine, fuel, firewood, and certain kinds of silk. A separate tax on commodities (*tsang-ch'ien* 臧錢), went directly to the royal privy purse, some portion of which was payable in silver coins. Sogdian merchants often paid both taxes. The prevalence of Persian silver coins has also been attested through archeological finds. Lay and religious practitioners alike were subject to taxation, levies, and corvée, although sometimes at different rates – these being strong evidence of the king's power to tax in the Kao-ch'ang kingdom.

Most official posts were filled by ethnic Chinese, although the Ch'ü family themselves were probably non-Chinese. Accordingly, the dominant culture in the Kao-ch'ang kingdom was also Chinese. At the same time that Buddhist texts from Liang-chou 涼州 and central China entered Kao-ch'ang, Sanskrit texts in Pothi format, with pages in the shape of palm leaves, were continuously introduced. Concurrently, Taoist beliefs were widespread.

Many aboriginal Ch'ü-shih people still remained in the area, as well as a diverse assemblage of foreign peoples, the most active of whom were the Sogdians, whose homeland was Samarkand (now in modern Uzbekistan). In Turfan,



as in Central Asia and China, the Sogdians were known primarily as merchants and negotiators. They engaged in commerce and different types of trade and helped to bring about the flourishing multilateral commerce of Kao-ch'ang. They also introduced their beliefs, including the Iranian religion of Mazdeism, or Zoroastrianism, into the Turfan Depression.

*Hsi-chou under T'ang Jurisdiction (640-803)*

In 640, T'ang T'ai-tsung 太宗 dispatched a strike force under the command of Hou Chün-chi 侯君集 and others, and the Kao-ch'ang kingdom fell. T'ai-tsung subsequently established Hsi-chou prefecture in the territory of the Kao-ch'ang kingdom. Following the Chinese administrative model, Hsi-chou prefecture contained five subprefectures – Kao-ch'ang, Chiao-ho 交河, Liu-chung 柳中, P'u-ch'ang 蒲昌, and T'ien-shan 天山. The T'ang also stationed four military units of the garrison militia system 折衝府 named Ch'ien-t'ing 前庭, An-t'ou 岸頭, T'ien-shan, and P'u-ch'ang. All four were subordinate to the distant control of the Right Metropolitan Guard (Yu ling-chün wei 右領軍衛) quartered at the dynastic capital of Ch'ang-an.<sup>6</sup>

The T'ang enforced the full range of its institutional systems in the area under its direct control. The equal field system of land redistribution brought with it the complex procedures for registering households and spawned a variety of documents including canton registers, declarations of the head of household, the household registers themselves, and sample household registers that had undergone official scrutiny. The T'ang also instituted their system of taxation and compulsory labor service. Military installations included those of garrison militia, expeditionary army, outpost garrisons, and networks of signal beacons and watch-posts; and the communication system comprised a postal relay service, long-distance relay horses, officially checked passports, and travel permits.

The An-hsi protectorate, the T'ang's highest military and administrative authority in the Western Regions, was first established at Chiao-ho in 640 and then transferred to Kucha in 649. But the capital of the prefecture remained at Kao-ch'ang city, and Hsi-chou prefecture (as the Turfan region was called in the T'ang) remained a base from which the T'ang conducted all its operations in the region.

The unification of China under T'ang rule and the expansion of its influence as far west as to the borders of Persia contributed to an economic boom during the K'ai-yüan 開元 (713-741) and T'ien-pao 天寶 (742-755) eras, and the Turfan region attained a new level of prosperity. As Chinese culture and

<sup>6</sup> The army in 684-705 was called the Right Jade-Strategy Guard (*yu yü-ch'ien wei* 右玉鈐衛).



education became more widespread, *The Analects* of Confucius and *The Canon of Filial Piety* came to be used as basic textbooks in school. The population retained their predominantly Buddhist beliefs, while the patronage of the T'ang imperial house extended the influence of Taoism to Turfan, where Taoist monasteries were established. Mazdeism seems to have waned at this time.

*From the Orkhun-Uighur Khanate (803-866) to the Qocho-Uighur Kingdom (866-1283)*

The outbreak of the An Lu-shan Rebellion (755-763) proved a hard blow to the T'ang dynasty. By 762 the rebellion was beaten back, but not entirely suppressed. During this troubled period, the withdrawal of the T'ang troops from the Ho-hsi and Western Regions allowed the Tibetans to conquer and occupy the T'ang's territory in the Lung-yu 隴右 area (west of the Lung Mountains, now called the Liu-p'an 六盤 Mountains, between Shensi and Kansu) and the Ho-hsi area. In 786 the Tibetans finally captured Sha-chou 沙州 (Tun-huang 敦煌), the last stronghold of the T'ang in the Ho-hsi corridor, and thus paved the way for their expansion westward into the region surrounding the Taklamakan Desert, a goal they had failed to achieve in the previous century. In the winter of 789, the Tibetans, in alliance with the Qarluq and white-clothed Turks (pai-fu 白服 T'u-chüeh), seized Pei-t'ing 北庭 (Beshbalyq) protectorate from the T'ang. The T'ang troops, with the active support of the Orkhon-Uighur Khanate, engaged in a series of military operations against the Tibetans in Beshbalyq and Turfan, which eventually concluded with the Uighur occupation of Turfan in 803. Under Uighur patronage, Manichaeism spread extensively in Turfan region.

The Orkhon-Uighur khanate was destroyed by the Qyrqyz in 840. With the Uighur confederacy now broken apart, some dispersed tribesmen fled westward to the eastern part of the T'ien-shan realm under the leadership of P'ang T'e-le 龐特勒 (Tigin), where they also established themselves in the Turfan region. After a series of conflicts, a chieftain named P'u-ku Chün 僕固俊 succeeded in grouping all the Uighur tribes into a state which finally coalesced in the period of 866-872, with Kao-ch'ang city, namely the original prefectural center of T'ang-dynasty Hsi-chou, Turfan, as its principal capital. Toward the middle of the twelfth century, the Qocho Uighurs dominated many of the Taklamakan oases: I-chou 伊州 (Qomul), Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Qarashahr), Kucha 庫車, and Pei-t'ing (Beshbalyq). In 1130, once the Western Liao or Qara-Kitai (1124-1223) attained the height of its power, the Qocho Uighurs submitted to them. In the early-thirteenth century, when Chinggis Khan founded his empire, Barchuq-Art-Tigin, the king of the Qocho Uighurs, who was titled

Iduq-qut, killed the junior supervisor of the Qara-Kitai and switched allegiance to the Mongols in 1209. Qocho became the vassal of the Mongol empire and then that of the Yüan dynasty, but it was still referred to as the Uighur kingdom.

