

A Tun-huang Manuscript of the Sixth Century A. D. concerning the *Chün-t'ien* 均田 Land System (I)

By TATSURŌ YAMAMOTO

The Chinese Ms. No. 613 of the Stein Collection in the British Museum, brought over from Tun-huang 敦煌, measuring approximately 607 cm. in length and lacking its opening and closing parts, represents a Buddhist Sūtra on one side of the paper and a census or taxation record on the other. It was, originally, a pieced-up document in nature of taxation record but made use of its back side in copying a sūtra; it follows, therefore that the date of sūtra-copying is later than that of the taxation record. In the present study, the side of the taxation record alone is discussed. It consists of 17 pieces, and is of the substance as shown in the attached plates. The Roman numbers given at the top denote the 17 pieces reading from the right. I studied this document in 1952 and 1957, and continued my researches availing myself of microfilm and photostat reproductions, thanks to the kind offices of the British Museum.

I. Arrangement of the Manuscript

The foregoing 17 piece document which measures a little over 28 cm. lengthwise and a little over 38 cm. sidewise, excepting the two—I and XVII which lack first part or last part—may be divided into two distinct groups both in form and substances:—one, a detailed individual record concerning descriptions of each family member, items of tax in kind, the amount of the tax (in *pu* 布 hemp cloth, *ma* 麻 hemp, *tsu* 租, 租 tax in grain), and the lands each family possessed or was granted; and the other, classified tables of the lands granted and taxes and other items grouped for several families. The former, in the present paper, are called Group A and the latter Group B. Of the 17 pieces, those of Group A are ten,—I, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XVI, XVII; and those of Group B are seven,—II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, XV. Groups A and B represent descriptions of different kinds, but the investigation of the contents which follows would show them to be closely related to each other. When the pieces of both Groups A and B were stuck together as the material for copying the Buddhist sūtra, their original consistent significance as a document was lost or disregarded. As they were employed simply as so many sheets of paper, there was no reason why they should be arranged in order. As a matter of fact, the pieces of both

Group A and B are mixed up in piecing-up. In some cases Group A pieces and Group B pieces are respectively put together as VIII-XIV, XVI-XVII, II-VII, but they could not indiscriminately be regarded as continuous in the contents. However, it was not a case in which entirely unrelated loose sheets were put together; investigation of the contents will show that some sheets are proved to have some internal, continuous relation with other pieces of the document. Such being the case, a general survey will be made in the following chiefly with reference to the continuous relationship with the other pieces of the document.

Let us first take up the pieces under Group A. The sheet I which records 10 *mou* 畝 of *ma-t'ien* 麻田 "hempfield" assigned to Kuang-shih 廣世 the family head, and 5 *mou* of *ma-t'ien* supposed to be assigned to the other member of the family is a fragment of 4 lines; its continuous relation with other pieces of the manuscript is not known. VIII and IX are continuous. 'The family head T'ien-fu 戶主天富 and the wife T'u-kuei 吐歸' in IX 3 and 5 stand for the family head K'ou-yen T'ien-fu 邨延天富 and his wife Liu T'u-kuei 劉吐歸 in VIII 4 and 6, and the first 6 lines in IX describe the land allotted to this family. VIII 21 and IX 1 are partially cut lengthwise with only part of the characters left; but VIII 21, judged from the preceding description, may be identified as 廿畝未受 *ju-mou wei-shou* '20 *mou* not yet received' and the remaining fragments of the characters may well read as part of the four characters. For the land for *ying-shou* 應受 'ought to receive' being 46 *mou* (l. 20) and that for *i-shou* 已受 'already received' 26 *mou* (l. 19), the remainder must naturally be 廿畝未受. IX 1 falling on the joint of the two pieces, though illegible from the front, may be clearly read when held to the light. The probable absence of any other writing between VIII 21 and IX 1 may be surmised from the presence of a similar form of recording, in other pieces of the document (X 11 and 12; XII 20 and 21; XIV 1 and 2), *ma-t'ien* allotted to the family-head in the line immediately after the total sum of *wei-shou-t'ien* 未受田 for each family. Again, that Pieces IX and X are continuous may be evident from the description in X of the farms allotted to family-head Wang P'i-luan 王皮亂 and his wife Ch'u-chi 處姬 represented in IX. The characters observed on the right half of the last line 14 of IX should probably read "計布一匹 *chi pu i-p'i*." Seeing that in VIII the family of K'ou-yen T'ien-fu, classified as 課戶中 *k'é-hu chung* (family [responsible] for *k'é*, middle grade), having with one *ting-nan* 丁男 (adult male) and one *ting-ch'i* 丁妻 (adult wife) represented as *k'é chien-shu* 課見輸 (actually paying *k'é*), has a tax item of *chi pu i-p'i*, the family of Wang P'i-luan of Piece IX, similarly classified as *k'é-hu chung*, with one *ting-nan* and one *ting-ch'i* represented as *k'é chien-shu*, should likewise be taken as of *chi pu i-p'i*. Between *pu* 布 on IX 14, and *tsu* 祖 on X 2, 3, and 4, there should have been a description of *ma* 麻, when judged from the form of other pieces of the document (VIII 10, 11 and 13; XI 12, 13, and 15; XII 9, 10, and 12; XIII

