

The Khotanese Documents from the Khotan Area*

KUMAMOTO, Hiroshi

with an Appendix by SAITÔ, Tatuya

1. Recent studies of Khotanese documents
2. Major collections of pre-Dunhuang Khotanese documents
 - 2.1 The St. Petersburg Collections
 - 2.2 The Hedin Collection in Stockholm
 - 2.3 The India Office Library Collection in London
3. The types of the documents
 - 3.1 Orders (*parau*)
 - 3.2 Petitions (*haşdi*)
 - 3.3 Contracts
 - 3.4 Personal Letters
 - 3.5 Economical documents
 - 3.6 Name-lists
4. The Chronology of the Documents
 - 4.1 Kings of Khotan
 - 4.2 Khotan under Chinese rule
 - 4.3 Khotan under Tibetan rule
5. The problems of "Six Villages"
6. Appendix

*I have benefited in the work for the present study from the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (category C) of the Education Ministry who supported the three year project (1993-1995) of "Japan-Russia Joint Study of Middle Iranian Documents" as well as from the Japan Foundation who financed my travel to St. Petersburg in 1996. I would like to thank the staff of the Ethnographical Museum in Stockholm and Professor Staffan Rosén who facilitated my research there in 1989, the staff of the India Office Library (British Library) who also helped me during my short stay in London in 1989 and 1992, and especially Dr. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, Prof. E. N. Tyomkin, Prof. L. N. Men'shikov, Dr. L. I. Chuguevsky and all the technical staff at the Institute of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg. Mr. SAITÔ Tatuya, who kindly contributed an essay as an Appendix, and Prof. ARAKAWA Masaharu helped me in Chinese matters. This study is to be understood as a completely rewritten and substantially expanded version of my paper entitled "A New Look at the Khotanese Documents" which was read at the 33rd International Congress of Asian and North African Studies in Toronto, 1990, and to which a few references by other scholars have appeared in the subsequent years in the discussion of the chronology of the Khotanese documents.

1. Recent studies of Khotanese documents

The publication in recent years of the Khotanese Saka manuscripts preserved in the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences¹⁾ is an important event in that a whole collection²⁾ comparable to those of the British Library in London and of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has come to light. A special reason to welcome these publications would be that, although many of the Buddhist texts were previously known to the world outside Russia through the pioneering works of Ernst Leumann and others, nearly 300 items of the so-called business documents (деловые документы) are published here for the first time both in facsimile and in transliteration and translation. At the same time one of the editors of the Khotanese texts in St. Petersburg published studies based on these and other Khotanese documents from the Khotan area proposing new interpretations of the historical data in Khotanese and Chinese sources.³⁾ On the other hand, the Chinese scholar Lin Meicun 林梅村 proposed some revisions to the previous readings of the Chinese-Khotanese texts of related Hedin and Stein documents.⁴⁾ All these text editions and studies concern the Khotanese manuscripts discovered in the Khotan area, which form a distinct group in place and time from those found in Dunhuang. The first group of documents can be dated to the eighth (some archaic documents on wood even earlier) and the first half of the ninth (under Tibetan rule) century, while those from Dunhuang to the Guiyijun 歸義軍 period from the late ninth up to the end of the tenth (possibly also the first few years of the eleventh) century.⁵⁾ Along with these Khotanese documents from Khotan we have a small number of contemporary Chinese documents, many of which provide exact dates and titles in terms of the Chinese administrative system. Moreover, there are a few bilingual documents—Chinese with an interlinear translation in Khotanese. All these documents are no doubt an important source for studies not only of the Khotanese language but also of the history and social structure of the southern part of the Tarim basin in the Tang period. In spite of important contributions in the works mentioned above, no conclusion that is altogether satisfactory seems to have been reached in regard to many problems posed by these documents. Part of the reason seems to be that specialists in Khotanese tend to misunderstand the Chinese background, while non-specialists in Khotanese likewise tend to distort the Khotanese evidence. Now with the publication of the St. Petersburg documents, it has become possible to deal with the Khotanese documents in general on a much firmer basis than before. The present study is an attempt to present a step in that direction.

2. Major collections of pre-Dunhuang Khotanese documents

2.1 The St. Petersburg Collections

According to the count of the Introduction to *Saka Documents Text Volume III* (= *SDTV III*), p. 12, the Petrovsky collection contains 268 “business documents” on paper, nine on wood and four private letters (three on paper, one on wood). The Malov collection has eleven documents on paper, three letters on paper, and the Oldenburg collection one document on paper. The Strelkov collection (named after the keeper of Central Asian materials at the State Hermitage) has one Khotanese document on wood among many others with Kuchean texts. The paper documents range from complete sheets with a full text to small scraps of paper with only a few letters (Brāhmī *akṣaras*) on them. Comparatively larger pieces are included in SI P (Serindia Petrovsky) 94 (24 items) and 103 (53 items). Some of them have Chinese texts up to a few lines. One group in this collection, originally called SI P 149, consisted of six documents with Chinese and Khotanese texts on them. Some of them can be shown to be bilingual texts, with the Chinese texts translated into Khotanese word by word. These manuscripts had once been removed from the Petrovsky collection to the Dunhuang Chinese collection, but recently became available again with the reassigned numbers Dx 18916, 18926, 18927, 18928, 18930, 18931 (although not from Dunhuang). In addition to these Dx 1461 also contains a Khotanese text unrelated to the Chinese on the other side.⁶⁾ Since their edition is still in preparation, they can only be used marginally in the following. Wooden documents are relatively short. The texts on them reflect temporary character compared to documents on paper. Since all these collections in St. Petersburg appear to have been purchased through local dealers rather than discovered *in situ*, it is now impossible to determine the provenance. Only in a few cases the common features (personal and place names, etc.) with some Stein documents suggest that they belonged to particular sites.

2.2 The Hedin Collection in Stockholm

In 1961 H. W. Bailey published 30 documents on paper and 45 on wood in the Ethnographical Museum in Stockholm as *Khotanese Texts* (hereafter *KT*) Vol. 4, with translation and commentary. These documents, consecutively numbered, are referred to as Hedin 1–75. In the preface (p. vii) Bailey notes that the Hedin Collection of the Saka Texts were obtained by Professor Dr Sven Hedin, Dr E. Norin and Dr N. Ambolt in the region of Khotan. These names suggest that the manuscripts were acquired not during Hedin’s earlier expeditions since 1894⁷⁾, but through the Sino-Swedish Expedition in 1927–1935 (中瑞西北科學考察團 [Sino-Swedish Scientific Research Team of the North-West] in Chinese).⁸⁾ No more details about the provenance of these documents and the circumstances of their acquisition are known at the Museum.⁹⁾ However, there are indications that the Hedin documents come from the same sources as some other manuscripts

elsewhere. The manuscripts and wooden sticks at the Museum had not been properly classified and catalogued until recently. They had in fact been stored together with a large number of forged paper manuscripts and wood sticks, of which Bailey tacitly avoids mention. For example, the group with the signature SR97c Bunt (“packet”) 10 contains the following items: a) forgery, b) Hedin 15 in KT 4, c) Hedin 1, d) Hedin 10, e) Hedin 11, f) Hedin 12, g) Hedin 13, h) forgery, i) forgery, j) Hedin 6, k) forgery, l) Hedin 3, m) Hedin 4, n) Hedin 2, and o) Hedin 7. These forged paper manuscripts were apparently made in imitation of the genuine ones, as occasionally syllables like *mye hadai* “on the ...th day” can be read among made-up Brāhmī-like letters. At the Museum some notes by Helmer Smith are preserved with these documents, who, being a non-specialist of Khotanese, had tried to decipher some of the forgery along with the genuine Khotanese texts.

As for the documents on wood, they are all preserved under the signature beginning with 1941.33 (Hedin 31 is currently missing), while those wood sticks from Loulan published by Conrady (1920) are separately classified under the signature 1903.26. This 1941.33 group includes all the Khotanese documents, one with both Khotanese and Chinese (Hedin 73), one with only Chinese, and many forgeries. Among the forgery on wood one has both Khotanese-like syllables and Chinese-like characters, the latter of which imitates part of the Chinese text on Hedin 16 (六城南牟沒納進奉) but the resemblance fails after a few characters.¹⁰⁾

In addition to forged paper manuscripts and wood sticks which are each given a signature, a few boxes full of unnumbered paper manuscripts are found. These have stamped letters not unlike formal Brāhmī with the same group of syllables repeated over and over again.

On the other hand, Huang Wenbi 黃文弼, who was a member of the Sino-Swedish Expedition, published in his *Talimu pendi kaoguji* [塔里木盆地考古記] [*Archaeological Reports of the Tarim Basin*], 北京 1958, which is the report of the 1928–1929 expedition, the photographs of exactly the same kind of forgery as those in Stockholm.¹¹⁾ They must have come from the same sources where such things were mass-produced. In a review of Huang Wenbi’s book in *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 1959/5–6, 229–242¹²⁾, E. Waldschmidt was able to recognize the forgery immediately, as he had seen the similar kind of forgery brought back by the geographer Emil Trinkler from the southern Chinese Turkestan after his travel there in 1927/1928. Unfortunately no genuine Khotanese documents like those in the Hedin collection have been reported to exist in China or Germany. In any case it is most likely therefore that the same sources supplied the Swedish as well as the Chinese team with this particular type of forgery.

2.3 The India Office Library Collection in London¹³⁾

The Khotanese documents first published by A. F. R. Hoernle in 1897 and 1901¹⁴⁾ with tentative readings were re-edited by H. W. Bailey as Hoernle 1–10 in KT 2.64–68. Another document published by Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of*

Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan, 400ff. is also found in KT 2.68 as Hoernle 143a. Later in 1963 Bailey published more documents and small fragments in transliteration (some also in facsimile in *Saka Documents* [= SD], portfolio II) in KT 5.1–22. They have the acquisition numbers at the division of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts (OPBM; now joined with IOL) from Or. 6392 to 6402, which suggests that they were acquired before or about 1900.¹⁵⁾

The next group of documents come from the three expeditions (1900–1901, 1906–1908, 1913–1916) of Aurel Stein. The information given on the manuscript findings in the three published reports by Stein, *Ancient Khotan* (Oxford 1907), *Serindia* (Oxford 1921) and *Innermost Asia* (Oxford 1928), is by no means complete. But these books give a useful illustration of the system of reference by the site number, which, although cumbersome at times, can serve as a guidance to the provenance of the manuscripts when they are so numbered. Thus D stands for Dandān-uiliq (*Ancient Khotan* 288–303), Kha. for Khādalik (*Serindia* 1432–1447), F for Farhād-Bēg-Yailaki (*Serindia* 1455–1456), M. Tāgh for Mazār-Tāgh (*Serindia* 1456–1459). This last is usually abbreviated as M.T. in referring to the Khotanese manuscripts, which causes the confusion with Mazār-Toghrak, for which Stein used the site number with M. T. Thus the texts published in KT 5.204–209 nos. 404–422 are from Mazār-Toghrak in the Domoko oasis according to *Serindia* 205–206, 1447, although they are explained as Mazār-Tāgh by Bailey in SD portfolios I and III. Other manuscripts given the site numbers are Balaw. (=Balawaste; *Serindia* 197, *Innermost Asia* 1026), Domoko (Dumaqu in KT 5; *Innermost Asia* 1026), Iledong (=Īle-dong; *Innermost Asia* 1027), and Sampula (*Innermost Asia* 100), all from the second and third expeditions. For the location of these sites see Gerd Gropp, *Archäologische Funde aus Khotan Chinesisch-Ostturkestan* (1974), 16–25. No information is available for the text published as Achma in KT 2.62 and the four texts (two with an interlinear Khotanese version to the Chinese text) published as Domoko A4, C, D, F in KT 2.62–64, apart from a note by Bailey in the Preface of SD, portfolio IV that “of Achma and Dumaqu texts on Plates xcv-xcvi only photographs are known, the original manuscripts were left in Central Asia”.¹⁶⁾ They show close affinity with the bilingual texts of Hedin 15 and 16.

Among these documents, two wooden tablets, F II.i.006 and F.II.i.1, published in KT 2.69 (the former also in facsimile in SD IV, plate LXXV), stand apart from other documents for their antiquity in language and script. This accords well with Stein’s estimate (*Serindia* 1254–1256) that the site was abandoned before the end of the sixth century.

The circumstances under which the third group of documents were acquired by the British Library is not clear. Here belong two acquisition numbers: Or. 11252 (42 paper documents and fragments) and Or. 11344 (18 paper documents and fragments). They were published by Bailey in KT 2.15–38 (Or. 11252.1 alone in KT 3.13–15). Since the Chinese and some bilingual manuscripts brought by the three expeditions of Stein are given the numbers Or. 8210, 8211, 8212¹⁷⁾, and the

box containing the wooden tablets Or. 9268 has a note “Presented by N. Fitzmaurice, Esq. 14 July 1923” with “From Khotan” in pencil writing on the bottom of the tablet, it might not be unreasonable to assume that the manuscripts Or. 11252 and Or. 11344 arrived some years later, possibly around the same time when the Sino-Swedish expedition obtained some Khotanese documents along with forgery. In fact so many common features (personal names, place names and expressions relating to the background information) shared by the Hedin documents and the two groups of the IOL documents strongly suggest that these IOL documents may have come from the same sources possibly mixed with forged manuscripts.¹⁸⁾

Besides these documents on paper, there are a few box-shaped wooden documents. Two of them, Or. 9268 I and II, are published by Bailey in *KT* 2.13–14 and in facsimile in *SD*, portfolio I, pl. iv–v. Another similarly shaped wooden tablet, with two separate documents, one inside and one outside, which recently came to light at IOL is published, together with Or. 9268 and another which was also discovered recently in China (Urumqi 1)¹⁹⁾ by P. O. Skjærvø.²⁰⁾ Its peculiar shape with a lid that slides off to reveal the inside of the “box” appears to be a development from a simpler type found in Kharoṣṭhī tablets, where a piece of wood is cut so that part of the upper side can slide sideways to serve as an envelope. In language and script these tablets can be placed between the archaic wooden documents from Farhād-Bēg-Yailaki and the later documents on paper and wood sticks in the eighth and ninth centuries, perhaps closer to the latter.

In *KT* 5 (1963) Bailey published about 760 texts of all kinds. Each item is given a signature, but no more information, even whether it is on paper or on wood, is supplied. Among the non-religious documents in *KT* 5 not mentioned above, a group of texts with the signature “Hardinge” (nos. 580–634, *KT* 5.271–291)²¹⁾ deserve attention, because some of them share personal and place names with the Hedin and IOL documents. As Appendix M to *Innermost Asia* (1052–1056) Stein gives a “Descriptive List of Antiques Brought from Khotan and Presented by H. I. Harding, Esq.” to the Indian Government’s Museum of Central Asian Antiquities, New Delhi. The list includes “wooden tablets with cursive Brāhmī script” (Har. 047–077). The information given in the list as to the signature of each tablet and the number of lines does not agree with the texts published in *KT* 5 as Hardinge 072–079, besides the difference in the spelling of the name “Hardinge”. Bailey refers to “Harding 028” of the list and plate LVI of *Innermost Asia* in *KT* 5.383. P. O. Skjærvø published in the article on “Kings of Khotan” (1991), 277–278 the text of Har. 061 (also called Or. 8211.1473²²⁾), which matches the description given in *Innermost Asia*. In the same article, p. 263, note 27, Skjærvø says that Hardinge 074.1 published in *KT* 5.274 is “currently preserved in a plastic envelope in a glass cupboard (#73) together with numerous other unpublished Khotanese and Sanskrit manuscript fragments”. It is hoped that the remaining Khotanese texts on the “Harding(e)” tablets will be published in Skjærvø’s forthcoming *Catalogue*.