In the second half of the thirteenth century, the Uighur kingdom was caught up in the Mongol khan's power-struggle, and Uighur territory became a battleground in the fighting between Qubilai khan (1260–1294) and his rival Qaidu, grandson of Ögödei. After a six-month siege in 1275, the Qocho-Uighur kingdom, previously an ally of Qubilai, finally ended, with the fall of its capital to Tuva (1274–1307), a prince of the Chaghatai line. The Qocho-Uighur royal family then fled eastward into Kansu province in 1283 and settled in Yung-ch'ang county 永昌, a place of refuge for migrating Uighurs.

Because the Orkhon-Uighur khanate took Manichaeism as the state religion, one of the most noteworthy features of their history is the flourishing of this faith. Under the patronage of the Qocho-Uighur khans, Buddhist temples and cave shrines were remade into Manichaean monasteries. But, given the strong Buddhist tradition that had developed in this region, some of these places reverted back to Buddhism by the early-eleventh century. By the end of the Qocho-Uighur period, the Iranian religion, Mazdeism, seems almost to have disappeared, while Taoism still lingered. Nestorian Christianity made some headway in Bulayiq, a hamlet to the north of present-day Turfan, and this community maintained a connection with the Syriac Eastern Church.

*Turfan under the Mongol-Yüan Dynasty and the Heirs of the Chaghatai Line (1283–1756)*

From the time of the eastward migration of the Qocho-Uighurs to Yung-ch'ang, down to the conquest of the Western Regions by the Manchus, the Turfan region came under the rule of different tribes or clans of the different Mongol houses. Having occupied Turfan, Tuva had to maneuver between the contending princes Qaidu and Qubilai during his rather long reign. In 1302 Qaidu was definitively defeated by the Yüan. In 1306 Chabar, son of Qaidu, also submitted to them, and so Turfan fell within Yüan jurisdiction, thus bringing about the establishment of a Route Command (Tsung-kuan-fu 總管府) for the collection of taxes and tribute.

With the fall of the Yüan dynasty in 1368, Turfan came to be dominated by the descendants of the Chaghatai line, forming a part of their Moghulistan territory. In 1383 Xidir (Xizir) Khwoja (1389–1399) became the Beshbalyq Chaghatai khan. He waged holy war against non-Muslim towns, taking Qarakhoja and Turfan and forcibly converting their inhabitants to Islam. As a consequence,

the population of the larger region in general gradually converted to Islam.

In the late-fourteenth century, the present-day city of Turfan (located very close to the site of the ancient town An-le 安樂) displaced the city of Kao-ch'ang, which became a small village after a protracted war. It acquired importance as the new capital of the eastern zone of the former Chaghatai khanate (Moghulistan). In 1473, Sultan 'Ali of Turfan seized Ha-mi (Qomul) and raided Su-chou 肅州 and Kan-chou 甘州, two important cities in modern-day Kansu province, while continuing to pledge allegiance and pay tribute to the Ming dynasty.

Early in the sixteenth century the realm of Turfan again disintegrated into several smaller regions. In 1679 the Junghars, a branch of the western Mongols known as the Oirats during the Ming dynasty, extended their effective authority over Turfan, putting an end to the rule of the descendants of the Chaghatai line.

#### *Turfan under Manchu Rule (1756-1911)*

Having adopted the Chinese-style dynastic name "Ch'ing," and having secured control over China proper, the Manchus began a campaign to conquer the Western Regions. This decision was in great part a response to the expansion of influence in the area made by the Junghar ruler Galdan late in the 1670s. In 1720 when, the Ch'ing forces finally marched into Turfan, Akhon Emin Khoja submitted to the Ch'ing emperor K'ang-hsi (r. 1662-1722) and brought along the city of Lukchun, one of the major towns of Turfan. Incessantly harassed by the Junghars, Emin Khoja was forced to lead more than 8,000 Uighur inhabitants of Lukchun eastward and establish a settlement in Kua-chou, a city close to Tun-huang in Kansu province. When the Ch'ing emperor Ch'ien-lung (r. 1736-1795) finally sent a punitive expedition against the Junghars, Emin Khoja again fled, this time to Turfan, to recruit collaborators from among the local Uighur population. He persuaded them to switch allegiance to the Ch'ing. In 1756 the Ch'ing delineated the boundaries of Turfan and allowed Emin Khoja to move back to Turfan with his retinue. Consequently Turfan came under the direct administrative authority of the central government of Peking. Henceforth it was ruled by the designated Manchu and Chinese officials with the cooperation of the Uighur princelings of Lukchun. Most of the local inhabitants were Uighurs, but others included Chinese, Mongols, Manchus, Hui, and other peoples, including Vietnamese immigrants who were resettled in Turfan by the Ch'ing authorities.

Documents unearthed from archeological expeditions and excavations give us a picture of the multiple cultures of the Turfan area that is far more

extensive and colorful than anything such a brief historical sketch can provide. It is only toward the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, when Western archeological expeditions competed for the hoards of buried relics, that Turfan emerged from the obscurity that had shrouded it since the fourteenth century.

#### ARCHEOLOGICAL EXPLORATIONS, COLLECTIONS, AND SCATTERED FINDS

##### *Russia*

As early as the 1880s, the Russian consul-general in Kashgar, N. F. Petrovsky (1837–1908), had already begun collecting manuscripts, artifacts, and art treasures largely from Khotan and Kucha. All his acquisitions were continuously forwarded to St. Petersburg and deposited in the Asiatic Museum there. The Russian consul-general in Urumqi, N. N. Krotkov (1869–1919), who served from 1898 to 1918, and the Russian consul in Korla (Kurla or Kurle), A. A. Dyakov, also purchased a considerable number of manuscripts and relics uncovered from Turfan. From 1893 onwards, the Russian government financed a series of expeditions to Sinkiang, where they hoped to collect and excavate manuscript remains and cultural relics. In 1898 the Russian expedition, organized by the Russian Academy of Sciences and led by D. A. Klementz (1848–1914), visited the ruins of Turfan, undertook excavations in the ancient city of Qocho and the graveyard of Astana; they also made surveys and measurements of the cave shrines of Bezeklik.<sup>7</sup> In 1906–1907 the Russian expedition led by A. I. Kokhanovsky again visited Turfan.<sup>8</sup>

In 1909–1910 another expedition under the guidance of the prominent Russian linguist and Indologist S. F. Oldenburg (1863–1934) left for Sinkiang. One of the principal purposes of the first Oldenburg expedition was to work in Turfan, mapping in more detail and excavating in part the ruins of the old cities of Qocho, which the local people called Iduqut-shahri (“king’s city”), and of Yarkhoto, along with the sites of Astana, Bezeklik, and Sangim.<sup>9</sup> All of their finds were originally deposited in the Asiatic Museum of St. Petersburg. Later the manuscripts in the Klementz, Kokhanovsky, Krotkov, Oldenburg,

<sup>7</sup> D. A. Klementz, *Nachrichten über die von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg in Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan* (St. Petersburg: Akademiia Nauk, 1899).