12, 13, and 15 ; XVI 7, 10, and 14), and the first two characters on X 1, when the paper is held against the light, may be read as '計麻 *chi ma*'. The whole line of this description of *ma*, when analogized from the case of K'ou-yen T'ien-fu in VIII 11 would certainly have read '計麻二斤 *chi ma erh-chin*'. Next, X and XI should be considered continuous. When X and XI are put together, it would mean that the family of 白醜奴 Po Ch'ou-nu included three *po-ting* 白丁 and two *ting-ch'i*, and this would coincide with the description of *k'é chien-shu* of XI 3 c, e, f, which included three *ting-nan* and two *ting-ch'i*, and also with that of *shou-t'ien-k'ou* 受田口 of XI 17, 18, and 19 which included similarly three *ting-nan* and two *ting-ch'i*. '口一老年八十六 *k'ou i lao-nien pa-shih-liu*' (XI 3 g) would certainly refer to no one but his mother 86 years old represented on X 19. If XI and X considered continuous, it would mean that there are descriptions for 14 persons belonging to the family of Po Ch'ou-nu, but as the total number of the family members given (XI 3 a) read '口十五 *k'ou shih-wu*' (15 persons), it may be considered that between X 21 and XI 1, there was, originally, a description for one more person. According to the record for the women (XI 3 h) '口二中年十二已下 *k'ou erh chung-nien shih-êrh i hsia*' two persons, *chung*, age 12 and less), it would mean that originally this family had two *chung-nü* 中女, and it is evident that the person recorded between the two pieces—X and XI—was one *chung-nü*. The expression '十二已下', judged from the usage in other pieces, would refer to a group including one 12 year-old person and younger person or persons; and considering the presence of one *chung-nü* 10 years old on XI 5, it would be inferred that the *chung-nü* whose record is missing was one 12 years old.

As for the next one, XII, no piece is to be found which could be placed immediately before it. The description which must follow XI, as would be evident from comparing the forms of description in X and XII, would have been that the total sum of *ying-shou-t'ien* 應受田 with its specifications of *i-shou* and *wei-shou*—卅畝麻 *sa-mou ma* on XI 20 must be the sum of *ma-t'ien* under *i-shou*—and there should have followed a description of lands (both *ma* 麻 and *chéng* 正) for three *ting-nan* and two *ting-ch'i* and the residential land *yüan-ché* 園宅 of the family of Po Ch'ou-nu. Since this description would have taken a considerable space, XII which begins with that of another family could not be considered directly continuing from XI. However, XII continues to the following piece, XIII, because '妻任舍女 *ch'i Jên Shê-nü*' on XII 2, and '妻舍女' found in the description of lands on XIII 1 must be one and the same person. As for the last line of XII, only some parts of the right hand side of the characters remain, but the line may be read as '右件二段戶主文成分麻正足'. Previous to XIII 1, originally there must have been one line describing *ma-t'ien* allotted to the wife Shê-nü. As for this family, *ma-t'ien* under *i-shou* is 15 *mou* (XII 17); and *ma-t'ien* allotted to family head [Liu] Wên-chéng being 10 *mou*, *ma-t'ien* allotted to his wife as *ma tsu*