3. The types of the documents

If we exclude scribal exercises, graffiti, syllabaries, etc., all the documents were made for some practical purposes. Since completely preserved documents are relatively few, it is not always possible to determine the purpose for which they were composed. Nevertheless, we can see the following types represented by a fairly large number of documents.

3.1 Orders (*parau*)

SI P 103.42²³) begins with: || *spāta ṣṣanīrakā tta parī* [SPACE] *gayseta sīḍakā vara u mūra-haṃgām vara* “General Ṣṣanīraka orders thus: —To Sīḍaka there in Gaysāta and the money-collectors there”, followed by the main text, and ends in *kaji māsti kṣemye haḍai tta parau tsve* “Kaji (= 2nd) month, 6th day, the order went out (to you)” with the SIGNUM (huaya 花押) of Ṣṣanīrakā. This formula is one of the most consistent. Sīḍaka here is a prominent person in the documents of the Petrovsky collection as the village head (*auva-haṃdasta*) of Gaysāta (傑謝 in Chinese documents). He is either addressed or referred to simply by name or with the title *auva-haṃdasta*, *spāta* and *auva-haṃdasta spāta* (once in Or. 6395.1.6 KT 5.3). When he is mentioned in a dated document with the title *auva-haṃdasta*, it is the 15th year (SI P 94.1), or the 16th year (SI P 103.49), or the 18th year (SI P 103.38) of the reign of the Khotanese king Viśa’ Vāhaṃ. When he is called *spāta*, it is in the 19th year (Or. 6396.2 KT 5.5), or the 20th year (SI M 52; 20th or 25th in Or. 6397.2 KT 5.5), or the 22nd year (SI P 103.31; Or. 6395.1 KT 5.3). It appears that he was promoted some time between the 18th and 19th year of the reign. Likewise in the Chinese document from Dandān-uiliq D.v.6 (Chavannes in Stein, *Ancient Khotan* 525–526) dated to the year 781 he appears as Liucheng Jixie baixing Silüe 六城傑謝百姓思略 “commoner Sīḍaka of Gaysāta in Six Towns”, while in Hoernle Chinese 3 (JASB 1901, Extra Number, plate iv; *Ancient Khotan* 525) dated to 786 as well as in ㄨx 18917 dated to 788 he is Jixie sabo Silüe 傑謝薩波斯略 “*spāta* Sīḍaka of Gaysāta”. Since the Khotanese king Viśa’ Vāhaṃ is plausibly identified with Weichi Yao 尉遲曜 in the Chinese sources who started his reign in 763/4²⁴), his 19th year would be 782/3. Thus the two groups of documents independently confirm the career of this official.

Shorter documents on wood sticks are mostly orders. Of the 45 documents on wood in the Hedin collection, 30 are orders (all except a few of the remaining 15 are too fragmentary to be fully legible).

3.2 Petitions (*haṣḍi*)

As *parau* “order” is a message from the superior to the subordinate, so is *haṣḍi* “petition” a message that goes in the other direction. A petition to the king of Khotan is preserved in Or. 11252.15 KT 2.21: *miḍā jasti vara tta haṣḍi yanāmam* [SPACE] *kṣvā auvā tsī[sī spāta su]dārrjām u kṣ(v)ā auvā bisā hārva u hamīḍa pa’kisina*

“To the Gracious God there we make a petition—*tsīšī* (= *cishi* 刺史) *spāta* Sudārrjām in ‘Six Villages’ and the rich and common people (*baixing* 百姓) together residing in ‘Six Villages’”. Hedin 3v is a similar petition. Hedin 7v is a petition to the head of a monastery from the resident monks.

Sometimes a petition is followed by an order which is a reply to it. Thus the first half of SI P 103.10 is a petition (*haṣḍi*) to the minister (*hiyaudi āmāca* “master minister”) to intercede with *spāta* Sīḍaka in behalf of one Lyūkhī (Liu Qing 劉慶?) C(h)emai. The second half is, by a different hand, an order (*parau*) from ṣṣau Ṣṣaṇīra to *spāta* Sīḍaka to act as requested. The first 7 lines Hedin 2 is likewise a petition of the widow of one Budasaṃga to the high official ṣṣau Śattum concerning her children who were taken away by the men who claimed to be creditors, and the next four lines (unfortunately fragmentary) are the order by this ṣṣau Śattum to return those children to their mother. So is Hedin 11, a petition from a man called Mulaki to the local official, *spāta* Sudārrjām, followed by an order in reply by the latter. Or. 11252.12 KT 2.20 has, in Bailey’s edition, a *parau* on the recto and a *haṣḍi* on the verso. This order is probably to be reversed as the *parau* is the reply to the *haṣḍi*.

3.3 Contracts

Contracts are represented first of all by the documents on “box-shaped” tablets (2.3 above), which is no doubt designed for the safe-keeping of important texts. Thus Or. 9268 I KT 2.13, translated in H. W. Bailey, *Saka Documents Text Volume [I]* (= SDTV), 7, is a contract of the payment for the use of irrigation water of Phamṇā by the people of Birgaṃdara. Or. 9268 II KT 2.14 (SDTV *ibid.*) is about the adoption of a boy in exchange with money. Urumqi 1 is likewise about the sale of a son. In the texts of IOL Wood 1.1 and 1.2 many difficulties remain (see Skjærvø’s translation in the article mentioned above). Both appear to be a record of transaction where the money for felt (*namatā*), corvée assignment (*kṣīrū kīra* “state work”), cattle (*stūra*), wheat (*ganam*), etc. are involved. SI P 103.17 is a contract of the sale of land, which shows clearly that land was privately owned (see Appendix).

These documents follow a special formula.²⁵⁾ Here Urumqi 1 after the reading of Skjærvø illustrates it:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <i>salī 4 māšta 2 haḍā 5</i> | Year 4, month 2 day 5 |
| <i>ṣa’ kṣuṇā miṣḍā gyasta</i> | the regnal year of the gracious lord |
| <i>hvanā rrāmḍā viśa’ sīhyi</i> | of Khotan, king Viśa’ Sīhya. |
| 2) <i>ṣā’ pāḍa tṭye pracaina cu ...</i> | This deed (is) for this reason that ... |
| 3) | [The main text] |
| 4) <i>tṭā vara byānā ya</i> | The following were witnesses: |
| 5) | [Name-list] |
| 6) <i>tṭī ra ṣā’ pāḍa prāmāna himi</i> | And this deed will then take effect |
| <i>khv-ī ṣau khamyikadattā pyaśdā</i> | when ṣau Khamyikadatta signs it. |
| 7) <i>aṣ-ī ra piḍem ka’rā khuradattā</i> | And I, Ka’ra Khuradatta wrote it |

naḍām khau śūrai salāna

from the dictation of the man Khau
Śūrai

In later documents on paper, for example in SI P 103.11 (with lost letters in []):

[hamā]rrīji 10 5mye haḍai

Hamārīji (3rd) month, 15th day

ṣi' pīḍakā tte [p]racaina cu

This document (is issued) for the
reason that ...

[ṣi' pīḍakā pramā] himi

This document will become authori-
tative

khu hā visarrjām u gūlai

when Visarrjām and Gūlai

hamguṣṭi vištārā

place (their) finger-seal.

Characteristic to these documents on paper are the names of the witnesses at the end (each name usually preceded by the word *bye* “witness”) and *hamguṣṭi* “finger-seal” (= *huazhi* 畫指) which is represented by three short vertical strokes dividing the syllables of the name; see KUMAMOTO, “*hagaiṣṭa”, in *Studies* II, 152–153. It is uncommon that the witness’s name is followed by his or her age; apart from the bilingual Chinese-Khotanese contract for the sale of a camel in *Äx* 18926+18928, only Hardinge 074.4 and 074.5 *KT* 5.274–275 (possibly also Hardinge 074.7, 075.8, *KT* 5.275, 277) show such practice.

3.4 Personal Letters

M.T. a. I, 0033 *KT* 2.71 (translated in Bailey, *SDTV* 73–74) is a letter of an official (*spāta*) called Īramañi to his wife asking her to take care of the day-to-day business of his farm while he is away. It begins with an inquiry of the health of their children and relatives. Similar private letters and fragments of such letters are found e.g. in M.T. a. vi, 0083 *KT* 2.216–217 (*SDTV* 82), M.T. a. vi, 0084 *KT* 2.217 (*SDTV* 90). Some documents exhibit formulae of greetings comparable to private letters, although from the content they may rather be classified as official letters. Thus SI P 94.18, 103.9, 103.35, 136.1 all begin with an inquiry (*pu'sū* “I ask”) of the health of the addressee. The expression *śamdā hambujsai hūñū* “bowing to the ground I speak” is frequent in such documents; see Or. 11344.12b1 *KT* 2.37, Balawaste 0154.1 *KT* 3.131, Iledong 026.a1 *KT* 3.134, Hedin 7v.2 *KT* 4.26, Or.6393.1.1 *KT* 5.1, M.T. 0468.a.1 *KT* 5.200, Kha.I.176.1b2 *KT* 5.190, M.T. 0468.a1 *KT* 5.200, M.T.a. iii 0080.1 *KT* 5.213, M.T. a. iv 00168.4 *KT* 5.214, and also M.T.a vi 0084.1 *KT* 5.217 above.

3.5 Economical documents

SI P 103.52 is a large document on paper of the size of 59.5cm x 15cm. It is part of a monastery account book with the purchase records in the years of Ācārya Puṇyasiddha (*āsrī puñasidā*) and Ācārya Abhayasiddha (*āsrī abayasidā*); see Emmerick, “A Khotanese monastic account book” (1996). A comparable and more extensive document in Chinese is represented in the four folios from Mazār-Tāgh, M.T. b. 009 published by Chavannes, *Les documents chinois* (1913), 205–216.²⁶⁾ Many other documents record the amount of payment following

personal names; see e.g. SI P 103.18. Among them are the records of tax payment in money (*mūra*) or cloth (*thauna*); see e.g. Hedin 19 translated in *KT* 4.119–120, SI P 103.19, 103.25. Most of these documents are unfortunately preserved in an incomplete form so that the exact circumstances under which they were written cannot be determined.

3.6 Name-lists

A number of documents, especially the majority in the groups of Or. 11252 and Or. 11344 (see 2.3 above), are name-lists. Many of them concern *spaśaṇa*, which Bailey interprets as “observation, guard duty” on etymological grounds (*KT* 4.79–80). They are no doubt records of the corvée assignment as a form of tax. In these lists the dates of dispatch are given, followed by the men’s names. When two or more men have the same name, the place name where they belong is added for distinction; thus in Hedin 6 we find *sudatti*, *pa’ sudatti*, *āskvī(ra) sudatti*. See also Or. 11252.10, 14, 22, 26, 27, Or. 11344.1, 3, 8, 13 *KT* 2.19–38. SI P 103.53 on wood is a list of the men for the maintenance work of irrigation (*ūci baštā tsīmdi* “go to dam the water”). Another document, SI P 103.36 is a list of the men who each contributed some money for the purpose of *sukavaṃdā*, a term which unfortunately cannot be interpreted so far.

4. The Chronology of the Documents

4.1 Kings of Khotan

Among the pre-tenth-century documents in Khotanese no official letter issued from a Khotanese king is found. All the names of the kings that we know of occur in the dating using the regnal year. Dealing with the names of the kings it is important to keep in mind that the same names were repeatedly used by different kings at different times, and that one of the most valuable sources, the “Prophecy of the Li Country” (*Li yul lun bstan pa*; translated by R. E. Emmerick, *Tibetan texts concerning Khotan*, 1967), does not necessarily give all the names of the kings, nor does it give those names which it mentions all in a chronological order, although it appears to cover a longer period and more generations of the Khotanese royal genealogy than the Chinese sources. Moreover, some of the earlier views based on insufficient information can now be considered dismissed. Thus the king Viśa’ Dharmā mentioned in the document on a wooden tablet Or. 9268 (see *SDTV* 7) cannot be the same as Viśa’ D(h)armā in the tenth century texts Ch. 1.0021a,a18, 20 (*KT* 2.54)²⁷ from Dunhuang. The date in the Chinese text of the bilingual Hedin 24 (interpreted by E. G. Pulleyblank in *KT* 4.136–138, 179–181) cannot be in the 54th year of the reign of a Khotanese king. As Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang (1988a), 70–72, point out, the facsimile shows “fourth year” or possibly “fourteenth year”, but not “fifty”. Another important point to which they drew attention is that this is essentially a Chinese document like others from Dandān-Uiliq dated to the second half of the eighth century. The Khotanese part

is merely an interlinear addition to the first half of it. It is not possible that the date is given in the regnal year of a Khotanese king; it must have been given in the Chinese era.

The names of the kings in the tenth century Khotanese documents from Dunhuang have been the subject of a number of studies. The results reached therein can now be seen in Skjærvø's article on "Kings of Khotan" (1991) 259–260.²⁸⁾ As pointed out by Skjærvø in this article (p. 260) the chronology of the pre-tenth-century Khotanese documents from the Khotan area were placed on a much firmer ground than before thanks to the identification by Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang of the official *spāta* *Siḍakā* of *Gaysāta*²⁹⁾ who flourished under the reign of the Khotanese king *Viśa' Vāhaṃ* with *Jiexie sabo Silüe* 傑謝薩波斯略 in a Chinese document from *Dandān Uiliq* dated to 786. Since the documents during the reign of this king in the 15th to the 22nd year (see 4.3 below) are known in which the same *Siḍakā* was active, Skjærvø (p. 264–265) was able to identify *Viśa' Vāhaṃ* with *Weichi Yao* 尉遲曜 in the Chinese sources.³⁰⁾ Skjærvø further points out that *Hardinge 074.4 KT 5.274* has the date not in the regnal year of a king but in the year of the crown prince (*salī 1 ṣi' kṣuṇṇā yauvarāyā gyastā* "Year 1. This is the regnal year of the divine Crown Prince"). Since it is known from the Chinese sources that in 756 *Weichi Sheng* 尉遲勝, the elder brother of *Weichi Yao*, left Khotan with 5,000 troops (most probably including the larger part of the Chinese garrison in Khotan) to support the emperor in the war against *An Lushan* 安祿山 entrusting the country in his absence to *Weichi Yao*, and that this latter was confirmed as king of Khotan during the *Guangde* 廣德 period (763–764) [this sequence of events and other possibilities of the year when his reign began are discussed in 4.3 below], at the recommendation of *Weichi Sheng*, who chose to remain in China and died there at 64 years of age in *Zhenyuan* 貞元 10th (794), there is a good chance that the document of *Hardinge 074.4* was written in 756. What is less certain would be the connection proposed by Skjærvø between this document and the document of *Or. 9268 1 KT 2.13*, which is dated to a year (the number lost) in the reign of *Viśa' Dharmā*, because it depends entirely on the identity of *ṣau Hvamḍū* in *Hardinge 074.4* (in the phrase *ṣau hvamḍū salya* "in the year of *ṣau Hvamḍū*") and *ṣau Hvimḍū* in *Or. 9268* (likewise in the phrase *ṣau hvimḍū salya*), although this name (with two forms within the possibility of spelling variety) is not found elsewhere. Nevertheless, if the identification is good, it follows that the Khotanese name of *Weichi Sheng* is *Viśa' Dharmā*. Since Skjærvø has shown that *Viśa' Dharmā* was immediately preceded by *Viśa' Sīhya*³¹⁾, this latter would be *Weichi Gui* 尉遲珪, the father and predecessor of *Weichi Sheng*.