<sup>8</sup> S. F. Oldenburg, “Kratkaya opis’ sostavlenno d-rom Kokhanovskim sobraniya drevnostey iz Turfana,” *Mélange asiatique* 13 (1907–1908), pp. 127–40.

<sup>9</sup> S. F. Oldenburg, *Russkaya Turkestanakaya ekspeditsiya 1909–10* (St. Petersburg: Akademiia Nauk, 1914).

and Roborovsky collections were entrusted to the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (originally called the Institute of Peoples of Asia and then the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies for some time), and now kept in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. All artifacts and other archaeological finds were stored in the Hermitage Museum. With the exception of mostly Uighur and Manichean and Christian-Sogdian texts, which were respectively edited by W. Radloff and K. Salmann in the beginning of this century, most of the manuscripts await systematic publication.<sup>10</sup>

A certain number of Chinese manuscripts discovered in Turfan were confused with those from Tun-huang and bear the misleading code label "Dkh." (that is, a Russian abbreviation for Tun-huang). Scholars have succeeded in identifying each of them, and have made transcribed copies. The facsimile plates or photographs of these Chinese manuscripts from Turfan have been published as part of the series of Tun-huang documents held in different libraries around the world published by Shang-hai ku-chi ch'u-pan-she.<sup>11</sup>

### Germany

The archeological discoveries of Dieter Klementz prompted the Germans to sponsor a series of expeditions to Turfan. From 1902 to 1907, and from 1913 to 1914, four expeditions, led by Albert Grünwedel (1856–1935) and Albert von Le Coq (1860–1930), set out for Sinkiang. Except for the fourth expedition that worked at sites between Tumshuq and Korla and failed in its efforts to revisit Turfan, the first three German expeditions did much exploring and digging work at almost all the important ruins and sites in the Turfan region, including the old city of Qocho and the sites at Sengim, Murtuk, Bezeklik, and Tuyuq. They acquired a great mass of manuscript fragments, block prints, paintings on both paper and silk, statues and other art treasures. Although most manuscript fragments were excavated, a considerable number were bought from the local inhabitants. Many stucco wall paintings were cave-temple walls that were detached by cutting them into pieces.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Vasilii Vasilevich Radloff, *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler: Materialien nach dem Tode des Verfassers mit Ergänzungen von S. Malov herausgegeben* (Leningrad: Akademie der Wissenschaften der U.S.S.R., 1928); A. N. Ragoza, *Sogdiyskie fragmenty Tsentral'noaziatskogo sobraniya Instituta Vostokovedeniya* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1980).

<sup>11</sup> O-lo-ssu k'o-hs'üeh-yüan tung-fang yen-chiu-so Sheng-Pi-te-pao fen so 俄羅斯科學院東方研究所聖彼得堡分所, eds., *O-lo-ssu k'o-hs'üeh-yüan tung-fang yen-chiu-so Sheng-Pi-te-pao fen so ts'ang Tun-huang wen-hsien* 俄羅斯科學院東方研究所聖彼得堡分所藏敦煌文獻 (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi ch'u-pan-she, 1992).

<sup>12</sup> Albert Grünwedel, *Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten in Idikutschari und Umgebung im Winter*

*The German Numbering System*

All the finds brought back by the four expeditions were sent to and stored in the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin. When the finds of the first expedition reached Berlin, the labels (called signatures in German) on the packing or on the envelopes were transferred to the items themselves, while the original paper wrappings were thrown away. As most fragments studied by F. W. K. Müller were identified as Manichaean, he began to number the Iranian fragments with consecutive numbers following a common letter "M" (for Manichaeica), from M 1 to M 919.

The individual numbering of fragments probably ceased with the second and third expeditions. It seems that the fragments each received an inventory number at the moment of accession or registration. The inventory number begins with a capital letter "T" showing its provenance (T is for Turfan). A Roman numeral I, II, III, or IV was added after a blank space to denote which expedition. Thus a capital T followed by I, II, III, or IV indicates the first, second, third, or fourth Turfan expedition. After T I, T II, T III, or T IV, the entry is marked with a second letter. This second letter can refer to the names of local people who had sold the manuscripts to the Germans (Usup, Shabit Haghim, Xantippe), the package number, or the site from which the item was excavated. Following is a brief list of the letter designations for the most important sites in or near Turfan:

B = Bulayik, a ruined temple	T = Tuyuq
D = Qocho old city (also Dakianus-shahr, or Iduqutshahr)	TB = Turfan Mountain (?)
K = Kucha	TV = Foreslope Turfan Mt.
M = Murtuk	X = uncertain site
S = Sengim	Y = Yarkhoto
S = San P'u	α = temple complex, SW corner of Qocho ruins
Sh = Shorchuk	Ξ = bought from Xantippe

---

1902-1903 (Munich: G. Franzischer Verlag, 1906); idem, *Altbuddhistische kultstätten in Chinesisch-Turkistan, bericht über archäologische Arbeiten von 1906 bis 1907, Kuca, Qarasahr und in der Oase Turfan* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1912); Albert von le Coq, "A Short Account of the Origin, Journey, and Results of the First Royal Prussian (Second German) Expedition to Turfan in Chinese Turkistan," *JRAS* (1909), pp. 299-322; idem, *Chotscho: Facsimile-Wiedergaben der wichtigeren Funde der ersten Königlich Preussischen Expedition nach Turfan in Ost-Turkistan* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1913); idem, *Auf Hellas Spuren in Ostturkistan: Berichte und Abenteuer der II. und III. deutschen Turfan Expedition* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1926); trans. A. Barwell, *Buried Treasures of Chinese Turkestan: An Account of the Activities and Adventures of the Second and Third German Turfan Expeditions* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1928).