麻足 (*ma full*) (XIII 1) was no doubt 5 *mou*. Therefore, it may be surmised that at the top of the line immediately before XIII 1, '一段五畝麻' was written. On the other hand, XIII and the next piece, XIV are continuous. Because the names '戶主老生 *hu chu* Lao-shêng', '妻臘 *ch'i* La-la', '息阿顯 *hsi* A-hsien' given on XIII 3, 4, and 5 appear on XIV 4, 7, and 10, in the account of lands. The last line, 20 of XIII and the first line I of XIV must be the lines on the extreme right and left of the description concerning *ying-shou-t'ien* of this family. The contents of this description will be more thoroughly investigated later on. As the family headed by '其天婆羅門 *Ch'i-tien* Po-lo-mên,' XIV 12,—though are written as '婆羅門 *Po-mên-lo*' they should read '婆羅門' because of the inversion mark on the right side—, are of six members (Line 15), besides the names of the five persons, the name of one more person was no doubt written on the line which followed Line 17 of XIV. And that person, if judged from the contents of the six members, (15 b) was no doubt entered as 中女 *chung-nü* 13 years old and '死 *dead*'. As for XVI, is found no piece before or after it which can be continuous with it. XVII lacks the left half. Basing upon the contents, the most probable piece that might be continuous from the right half of XVII would be XIV. If the account '牛兩頭特大 (*niu liang-t'ou t'ê ta*)' on XVII 1 were given on the line following the missing description of *chung-nü* of Po-lo-mên family it would not read unnatural. For on XIII 10 and 11, immediately following the description of the people composing the family, there is an instance of registering cattle on an indented line. The family of Po-lo-mên in XIV is *k'ê chien-shu* with one *ting-nan* and one *ting-ch'i* (15 e, h, i), while in XVII a family with one *ting-nan* and one *ting-ch'i* is given as *shou-t'ien-k'ou*. But on the other hand, comparison of the handwriting in XI, XIII, and XIV, and that in XVII would show a number of points of difference in the shape of such characters as '應 *ying*' and '分 *fên*'. Although we could not say that it is absolutely improbable to change hands in writing one document, yet it would be somewhat more prudent, on account of this difference, not to join XVII with XIV directly as continuous at this stage.

When viewed in this light, it is evident that VIII, IX, X, and XI form one group, and XII, XIII and XIV form another. Though there is found no direct evidence that the pieces of these two groups are continuous, it may be seen from the presence of some personal names in common to the two groups, that they are closely and inseparably related to each other. For '白醜奴 *Po Ch'ou-nu*' X 18 is '白醜奴' observed on XII 21; '元興 *Yüan-hsing*' X 12, 13, is '元興' XIV 3; '豐虎 *Fêng-hu*' X 15 is '豐虎' XIV 9; '婆羅門 *Po-lo-mên*' X 15 is suspected of being '婆羅門 *Po-lo-mên*' XIV 12; '匹知拔 *P'i-chih-pa*', '鳥地拔 *Niao-ti-pa*' IX 2, 4 may be respectively identified with '曹匹智拔 *Ts'ao P'i-chih-pa*', '曹鳥地拔 *Ts'ao Niao-ti-pa*' XIV 2, 6. From the fact that the same personal names in common to the two groups appear in the boundary accounts of the farms of