Two documents, *Hardinge 073 11 1* and *Hardinge 073 11 2 KT 5.273*, probably copies of the same text³²⁾, are dated to the 14th year of the Khotanese king *Viśya Vikraṃ*. Skjærvø argues that, since the form *Viśya* is more archaic than *Viśa'*, he must have been the earliest of the known pre-tenth-century kings. Such an argument alone is hardly convincing, because the name *Viśya/Viśa' Sīhya* is

written in two ways, while we have practically only one instance of the name Viśya Vikram. On the other hand, J. E. Hill, “Notes on the dating of Khotanese History”, *IJ* 31/3 (1988) 181–182, argues that Vijaya Vikrama in the Tibetan “Prophecy” (No. 53 in the table of Emmerick, *Tibetan texts concerning Khotan*, 77) is to be identified with Fushe Jing 伏闍璫 in the Chinese sources because of his association with the Khotanese monk Devendraprajña. As Hill points out the narrative in the “Prophecy” (pp. 58–61) about Vijaya Saṅgrāma and Vijaya Vikrama³³⁾ and the information in the Chinese sources agree in essence that Vijaya Saṅgrāma, after fighting with the Tibetans, died in China and that Vijaya Vikrama returned to Khotan to assume the throne after a long stay in China with his father. Hill further assumes that the pious friend of Vijaya Vikrama, the Ārya Arhat Devendra, is no other than the famous Khotanese monk Devendraprajña (Tiyunpanro 堤雲般若 in Chinese) who died in China in 691/692 shortly after coming there according to Antonino Forte, “Le moine khotanais Devendraprajña”, *BEFEO* 66 (1979) 295. If this identification is good, Vijaya Saṅgrāma who died in China is not Weichi Sheng, who likewise came to China in 756 and did not return to Khotan (Pulleyblank *apud* Emmerick, *Tibetan texts*, 100), but Fushe Xiong 伏闍雄 who came to China in 674/675 and died in 692, when his son, Fushe Jing, was made king of Khotan. Based on Hill’s argument so far, Skjærvø proposes to identify Viśya Vikram of Hardinge 073 II with this Vijaya Vikrama (Fushe Ching). Since it is known that Fushe Ching was still active in 717³⁴⁾, it is possible that the 14th year in the dating of the Khotanese document, which would be 706, occurred in this king’s reign. The problem is rather that there might be many other Vijaya Vikramas, of whom we happen to have no information, before or even after this particular Vijaya Vikrama. In the Khotanese text of Hardinge 073 II two officials, spāta Pakaḍa³⁵⁾ of Phema and pharṣa Maharā, are mentioned, but these names are not found elsewhere. Another name there, Puṇadattā, is too common to help us specify the connection with other documents.

The last king known in the documents before the tenth century is Viśa’ Kīrtti. His name is used for dating in two documents from Mazār-Tāgh, M.T. b. ii, 0065 *KT* 2.72 (translated in *SDTV* 90–91) and M.T. c. 0018 *KT* 2.72 (*SDTV* 71). The first is a panegyric verses in which the Tibetan rule over Khotan is mentioned (“With the Tibetan overlords—*ttāguttayau hvāṣṭayau*—who watch over the Khotan land, (his) 16th regnal year has come”). The second is dated to the fourth year of his reign. See further 4.3 below.

4.2 Khotan under Chinese rule

From the end of the seventh to the middle of the eighth century Khotan was ruled by the Jiedufushi 節度副使 “Vice Governor” of the Anxi Protectorate. This post was occupied either by a Chinese general or by a Khotanese king as it is known that in 760 the Chinese court appointed Weichi Yao (= Viśa’ Vāham) to be Vice Governor. Two Chinese documents, Hedin 24 and M.T. c iii (dated to 786; see Chavannes, *Les documents chinois*, p. 217), were issued from the Vice Governor

whose name, in either case, appears to be Chinese.³⁶⁾ After the rebellion of An Lushan 安祿山 broke out in 755, the Tibetans under Khri srong lde btsan (r. 755–796) started to expand towards the east³⁷⁾ and by 763 captured the eastern part of the present-day Gansu, effectively isolating the Chinese garrisons in the Tarim Basin from the central government. From 763 until sometime around 790³⁸⁾ when Khotan was at last occupied by Tibet, the Chinese administration in Khotan continued as the documents bearing the dates in this period show.

The dated Chinese documents discovered from the Khotan area (Dandān-Uiliq, Domoko, Mazār-Tāgh) all fall into the period between An Lushan's rebellion (755) and the Tibetan occupation of Khotan (ca. 790) except two fragmentary documents dated to 747 and 748 (M.Tāgh 0129, 0103; Chen Guocan 501–502) and the monastery account book from Mazār-Tāgh if the date of 721 is correct. These texts, 16 altogether, are conveniently listed in Zhang and Rong (1988a) 75, to which D.vii, 4.d (S 6969) dated to 789 (Chavannes 1907, 531) may be added. The date of Kaiyuan 開元 18 (730) on the verso of Hedin 22 is to be excluded, because this date alone and nothing else is written on the blank side of paper which was apparently used as a scrap on which to write some Khotanese texts. The Russian materials which recently came to light belong to the same period. Thus, 𐰌𐰆 18920 is dated to Dali 大曆 14th (779), 𐰌𐰆 18916 to Dali 15th (=780 [Jianzhong 建中 1st]), 𐰌𐰆 18926+18928 to Dali 16th (= 781 [Jianzhong 2nd]), 𐰌𐰆 18919 to Dali 17th (=782 [Jianzhong 3rd]), 𐰌𐰆 18927 to Jianzhong 6th (= 785 [Zhenyuan 貞元 1st]), 𐰌𐰆 18917 to Zhenyuan 4th (= 788). 𐰌𐰆 18939 has the era Zhenyuan. It must belong to the period after the change of the era became known in Khotan, that is, 787 at the earliest.

An important document among them is 𐰌𐰆 18919 with the date of the intercalary 3rd month (大曆十七年閏三月廿九日). It proves clearly that the position of the intercalary month (after the 3rd) was different from that given in Chen Yuan's table (after the 1st month). It also establishes the correct reading of the date of D. vii, 4.a (S 5871) (Chavannes 1907, 530 with plate cxv) as 大曆十七年閏三月 as proposed by Fujieda, "The Tunhuang Calendar and its Peculiarities", (1973) 383, and suspected by Zhang and Rong (1988a) 76–77, and not 大曆十七年閏正月 in accordance with Chen Yuan (so Yamamoto and Ikeda (1987) 76 (145) and Chen Guocan (1995) 544). This confirmation opens up two possibilities: either the garrison in Khotan, and probably other garrisons of the Anxi Protectorate, was not informed of the correct position of the intercalary month, as it was also ignorant of the change of the era, or Chen Yuan's table itself is incorrect at this point. The garrison of Khotan learns of the change of the era later in that year (782) as we have a contract dated to Jianzhong 3rd, 7th month (D. vii, 2 = S 5871; Chavannes 527), but remains uninformed again of the era Zhenyuan even in its 3rd year (787).

This discovery has some consequences for the chronology of the Khotanese documents. Since the bilingual Hedin 24, which was clearly written under Chinese rule, has 閏四月四日 in the Chinese text and *še' semjsijsä 4mye hadai* "the second

Simjsimjsa (= 4th) month, 4th day” in the interlinear Khotanese, it has been assumed that the Khotanese used the Chinese calendar with the month’s name replaced by their own.³⁹⁾ This assumption has been proved to be correct since Hedin 15 and 16 have *skarhvārā* (= 11th month) for 十一月 and *rrāhaji* (= 12th month) for 十二月 with matching “day” in two versions and Dx 18926+18928 has 大曆十六年六月廿一日 glossed in interlinear Khotanese as *10 6mye salye rarūyā māsti 20 1mye hadai* “16th year, Rarūya (= 6th) month, 21st day”. Now this expression of intercalary month in Khotanese only occurs in Hedin 24 and Hedin 21 (*še’ simjsimjsa 28mye hadai* “the second Simjsimjsa month, 28th day”). From its content this Hedin 21 was clearly written in the Tibetan period, in the 32nd regnal year of an unnamed king. In either case it is now impossible to determine the exact year when these two documents were written by means of the position of the intercalary month in Chen Yuan’s table.⁴⁰⁾

The only indication of the beginning of the Tibetan occupation of Khotan is the absence of the use of the Chinese era, which is admittedly hardly decisive. Most of the Khotanese documents with the dates in the regnal year of Viśa’ Vāhaṃ may belong to the pre-Tibetan period, but the end of his reign may not have coincided with the beginning of the Tibetan rule (see further 4.3 below). The same is true of a number of documents associated with Siḍakā of Gaysāta (see 3.1 above). He may or may not have been active for some more years into the Tibetan period.

4.3 Khotan under Tibetan rule

Khotan had come under Tibetan rule in 670 and 676/677 according to the Chinese sources, but not for a prolonged period except from ca. 790 to some time after 840 when the Old Tibetan Empire began to disintegrate. Khotanese documents written during this period are recognized through a number of features. For example, the Tibetans (*ttāgutṭa*) are described to be ruling in M.T. b. ii, 0065 KT 2.72 (see 4.1 above). In a series of documents an official *bulunā* (= *blon*) *rmamā-śi’rā* (an unidentified Tibetan name) gives orders (Or. 11252.3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 29, Or. 11344.3, KT 2.15–35). They certainly belong to the Tibetan period (the mention of *ttāgutṭa hvāṣṭa* “Tibetan overlord” is found in Or. 11252.12a5, 18.a2 KT 2.20, 22). Another series of document, partly overlapping with the first, in which a Khotanese official *spāta Sudārrijām* gives orders to his subordinate *pharṣa Sāṃdarā* (Or. 11252.4, 6, 12, 16, 35, Or. 11344.3, 7, 11, 12 KT 2.16–37; Hedin 3, 20), also belong to the Tibetan period, since sometimes on a single sheet of paper his order is preceded or followed by the order of the Tibetan official mentioned above (Or. 11252.7, Or. 11344.3). The name of *pharṣa Sāṃdarā* also occurs in the Hedin Tibetan documents 1 and 3 as *par-śa Soṇ-hdar*; see Takeuchi (1994) 584, (1995) 174, 273. But the Chinese form *posha songta* 破沙宋闐 in Hedin 16.26 has the Khotanese counterpart *pharṣa sudarāna* and seems to be a different person; cf. Takeuchi (1994) 578, fn. 17, (1995) 171, fn. 15. In view of the form *spa sor-žon* added in Tibetan script in the Khotanese document Or.

11252.37v *KT* 2.28, the person *li sar-žon* in Hedin Tibetan 2 and 3 is no other than *spāta Sudārrjām* in the Khotanese texts; see Takeuchi (1994) 584, (1995) 188, 272.⁴¹⁾

A hitherto overlooked fact which could be significant for the chronology of the documents is that the four Chinese-Khotanese bilingual documents, Domoko C, D *KT* 2.63 and *SDTV* 123, Hedin 15, 16, also belong to the Tibetan period. These documents have been taken to belong to the pre-Tibetan period (Zhang and Rong 1988a, 77–78; Lin, *op. cit.* 102) because, apart from the use of the Chinese language, they follow the regular format of tax receipt in the Tang period (see **Appendix**). But a close look at the bilingual Chinese-Khotanese documents, excluding those on which unrelated texts are found in two languages, enables us to divide them into two groups. To the first group belong Hedin 24 and Dx 18926+18928. They are essentially Chinese documents, one is an official document of the Jiedufushi 節度副使 which is the highest official of Khotan (the king or the chief Chinese officer), while the other is a private contract. The Khotanese part is added later between lines apparently for the benefit of the party with limited or no knowledge of Chinese. In these documents the date is given in the Chinese era, which is translated into Khotanese (in Hedin 24 this part is missing in Khotanese). On the other hand, the second group comprises the four bilingual documents mentioned above. In these documents the Khotanese part is equally important to or more extensive than the Chinese part. The date there is indicated by the twelve year animal cycle in Chinese and by the regnal year of a Khotanese king in the Khotanese part (with the month and the day agreeing with each other). It has already been pointed out by Fujieda, “Tunhuang under Tibetan rule” (1961) 205, that the Dunhuang documents with the date only in the twelve year animal cycle can safely be classified as belonging to the Tibetan period, while it is impossible to assign to particular periods those with the date in the sexagesimal cycle. It is natural to suppose that the Chinese population in the garrisons of the Anxi Protectorate did not disappear when the Tibetans took over, especially so because the road to home was closed. The use of the Chinese language in the day-to-day business continued, but the dating in the Chinese era was of course impossible.⁴²⁾

Let us examine the dates of these documents. Hedin 16 has dates from 巳年十一月廿五日 [Snake Year, 11th month, 25th day] to 巳年十二月九日 [Snake Year, 12th month, 9th day] and in Khotanese accordingly from “35th regnal year, *skarhvārā* (= 11th) month, 25th day” to “35th regnal year, *rrāhaji* (= 12th) month, 9th day”. Hedin 15 has 巳年十二月廿一日 [Snake Year, 12th month, 21st day] and in Khotanese “35th regnal year, *rrāhaji* (= 12th) month, 21st day”. Domoko C and D have Chinese dates only, 巳年十二月廿二日 [Snake year, 12th month, 22nd day] and 午年三月六日 [Horse year, 3rd month, 6th day]. Hedin Tibetan 1 has “Snake Year, Summer”, and Hedin Tibetan 3 “Snake Year, Autumn”, while in Hedin Tibetan 2 only “Winter” remains. All these documents are obviously related as indicated above. Takeuchi tried to estimate the dates of

these documents as follows: “the date of the Chinese-Khotanese bilingual texts may be ascribed to 789, the last snake year before 790, and the date of the Hedin Tibetan contracts may be ascribed to 801 (/813), the first (or the second) snake year after 790”. Now it is unnecessary to separate them by one (or more) cycle(s) of twelve years. They were all written in the Tibetan period.