After the initial for the sites comes the inventory number of the fragment.<sup>13</sup> Sometimes the labels indicating the place of origin of a fragment are contradictory.<sup>14</sup>

With the outbreak of World War II in 1939, the artifacts and manuscript remains were sent for safe storage to different places within Germany, and after the war they were divided between East and West Germany. Several hundreds of fragments found their way to West Germany, where they were temporarily housed at the University of Hamburg. But the major portion of the collection was left in the care of Zentralinstitut für Alte Geschichte und Archaeologie of the Akademie der Wissenschaften of East Germany. There they were renumbered according to language:

Ch = Chinese text

U = Uighur

So = Sogdian

M = Manichaean

The fragments that had been kept at Hamburg were later transferred to the Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Mainz, in 1956, and the letter "M" was added to their code numbers. This group of manuscripts was later handed over to the Orientabteilung of the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz. These fragments are marked in Boyce's *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts* with an asterisk.

The artifacts and other art treasures were stored in the Museum für Indische Kunst in Berlin-Dahlem with the code MIK III plus identification number.

After the reunification of East and West Germany, all manuscripts in Chinese and other languages that had originally been kept in East Germany were transferred to the Orientabteilung of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. The only exceptions are the texts in Turkic, Uighur, and Iranian languages. They are kept in the Turfanforschung group of the newly organized Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Artifacts and relics were transferred to the Museum für Indische Kunst, with the original code numbering system of East Germany retained unaltered.

<sup>13</sup> For more detailed information about the history of the German expeditions and the inventory numbering system, see Mary Boyce, *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960), pp. xxi-xxiii, xxvii-xxviii.

<sup>14</sup> See W. Sundermann, "Completion and Correction of Archeological Work by Philological Means: The Case of the Turfan Texts," in Paul Bernard and Frantz Grenet, eds., *Histoire et cultes de l'Asie Centrale préislamique* (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991), pp. 283-85.



*German Studies of Turfan*

Turfan studies in Germany began almost immediately with the arrival of the finds from the first German expedition. F. W. K. Müller's *Handschriftenreste* I and II, the first two representative editorial works on Iranian manuscript fragments from Turfan, were published in 1904.<sup>15</sup> In 1912 the Königlich Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften created an Orientalische Kommission, with three designated fields of study, one of which focused on the newly discovered Turfan texts. The year 1934 marked the culmination of the editorial work of the first three decades of German Turfan studies with the publication of both the third volume of F. Andreas' and W. Henning's *Mitteliranische Manichaeica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan* and the second volume of F. W. K. Müller and W. Lentz's *Sogdische Texte*.<sup>16</sup> *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichean Script in the German Turfan Collection*, compiled by Mary Boyce and published in 1960, clearly reflects the extensive achievements of German scholars in Turfan in the first half of the twentieth century.

In recent years great progress has been achieved in the study of the Iranian and Turkic texts of the German Turfan collection. Many new editions of the texts have been made available. They are furnished with markedly improved readings, exact and precise transliterations, trustworthy translations, copious annotations, and photographic plates of the originals. Thanks to the efforts of Dr. Werner Sundermann, we now have at our disposal a photographic edition of *Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts in Early Publications (1904–1934)*, which appeared in 1996. Moreover, a photographic edition of the texts edited in later works (mainly between 1935–1973) without reproductions of the originals can be also expected in a forthcoming volume. A text volume containing alternative readings, corrections, and additions is also planned by Dr. Sundermann.

Before and after the war some objects in the German Turfan collections were dispersed. One may cite the fragments that entered the collection of the library of Istanbul University in Turkey and that of the Shi Tenōji 四天王寺 of Osaka in Japan. These scattered fragments, originally a part of the German

<sup>15</sup> F. W. K. Müller, "Handschriften-Reste in Estrangel-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkestan, I," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin), Phil.-hist. Klasse 1904, pp. 348–52; II, in *Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin), Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1904.

<sup>16</sup> F. C. Andreas and W. B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaeica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, I–III," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin), Phil.-hist. Klasse 1932, pp. 175–222; 1933, pp. 294–362; 1934, pp. 848–912; F. W. K. Müller and W. Lentz, "Sogdische Texte II," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin), Phil.-hist. Klasse 1934, pp. 504–607.

Turfan Collection in Berlin, were bought respectively by the Turkish scholar Resid Rahmeti Arat and the Japanese abbot Deguchi Jōjun 出口常順.<sup>17</sup> To give another example, a fragment of a painted banner from Bezeklik was bought from Albert von le Coq by Mrs. William H. Moore, who sent it to Yale as a gift in 1937. It is now in the Yale University Art Gallery.<sup>18</sup>

### Japan

Also in the first years of this century, a Japanese team quickly made its way into Sinkiang, competing with other expeditions. Motivated by a desire to learn more about the history of the spread of Buddhism from India to China and stimulated by the competitive spirit in the race for archeological discoveries, Count Ōtani Kozui 大谷光瑞 (1896–1948), twenty-second abbot of the Nishihonganji Temple of the Jōdo Shin Shū 浄土真宗 in Kyoto, organized and funded three separate expeditions and sent them to Sinkiang to collect antiquities during 1902–1904, 1908–1909, and 1910–1914. Such members of the expeditions as Watanabe Tesshin 渡邊哲信, Hori Kenyū 堀賢雄, Tachibana Zuichō 桔瑞超, Nomura Eizaburō 野村榮三郎, and Yoshikawa Shōichirō 吉川小一郎 carried out successive digs in most of the sites in Turfan and extensively despoiled the Astana and Qarakhoja graveyards of their buried objects. Unlike the European expeditions, the Japanese teams were composed chiefly of junior monks. For example, Tachibana was only seventeen years old when he began work. With the enterprising enthusiasm of youth, but without adequate specialized training, the members of the Ōtani expeditions were unqualified for field excavation.