each family, it may be seen that between the families recorded in the two groups, specially between the family of 白醜奴 Po Ch'ou-nu (X, XI), and that of 劉文成 Liu Wên-chêng (XII, XIII), between the family of 王皮亂 Wang P'i-luan (IX, X) and that of 侯老生 Hou Lao-shêng (XIII, XIV), between the family of 耶延天富 K'ou-yen T'ien-fu (VIII, IX) and that of Hou Lao-shêng (XIII, XIV); and very probably between the family of Wang P'i-luan and that of 其天婆羅門 Ch'i-t'ien Po-lo-mên (XIV), there existed relations of adjacency or neighbourhood. It is not clear whether the group of VIII, IX, X, XI, or the group of XII, XIII, XIV, was placed foremost, but I rather favor the view that the latter was probably placed before the former, because in the boundary accounts of farms the names Ts'ao P'i-chih-pa, Ts'ao Niao-ti-pa in the latter group XIV appear in the former group IX, in an abbreviated form, without the family name 曹 Ts'ao. In a continuous document, it is customary to write first the family name and the individual name and later omit the family name; and when this order is reversed, it must be regarded as a special exceptional instance. For instance, Hou Lao-shêng and Liu Wen-chêng, in the earlier part (Lines 2, 3 of XIV) are written only Lao-shêng and Wên-chêng in the following account (Lines 5, 6). If the supposition that 婆羅門 Po-lo-mên X 15 and 其天婆羅門 Ch'i-tien Po-lo-mên XIV 12, are, as previously referred to, one and the same person, is correct, it would be more natural to place X with the abbreviated name, namely without 'Ch'i-t'ien', after XIV. This being about all we can suppose, it would be difficult to determine definitely the sequential relation between the two groups. But if, at any rate, as stated already, they are closely and inseparably related with each other, they would be considered part of a record continuous and placed in adjacency. It would not be improbable to regard as part of the record or of the related documents not only XVII, but also I and XVI whose sequential relation is unknown. 阿奴孤 A-nu-ku I 2 and 阿各孤 A-ko-ku XIV 8 are also personal names which considerably resemble each other; the two may be brothers or men of the same generation of the same clan. However, there being no positive evidence, I shall only point out the resemblance at this stage.

The foregoing are the questions on the interrelations of the pieces in Group A. Let us now examine the pieces in Group B. If we compare the descriptions in II, III and XV (7 et seq.), we notice that their form is similar: first are given the number of families, classified as *tsu* 足 and *wei-tsu* 未足 and the number of family-members; then are written *chien* 賤 and *niu* 牛 if any; after this comes the total sum of farms under *ying-shou* 應受 allotted to these families; and the differentiation between *i-shou* 已受 and *wei-shou* 未受; this order is repeatedly observed. It is true, the farms under *ying-shou* (10, 11, 12) for the 6 families XV 7 are not differentiated between *i-shou* and *wei-shou*, but this is because these 6 families are all *tsu* (full) and therefore farms are allotted to each one of the families

as stipulated in the law. II contains only a 5-lines record at its opening, leaving the rest blank; therefore, this must be one at the end of a series of such records. XV 6 '都合應受田戶參拾參 *tu-ho ying-shou-t'ien-hu san-shih-san*' (The families to receive lands number 33 in all) gives the total of the families; and 6 families of Line 7 which follows and 6 families of Line 13 must be included in the 33 families; but if III is joined to XV and II is joined to III, III would reveal '13 families', '7 families' and II would reveal 'one family', therefore, the number of the families read on these three pieces,—namely, 6, 6, 13, 7, 1 would be exactly 33, the total sum. Very probably, the original order of XV, III, II was this. According to the pieces in Group A (VIII 3, 20; IX 6; X 10, 17; XII 19; XIII 2; XIV 11; XVI 22), 1 *mou* 畝 is allowed as *yüan-chê* 園宅 to each family; now, if we suppose that a similar rule is applied in the pieces in Group B, and join III to XV, *yüan* 園 for 6 families XV 13 will be that on III 4,—namely exactly 6 *mou*; if we join II to III, *yüan* for 7 families on III 17, will be that on II 1,—namely, exactly 7 *mou*. Judging from the style and mode of writing, it would be quite natural to regard these pieces as sequential. If these are considered sequential, it would mean that there is an omission of at least one line between XV and III; and it may be supposed that, there was the description of 9 *liang-k'ou* 良口 most probably *k'ou chiu ting-nü* 口九丁女 which, when 11 *ting-nan* on XV 14 is added to it, should become *k'ou ju liang* 口廿良 on XV 15. When III and II are joined, immediately before II 1, we should also suppose an omission of the sum of the lands under *i-shou* and the number (quantity) of *ma* 麻 and *chéng* 正 which originally existed there. Since, as already stated, there occur omissions of a line or so in the sequential pieces in Group A, we must admit that it is only natural that such omissions should be also in Group B. The total sum of *i-shou* and the number of *ma* and *chéng* immediately before II 1 were most probably written in two lines, but this kind of writing, judged from the other examples III 2, 3, 13, and 14, should have had quite a narrow interval between lines, and compared with the space of omission between other sequential pieces, there would be no objection to such interpretation. It is probable, on the top of the part missing, was written '一頃一十二畝已受 *i ch'ing i-shih-êrh mou i-shou*'.