Then, who was the Khotanese king whose 35th regnal year is the Snake year? Can he be Viśa’ Vāhaṃ (Weichi Yao) or is he one of his successors? Different years have been proposed for the ascension to the throne of Weichi Yao. It could have been 756, if the count starts when his elder brother, Weichi Sheng, left the country entrusting it to Yao in order to defend the Chinese capital (Zhang and Rong 1988a, 77–78).⁴³⁾ In this case his 35th year would be 790, a Horse year, which is still before the Tibetan occupation as we have a few Chinese documents with the date of Zhenyuan 6th year. The existence of a Khotanese document having the date “in the first regnal year of *yauvarāyā*” (see 4.1 above), if it indeed refers to the earliest year of Weichi Yao, also speaks against this alternative. His reign may have started in 760 (Ganyuan 乾元 3rd), when Weichi Yao was appointed jiedufushi 節度副使, which is the highest position in Khotan in terms of the Chinese bureaucracy. But the appointment was provisional (權知本國事) because the king was still living elsewhere. In this case his 35th year would be 794, a Dog Year. And finally it may be 763/764 (see 4.1 above), if the passage on his appointment as king in the Biography of Weichi Sheng in the *Xin Tangshu* could be taken that way. Strictly speaking other possibilities cannot be excluded. The next date mentioned there being Xingyuan 興元 (784), the appointment could have occurred anytime between 763/764 and 784. But the existence of the sabo Silüe documents (see 3.1 above) suggests that his reign started in the 760’s. In this case his 35th year would be 797/798, which is a(n) Ox/Tiger Year. Thus none of these years can satisfy the requirement of the 35th year being the Snake year.⁴⁴⁾

On the other hand, the latest year in the reign of Viśa’ Vāhaṃ attested among the Khotanese documents is the 20th (Or. 6397.1 = Hoernle 7 KT 2.66).⁴⁵⁾ but some documents with the personal names of those who were active under Viśa’ Vāhaṃ have the date of the 22nd year without naming the king (Or. 6395.1 KT 5.3, SI P 103.31). Moreover, the traveling monk Wukong confirms that Weichi Yao was still reigning in 788; see Lévi et Chavannes, “L’itinéraire d’Ou-K’ong” (1895), 363. Therefore, if we seek another king whose 35th regnal year was a Snake Year, the year could be no earlier than 825 (837, near the end of the Tibetan period, is a possibility), the beginning of his reign being 791. This king is likely to be Viśa’ Kīrtā of the Khotanese documents (see 4.1 above). A large number of Khotanese documents written in the Tibetan period dated to the 32nd to 35th year but without the name of the king can all be assigned to the years from 822 to 825.⁴⁶⁾

5. The problems of “Six Villages”

The term *liucheng* 六城 “Six Towns” attracted attention of scholars when E. Chavannes published a series of Chinese documents from Dandān Uiliq as Appendix A to Aurel Stein’s *Ancient Khotan* (1907). These eighteen documents, including three which had been published earlier without detailed interpretation by Hoernle (1901), are dated to the years between 768 and 790 and concern transactions of the local administration, financial records of a monastery called *huguosi* 護國寺, and some private contracts.

Already during the first expedition Stein was informed by Macartney and his Chinese associate that “the term ‘Six Cities’ is still well known by Chinese officials in the ‘New Dominion’ (*i.e.* Xinjiang) as an old designation of the Khotan territory” (*Ancient Khotan* 267–268). According to this “knowledge” the “Six Cities” of Khotan covers the whole area between the (modern) city of Khotan and Keriya, possibly including Niya, but it is not always clear what each constituent of the six was. Chavannes’s note in *Ancient Khotan*, 522, is based on these lines of arguments and lists five garrisons (*zhen* 鎮) to the east, south and west of Khotan from the Book of Administrative Geography in the *Xin Tangshu*, which, together with the main city of Khotan, would constitute a body of six.⁴⁷⁾

However, when the Khotanese documents from the Domoko oasis became available, and the comparable term *ksvā auvā* “Six Villages (in the loc.pl.)” was found as the counterpart of the Chinese *liucheng*⁴⁸⁾, it was evident that the term represents only a relatively small district within the kingdom of Khotan. G. Haloun, in a note to the Chinese text of Hedin 15 and 16 (*KT* 4.176), pointed out that “its administrative head being addressed as *cishi* 刺史 ‘magistrate’ proves ‘Six Towns’ to have been no larger unit than a *zhou* 州 ‘district’, undoubtedly one of the ten into which the country of Khotan, officially ‘Government General of Pisha’ 毗沙都督府, was divided by the Chinese in 675”.

In the article of 1988b, Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang proposed to identify all the six cities/villages as follows: 1) *Cira* (Khot.)/*Zuilo* 質邏/*Jila* (Tib.), 2) *Phema* (Khot.)/*Pimo* 媲摩 also translated as *Kancheng* 坎城/*Kam-šeñ* (Tib.), 3) *Phamña* (Khot.)/*Fanye* 潘野/*Phoña* (Tib.), 4) *Birgaṃdara* (Khot.), *Be-rga-hdra* (Tib.), 5) *Āskvīra* (Khot.)/*Osku* (written also as *Orgu*) (Tib.), 6) *Gayseta* (Khot.)/*Lixie* (?) 傑謝.⁴⁹⁾ They have not shown why these particular names are taken. Presumably these place names are taken from the passage in the “Prophecy” (p. 73f. of the translation), which says: “Down to Kam-šeñ and Pho-ña and Be-rga-hdra and ‘O-rgu from Ji-la”, with the addition of Gaysāta = Jiexie.

In 1994, Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya proposed a totally different solution. According to her, *Cira* is not the name of a village, but the name of an oasis or a region (p. 400), and *Phema*, always referred to as “city” (*kaṃṭha*), could not be one of the six “villages” (p. 399). Not only these two are not part of “Six Villages”, but also *Birgaṃdara*, *Āskūra*, and *Gaysāta* were each independent administrative

units from “Six Villages” (p. 405–406), although they were all located in the same neighborhood. Moreover, she claims to have successfully identified all the “Six Villages” merely by examining the contexts of Khotanese documents; namely, they are: 1) *Phaṃnā*, 2) *Tcina*, 3) *Pa’*, 4) *Viṃgūla*, 5) *Jīvvā*, 6) *Ysāḍa*. The same conclusion is presented in the “Introduction”, p. 12, of *Saka Documents Text Volume III* as something already established. Since this volume is far more widely accessible than the previous article in Russian, this conclusion might be accepted among non-specialists of Khotanese without its arguments being closely examined. It seems to be appropriate therefore to see how she reached that conclusion.

It is unfortunate that this somewhat surprising solution to the long-standing mystery of the names of “Six Villages” cannot stand up to scrutiny, mainly because the arguments presented there are characterized by total ignorance of the important Chinese evidence as well as not too careful handling of the Khotanese texts. In what follows it will be shown how her conclusion is untenable, and whether any alternatives are possible.

On the name of *Cira*⁵⁰, her argument goes as follows (p. 400; here and below the translation and additions within square brackets are mine):

There are a number of contexts where *Cira* is mentioned independently without combination with other toponyms. Since an assumption was stated by the [two] Chinese scholars [Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang] that *Cira* is the name of one of the “Six Villages”, we shall analyze these contexts. In the Hedin collection there are two such contexts: 1) Hedin 16.1 *KT* 4.30 *Cirāṃ Naṃdaka* [recte *Naṃdakā*] “*Naṃdaka* from *Cira*”, 2) Hedin 19.3 [recte 19.11] *KT* 4.33 *Cira Haskadarmā* “*Haskadarmi* from *Cira*”. In both cases *Cira* is combined with the proper names of the men who are also mentioned in other documents, by means of which their residence can be defined more precisely. Thus, in the document Or. 11252.2.15 *KT* 2.15 the same *Naṃdaka* is found (this can be confirmed by prosopography), and his residence is called the district of the village *Birgaṃdara* with the name *Mattiškā*; this is repeatedly mentioned in the documents of Or. 11252.6 and Or. 11344.8. *Haskadarmi* lived in the village *Viṃgūla* according to the document Or. 11252.2.7 *KT* 2.15. In this way, in both cases *Cira* appears not as the name of a village, but as the name of an oasis or a region. In the document Or. 11344.8 (a3, 4; b4) *KT* 2.35-36, a voucher about various kinds of labor, *Cira* is mentioned three times, and all three appear to be likewise a designation of an oasis or a region.

However, when the same personal name is associated with two (or more) different place names, the first possibility that comes to mind is that those place names are used to distinguish different individuals with the same name but from different places. Thus *āskūrī altām* “*Altām* of *Āskūra*” (Hedin 10.2) as against *gaysātaḥ alttūṃ* “*Altām* of *Gaysāta*” (SI M 53.1); *cirāṃ īrvadattī* “*Īrvadattā* of *Cira*” (Or. 11344.1.8

KT 2.30) as against *khara ĩrvadatti* “Īrvadattā of Khara” (*id.* 2–3), and numerous other examples. It is possible that one place name represents a subdivision of another; e.g. *birgaṃḍara mattiškāña vidarrjām* “Vidarrjām of Mattiška of Birgaṃḍara” (Or. 11252.24.1 KT 2.24), or *āskvīra gūmaji vidyade* (*id.* 2 *ibid.*) “Vidyade of Gūma of Āskūra”. Otherwise, the identity of the person in question has to be independently proven in order for one place name associated with the same personal name to represent a larger unit and for another place name part of that. Whether this Naṃḍakā, or Haskadarmā, in two texts each refers to one and the same person is open to question.⁵¹⁾

On p. 404–405 Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya adduces the contexts based on which she claims to have identified all the six village names (words within round brackets are original additions):

Two villages are named in the document Hedin 16.6 KT 4.30. *kṣvā auvā Phaṃnā* [recte *phaṃña*] *Suhadatti u Kharamurrai Tcinaji thau hauḍāṃde 40 6 chā* “Suhadatti from (the village of) Phaṃnā, (which is) in ‘Six Villages’, and Kharamurrai from the village Tcina gave 46 *chā* of cloth”. Tcina is also mentioned in the document Hedin 24b.2 (in the form *Tcina*). As regards Phaṃnā, it is often mentioned not only in Khotanese documents but also in Chinese and Tibetan [documents]; all the researchers report on this, among whom are Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang. In immediate proximity from Phaṃnā, in all probability, the small village Pa’ was located. We turn once more to the document Hedin 13 KT 4.29. It is said in it: “The 35th year of the reign. Working men in ‘Six Villages’ of Cira, 44. To each man comes (the tax) in the piece of woolen cloth in 23 feet (long). In accordance with the number of men it adds up in all to 25 pieces in 12 feet”, and further the allocation of these pieces among the taxpayers is quoted: (line 10) *Phaṃnājā u Pa’jā paṃjyi thaunakā mūri himārā 10 4 ysā’ ca drraise 10* “For (the men) living in Phaṃnā and Pa’, in 5 pieces of cloth, (in money) 14,310 *mūra*”. In this way Phaṃnā and Pa’ together paid one fifth portion of the total sum of the tax being due to “Six Villages” in cloth. The village Pa’ is repeatedly mentioned in the documents in the S. Hedin collection.

We find three more names of the villages in the document Or. 11252.2 KT 2.15–16: “The merciful, divine [one] (issues) the order. *Piškala* of ‘Six Villages’ (of the oasis) Cira. In this year the number of taxpayers in grain is 53 in all. He ordered each man to pay tax in Chinese measure *ṣaṃga*, (equal to) 7 Tibetan [measure], (in all) in 11 *kusa* and 9 *ṣaṃga*”. And further the allocation of tax goes among the independent taxpayers: 7 men give only millet, among them the following men are indicated (lines 7–8): *Viṃgūlaña Haskadarmā 29. Jīvā Khaṣṭarām ... Ysāḍāña Hvrrīvidtā pūrā Vismadatta 18* [the misprints in the text quoted by V.-D. are corrected according to KT 2] “Haskadarmi from (the village) Viṃgūla—29 (*kūsa*). Khaṣṭarām in (the village) Jīvva ... Vismadatti, son of Hvrrīvidti from (the village) Ysāḍa—18

(*kūsa*) ...”. From the three names of the villages, Viṃḡūla, Jīvva and Ysāḡa we have managed to find in other documents only Viṃḡūla—in the form of *Vemḡulām* in the document Or. 6393.2 *KT* 5.2, No. 3, line 2, which is dated in the reign of Viśa’ Vāhaṃ and is dedicated to the purchase by Siḡaki of land from a certain Braṃḡā from the village *Vemḡulām*.

First, let us consider the last three names. Here a passage from Or. 11252.2 *KT* 2.15 is quoted on the basis of the translation given by Bailey, *SDTV* 34–35. This document, comparatively well preserved but not complete (facsimile in *SD I*, plate xiv), is a record of tax receipt concerning three kinds of grain (*jsāra*; i.e. *rusa* “barley”, *ganam* “wheat”, *gau’sā* “millet”). Names of individuals are listed along with the amount he has paid. From the facsimile it appears that the extant document is divided into five sections. The first three sections, lines 1–4, 5–8, and 9–12 are each marked by two short parallel strokes at the end (cf. *SI P* 99.5 in *SDTV III*, 120). Between sections 4 (lines 13–16) and 5 (lines 17–20) there is a space of about one line. In section 1 it is declared that this is the king’s order for this year for grain-giving men (*jsāra-haurā hvamḡdā*), i.e. the taxpayers in grain, of *cira kṣvā auvā* (literally “Cira among ‘Six Villages’”).⁵²⁾ In section 2 these three names in question occur⁵³⁾ following another, one Visarjām, but the ms breaks off just before his name and there is no way to know whether his name was also preceded by an adjective of origin. In section 3 another name, Sividattā, occurs and a passage follows about the calculation of the accumulated grain. In sections 4 and 5 more names, some preceded by an adjective of origin, are listed. Thus, Ṣanīrakā of Mattiśka in Birḡamḡdara, Hunakā of Dumesala, Īrasamḡā of Suhīka, Virḡam of Spa, Naṃḡdakā of Mattiśka, Ṣanīrā of Bikina, Sīlām of Spa in Khau, Kharamurrai of Buttaka, and many others without place name. It is clear that when one considers the document, though incomplete, as a whole, it is not possible to separate the three names, Viṃḡūla, Jīvva and Ysāḡa, in an arbitrary way ignoring all others.⁵⁴⁾

Hedin 13 is a record of tax collection in cloth. Bailey’s translation makes it sound as if the individuals listed there are each entitled to certain length of cloth, but such a situation hardly makes sense under the circumstances of these documents. It must be talking about how much each person has to pay or has paid. This document also begins with *cira kṣvā auvā*, and in lines 9 and 10 three other place names occur: (9) *āskvīra paṃji hvamḡdā thaunakā nva mūri himārā 8 ysārā dvī 10 8 hā drai tsuna thau va*—(10) *phaṃnājā u pa’jā paṃji [hvamḡdā] thaunakā nva mūri himārā 10 4 ysā’ca drrai-se 10*—. The perfectly parallel syntax suggests that in line 10 *hvamḡdā* “men” is to be supplied. Thus “(9) In Āskūra, for five men the cloth (to be paid as tax) amounts to 8,200 mūra in money, for the cloth of 18 *chā 3 tsuna*. (10) For the five [men] of Phaṃnā and Pa’, the cloth (to be paid as tax) amounts to 14 thousand 310 mūra in money”. From this context it is clearly impossible to take Phaṃnā and Pa’ specially but not Āskūra as part of “Six Villages”.

In the passage quoted above, Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya lists from Hedin 16

the form *Phamṇā* as the name of a village. However such a form has never been attested. It always occurs in the adjective form *phamṇāja*.⁵⁵⁾ She also claims that “it is often mentioned not only in Khotanese documents but also in Chinese and Tibetan”. This is simply not true. The Chinese form *fanye* 潘野 is found only once here in the bilingual Hedin 16 together with the Khotanese *phamṇā* and the Tibetan form *phañā/phoñā* is so far noticed only in the “Prophecy” (p. 73 of the translation as referred to above). Apart from Hedin 16.6 (*kṣvā auvā phamṇā suhadatti*) the Khotanese form *phamṇā* is found only in Or. 11252.2.19 KT 2.15 (*phamṇā spāñi sivi[da]ttā*). We shall come back to this problem below.