In 1914 a financial scandal caused by one of his subordinates led to Ōtani's retirement from his public offices. The dispersal of his collection followed close on his resignation from the post of the abbot of Nishihonganji. We know that the manuscripts and artifacts amassed by the Ōtani expeditions are scattered among many Japanese, Chinese, and Korean public and private collectors, but the details of how the collection was dispersed are not clear. In brief, all of the collected artifacts and manuscripts from the first expedition were entrusted

<sup>17</sup> Yamada Nobuo 山田信夫, "Isutanburu daigaku toshokan shozō higashi Torukisutan shutsudo bunshorui toku ni Uguru bunsho ni tsuite" イスタンブル大學圖書館所藏東トルキスタン出土文書類とくにウイグル文書について, *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 20 (1968), pp. 11–29; Kudara Kōgi 百濟康義, "Isutanburu daigaku shozō no Higashi Torukisutan shutsudo bunken toku ni sono shusho ni tsuite" イスタンブル大學所藏の東トルキスタン出土文獻特にその出所について, *Tōhōgaku* 84 (1992), pp. 1–12; Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃, "Kōshō zanei Deguchi Jōjun sō Toroban shutsudo Buttsuden danpen toroku" 高昌殘影出口常順藏吐魯番出土佛典斷片圖錄, unpublished paper, Osaka, 1978.

<sup>18</sup> George J. Lee, *Selected Far Eastern Art in the Yale University Art Gallery: A Catalogue* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1970), pp. 42–43.

ed to the Imperial Tokyo Museum (present-day Tokyo National Museum) in 1926. This portion fell into the hands of a collector in Tokyo by the name of Kimura Sadaoitaru 木村貞造 toward the end of the war in 1944. After the war the Japanese government repurchased these materials and stored them in the Oriental Section of the Tokyo National Museum with some additional items of the Ōtani collection bought from other individuals.<sup>19</sup>

The materials collected by the second and third expeditions were largely kept at Ōtani's private home, the Nirakusō villa on the Rokkō mountain near Kobe. In January 1916, a wealthy and influential businessman with extensive business connections by the name of Kuhara Fusanosuke 久原房之助 bought the Nirakusō villa from Ōtani, and both the villa and the archeological material from the expeditions housed in it passed into the hands of Kuhara. Kuhara was a fellow townsman and close friend of Terauchi Masatake 寺内正毅, then governor-general of Korea, which had been annexed by Japan in 1910. In 1916 Kuhara gave the Ōtani collection he had bought to Terauchi, who stored it in the Museum of the governor-general of Korea in Seoul (now the National Central Museum in Seoul).<sup>20</sup>

Another part of the Ōtani collection, especially the manuscript remains, was shipped to Lü-shun (Port Arthur), when Ōtani and Tachibana tried to establish themselves in Ta-lien. But when Ōtani decided to go to Shanghai in 1916, he left this portion of his collection in charge of the Southern Manchuria Railway, a government entity in charge of the extensive railways of the region. Soon afterwards, the Southern Manchuria Railway transferred all of the Turfan material in its charge to the Exhibition Hall of Mongolian and Manchurian Products (Man-Meng wu-ch'an-kuan 滿蒙物産館) under the government of the Kantō (northeastern China) governor (also called Museum of the Guangdong Governor, or the Lü-shun Museum) to celebrate its formal opening in April 1917. After the defeat of Japan in 1945, the Soviet Red Army occupied Lü-shun. Before the Soviet takeover of the Lü-shun Museum, Tachibana managed to ship back to Kyoto a considerable quantity of the materials of the Ōtani collection, packed in two large boxes. These materials, including manuscripts, wooden tablets, and silk paintings, remained with the Ōtani family in Nishihonganji. They were donated by Nishihonganji after Ōtani's death to Ryūkoku University for research.

<sup>19</sup> *Tōkyō kokuritsu hakubutsukan zuhan mokuroku Ōtani tankentai Shōraishin hen* 東京國立博物館圖版目錄施大谷探險隊將來品編 (Tokyo: Tōkyō kokuritsu hakubutsukan, 1971).

<sup>20</sup> This collection has not been published in full. Various photographs are in *Chūō Ajia no bijutsu* 中央アジアの美術 (Seoul: Sanwa shuppansha, 1989).

The manuscripts donated to the Ryūkoku University have been catalogued under the letter “O” (大谷) and numbered from 1000 to 8000 plus, with many missing numbers. In recent years many tiny fragments were also registered as O.10001–10668. In addition, part of the Ōtani collection that Tachibana brought back from Lü-shun and kept with him for his personal research was also entrusted to the Ryūkoku University Library, which catalogued it under the code “Tachibana” 橘. Yoshikawa Shōichirō also had a collection of manuscripts of his own, which, after mounting, he had bound into volumes with the title *Fragments from the Moving Sand* (*Ryūsa zanketsu* 流沙殘闕) and donated them as well to the Ryūkoku University Library, which catalogued them under the code O.9001–9166.

Manichaean texts in the Ōtani Turfan collection constitute an important collection in quantity second only to that of Berlin. There is now a provisional catalogue – *Catalogue of Iranian Fragments Unearthed in Central Asia by the Ōtani Expeditions and Preserved at Ryukoku University*, compiled by K. Kudara, Y. Yoshida, and W. Sundermann in 1993.

The part of the Ōtani collection that was left in the Lü-shun Museum was transferred to the Chinese government in February 1951, after a period of Soviet supervision. The Museum changed its name to the Lü-shun Historical and Cultural Museum, and now is simply called the Lü-shun Museum. This portion of the Ōtani collection bears the code numbers given by the Japanese, and the research staff of the Museum are working on them, while retaining the original code numbers.<sup>21</sup>

### *Chinese Private Collections Transferred to Japan*

Local officials and inhabitants in Turfan had already begun searching for “*khats*” (a term used by the explorers for “papers”) and hidden treasure even before the coming of the different competing foreign explorers. Ch’ing bureaucrats, both high and low, seized the chance to obtain ancient manuscript remains when delegated to Sinkiang. Wang Shu-nan 王樹楠, Provincial Administration commissioner of Sinkiang, and Liang Yü-shu 梁玉書 (*h.* Su-wen 素文), the provincial treasurer, took the lead in purchasing antiquities. Because these bureaucrats, like Count Ōtani, treated the manuscripts and artifacts in their possession as their own personal belongings, they sometimes sent them to officials as a bribe or gave them to friends. These articles were always

<sup>21</sup> Wang Chen-jen [Wang Zhenren] 王珍仁, “Lü-shun po-wu-kuan tsang Hsin-chiang ch’u-tu te ku wen-shu” 旅順博物館藏新疆出土的古文書 (parts 1–6), *Hsin-chiang wen-wu* 新疆文物 (1992.4), pp. 116–21; *ibid.* (1994.1), pp. 13–20; *ibid.* (1994.2), pp. 99–107; *ibid.* (1994.4), pp. 49–55; *ibid.* (1995.1), pp. 61–69; *ibid.* (1995.2), pp. 29–39.