Now, as for Piece V, I think this ought to be placed immediately before VX. On V 12, is written '都合課丁男參拾柒人 *tu-ho k'é-ting-nan san-shih-ch'i jên* (sum total of male adult [responsible] for *k'é*, 37 persons)'; then follows its specification 五人雜任役 *wu-jên* (5 persons) *tsa-jên-i*'; on XV 3 is written 參拾兩人定見 *san-shih-liang-jên* (32 persons) *ting-chien*; therefore, the total of both kinds would be exactly 37 persons. As a specification of five *tsa-jên-i* 雜人役, one person is given on V 14, while on XV 1, is given one person, and on XV 2 two persons; therefore, if V and XV are pieced together, there should have been between the two an account of one person (一人□□?). If III followed XV, and II followed

III, as previously stated, to wind up the document, all the specifications of 33 *ying-shou-t'ien* families XV 6, excepting the omissions on the ends of the pieces, would be clarified; moreover, since the accounts supposed to have been on the missing parts included no *ting-nan* as already stated, it follows that the number of *ting-nan* in the 33 families is completely recorded; and excepting the first 6 and the last one of the 33 families, as having no *ting-nan*, 11 *ting-nan* in the second 6 families (XV 14), 18 *ting-nan* in the third 13 families (III 7), and 8 *ting-nan* in the fourth 7 families (III 18) would correspond to it. The total of these *ting-nan* would be 37, which would coincide with 37 the exact number of *kê-ting-nan* 課丁男 on V 12. It must be said that this fact confirms the view that supposes V to precede the sequential pieces XV, III, and II.

Now, as for IV, in its first part numbers and quantities with *chin* 斤 and *liang* 兩 as units are written under the classification *liang* 良 and *chien* 賤; then, after the account '都合祖捌拾捌升(石)參躉(斗) *tu-ho tsu pa-shih-pa tan san tou* (sum total of *tsu*, 88 *tan* 3 *tou*)' an explanation of the specification of this *tsu*. The total of 50 *tan* 石 3 *tou* 斗 of *shu-tsu* 輸祖 on line 7 and 38 *tan* of *chê-shu* 折輸 on line 13 would be 88 *tan* 3 *tou*. As a specification of 38 *tan* of *chê-shu*, only the description of 6 *tan* 石 7 *tou* 斗 5 *shêng* 升 and 21 *tan* 7 *tou* 5 *shêng* occurs in IV; hence, besides this, there should be a description of 9 *tan* 5 *tou*. Judging from the account IV 14 and 15, the next line, it is supposed, most probably read [九石五升折輸草十九圍] 下 *chiu tan wu tou chê-shu ts'ao shih-chiu wei, hsia*. Nothing shows on the front side of the joint of IV and V, but when held against the light, one line of writing, of which the right half is cut off, is visible, and the remaining part can be exactly read '九石五升折輸草十九圍下', especially the last character '下' is distinctly legible. As this line is found at the extreme right of V, IV and V must be considered consecutive. As for VI, which contains sum total of *t'iao-pu* 調布 and *ma* 麻 (VI 6, 14), it may be placed consecutively before IV. On the last line, VI 14, it reads '都合麻陸拾柒斤捌兩 *tu-ho ma liu-shih-ch'i chin pa liang* (sum total of *ma*, 67 *chin* 8 *liang*)', while the quantities on the first part of IV (2, 5) read 67 *chin* for *liang* 良 and 8 *liang* 兩 for *chien* 賤; therefore, when IV 4 is considered to be consecutive to VI, the quantities may be quite naturally explained. When IV is joined to VI, the description of *tsu* 祖 will come after the account of *ma* 麻 which follows that of *t'iao-pu*, but seeing that in the pieces in Group A these taxes are recorded in the order of first *pu*, then *ma* and finally *tsu*, the above-said order of Group B will accord with this order of Group A. When VI and IV are joined, another omission must be suspected; which may be supposed one of specification of *ma* immediately after VI 14. Didn't the line read 十斤臺資 *shih-chin t'ai-tzŭ*? For judging from the description of the quantities on IV 1, 2, 3, 4, the sum 10 *chin* should have been given immediately before IV 1, and if VI and IV were consecutive, and the *pu* and *ma* here seen were levied upon the same group of families,