On the problem of “Six Villages/Towns” no serious study is possible without considering the important Chinese materials, which recently redoubled with the inclusion of the documents from St. Petersburg. Among them the most important is Hoernle Chinese 1 (Chavannes No. 1 = 1907, 523) dated to Dali 3rd year (768) which was the subject of the detailed study of Zhang and Rong (1988b). In this document it is reported that the inhabitants of Gaysāta (Jiexie 傑謝) had to leave the village because of the damages inflicted upon them by brigandage. In reply to their request for the grace in regard to tax payment and corvée labor, the Prefect of “Liucheng Zhiluo” 六城質邏, the *āmāca* (minister) Weich Xin 尉遲信 gives the authorization. This document clearly shows that Gaysāta and Liucheng were two separate locations, and that the Prefect of “Liucheng Zhiluo” has the authority over the people of Gaysāta.⁵⁶⁾ ARAKAWA Masaharu kindly informed me (letter of Sept. 11, 1996) that the title Liucheng Zhiluo Cishi 六城質邏刺史 is from the syntax of Chinese best interpreted as Cishi who governs two prefectures at the same time, Liucheng-zhou 六城州 and Zhiluo-zhou 質邏州 (neither of them is actually attested as such). In this case Liucheng and Zhiluo would be at the equal level in the administrative organization of Khotan. He also refers to the phrase in which the two names occur in the reverse order, 質邏六城百姓等 “common people in Zhiluo-Liucheng” in Dx 18940 (without date) as the proof that Zhiluo was not subordinate to Liucheng. However, other instances of a place name following Liucheng tend to indicate that that place is part of Liucheng. Another document D.vii. 2 (Chavannes No. 4 = 1907, 526) has the phrase 六城傑謝百姓思略 where 傑謝 appears to be part of 六城 (Jiexie of Liucheng) as previously assumed. Hedin 16 has 六城潘野 with *kṣvā auvā phamṇā* as mentioned above. Here again *Phamṇā* appears to be part of “Six Villages/Towns”. Hedin 15 has 六城勿薩踵 for the Khotanese *Cira Visarjām*,⁵⁷⁾ which, taken at face value, equates Liucheng with Cira. In addition to the cases listed above, 六城 in Chinese occurs four times in Hedin 16 and twice in Domoko C and D (all from the Tibetan period) always with *kṣvā auvā* in Khotanese.

Among the place names listed in the passage referred to above of the “Prophecy” (p. 73–75) all except *Phamṇā* (the variant form; *Phoñā* in the edition), namely, *Kamṣeñ* in the Khotanese form of Phema, Birgaṃdara, Āskūra and Cira are found many times in the Khotanese documents. *Phamṇā*, on the other hand, occurring only twice (Hedin 16 and Or. 11252.2) in the documents of the same

period, may not be connected for the phonetic difficulties with the adjective of origin *phaṃnāja* which is found about 30 times. Still the agreement of this *phaṃña* with the Tibetan form *phaña* in the “Prophecy” (the Chinese form *fanye* in Hedin 16 is simply a transcription of Khotanese) guarantees the existence of the place name.⁵⁸⁾

“Six Villages” in Khotanese occurs 26 times. The great majority of them are in the locative plural *kṣvā auvā*, but the forms *kṣa auve* in Hedin 64.a1 (nom. pl.) and *kṣyau auyau* in Hedin 8.4 (abl. pl.) show that the term has not lost its inflection like most place names (e.g. *Cira* is indeclinable). Among these cases it occurs 6 times with *Cira* in the phrase *cira kṣvā auvā* (Or. 11252.2.1, 30.1, Or. 11344.4.1, Hedin 13.1, 21.1, SI P 136.1.3). If the locative case still retains its meaning, it is difficult to take it as anything other than “*Cira* among Six Villages”. This word order is in accordance with 質邏六城 in ㄈx 18940 mentioned above, which may therefore be influenced by the underlying Khotanese phrase.

Thus we are confronted by the mutually conflicting pieces of evidence. A possible solution would be to assume the existence of two uses of the term *Liucheng/kṣvā auvā*. One would stand for the Prefecture (zhou 州) as a whole and the other for the capital, or the administrative center of the Prefecture. The question as to which towns were included in the Prefecture need not be equated with another question, namely what six towns/villages constituted *Liucheng/kṣvā auvā*. Trying to identify the original components of such an old name as *Penjikent* or *Bišbaliq* seems to be a futile attempt. It must be pointed out here that the term *au* “village” (in Late Khotanese) is never used either in conjunction with one of the place names such as *Birgamdara*, *Āskūra*, *Gaysāta* as well as those which *Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya* considers to be “villages”, or in referring to any of them, although the collective term “Six Villages” is frequently used. This may indicate that the term no longer stands for the actual collection of six communities at the time of our documents.

Another aspect which deserves attention of *Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya*’s work on “Six Villages” is her attempt to define the size and the social structure of those communities. On these problems her argument goes as follows: (p. 401–402)

Three documents allow us to show the size of the district of “Six Villages” rather precisely. It is the document Hedin 18, dated to the 33rd year of the reign, that should be named the first in time and in significance. In it the social structure and the number of the resident people are cited. Not all the terms in the document are clear, so H. W. Bailey, whose interpretation we make use of, has left something without translation. The document says: “In accordance with the register the number of men (the taxpayers) is 52. (Beside that) [the number] of workers (assigned) to the king’s court is 15. (Men) *paśāta* [is] 18, they belong to the divine *cām-ṣṣī* and to the divine prince. His own *paśāta* is 10. Men *paśāta* belonging to the official *haubaraa* and the two ministers *āmāca* is 13. Men (in “Six Villages”) in all are 100 and 8. In “Six

Villages” [there are] six *stānaḍa* officials”.

The documents Hedin 1.1 *KT* 4.21 and Hedin 13.1 *KT* 4.29, dated to the 35th year of the reign, indicate the number of the men-workers paying tax [to be] 44. By taxpayers one should understand householders, managing his own household and growing grain, since various kinds of grain and textile were two main necessities of taxes. Upon their shoulders lay also the expenses for the social needs. Thus, in the document Hedin 18 cited above, an order is contained of *ṣṣau Cviṃdū* to all the inhabitants of “Six Villages” to buy together one camel for the watch service. In the document Hedin 8 *KT* 4.26 an order is contained, without date and address, to acquire jointly with the inhabitants of “Six Villages” one horse for the guarding of the crop, in such a way that it was done formerly.

From the documents cited [above] it is clearly seen that “Six Villages” present themselves as not a big administrative unit, —*pīṣkala*, to the make-up of which, on average, about 50 households entered. The “Six Villages”, from 5 to 10 households each, were joined evidently for the convenience of administration and tax collection. It is possible to suppose that these households were closely adjacent to one another, and were bound by the common irrigational structure, on which we shall speak below.

Hedin 18 is, like many other similar documents, a difficult text in that it is not clear for what purpose and under what circumstance it was written. It is not possible, for example, to interpret confidently the key term *pravānai*, which, considering the connection with Niya Prākṛit *pravamṇaḡa*, may well be a sort of “register, account” (*KT* 4.70 *ad* Hedin 3.14 *pravānāja*).⁵⁹ But what sort of “register, account” would that be? There is no evidence that it could refer to the household register which theoretically covers all the tax-paying households in a given community (see **Appendix**). Since the document does not even mention any of the three standard forms of tax, namely grain/money, cloth and labor, it is not possible to take *hvaṃḍi* “men” here as “(all the) taxpayers (in the community)”. In the last line of Hedin 18 what Bailey read as the numeral 8 and appended a note “suprascript *au* over 8” must be the right-hand part of a *SIGNUM* (*huaya*) as the same sign occurs again at the end of the line. The document appears to have been broken off there without being completed. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya takes the term *stānaḍa* just before the end to mean the local nobility as opposed to the ordinary people (p. 402):

Based on the context of the document Hedin 18 cited above, by *stānaḍa* one must understand local nobility. They are contrasted with the ordinary householders; see e.g. the document Hedin 21.1–2 *KT* 4.34, which is addressed to *Cira kṣvā auvā stānaḍām vara u pa’kisanām vara* “to the *stānaḍa* officials of “Six Villages” in the district of Cira, and also to the farmers—all (the residents)”. According to the document Hedin 13.4, the *tsīṣi* themselves,

merchants and rich men ought to be counted into the category of *stānaḍa*. Their names are listed, together with that portion of the tax which was paid, in the lower part of the scroll, in the opposite direction to the rest of the text: 1) *tsīṣī* official *spāta* *Sudārrjām*; 2) *spāta* *Yaṃniviḍti*; 3) *pharṣa* (“judge”) *Sāmadi*; 4) *Ṣanīraki*; 5) *Budarma*; 6) *Sakām*. These same people are listed in the document Hedin 1.4–6, only instead of *Sakām* the necessary amount of cloth was handed over, in accordance with the voucher, to *Hvīviṭi* and *Visarrjām* together.

She is here probably misguided by Bailey’s translation “an official” in *KT* 4.119. From the context of Or. 8212.162.62 *KT* 2.4 *stānaḍa prraumūha ttravīlā u dvīlā* “*Stānaḍas*, *Pramukhas*, *Tripiṭakas* and *Dvipiṭakas*” quoted by Bailey, it is clear that a *stānaḍa* must refer to a kind of the priestly rank. The personal name *sakām* in the above passage is to be read as *sa[r]kām* as the name *sarkām* is attested ten times elsewhere.

All the information gleaned from this and other extant Khotanese documents on the social structure of Khotan is unfortunately so fragmentary and so full of uncertainties that it does not allow us to draw any decisive conclusions as was done by Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya. For example, we do not know the proportion of independent, land-owning farmers in the Khotanese society. The existence of the tenant system is quite likely in view of the situation in Turfan (see **Appendix**), and some contracts concerning the sale of person may even suggest the existence of a degree of serfdom or slavery (see 3.3 above). From all this it is clear that, even if we had a complete list of the taxpayers in a community, there is no way that the number of the taxpayers directly reflects the size of the community. It seems therefore that Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya’s bold attempt to define the size and social structure of “Six Villages” solely on the basis of the contexts of the extant Khotanese documents was destined for failure. She may have been led astray by the notion that, if there is a name “Six Villages”, there ought to be six “villages” and that they ought not to have so many households to be called “villages”. Nevertheless her study deserves close attention and careful reading as the first of this kind, which has brought to light a number of potentially important points from the Khotanese documents of the eighth and ninth centuries.

6. **Appendix** by SAITÔ Tatuya

(a) Two Types of the Social Systems in the Oases of East Turkestan

Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya mentions the differences and characteristics of social systems of the East Turkestan Oasis area in “The Leningrad collection of the Sakish business documents and the problem of the investigation of Central Asian texts” (1992).⁶⁰⁾ Although her article has valuable points which should be emphasized, I noticed certain questionable passages which will be analyzed in

what follows.

Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in her above mentioned article, pages 93–94, mentions that there were two types of social systems in the East Turkestan Oases, that is, one being the Chinese type and the other the Khotan-Kroraina type. To summarize her analysis, the characteristics of the two types are as follows. The Chinese type is characterized by the following three points: 1) there are lists of homesteads enumerating all the members of a family; 2) the allotment of land to each household under *juntianzhi* 均田制, whereby the land was measured by a unit of area called *mu* 畝; and 3) the taxes were levied on each single farm (household) and the tax quota for each resident was determined through the above list. On the contrary, in the second, Khotan-Kroraina type: 1) there were no lists of homesteads enumerating all the members of a family; 2) there is no description of the allotments of land to each household among the documents from the Southern Oases (such as Khotan and Kroraina), the land being measured by the quantity of seeds with which to sow it; and 3) the taxes were levied on the entire local community and the sum total of taxes on it alone was determined.

The problem in her discussion of the social systems is that she does not make it clear as to which particular period her analysis is being focused on. (Probably her discussion is limited to the first millennium C. E.). It is difficult to find, among the oases of East Turkestan, any region which possessed all the characteristics of either of the two types over a period of time. And probably presentation of a simple and clear-cut explanation for the land and tax system in Khotan and Turfan is virtually impossible.

For this problem first let us consider the case of Khotan. Numerous Chinese documents as well as some written both in Chinese and Khotanese belonging to the mid-eighth and early ninth centuries have been unearthed from the vicinity of Khotan. Hedin 15, Hedin 16, Domoko C and Domoko D are some of those bilingual documents.⁶¹⁾ Of these documents, the Chinese part is written in the format known as *lingchao wenshu* 領抄文書 from the Tang Dynasty which are tax receipts.⁶²⁾ The *lingchao wenshu* records each taxpayer's name together with the kind of tax, the amount and the date of payment, and it contains in its last part a signature of the official who had received the payment. One learns from this kind of documents that the administration, in other words the tax official in charge, was able to identify the name of the individual taxpayer and the amount of his payment. Also from such documents, an example of taxation on individuals and tax-quota for each can be seen. Therefore we cannot simply apply the third characteristic of the "Khotan-Kroraina type" above to the case of Khotan without regard to the difference of time. A similar method of taxation and documentation had been used in eighth century Turfan.⁶³⁾ Thus it can be said that Khotan adopted at least some part of the Chinese system to be employed by the local administration even at the lower level. From the mid-seventh century, Khotan was subject to Tang (initially it was intermittently), and later Tang's defense forces were stationed in Khotan. The Chinese system of local administration had

probably been introduced in Khotan under such Chinese influence and continued to function even after the late eighth century when the political circumstances had changed. In order to analyze the taxation system in Khotan, we must take into account the existence of this Chinese system.

Our next concern is the case of Turfan. When we analyze the land policy of the Turfan Basin during the seventh and eighth centuries, the existence and manner of enforcement of the *juntianzhi* 均田制 (equal land allocation system) become the most important factors. *Juntianzhi* was enforced after the Tang conquest of the Turfan Basin in 640. But as to the Gaochangguo 高昌國⁶⁴⁾ era (498-640 C. E.) before that, many studies of extant Turfan documents show that *juntianzhi* was never enforced in the Turfan Basin. During this period, sale and purchase of land were conducted there, but theoretically they were not approved under *juntianzhi*. Thus, we find that land allocation according to *juntianzhi* was not a permanent system of land use in Turfan throughout the successive periods. Then, as for the land allotment the second characteristic of the "Turfan type" above cannot be applied to the Turfan society when we consider the Gaochangguo period.