changing hands, since they were sold whenever the financial situation of these officials' families required. Both Wang and Liang collected a considerable amount of manuscripts, many of which were of top quality. It seems that all of these were completely sold by the 1930s, at the latest. The major portion of Wang's collection was bought by Nakamura Fusetsu 中村不折 (1866–1943) for his Shodō (Calligraphy) Museum in Tokyo,<sup>22</sup> while much of Liang's collection went to Seikadō Bunko (Library), also in Tokyo.<sup>23</sup> Many scattered manuscripts separated from these two collections found their way to other Chinese and Japanese academic institutions, such as Peking Library, the Library of Peking University, the Library of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Chun-king Museum in Szechwan, and the Tenri Library in Japan, among others.

### *Finland*

From 1906 to 1908 Colonel Gustav E. Mannerheim (1867–1951) went to Sinkiang, Kansu, and other places in China. As a Russian military officer, he undertook the trip with the task of military reconnaissance and geographical investigation under the orders of the Russian imperial government. At the same time he also had a special mission to collect antiquities and ethnological materials for the Finno-Ugarian Society of Finland. He examined the old city of Yarkhoto and visited the old city of Turfan and other towns, collecting and purchasing a great number of manuscripts and art treasures unearthed from different sites of Turfan. His collection, now stored in the Helsinki University Library, has not yet been published, although it has been visited by scholars in recent years.<sup>24</sup>

### *Great Britain*

Turfan did not escape the attention of the English explorer Mark Aurel Stein (1862–1943), whose successive visits to and excavations of Khotan, Niya, and Tun-huang produced a wealth of written material and artistic remains. During his third expedition to Central Asia (1913–1915), Stein went on to Turfan after his survey of Kansu, reaching Turfan by early November, 1914. He spent the winter, the best season for excavating, digging at the old city of Qocho and the graveyard of Astana, detaching the remaining stucco wall paintings left by the Germans from the walls of the Bezeklik cave shrines (some of

<sup>22</sup> Jung Hsin-chiang [Rong Xinjiang] 榮新江, *Hai-wai Tun-huang T'u-lu-fan wen-hsien chih-chien lu* 海外敦煌吐魯番文獻知見錄 (Nan-ch'ang: Chiang-hsi jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1997), pp. 174–83.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., pp. 183–93.

<sup>24</sup> Kudara Kōgi, "Chinese Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia in the Mannerheim Collection," in Yamamoto Tatsuro, ed., *Proceedings of the Thirty-first International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa* (Tokyo: Tōhō gakkai, 1984) 2, pp. 995–97.

which were fully eleven by sixteen feet in size), and working at a series of sites at Toyuq.<sup>25</sup>

The great mass of his finds, when shipped back in neat packages to England in 1915, was to be partitioned among the British Museum, the Government of India, and the India Office on the basis of an agreement drawn up when raising funds for Stein's third expedition. The British Museum was to receive all manuscripts in Chinese, Sogdian, Turkish, and Uighur; the India Office, all those in Khotanese, Kuchean, and Tibetan. Sanskrit texts written in the Kharosthi script were allotted to the British Museum while those written in the Brahmi script went to the India Office. All other relics, such as paintings on silk, embroidery, panel drawing, pottery, wooden sculpture, and coins, were to be divided equally between the British Museum and Central Asian Antiquities Museum of India. Thus, archeological articles allotted to England went to the Department of Oriental Antiquities of the British Museum. All written documents were given to the Section of Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books, which were transferred to the British Library in 1973 and are now all stored there.

#### *The British Numbering System*

The whole of Stein's Turfan collection was classed under a single inventory number in the British Library, "Or. 8212," the individual items of which, together with the finds from the other sites of Turfan, bear the subnumerals 1 to 1946. In addition, each wooden or paper document has its original archeological serial number, with the following abbreviations:

Ast. = Astana graveyard in Turfan

Kao. = old city of Qocho

Toy. = cave temple of Toyuq

Yar. = Yarkhoto

The original serial numbers are still retained to mark the individual articles deposited in the British Museum, Indian Office Library (now incorporated into the British Library), and National Museum of India in New Delhi, of which the Central Asian Antiquities Museum has become a section.

#### *China*

##### *The Sino-Sweden scientific expedition and its numbering system*

The Sino-Sweden Scientific Expedition, which worked in northwestern China from 1927 to 1935 under the leadership of Sven Hedin (1865–1952), collected material of significant archeological interest. In particular, Huang

<sup>25</sup> Aurel Stein, *Innermost Asia: Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia, Kan-su, and Eastern Iran* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928).

Wen-pi, a member of the Chinese team, contributed to the state of Turfan archeological collections. In both 1928 and 1930 Huang examined the ruined sites, excavated the grave pits of the ancient burial ground near Chiao-ho, and found epitaph-tablets and pottery.<sup>26</sup> He also bought a number of manuscripts and artifacts unearthed from the local ruined sites that were for sale in the local bazaars.<sup>27</sup> While preparing the scientific report of his fieldwork, his collection obtained from Turfan, together with that obtained from the Tarim Basin, was housed in the Archeological Institute of the Chinese Academy of Sciences in Peking. There, each item was given a serial number under the inventory label “考 (K'ao),” the first word in the name of the Institute. When the collection was transferred to the Chinese Historical Museum, where it is held today, each item was given a Historical Museum inventory code number. The latter number is rarely used, because the collection has not yet been reorganized. Only a very few people have gained access to the original pieces for research.

*Excavations undertaken by the Sinkiang Museum*

From 1959 to 1975 the Sinkiang Museum undertook thirteen excavations at the Astana and Qarakhoja graveyards; workers unearthed 456 tombs, which yielded a great wealth of documents and artifacts. While the excavated Chinese documents have been published in their entirety, the artifacts found between 1959 and 1975 have been described only in a piecemeal way in individual brief reports of the excavation. We have at our disposal photographs of only the most beautiful artifacts published in a few albums.<sup>28</sup> No complete site report was ever published.