since for *pu* on Lines VI 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 the amounts levied upon *t'ai-tzŭ* 臺資 are written prior to the various classes top, middle and low, it may be considered natural that the amounts of *ma* for *t'ai-tzŭ* should likewise be written prior to the description of *ma* (IV 1, 3, and 4) of the various classes (top, middle, and low).

Next comes VII. This may be placed before VI. VII 6 read '口作拾捌課見輸 *k'ou wu-shih-pa* (58 persons) *k'é chien-shu*' with its specification given as '口卅二男 *k'ou sa-êrh nan* (32 persons male)' (VII 9) and '口兩拾作妻妾 *k'ou liang-shih-wu ch'i ch'ieh* (25 persons, wife and concubine)' (VII 16). The total number of these men and women would be 57, but if VI followed VII, '口賤婢一新 *k'ou chien-pi i hsin* (1 person slave woman, new)' VI 2 could be added to it, making the sum total exactly 58. If VI is joined to VII, both the last line (18) of VII '口三上 *k'ou san shang* (3 persons, top)' and the first line (1) of VI '口九下 *k'ou chiu hsia* (9 persons, low)' may be supposed to explain the contents of 25 wives or concubines, and one line reading '口十三中 *k'ou shih-san chung* (13 persons, middle)' between two lines is missing; its form may be supposed to have been similar to that of explaining 32 males VII 11, 12, 13. If we assume VII, VI, and IV consecutive in order, a quantitative connection may be observed between the total number of men and women classified with the top (*shang* 上), middle (*chung* 中), and low (*hsia* 下) classes, extending over VII and VI, and the total number of *chin* 斤 of the supposed *ma* 麻 likewise divided into the top, middle, and low classes, extending over VI and IV. The total number of 6 men and 3 women classified as top (VII 11 and 18) would agree with 9 (IV 1), the number of *chin* of *ma* likewise classified top, and the total of 10 men and 9 women classified as low (VII 13, VI 1) would agree with 19 (IV 4), the number of *chin* of *ma* likewise classified low. As 13 for the women classified middle may be supposed to have existed between VII and VI, the total of this number 13 and 16, the number of the men classified middle (VII 12), would agree with 29, the number of *chin* of *ma* likewise classified (IV 3). This kind of agreement could by no means be accidental; this could be taken as an evidence that VII, VI, and IV are consecutive. According to the pieces in Group A, as stated later, one *ting-nan* and one *ting-nü* were to pay respectively one *chin* of *ma*; and if the same rule existed in the pieces in Group B, the total of the numbers of *ting-nan* (male adult) and *ting-nü* (female adult) classified into top, middle, low was naturally to agree with the total of the number of *chin* 斤 of *ma* 麻 classified into top, middle, low. 32 men and 25 wives and concubines on VII 9 and 16, are those of *k'é chien-shu* (actually paying *k'é*) and therefore naturally considered *ting-nan* and *ting-nü*.