According to the Tang Dynasty *juntianzhi* regulations, male adults were generally allotted 20 mu of *yongyetian* 永業田 (inheritable land) or perpetual private ownership of property, and 80 mu of *koufentian* 口分田 (personal share land) from the state. Studies of Turfan documents show that, after the Tang conquest, distribution and expropriation of arable land was conducted according to *juntianzhi* in Turfan. But, at the same time, it is sure that each male adult in Turfan in fact only received about 10 mu of arable land and that the land distributed in the Turfan Basin was characterized either as *changtian* 常田 (fertile land) or *butian* 部田 (non-fertile land), the terms which are not commonly used in the *juntianzhi* regulations. From these facts, we know that *juntianzhi* was enforced only in irregular formats in this area.⁶⁵⁾

Theoretically, *juntianzhi* supposes that the owner of arable land farms the plot himself, but in the Turfan Basin tenancy and lease of land were very common. According to the studies of *zudianqi* 租佃契 (tenancy contract) of the sixth to eighth centuries from the Turfan region, this trend had existed from the Gaochangguo period and no change can be seen later even after *juntianzhi* was enforced.⁶⁶⁾

The studies of the documents from the Turfan Basin in the sixth to eighth centuries suggest the following situation. During the Gaochangguo period arable land in Turfan was characterized as being small and subdivided, and land tenancy and lease had already been established as a system of utilizing arable land. Surely *juntianzhi* made an impact on the society of Turfan, but it was too external and never succeeded in transforming the basis of land use, which was kept intact in the years that followed.⁶⁷⁾ It is supposed that, even with *juntianzhi*, for the peasants in the Turfan region to earn their livelihood income from tenant farming and land leases was very important. This factor should be considered as a special

characteristic of the sixth to eighth century land system in the Turfan Basin. As for the tenant system, it can be compared to the cases in Kroraina and elsewhere.⁶⁸⁾

- (b) Tang Chinese Documents from Turfan for estimating the number of the households and population

Of the Chinese documents unearthed at the Turfan Basin, *huji* 戶籍 (household registers) and *hukouzhang* 戶口帳 (statistical reports of households and population) enable us to identify the total population and households of a specific area.

The first type of documents, household registers, were used as registers of residents by the state to identify the local populace and were utilized as a basic source of information necessary for administrative purposes.⁶⁹⁾ Household registers were compiled at the *xiang* 鄉 (subdistrict) level, and all the individuals were registered except for those with Taoist affiliation, Buddhist monks and nuns. The Tang household register records individual names, the age of each member of the household, their relationship to the household head, as well as the amount of land specified in *mu* 畝 and the location of the land belonging to the household, and others. Therefore, with a complete household register of one specific area, the total population and households in that area can be determined.

The second type of documents, statistical reports of households and population recorded the total number of households and residents in a specific *xiang* 鄉 (subdistrict) or *li* 里 (village), where five *lizheng* (village head) co-signed and reported to a higher administrative level. It was probably used as a source of information for a *xian* 縣 (district) to produce household registers and tax registers.⁷⁰⁾ At the top of the statistical report, the name of the *xian* or *li* is given, followed by the number of households and population and its details (the number of males, either to be exempted or not, from taxation and forced labor, females, children, the aged and lowly people) are listed.

Another type of registers in the Tang period providing information on population is the *chaikebu* 差科簿 (registers of graded forced labor).⁷¹⁾ This type of documents were compiled at each local district, intended as name-lists to allocate laborers, with the names and the number of adult males and adolescent males of each *xiang*. From such documents, we can estimate the population size of a specific area listed there to some extent, but we cannot determine the total number of households and population since the documents only include the number of adult and adolescent males while other residents are omitted.

Contrary to this, the household register and the statistical report theoretically cover all the residents and households aside from some exceptions previously mentioned. Concerning the compilation of these documents, the contents are at times unreliable filled with fictitious reports provided by those residents being investigated, and at times, due to administrative errors being committed. But, at

least the household register and the statistical report should be acknowledged as a valuable source of information on the total population and households of a certain area as taken hold of by the administration.

The Tang household registers and the statistical reports of households and population unearthed from the Turfan Basin are only found in fragments and none in complete forms. As a result, we cannot find any household register of which the extant contents enable us to determine the total population and households of a specific area, although there are many household registers as Kaiyuan 4 nian Xizhou Liuzhong-xian Gaoning xiangji 開元四年西州柳中縣高寧鄉籍 (Household register of Xi Prefecture, Liuzhong district, Gaoning Sub-district dated 4th year of Kaiyuan=716).⁷²⁾ where the relevant location can be identified. On the other hand, we can find some statistical reports where the name of a relevant area and a portion of the statistical data remain, for example, Tang Xizhou Gaochang-xian Ningrong-xiang hukouzhang (1) 唐西州高昌縣寧戎鄉戶口帳一 (Statistical report of households and population of Xi Prefecture, Gaochang District, Ningrong Subdistrict, Tang Dynasty (1)). From this document we can determine that in Xi Prefecture, Gaochang district, Ningrong subdistrict, during a certain period of Tang, households were in the order of three hundred.⁷³⁾

Notes

- 1) Ronald E. Emmerick and Margarita I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, *Saka Documents VII: the St. Petersburg Collections*, London 1993, 24pp. + 159 plates [reviewed by the present writer in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 38/4, 1995, 371–376]; Ronald E. Emmerick and Margarita I. Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, *Saka Documents Text Volume III*, London 1995, 256pp. + plates 160–198 [to be reviewed by the present writer in one of the forthcoming issues of the *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*].
- 2) At the Institute of Oriental Studies these manuscripts are classified under the names attached to each group. Thus, the Petrovsky collection, Oldenburg collection, Malov collection, Berezovsky collection, etc. together form the St. Petersburg “collections” of Khotanese manuscripts.
- 3) Margaret I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, “The Leningrad Collection of the Sakish Business Documents and the Problem of the Investigation of Central Asian Texts”, A. Cadonna ed., *Turfan and Tun-huang. The Texts. Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route*, Firenze 1992, 85–95; М. И. Воробьева-Десятовская, “Хотано-саки”, *Восточный Туркестан в Древности и Раннем Средневековье. Этнос Языки Религии* [East Turkestan in Antiquity and Early Middle Ages. Races, Languages, Religions], Moskva 1992, 32–76; “Топоним ‘Шесть деревень’ по хотаносакским деловым документам I тыс. н. э. из Восточного Туркестана [The toponym “Six Villages” in Khotanese business documents in the first millennium A.D.]”, *Петербургское Востоковедение* [St. Petersburg Journal of Oriental Studies] 6, 1994, 395–414.
- 4) 林梅村「新疆和田出土漢文于闐文雙語文書」[On the Sino-Khotanese Bilingual Documents unearthed from Hotan, Xinjiang], *Kaogu Xuebao* [考古學報], 1993/1, 89–107. His criticism is directed, among others, to Zhang Guangda 張廣達 and Rong Xinjiang 榮新江「關於和田出土于闐文獻的年代及其相關問題」[On the Chronology and Related Problems of the Khotanese Documents Discovered in Khotan], *Tōyō Gakuhō* [東洋學報] 69, 1988, 59–86 (concerning Hedin 24) and 「唐大曆三年三月典成銑牒」跋 [Postscript to the ‘Official Letter of the Clerk Cheng Xian dated in the 3rd month, 3rd year of Dali’], *Xinjiang Shehui Kexue* [新疆社會科學], 1988/1, 60–69

- (concerning “Six Villages”).
- 5) On the characteristics of the Khotanese manuscripts from Dunhuang, see KUMAMOTO, “The Khotanese in Dunhuang”, A. Cadonna e L. Lanciotti eds., *Cina e Iran. Da Alessandro Magno alla Dinastia Tang*, Firenze 1996, 79–101.
 - 6) Л. Н. Меньшиков и др., *Описание китайских рукописей дуньхуанского фонда Института Народов Азии*, вып. 1, Москва 1963, 659.
 - 7) Gösta Montell, “Sven Hedin’s archaeological collections from Khotan [I]”, *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities*, 7, 1935, 145–221, “id. II”, *ibid.* 10, 1938, 83–113, both with numerous plates, refers (7, 151) to Hedin’s diary entry (31.5.1986) which says, “I also acquired two extremely tattered Sanscrit manuscripts from the desert below Hanguja, seven days’ journey distant [from Khotan]”. One of these turned out to be Khotanese, and was published by Helmer Smith as an Appendix to the second part of Montell’s report (*BMFEA* 10, 101–102, with plate ix). The transcription was later revised by Sten Konow in *Acta Orientalia* xvii, 1939, 246–248, and by H. W. Bailey in *KT* 3.16. The manuscript itself has turned up in the Petrovsky collection in St. Petersburg and republished as SI P 47 in *SDTV III*, plate 162 and on p. 37f. Montell’s report concerns the findings of the 1896 expedition, and nowhere mentions the 75 documents on paper and wood. Lin Meicun, *op. cit.* 89, on the other hand, erroneously considers that Montell’s report is about the results of the Sino-Swedish expedition. Lin goes on to say that the Hedin collection is actually to be called the “Ambolt collection.” Although Montell mentions a small pottery collection brought by N. Ambolt from Karakir (*BMFEA* 7, 154, 201) and compares it to those in the Hedin collection, it has nothing to do with the documents. Only a very cursory reading of Montell’s report could lead to such a misunderstanding.
 - 8) See George Kish, *To the Heart of Asia. The Life of Sven Hedin*, Ann Arbor 1984, 111–123; Eric Wennerholm, *Sven Hedin*, Wiesbaden 1978, 173–203. It is true that Hedin’s role in these years was more of an organizer than of a field geographer, which does not mean that the findings cannot be associated with his name.
 - 9) On the “Provisional Catalog” (Proviscrisk katalog) at the Museum which indicates that these documents were acquired by N. Ambolt in Xinjiang between 1929–1932, see Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang (1988a) 72. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, (1994) 396, says that Prof. Staffan Rosén, who is preparing a facsimile edition of the Hedin documents, is undertaking an attempt to track down the mention of the acquisition of the documents in the detailed diaries of S. Hedin. No results from this research have been published.
 - 10) 日本書道教育會議・編『スウェーデン・ヘディン樓蘭發現殘紙・木牘』[Nihon Shodō-Kyōiku-kaigi ed. *Documents on Paper and Wood Discovered by Sven Hedin at Loulan*] 東京 1988, p. 127, No. 115 with the Museum number 1941–33–46 (see also KUMAMOTO Hiroshi 熊本 裕, 「コートン語寫本學」 [Studies of Khotanese manuscripts], *Sinica* 『しにか』 1991/1 (特集◎シルクロード寫本學入門 [Special Issue: Introduction to the Studies of the Manuscripts on the Silk Road]), 39–46). Lin Meicun, *op. cit.* 95, unaware that it is a forgery, gives the reading of the “Chinese text”. It is small wonder that 「予闕文部分无法釋讀」 (“it is not possible to interpret the Khotanese part”). Another wood stick reproduced on p. 128 (No. 116 with the Museum number 1941–33–45) is Hedin 73, on which both Khotanese and Chinese texts are found. The first character of the Chinese text is *zhuang* 狀 rather than *yu* 於 (corrected in the reprint from the misprinted *yu* 于 in the article of 1993) given by Lin, and the 4th and 5th characters are certainly not *fanye* 翻野. The third document (No. 117 = 1941–33–52) has a Chinese text only with the date of 永泰 3 年 (767); see Zhang and Rong (1988a) 74.
 - 11) See Plates 15–27 and p. 98. Huang Wenbi’s diary published recently records, on May 9, 1929, that he purchased in Khotan a number of manuscripts with Indian-like script and some printed ones (黃文弼『蒙新考察日記 (1927–1930)』[*Diary during the researches in Mongolia and Xinjiang (1927–1930)*], 426). Forgery itself is an old business, and we have the famous forger Islām Ākhūn who deceived Hoernle (Stein, *Ancient Khotan* 507–514). But the forged manuscripts published in *JASB* 1897, Plates xvii–xxvi, have no resemblance to those in Stockholm, while those published by Huang Wenbi may be called the exact replica of the ones in Sweden.

- 12) Reprinted in *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* (ed. H. Bechert und P. Kieffer-Pülz), Stuttgart 1989, 173–179.
- 13) More detailed information is expected in the *Catalogue of the Khotanese Manuscripts in the British Library* being prepared by P. O. Skjærvø.
- 14) “Three further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts from Central Asia”, *JASB* 1897, 213–260, with Plates vii–xxx; “A Report on the British Collections of Antiquities from Central Asia”, *JASB*, Extra Number 1, 1901pp. 55+31+7, with 3 Tables and 13 Plates.
- 15) Hoernle 1 (published in 1901) is kept together with a smaller manuscript published as Or. 6392 in *KT* 5.1 between glass plates with the label of Or. 6392 for the whole plates. Hoernle 2 is Or. 6394.1, Hoernle 3 is Or. 6395.2 (both published first in 1901); Hoernle 6 is Or. 6401.1.3, Hoernle 7 is Or. 6397.1 (both published in 1897).
- 16) Two Chinese manuscripts with interlinear Khotanese, Domoko C and Domoko D, are probably what Haloun refers to in the commentary to Hedin 15 and 16 as “two other vouchers of our series found by Stein in the Dumaqu oasis” in *KT* 4.177. Lin Meicun, *op. cit.* 89, erroneously considers that they are part of the Hedin collection.
- 17) Not necessarily in the chronological order. Or. 8210 consists mainly of the Chinese manuscripts acquired by Stein at Dunhuang in the second expedition (usually referred to by the S number), Or. 8211 mainly of the Chinese manuscripts from the first expedition, and Or. 8212 of manuscripts in various languages from different sites (Dunhuang and elsewhere) from the third and partly the second expeditions.
- 18) Or. 11344.4 *KT* 2.34 has partly the same text as Hedin 1, and both probably come from the same source.
- 19) Published by R. E. Emmerick, “A new Khotanese document from China”, *Studia Iranica* 13/2, 1984, 193–198. The photograph in *National Geographic* 189/3, March 1996, 49 (in an article “Xinjiang” by Thomas B. Allen, with Photographs by REZA), shows the same document. Another wooden document of similar shape has been discovered in the Khotan area but remains so far unpublished.
- 20) “King of Khotan in the eighth century”, in Paul Bernard et Frantz Grenet, *Histoire de l'Asie Centrale préislamique. Sources écrites et documents archéologiques*, Paris 1991, 255–278.
- 21) See Bailey, “Saka miscellany” (1964), 12, where he states that he had access to Hardinge 073 II 1 and 2 “in the British Museum”.
- 22) According to T. Takeuchi, “Old Tibetan manuscripts from East Turkestan in the Stein collection—the catalogue project—”, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* xi, 1996, 127, Or. 8211.1–991 were published by E. Chavannes, *Les documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein dans les sables du Turkestan Oriental*, Oxford 1913. Or. 8211.992–3326 contain uncatalogued Chinese documents and Kharoṣṭhī tablets. Likewise Or. 8212.200–477 are Chinese documents on wood, 478–855 are Chinese documents on paper, both published by H. Maspéro, *Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie Centrale*, London 1953, while Or. 8212.856–1360 are uncatalogued Chinese documents, 1361–1927 contain miscellaneous fragments in Chinese, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Khotanese, Uigur, Sogdian, etc. These uncatalogued Chinese documents in the Or. 8212 series are published by Guo Feng 郭鋒, *Sitanyin disanci zhongya tanxian suohuo Gansu Xinjiang chutu wenshu* [斯坦因第三次中亞探險所獲甘肅新疆出土文書] [Documents from Gansu and Xinjiang acquired by the third expedition of Stein], Lanzhou 1993.
- 23) All the documents in the St. Petersburg collection transliterated and translated in *Saka Documents Text Volume III* (= *SDTV III*) are arranged according to their signature. So the page reference for each document is omitted here.
- 24) See Skjærvø, “King of Khotan in the eighth century” (1991), 265, and 4.1 below.
- 25) For the literature on the contracts in Central Asia (Niya Prākṛit, Chinese, Khotanese, Tumshuq, Tibetan, Qarakhanid Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Tangut, Uigur, Mongolian) see Y. Yoshida and T. Moriyasu, “A Sogdian sale contract of a female slave from the period of Gaochang kingdom under the rule of the Qu clan”, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* iv, 1988, 33–37.
- 26) According to Ikeda (1979), 348, who gives a revised text, the document is to be dated to the year