Of the excavated 456 tombs, 205 contained manuscript fragments. Most

<sup>26</sup> Huang Wen-pi 黃文弼, *Kao-ch'ang t'ao chi* 高昌陶集 (Peking: Chung-kuo hsüeh-shu t'u'an-t'i hsieh-hui, 1933); idem, *Kao-ch'ang chuan chi* 高昌磚集 (Peking: Chung-kuo k'o-hsüeh-yüan, 1951).

<sup>27</sup> Huang Wen-pi, *T'u-lu-fan k'ao-ku chi* 吐魯番考古記 (Peking: Chung-kuo k'o-hsüeh-yüan, 1954; 2d edn. Peking: K'o-hsüeh ch'u-pan-she, 1958).

<sup>28</sup> Hsin-chiang po-wu-kuan 新疆博物館, ed., “Hsin-chiang T'u-lu-fan A-ssu-t'a-na pei-ch'ü mu-tsang fa-chüeh chien-pao” 新疆吐魯番阿斯塔那北區墓葬發掘簡報, *WW* (1960.6), pp. 13–21; idem, “T'u-lu-fan hsien A-ssu-t'a-na Ha-la-ho-cho ku-mu-ch'ün fa-chüeh chien-pao” 吐魯番縣阿斯塔那哈喇和卓古墓群發掘簡報, *WW* (1972.1), pp. 8–29; idem, “T'u-lu-fan A-ssu-t'a-na 363 hao mu fa-chüeh chien-pao” 吐魯番阿斯塔那363號墓發掘簡報, *WW* (1972.2), pp. 7–12; idem, “T'u-lu-fan hsien A-ssu-t'a-na Ha-la-ho-cho ku-mu-ch'ün fa-chüeh chien-pao” 吐魯番縣阿斯塔那哈喇和卓古墓群發掘簡報, *WW* (1973.10), pp. 7–27; idem, *Ssu-ch'ou chih lu Han-T'ang chih-wu* 絲綢之路漢唐織物 (Peking: Wen-wu ch'u-pan-she, 1973); idem and Hsi-pei ta-hsüeh li-shih hsi k'ao-ku chuan-yeh 西北大學歷史系考古專業, eds., “1973 nien T'u-lu-fan A-ssu-t'a-na ku-mu-ch'ün fa-chüeh chien-pao” 1973年吐魯番阿斯塔那古墓群發掘簡報, *WW* (1975.7), pp. 8–26; Hsin-chiang po-wu-kuan, *Hsin-chiang ch'u-tu wen-wu* 新疆出土文物 (Peking: Wen-wu, 1975); idem, “T'u-lu-fan Ha-la-ho-cho ku-mu-ch'ün fa-chüeh chien-pao” 吐魯番哈喇和卓古墓群發掘簡報, *WW* (1978.6), pp. 1–14; idem, *Hsin-chiang Wei-wu-erh tzu-chih-ch'ü po-wu-kuan* 新疆維吾爾自治區博物館 (Peking: Wen-wu, 1991).



of these fragments were originally part of funeral objects – paper shoes, paper hats, paper belts, paper coffins, and the like – made out of discarded documents. The individual fragments are usually too mutilated to read, but some of them can be fitted together into sections whose contents can be deciphered. Archeologists have pieced together more than 1,600 reconstituted documents. Apart from a small portion of these documents that has been left in the local Turfan Museum, the majority of excavated material from Turfan is now stored in the Museum of the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region in Urumchi.

*The numbering system of the Sinkiang Museum*

Each document has been given a number showing the year of excavation, the site at which it was found, the tomb number, and the item number. For example, “73TAM506:4/35” refers to document no. 4/35 excavated from tomb no. 506 at Astana in 1973. Likewise, “75TKM96:33(a)” refers to document no. 33, recto, excavated from tomb no. 96 at Karakhoja in 1975. Starting in 1975, a research group under the guidance of the late professor T’ang Chang-ju began to prepare this manuscript collection for publication. Ten volumes of hand-written transcriptions were published between 1981 and 1991, and four volumes of photographic reproductions with revised transcriptions came out between 1992 and 1996. Both are published by the Wenwu Publishing House, and, confusingly, both bear the same title: *Excavated Documents from Turfan* (T’u-lu-fan ch’u-t’u wen-shu 吐魯番出土文書).

Two groups of unpublished materials have piqued scholarly interest. In 1956 the students of the first session of a short-term course in archeological training in Sinkiang set out for Chiao-ho, where they excavated in the old city, surrounding temples, and the graveyard. Documents obtained from the temple sites were given the number “56TYD,” and objects and epitaphs from the graves were given the number “56TYM.”<sup>29</sup> Then, in 1965 an earthenware jar with Chinese and Uighur documents was unearthed from the city of An-le, Turfan. The documents found there are marked with the code “65TIN.” These two Turfan collections are also stored in the Sinkiang Museum and, with the exception of a few individual items, remain unpublished. After 1979, when sites came under the jurisdiction of the locality (and not the provincial authorities), the Turfan Museum (T’u-lu-fan ti-ch’ü wen-kuan-so 吐魯番地區文管所) continued to work the site, excavating ten tombs at Astana.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Hsin-chiang shou-chieh k’ao-ku chuan-yeh jen-yüan hsün-lien pan 新疆首屆考古專業人員訓練班, eds., “Chiao-ho ku-ch’eng ssu-yüan chi Yeh-erh-hu ku-mu fa-chüeh chien-pao” 交河故城寺院及雅爾湖古墓發掘簡報, *Hsin-chiang wen-wu* (1989.4), pp. 2–12.

<sup>30</sup> T’u-lu-fan ti-ch’ü wen-kuan-so 吐魯番地區文管所, eds., “T’u-lu-fan ch’u-t’u shih-liu kuo shih-ch’i te wen-shu T’u-lu-fan A-ssu-t’a-na 382 hao mu ch’ing-li chien-pao” 吐魯番出土十六國

In 1980 and 1981 the museum cleared out the heaped-up loess and sand from the cave shrines of Bezeklik.<sup>31</sup> Apart from these two excavations, there were some other acquisitions that enriched the document and artifact collections in the Turfan Museum.<sup>32</sup> The registration system of the Turfan Museum is similar to that of the Sinkiang Museum, with new abbreviations for different sites. For example, “80TBI:001a,” refers to the recto of document no.001 found from the loess accumulations in front of the cave shrines of Bezeklik in 1980, while “76TCM3:20” refers to document no. 20 from tomb no. 3 of Ts'ai-k'an graveyard of Turfan excavated in 1976.