From the foregoing, we have seen the fact that of the seven pieces of the document in Group B, VII, VI, and IV stand in order and V, XV, III, and II are consecutive. Moreover, a close examination of the contents of the descriptions in the pieces in Group B will show some correlations among many parts,

which will serve to confirm the idea that these two groups of sequential pieces are again consecutive. For it may be noticed that while VII 9 gives 32 as male members (*ting-nan*), XV 3 likewise records 32 as the number of *ting-chien* 定見 corvée. This could by no means be a mere numerical coincidence. The males in VI and IV to be examined in connection with *pu* and *ma* seem to have included, besides the above-mentioned 32, some 臺資 *t'ai-tzŭ*; but the *t'ai-tzŭ*, as will be explained later, are ten men and women—it is quite probably five men and five women, therefore, if five men as *t'ai-tzŭ* were added to 32, the total would be 37. This would agree with 37, the total of *k'é-ting-nan* 課丁男 on V 12, and also with the total of *ting-nan* in the 33 families extending over XV, III, and II—namely, 37 the total of 11 persons (XV 14), 18 persons (III 7), and 8 persons (III 18). Similarly, as for 25 persons as wives and concubines on VII 16 in the former group, if 5 *t'ai-tzŭ* as female members were added to this, the total would be 30, the number of *ting-nü* in the 33 families extending over XV, III, and II (XV 16 [missing], III 10, 20), namely the total of 9 *ting-nü* inferred from the description in XV (14, 15), described 15 *ting-nü* (III 10) and 6 *ting-nü* (III 6). One *chien-pi* 賤婢 (VI 2) of the former group would correspond to one *chien-pi* 賤婢 (III 11) of the latter group. As for 6 cattles in VI (3, 4, and 5), this would correspond to the total 6, namely one cattle, three cattles and two cattles (VX 9, III 1 and 12) kept in the 33 families, extending over XV, III and II.

According to the pieces in Group A, the order of description is as follows: first comes the composition of the family, then below or to the left, is given an account of the total of the family members and of their specifications, representing in the part to the extreme left the number of *ting-nan*, and *ting-ch'i* of *k'é chien-shu*, then is given the amount of *pu*, *ma*, and *tsu* (*shu-tsu* and *chê-shu*) and the number of *shou-t'ien-k'ou* 受田口 (*ting-nan*, *ting-nü*, and *chien-pi*), then is entered the number of *ying-shou* lands classified under *i-shou* and *wei-shou*, then the areas and boundaries of *ma* and *chéng* lands allotted to the members of the family, and is wound up with the account of *yüan-chê*. When the pieces in Group B are joined as already stated, the order of description is as follows: first comes the classification of the members, then is given the number of the male and female persons under *k'é-chien-shu*, and *chien-pi* and cattles, then comes the account of *t'iao-pu*, *ma*, *tsu*, *shui-tsu* 稅祖, and *k'é-ting-nan* and finally the account of *ying-shou-t'ien* families classified by the rate of *i-shou* and *wei-shou*. The arrangement is found to be almost similar to the order of accounts in Group A.

The above investigation has rather clearly shown the order of the arrangement of the pieces in Groups A and B. The result may graphically be shown in the following table.

Throughout the two groups, a piece of paper usually for a line or so is missing on the joint of the two pieces where the writings are consecutive, as has been

pointed out. As this kind of missing occurs regularly, it must be considered that the sheets of paper were uniformly cut off before they were pieced together. Also on the fragments where consecutiveness is doubtful (XVI. I), it seems obvious that cutting was similarly made. As a rule, cutting is noticed to appear at both ends of each sheet of paper. This may be noticed clearly at the joints between IV and V, VIII and IX, IX and X. When this document is studied from the reverse side,—namely the side on which the sūtra is copied, on the extreme right of the left-side paper on the joint, is often observed a vertical strip of the left end of a square vermilion seal mark; sometimes four or five such seal-marks are