- 721, but no grounds for the dating are given; see also Chen Guocan (1995), 489–499.
- 27) In the second box from the bottom in Skjærvø, *op. cit.* 258, Table 1, read Ch. I.0021a,a18 for P 2958.123.
 - 28) There is no reason to believe that the marriage of a daughter of Cao Yijin 曹議金, Jiedushi 節度使 of the Guiyijun 歸義軍 to the Khotanese king Li Shengtian 李聖天 (= Viśa' Sambhava) took place when Cao Yijin had died in 935/936. Skjærvø took Cao Yijin for the emperor of Later Jin 後晉, and made up a marriage of the Khotanese king to a daughter of the deceased “emperor” after the envoys from China visited Khotan in 940.
 - 29) The identification of the name of the village Gaysāta with Jiexie-zhen 傑謝鎮 in the Chinese documents is independently confirmed by Δx 18930, where the Chinese text [傑謝/牛皮壹張/抄] (bottom of each line lost) is followed by Khotanese || *gayseta gūha kamgā* “In Gaysāta. Ox skin”.
 - 30) Lin, *op. cit.* 103, claims that Sten Konow had already identified Viśa' Vāhaṃ with Weichi Yao in as early as 1914. Actually Konow's argument is based on the very limited material (only those published by Hoernle in 1897–1901) of the Khotanese documents known at that time and the insufficient information on the length of the reign of Khotanese kings from the Chinese sources. Konow's conclusion, which happens to be the same as Skjærvø's, was reached by little more than guesswork. The similar line of argument is employed by F. W. Thomas, *TLTD* 2.188, but it remains inconclusive because of the lack of the agreement of king's name (Tib. *htran ched po* in M. Tāgh b. i, 0092).
 - 31) The Urumqi tablet is dated to “Year 4 of Viśa' Sihya”, the document in the inside (i.e. written earlier) of the IOL tablet to “Year 1 of Viśya Sihya”, the document in the outside (i.e. written later) of the IOL tablet to “Year 2 of Viśa' Dharmā”. These three and Or. 9286 1 *KT* 2.13 mentioned above together with Hardinge 074.1 *KT* 5.274 as well as Harding 061 (unpublished) are evidently closely connected as they share many personal names not found elsewhere; see Skjærvø, *op. cit.* 261–264.
 - 32) The latter has a mistake (*ttye pramāna cu* for *ttye pracaina cu* “for the reason that”), so the former is the corrected version.
 - 33) The “Prophecy” says that Vijaya Saṅgrāma and his son, Vijaya Saṅgrāma “the Younger” went to China and that, when the father died there, his son, being small, was unable to return. Then, after many years, Vijaya Saṅgrāma's son, Vijaya Vikrama, returns to Khotan. Although it is theoretically possible that the father of Vijaya Vikrama was Vijaya Saṅgrāma the “Younger”, no immediate succession of the Khotanese kings with the same name is found, at least so far, in the chronological part of the “Prophecy” and elsewhere. It is therefore more likely that it is not until the father's death that the son assumed the royal name Vijaya Vikrama.
 - 34) According to the *Xin Tangshu* Fushe Ching sent tribute to China during the Kaiyuan 開元 period (713–741). *Cefu Yuangui*, chap. 971, specifies it to the year 717.
 - 35) Or. 6400.2.1 *KT* 5.10, SI P 98.10 and SI P 103.53 have *phakadā* (SI P 103.2 *phakaidā*). The personal names occurring in these documents show nothing in common with those in Hardinge 073 ii.
 - 36) The reading of Lin, *op. cit.* 101, of *zhu* 主 for *wang* 王 in Hedin 24 is impossible.
 - 37) Beckwith, *The Tibetan Empire* (1987), 144–147.
 - 38) Despite the statement by Lin, *op. cit.*, 103, there is no record either in Chinese or in Tibetan that indicates the exact year of the fall of Khotan to Tibet. 790 is the latest year of use of the Chinese era among the Chinese documents from the Khotan area. Lin, *ibid.*, misunderstands the passage in the “Prophecy” (p. 23 in Emmerick's translation) that “there were fifty-six generations of kings of Li and one regent”, and says that this was a Tibetan “regent” who replaced the Khotanese king when Tibet occupied Khotan, and that the “Prophecy” was written in 794, the first Dog Year (cf. p. 75 of the translation) after the Tibetan occupation. This one “regent” is Amacha Khemeg, who served between Vijaya Saṅgrāma and Vijaya Vikrama; see p. 59 of the translation. The “Prophecy” does not cover the Tibetan occupation in the late eighth century, and Vijaya Vāhana the Great in the “Prophecy” cannot be Viśa' Vāhaṃ in the Khotanese texts and Weichi Yao in Chinese.
 - 39) A similar practice is found with the Tokharians. See the expression *postano[nt] shasce* “(in) the **next** sixth (month)” in the inscription G-Qa 1. Pinault 1987, 160, failed to see the parallel with the

- Khotanese expression. It is not surprising that the Chinese calendar as given by Chen Yuan for the Tiger year 642 has no intercalary month, while the Hare year 643 has the intercalary sixth month, in view of the fact that Kučā had not been under direct rule of the Chinese.
- 40) Lin Meicun, *op. cit.* 102, relies on Chen Yuan's table, in addition to his impossible reading of 午年 "Horse Year" for (+) 四年 in Hedin 24, to give the date of 790 to this document.
 - 41) At the beginning of Or. 11252.37v part of his name occurs as *spāta sudā[rrjām]*. Another candidate Svārrjām, who appears in Or. 11252.2, 32, 36, Or. 11344.2, 8 *KT* 2.15–36, Achma, Domoko *F KT* 2.62–64, Hedin 9, 16, 19, is never called *spāta*.
 - 42) Likewise the use of the Tibetan language lingered in Dunhuang and elsewhere after the Tibetans fell from the power; see Uray, "L'emploi du tibétain dans les chancelleries des états du Kan-su et de Khotan postérieurs à la domination tibétaine" (1981), "New contributions to Tibetan Documents from the post-Tibetan Tun-huang" (1988), Takeuchi, "A group of Old Tibetan letters written under Kuei-I-Chün: a preliminary study for the classification of Old Tibetan letters" (1990).
 - 43) An Lushan's rebellion began near the end of 755. It is extremely unlikely that Weichi Sheng departed the country after hearing the news and making all the necessary arrangements in a matter of a few weeks (Zhang and Rong 1988a, note 71). To suppose so is simply motivated by the desire to obtain the Snake Year 789 as the 35th regnal year of Weichi Yao.
 - 44) If the ascension took place in 767 (Sheep Year), his 35th year would be 801 (Snake year), well into the Tibetan period. However it would be quite unexpected that such an important event be recorded without explicit date, while less significant appointments and grants are listed under the years 763/764.
 - 45) The text is: *salī 20 māstā cvātaja haḍā 13 tye hvamñā rrāmḍā vāśa' vāham dādye ṣṣau vidyadattā [salya]* "Year 20, month Cvātaja (= 1st), day 13, of this Khotanese king V.V., in the third year of ṣṣau Vidyadattā", not "in the third (regnal year) of the king of Khotan V.V." as in *SDTV* 54. Cf. *SI P* 103.6, line 5 *tsīṣīyām śe'ña salya* "in the second year of the *Tsīṣīs*".
 - 46) [32nd year] Hedin 21; [33rd year] Or. 11344.3 *KT* 2.32–33; [35th year] Or. 11252.16 *KT* 2.21–22, Or. 11252.30 *KT* 2.25, Or. 11344.4 *KT* 2.34 (partly a copy of the same text as Hedin 1), Achma *KT* 2.62, Hedin 1, 15, 16, 19.
YOSHIDA Yutaka points out that the above dating causes difficulties, if the Panguan Fu 判官富 in Hedin 15/16 and that (part of the name lost) in Hedin 24 are the same person. Speculations about various possibilities of their not being the same person will remain just that. On the other hand, one would face more difficulties if they are one person. A new material, especially about the exact year of the beginning of Viśa' Vāham's reign, would solve the mystery.
 - 47) No such conglomerate is actually mentioned there, neither is the garrison of Gaysāta, Jixie-zhen 傑謝鎮, prominent in the documents, found there.
 - 48) The word *āvut(a)-* in Old Khotanese translates *grāma-* "village" in the *Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra*. In spite of the difference of meaning numerous correspondences make it certain that the Chinese and Khotanese terms designate the same entity. As a place name the Khotanese term could preserve an age-old, traditional name, while the Chinese, when they settled in the Khotan area in the late seventh century, could have translated it into a designation more appropriate for a Chinese place name.
 - 49) As Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (1994), fn. 5, points out, *āskvīra* and *gayseta* are the loc.sg. forms of *āskūra*, *gaysāta*, respectively. As Zhang and Rong show, the Chinese character transcribed as *li* does not exist; it is another way of writing *jie* 傑.
 - 50) The identification of Cira with modern Cele 策勒 is inconclusive (cf. Zhang and Rong 1988b). There is no guarantee that the modern name continues the ancient place name. We know that Keriya took over the traditional name Yutian only recently.
 - 51) The name *Naṃḍakā* occurs 16 times without place name, and three times each with a different place name. *Haṣkadarmā* occurs three times, once (Or. 11344.8.7 *KT* 2.35) without place name, and twice, as referred to above, with a different place name.
 - 52) Bailey's translation "Six Villages of Cira" (*KT* 4.104) [but "Six Towns of Cira" in *SDTV* 34] has

generally been accepted without much discussion.

- 53) Since both Jīvā and Khāṣṭarāṃ are found only here, either can be an adjective of origin qualifying the other (it is not too rare that an adjective follows a personal name).
- 54) Notice that Bailey, *SDTV* 35, omits the translation of sections 4 and 5.
- 55) It occurs about 30 times. Or. 11344.1.11 *KT* 2. 30 *phaṃnā suhadatti* is certainly to be read as *phaṃnā[ji] suhadatti* as in Or. 11252.9, 10, 27, 34, Or. 11344.3 *KT* 2.19–33.
- 56) From Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, (1994), 412, fn. 9, it is clear that she failed to understand the significance of the document. There are no more similarities between this and Hedin 3v from the Tibetan period than the general difficulties of paying tax. Her refutations of Zhang and Rong are groundless in every respect. The identification of Dandān-Uiliq, where this document was found, with Liucheng is inconclusive. If this document was discovered where the Liucheng Zhiluo Cishi received it, Liucheng would be Dandān-Uiliq. However, the document could have been sent back with the message of authorization of the request. Moreover, this document only confirms the authority of the Liucheng Zhiluo Cishi over Gaysāta, and there is no indication as to the relation of Liucheng with either Phema or Fanye as alluded by Zhang and Rong 1988b.
- 57) Here Lin Meicun's guess (*op. cit.* 96) against Bailey's reading of *vira* in *KT* 4 on the basis of the similarity of the two akṣaras *va* and *ca* proves to be correct. The reading *cira* can be confirmed on the ms.
- 58) The stem *phaṃnaā-* could yield both the pre-suffixal *phaṃnā-* and the loc. sg. *phaṃnya* which could have been written as *phaṃña*. But the Tibetan form and the Chinese transcription suggest that *phaṃña* is the nom. sg. (or the unique indeclinable form).
- 59) Other terms whose meanings are, apart from etymological speculations, not entirely clear in the present context are, e.g. *māsavīrai* translated as "house-worker" (see *KT* 4.81), *paśāta* which is not translated but normally is the past participle "sent" (*KT* 4.118). For *stānaḍa* see below. Notice that Bailey constantly mistranslates *himya* in the present tense; it is the perfect "were" (3pl. masc., not formally identical 3sg. fem.).
- 60) See A. Cadonna ed., *Turfan and Tung-huang. The texts. Encounter of civilizations on the Silk Route*. Firenze, 1992.
- 61) See *KT* IV pp. 29–31, 173–176, *SDTV* p. 123.
- 62) Concerning lingchao wenshu 領抄文書 (tax receipt) see Sutō Yoshiyuki 周藤吉之, "Study of Hushui in the Middle of the Tang Era" 「唐代中期における戸税の研究—周氏一族文書を中心として—」, *Chinese fragmentary manuscripts on social and economical system in the Tang Era unearthed from Tunhuang and Turfan* 2, Monumenta Serindica, Vol. III. 『西域文化研究第3 敦煌吐魯番社會經濟資料 (下)』. Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1960., see also Sekio Shirō 關尾史郎, "The Basic Study of the Documents concerning the Taxation in Kao-Ch'ang excavated from Turfan: A Paleographic Analysis of Tiao-Chi-Wen-Shu" 「トウルファン出土高昌國稅制關係文書の基礎的研究 (1)—條記文書の古文書學的分析を中心として—」, *Jinbunkagaku Kenkyū* 『人文科學研究』, Niigatadaigaku Jinbun gakubu 新潟大學人文學部, vol. 74, 1988, pp. 60–66.
- 63) Suto *op. cit.*, pp. 229–231.
- 64) Lu Kai-wan 盧開萬, "Gaochang Kingdom didn't practise the Juntian Land-System during the rule of the Ju Family (497–645 A. D.)" 「麴氏高昌未推行均田制度論」, *敦煌學輯刊* 1986, 1, see also Sekio Shirō, "Gaochang 高昌 as seen from Turfan Documents and Official Histories" 「『文書』と『正史』の高昌國」, *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 『東洋史研究』, 47–3, 1988.
- 65) Nishijima Sadao 西嶋定生, "Chun-t'ien 均田 System in Turfan viewed from unearthed Chinese Documents." 「吐魯番出土文書より見たる均田制の施行狀態—給田文書・退田文書を中心として—」 *Chinese Fragmentary Manuscripts on Social and Economic System in the Tang Era unearthed from Tunhuang and Turfan* 1, Monumenta Serindica, Vol. II. 『西域文化研究第2 敦煌吐魯番社會經濟史料 (上)』. Hōzōkan, 1959.
- 66) See Ikeda On 池田溫, "A Study on the Tenancy Contracts and Related Documents in Ancient China, parts 1–3" 中國古代の租佃契 (上) (中) (下). *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 『東洋文化研究所紀要』, Vols. 60, 62, 117; 1973, 1975, 1990.
- 67) Ikeda *op. cit.* Pt. 2, pp. 72, 76–77., Ikeda On, "Some thoughts on the land system in Xizhou in early