In the period 1994–1996 Waseda University of Japan, in collaboration with the Institute of Archeology of the Sinkiang Academy of Sciences, carried out a series of excavations at the graveyard to the west of Yarkhoto, which yielded a number of epitaphs and other objects. These were given the label “TYGXM,”<sup>33</sup> but no manuscripts or documents were found by this expedition.

#### *Miscellaneous holdings*

In addition, the Shanghai Library, the Shanghai Museum, the Liaoning Archives, the Kansu Museum, the Neiraku Art Museum, the Kyoto National

---

時期的文書吐魯番阿斯塔那382號墓清理簡報, *WW* (1983.1), pp. 19–25; idem, “Kao-ch'ang mu-chuan shih-i” 高昌墓碑拾遺, *Pei-ching ta-hsüeh Chung-kuo chung-ku shih yen-chiu chung-hsin* 北京大學中國中古史中心, ed., *Tun-huang Tu-lu-fan wen-hsien yen-chiu lun-chi* 敦煌吐魯番文獻研究論集 (Peking: Peking U.P., 1986) 3, pp. 585–602; idem, “1986 nien Hsin-chiang T'u-lu-fan A-ssu-t'a-na ku mu ch'ün fa-chüeh chien-pao” 1986年新疆吐魯番阿斯塔那古墓群發掘簡報, *KK* (1992.2), pp. 143–56; idem, “T'u-lu-fan Pei Liang Wu-hsüan wang Chü-ch'ü Meng-hsün fu-jen P'eng-shih mu” 吐魯番北涼武宣王沮渠蒙遜夫人彭氏墓, *WW* (1994.9), pp. 75–81. The documents found in these ten graves have been published separately: Liu Hung-liang [Liu Hongliang] 柳洪亮, *Hsin-ch'ü T'u-lu-fan wen-shu chi ch'i yen-chiu* 新出吐魯番文書及其研究 (Urumchi: Hsin-chiang jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1997).

<sup>31</sup> T'u-lu-fan ti-ch'ü wen-kuan-so 吐魯番地區文管所, “Po-tzu-k'o-li-k'o ch'ien-Fo tung i-chih ch'ing-li chien pao” 柏孜克里克千佛洞遺址清理簡報, *WW* (1985.8), pp. 49–65. The Museum's name is now T'u-lu-fan ti-ch'ü wen-wu chung-hsin 吐魯番地區文物中心.

<sup>32</sup> T'u-lu-fan ti-ch'ü wen-kuan-so, “T'ang Pei-t'ing fu-tu-hu Kao Yao mu fa-chüeh chien-pao” 唐北庭副都護高耀墓發掘簡報, *Hsin-chiang she-hui k'o-hsüeh* 新疆社會科學 (1985.4), pp. 60–68; idem, “T'u-lu-fan Ts'ai-k'an ku mu ch'ün ch'ing-li chien-pao” 吐魯番采坎古墓群清理簡報, *Hsin-chiang wen-wu* (1990.3), pp. 1–7; Liu Hung-liang 柳洪亮, “T'ang T'ien-shan hsien Nan-p'ing hsiang Ling-kua shih mu-chih k'ao-shih” 唐天山縣南平鄉令狐氏墓誌考釋, *WW* (1984.5); idem, “T'u-lu-fan A-ssu-t'a-na ku mu hsin fa-hsien te 't'ao jen mu p'ai” 吐魯番阿斯塔那古墓新發現的桃人木牌, *K'ao-ku yü wen-wu* 考古與文物 (1986.1), pp. 39–40; idem, “Hsi-chou chih yin' yin-chien te fa-hsien chi hsiang kuan wen-t'i” 西州之印印鑒的發現及相關問題, *K'ao-ku yü wen-wu* (1992.2); idem, “Ta T'ang hsi-yü chi ch'uan-ju hsi-yü te yu kuan wen-t'i” 大唐西域記傳入西域的有關問題, *Hsi-yü k'ao-ch'a yü yen-chiu* 西域考察與研究 (Urumchi: Hsin-chiang jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1994), pp. 299–306.

<sup>33</sup> Lien-ho-kuo chiao-k'o-wen tsu-chih chu Chung-kuo tai-piao ch'u 聯合國教科文組織駐中國代表處 et al., eds., *Chiao-ho ku-ch'eng* 1993, 1994 nien-tu k'ao-ku fa-ch'üeh pao-kao 交河古城 1993, 1994 年度考古發掘報告 (Peking: Tung-fang ch'u-pan-she, 1998).

Museum, the National Diet Library in Japan, and Gest Library of Princeton University also have a number of Turfan documents or artifacts in their collections. There is probably only one item from Turfan in Sweden. When Sven Hedin passed through Turfan in 1934, he bought a paper drawing dating from the T'ang, now stored in the National Museum of Ethnography in Sweden. The location of other scattered remains from Turfan remains unknown, but items still surface from time to time.

#### FUTURE PROSPECTS

To be sure, the obstacles to studying Turfan seem overwhelming at first sight. As described above, artifacts and documents from the site are stored in at least six countries (China, Finland, Germany, Japan, Great Britain, and Russia) in over twenty different locations – each with its own numbering system – and not all have been published.

Electronic resources should provide some guidance. The database of “The Silk Road Project: Reuniting Turfan’s Scattered Treasures” (<http://www.yale.edu/ceas/main.html>) has over 3,000 entries for documents and artifacts, most of which have been excavated by Chinese archeologists since 1949. The database translates the titles of the individual items into English, and it provides a set of key words (in both Chinese and English) for those doing searches by topic. Thus it is possible both to identify which documents and which artifacts were found in the same tomb and to understand the original contexts of documents and artifacts.

The Silk Road Project web-site also contains an extensive bibliography on different aspects of life in Turfan. As one might expect, institutional topics, such as the equal-field system, have received the most attention, and scholars have worked most extensively with Chinese-language materials from the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, from the periods of the Kao-ch'ang kingdom and that of direct T'ang control. As Central Asia once again becomes an area of world attention, scholars are beginning to use archeological data to illuminate its early history – identifying the culture of the indigenous peoples and determining when they were absorbed by the Chinese settlers. Researchers are also seeking to understand the period that began around the time of the T'ang withdrawal from Central Asia, when the Uighur kingdom ruled and when Manicheanism was a state religion for the only time in world history. One trend is certain: the dispersal of Turfan materials all over the world means that only teams of scholars from different countries working together will be able to advance the field.