- Tang period" 「初唐西州土地制度管見」. *Shiteki* 『史滴』 5, 1984, pp. 18–20.
- 68) In seems that, in Kroraina during the 3rd–4th centuries, tenant system had already existed. See Kharoṣṭhī Documents Nos. 160, 498, 574, 713 and others. (As for the document numbers, refer to A. M. Boyer et al. ed., *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*, 3 Vols. Oxford, 1920–29.) Furthermore, it is evident that ownership, purchase and sale of land by monks were very common in Kroraina. Considering the patterns of general lifestyle of monks, this must indicate that tenant farming must have existed. Refer to the Kharoṣṭhī documents Nos. 473, 549, 582, 652, 655, and others, as referred to by Nagasawa Kazutoshi 長澤和俊 in his *Rōlan Ōkokushi no Kenkyū* 『樓蘭王國史の研究』. Yūzankaku 雄山閣, 1996, pp. 437–438. Furthermore, in circa 100 B.C.E., Kroraina's people leased arable land (寄田) in neighboring regions. *Hanshu* 『漢書』, ch. 96A (the monograph on the Western Regions 西域傳), the account of Shanshan guo 鄯善國. Also Yamamoto Mitsuo 山本光朗, "The jutian yanggu" 「寄田仰穀考」. *Shirin* 『史林』, 67–6, 1984.
- 69) Concerning the Tang Dynasty *huji* 戶籍 (household registers), see Ikeda On, *Ancient Chinese household registers and related documents; a historical study*, 『中国古代籍帳研究概観・録文』 pt. 1, 'General introduction', pp. 57–98, and T. Yamamoto and Y. Dohi ed., *Tun-huang and Turfan documents concerning social and economic history II, census registers* (A). The Toyo Bunko, 1985. pp. (4)–(12), 'General introduction'.
- 70) For a detailed analysis of the statistical report of households and population, see Tang Changju 唐長孺, "Tang Xi zhou zhu xiang hukouzhang shishi", 「唐西州諸鄉戶口帳試釋」 in 唐長孺 ed., *Dunhuang Tulufan wenshu chutan*, 『敦煌吐魯番文書初探』. Wuhan Daxue Chubanshe 武漢大學出版社, 1983. A study of the Turfan region in the Tang era using statistical reports has been conducted by Kegawa Yasunori, 氣賀澤保規, "A study on the position of fubing in Xi prefecture (Turfan) in Tang era." 「唐代西州(吐魯番)における府兵の位置について」, *Historical studies of frontier societies of China* 『中國邊境社會の歴史的研究』, Showa 63 nen, Kagakukenyūhi Joseikin, Sōgō kenkyū (A) kenkyū Seika hōkokusho.
- 71) Concerning the Tang Dynasty register of graded forced labor, see Nishimura Genyū 西村元佑, "Study on the Tun-huang Ch'a-k'o-pu of the T'ang period" 「唐代敦煌差科簿の研究—大谷探検隊將來、敦煌・吐魯番古文書を參考資料として—」. *Chinese Fragmentary Manuscripts on Social and Economic System in the T'ang Era unearthed from Tunhuang and Turfan 2*, Monumeta Serindica, vol. III. 『西域文化研究第3 敦煌吐魯番社會經濟資料(下)』. Hōzōkan, 1960. Also, refer to Ikeda, op. cit., 'General introduction' pp. 98–115.
- 72) For the text, Ikeda, op. cit., pt. 2, 'Texts', pp. 243–249. Yamamoto, Dohi, pp. (201)–(204).
- 73) This statistical report of households and population is probably from Zhenguan 貞觀 era, 627–649 C.E.. The text given below is from *Tulufan chutu wenshu* 『吐魯番出土文書』 貳, (*Documents unearthed from Turfan 2*), Wenwu chubanshe 文物出版社, 1994, p. 124.

寧戎

□去年帳後已來新舊戶□

□戶 三 百 七 □

□ 四 新

□ 十九

[missing]

For an interpretation of this document, see Tang *op. cit.*, pp. 130–131. According to this, the first line is interpreted as reference to the location (Ningrong Sub-district). The second line indicates [the total of] the old and new households found after [the compilation of] the last year's register. The third line indicates the total of old (former) households (three hundred and seven . . . ?) and the fourth line indicates the total of new (newly registered) households as (. . . four?).

The author of the Appendix wishes to express his gratitude for valuable comments by ARAKAWA Masaharu (Ōsaka University) in writing this.

References

- Allen, Thomas B. (1996) with photographs by REZA, "Xinjiang", *National Geographic* 189/3, March 1996, 2–43.
- Bailey, H. W., *Khotanese Texts*, Vol. 1 (1945), Vol. 2 (1954), Vol. 3 (1956), Vol. 4 (1961), Vol. 5 (1963); revised ed. of Vol. 1-3 in one volume (1969), Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Bailey, H. W. (1964), "Saka miscellany", G. Redard ed., *Indo-Iranica. Mélanges présentés à Georg Morgenstierne*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 8–12.
- Bailey, H. W., *Saka Documents*, Portfolio I (1960), Portfolio II (1961), Portfolio III (1963), Portfolio IV (1967), London, Lund, Humphries & Co. on behalf of CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM IRANICARUM.
- Bailey, H. W. (1968), *Saka Documents Text Volume [I]*, London, Lund, Humphries & Co. on behalf of CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM IRANICARUM.
- Beckwith, C. I. (1987), *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia*, Princeton, Princeton UP.
- Chavannes, E. (1907), "Chinese documents from the sites of Dandān-uiliq, Niya and Endere", in M. Aurel Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, Oxford 1907, 521–547.
- Chavannes, E. (1913), *Les documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein dans les sables du Turkestan Oriental*, Oxford, Oxford UP.
- CHEN Guocan 陳國燦 (1995), *Sitanyin Suohuo Tulufan Wenshu Yanjiu* 『斯坦因所獲吐魯番文書研究』 [*Studies of the documents from Turfan acquired by Stein*], Wuhan, Wuhan University Press.
- CHEN Yuan 陳垣 (1956), *Ershishi Shuorunbiao* 『二十史朔閏表』, Beijing.
- Conrady, A. (1920), *Die chinesischen Handschriften und sonstigen Kleinfunde Sven Hedins in Lou-Lan*, Stockholm, Generalstabens Litografiska Anstalt.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. (1967), *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*, London, Oxford UP.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. (1984), "A new Khotanese document from China", *Studia Iranica* 13/2, 193–198.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. and Skjærvø, P. O. ed. (1982, 1987), *Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese*, I, II, Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, Margarita I. (1993), *Saka Documents VII: the St. Petersburg Collections*, London, SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES on behalf of CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM IRANICARUM.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. and Vorob'ëva-Desjatovskaja, Margarita I. (1995), *Saka Documents Text Volume III*, London, SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES on behalf of CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM IRANICARUM.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. (1996), "A Khotanese monastic account book", R. E. Emmerick et al. ed., *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung „Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung“*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 51–65.
- Forte, Antonino (1979), "Le moine khotanais Devendraprajña", *BEFEO* 66,

289–298.

- FUJIEDA Akira 藤枝晃 (1961), 「吐蕃支配期の敦煌」 [“Tunhuang under Tibetan rule”], *Tōhō Gakuhō* 『東方學報』 31, 199–292.
- Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃 (1973), 「敦煌曆日譜」 [“The Tunhuang calendar and its peculiarities”], *Tōhō Gakuhō* 『東方學報』 45, 377–441.
- Gropp, Gerd (1974), *Archäologische Funde aus Khotan Chinesisch-Ostturkestan. Die Trinkler-Sammlung im Übersee-Museum, Bremen*, Bremen, Friedrich Röver.
- GUO Feng 郭鋒 (1993), *Sitanyin disanci zhongya tanxian suohuo Gansu Xinjiang chutu wenshu* 『斯坦因第三次中亞探險所獲甘肅新疆出土文書』 [Documents from Gansu and Xinjiang acquired by Stein's third expedition to Central Asia], Lanzhou, Gansu People's Press.
- Hill, John E. (1988), “Notes on the dating of Khotanese history”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31/3, 179–190.
- Hoernle, R. F. A. (1897), “Three further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts from Central Asia”, *JASB* 1897, 213–260, with Plates VII–XXX.
- Hoernle, R. F. A. (1901), “A Report on the British Collections of Antiquities from Central Asia”, *JASB*, Extra Number 1, 1901pp. 55+31+7, with 3 Tables and 13 Plates.
- Hoernle, R. F. A. (1916), *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan I*, Oxford, Oxford UP.
- HUANG Wenbi 黃文弼 (1958), *Talimu pendī kaoguzi* 『塔里木盆地考古記』 [Archaeological Reports of the Tarim Basin], Beijing.
- HUANG Wenbi 黃文弼 (1990), *Mengxin kaocha riji* 『蒙新考察日記 (1927–1930)』 [Diary during the researches in Mongolia and Xinjiang (1927–1930)], Beijing.
- IKEDA On (1979), *Chūgoku Kodai Sekichō Kenkyū* 『中國古代籍帳研究』 [Ancient Chinese Household Registers and Related Documents. A Historical Study], Tokyo.
- Kish, George (1984), *To the Heart of Asia. The Life of Sven Hedin*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.
- Konow, Sten (1914), “Khotan studies”, *JRAS*, 339–353.
- Konow, Sten (1939), “(Review of) *The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities (Östasiatiska Samlingarna) Stockholm. Bulletin No. 10*”, *Acta Orientalia* 17, 246–248.
- KT = H. W. Bailey, *Khotanese Texts*.
- KUMAMOTO Hiroshi 熊本 裕 (1991), 「コータン語寫本學」 [Studies of Khotanese manuscripts], *Sinica* 『しにか』 1991/1 (特集◎シルクロード寫本學入門 [Special Issue: Introduction to the Studies of the Manuscripts on the Silk Road]), 39–46.
- KUMAMOTO, Hiroshi (1996), “The Khotanese in Dunhuang”, A. Cadonna e L. Lanciotti eds., *Cina e Iran. Da Alessandro Magno alla Dinastia Tang*, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki Editore, 79–101.
- Lévi, Sylvain et Ed. Chavannes (1895), “L'itinéraire d'Ou-K'ong (751–790)”, *Journal Asiatique*, sér. 9, v. 6, 341–384.
- LIN Meicun 林梅村 (1993), 「新疆和田出土漢文于闐文雙語文書」 [On the Sino-Khotanese Bilingual Documents unearthed from Hotan, Xinjiang], *Kaogu*

- Xuebao [考古學報], 1993/1, 89–107; reprinted in Lin Meicun, *Xiyu Wenming* [西域文明] [*Civilizations of the Western Regions*], Beijing 1995, 209–233.
- Maspéro, H. (1953), *Les documents chinois de la troisième expedition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie Centrale*, London, British Museum.
- Л. Н. Меньшиков и др., *Описание китайских рукописей дуньхуанского фонда Института Народов Азии*, вып. 1, Москва
- Montell, Gösta (1935, 1938), “Sven Hedin’s archaeological collections from Khotan [I]”, *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 7, 145–221, “id. II”, *ibid.* 10, 83–113.
- 日本書道教育會議・編 (1988), 『スウェン・ヘディン樓蘭發現殘紙・木牘』 [*Nihon Shodō-Kyōiku-kaigi ed. Documents on Paper and Wood Discovered by Sven Hedin at Loulan*], Tokyo.
- Pinault, Georges (1987), “Épigraphie koutchéenne”, *Mission Paul Pelliot. Documents Archéologiques VII. Sites divers de la Région de Koutcha*, Paris, Collège de France, Institut d’Asie, 59–196.
- Prophecy*, see Emmerick (1967).
- SD = H. W. Bailey, *Saka Documents*.
- SDTV = H. W. Bailey, *Saka Documents Text Volume*.
- SDTV III = Emmerick, Ronald E. and Vorob’ ëva-Desjatovskaja, Margarita I., *Saka Documents Text Volume III*.
- Skjærvø, P. O. (1991), “King of Khotan in the eighth century”, in Paul Bernard et Frantz Grenet, *Histoire de l’Asie Centrale préislamique. Sources écrites et documents archéologiques*, Paris, Editions du CNRS, 255–278.
- Stein, M. Aurel (1907), *Ancient Khotan*, 2 vols., Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Stein, M. Aurel (1921), *Serindia*, 5 vols., Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Stein, M. Aurel (1928), *Innermost Asia*, 4 vols., Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Studies* I, II = Emmerick, Skjærvø, *Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese*, I, II.
- TAKEUCHI, T. (1990), “A group of Old Tibetan letters written under Kuei-I-Chün: a preliminary study for the classification of Old Tibetan letters”, *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* XLIV/1–2, 175–190.
- TAKEUCHI, T. (1994), “Three Old Tibetan Contracts in the Sven Hedin Collection”, *BSOAS* LVII/3, 576–587.
- TAKEUCHI, T. (1995), *Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia*, Tokyo.
- TAKEUCHI, T. (1996), “Old Tibetan manuscripts from East Turkestan in the Stein collection—the catalogue project—”, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* XI, 121–137.
- TLTD = F. W. Thomas, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*.
- Thomas, F. W. (1951), *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. Part II. Documents*, London, The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Uray, Géza (1981), “L’emploi du tibétain dans les chancelleries des états du Kan-su et de Khotan postérieurs à la domination tibétaine”, *Journal Asiatique* CCLXIX, 81–90.
- Uray, Géza (1988), “New contributions to Tibetan Documents from the

- post-Tibetan Tun-huang", Helga Uebach and Jampa L. Panglung ed., *Tibetan Studies, Proceedings of the 4th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, München, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, Margaret I. (1992), "The Leningrad Collection of the Sakish Business Documents and the Problem of the Investigation of Central Asian Texts", A. Cadonna ed., *Turfan and Tun-huang. The Texts. Encounter of Civilizations on the Silk Route*, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki Editore, 85–95.
- Воробьева-Десятовская, М. Т. (1992), "Хотан-саки", *Восточный Туркестан в Древности и Раннем Средневековье. Этнос Языки Религии* [East Turkestan in Antiquity and Early Middle Ages. Races, Languages, Religions], Москва, Наука, 32–76.
- Воробьева-Десятовская, М. Т. (1994), "Топоним 'шесть деревень' по хотан-сакским дедовым документам I тыс. н. э. из Восточного Туркестана [The toponym "Six Villages" in Khotanese business documents in the first millennium A.D.]", *Петербургское Востоковедение* [St. Petersburg Journal of Oriental Studies] 6, 395–414.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst (1959), "Chinesische archäologische Forschungen in Sinkiang (Chinesisch-Turkestan)", *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 1959/5–6, 229–242.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst (1989), *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* (ed. Heinz Bechert und Petra Kieffer-Pülz), Stuttgart, Steiner.
- Wennerholm, Eric (1978), *Sven Hedin 1865–1952*, Wiesbaden, Brockhaus.
- YAMAMOTO, Tatsuro and IKEDA, On eds. (1987), *Tun-huang and Turfan Documents Concerning Social and Economic History, III Contracts*, Tokyo, The Toyo Bunko.
- YOSHIDA, Y. and T. MORIYASU (1988), "A Sogdian sale contract of a female slave from the period of Gaochang kingdom under the rule of the Qu clan", *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* iv, 1–50.
- ZHANG Guangda 張廣達 and RONG Xinjiang 榮新江 (1988a), 「關於和田出土于闐文獻的年代及其相關問題」 [On the Chronology and Related Problems of the Khotanese Documents Discovered in Khotan], *Tōyō Gakuhō* 『東洋學報』 69, 9–86; reprinted in ZHANG Guangda and RONG Xinjiang 『于闐史叢考』 [Studies on the History of Khotan] Shanghai 1993, 71–97.
- ZHANG Guangda 張廣達 and RONG Xinjiang 榮新江 (1988b), 「《唐大曆三年三月典成銑牒》跋」 [Postscript to the 'Official Letter of the Clerk Cheng Xian dated in the 3rd month, 3rd year of Dali'], *Xinjiang Shehui Kexue* 『新疆社會科學』, 1988/1, 60–69; reprinted in 『于闐史叢考』, 140–154; also in French "Un manuscrit chinois découvert à Circa près de Khotan", *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 3, 1987, 77–91.