A	XVII XVI I <u>XI X IX VIII</u> <u>XIV XIII XII</u>
B	<u>II III XV V IV VI VII</u>

observed up and down. One and the same seal-mark (approx. 4 cm., up and down) appears again and again, and the character on the upper left seems to be '縣 *hsien*', but the right end of the seal-marks being always missing, it is impossible to determine the name of the place. There are also some other traces of a somewhat smaller seal (approx. 3 cm. up and down) used. Judging from the manner of appearances of seals and written lines, it may be seen that the two ends of original pieces of the document were cut off, and that if the original pieces were consecutive with seal-marks on the joint, in cutting off the ends, the ends to the right of the observer of the side under examination were cut off more generously than the other ends. The reason why the ends of each piece were cut is not clear, but it may be inferred that this was to remove the writings which showed the official nature of document including a place name, and was to show the pieces to be legally old scraps. The original form of document before this severance is not known, but from the usual form of documents, it would be natural to suppose that this also formed a scroll. Examination of both ends of each sheet shows that some sheets have a considerable blank space left between the writings and the edge of the paper, others have the writings running up to the very edge of the paper, still others have the writings cut off on the way—and that in various part of the characters. This extreme variety of cutting with regard to the written lines appears to be favourable for the original scroll form. My view is that, if ever the original document had been written separately on separate sheets of paper and then the sheets had been piled in order or bound up, more regularity arising from the circumstances of writing on separate sheets would have remained on the extant sheets, even after the cutting off of both ends, for the cutting itself kept some kind of regularity, which could be observed on the regular side and

width of remaining parts of seal-marks on the other side of the document. Throughout the whole document, a slanting of lines is noticed ; the writings in Group B generally slant toward the right ; this is a likely tendency, not in writing on small separate sheets of paper, but in writing on a long scroll. The Tun-huang document written on the back of paper, it may be supposed, was sometimes cut off at the paper-seam and then rejoined. As for the document we are now investigating, it is inferred that, after some cutting was given to the original form, in piecing the separate sheets, the original order was broken and the writings in Groups A and B became also mixed up.

Now, what was then the relation between Groups A and B? The two groups could not be considered writings completely unrelated at the beginning. As briefly stated previously, they both contain the accounts of family-composition, tax, *corvée*, and allotment of farmlands. The substance and language of the rules concerning these items in both are extremely alike. When closely examined, as stated later, the conformity of accounts appears in such details that the document in the two groups must be written on one and the same legal principle. Group A describes the details of individual families, while Group B gives totals under various classifications for a number of families—33 according to XV 6 ; it follows, therefore, that in compiling a document like B, a knowledge of the details of each family such as given in Group A was naturally imperative. The relation would be understood quite naturally if the writing in Group A is supposed to have existed prior to that in Group B, and Group B was compiled on the basis of Group A. Even A and B were writings compiled on the same legal principle, it would be difficult to determine them as, originally, writings concerning one and the same group of families. A and B seem to have been copied by different hands ; for not only are differences found in the writing of individual characters, but also each line in Group B generally slants toward the right, while most of Group A writings slant to the left. As the two groups being descriptions of different kinds, it is quite possible that they were copied by different hands, and this would not conflict with the idea that originally, A and B possibly were writings of one and the same group of families. When you ran over the contents of the descriptions in Groups A and B, no description is found which would render impossible the idea that both dealt with one and the same group of population. Group B, being a sort of statistics, includes 33 families as seen in B XV, III, and II ; but here I must call your attention to the fact that no inconvenience whatever would ensure even if one took all the writings in Group A to be included in it. Now let us take up the question of *chien* 賤 (-*pi* 婢) found in A and B ; in A, one *pi* appears in XVI 3, and in B one *pi* in III 11 ; so it would be possible to include A in B. But supposing that there were found in A a description of two *pi*, or *nu* 奴 (slave), it would be impossible to include A in B.

The description concerning *pi*, when examined more closely, would serve as a ground for the view that B may be considered a record of statistics which includes A in it. (1) As the family with one *pi* (A XVI 3) is recorded '二分未足 *érh-fén wei-tsu*' (XVI 22), when counted in the record of the totals (B XV, III and II), it should have been included in '戶十三二分未足 *hu shih-san* (13 families) *érh-fén wei-tsu*' (III 6), but in the 13 families in Group B this very '口一賤婢 *k'ou i chien-pi* (1 person slave woman)' (III 11) appears. (2) *pi* in A (XVI 3) represented as '進丁 *chin-ting*', seems to have been promoted to *ting* 丁 and counted as *ting*; and '口一賤婢新 *k'ou i chien-pi hsin* (1 person slave woman, new)' in B (VI 2) shows that, as stated later, just at the time this document was made, there was one who came to be counted newly (新) as a *pi* at this time; so the two perfectly agree. It would be impossible to take this kind of arrangement a mere coincidence, but should be taken to prove that the writings of Group B and of the major part of Group A treated one and the same group of families. The probability that, originally, A and B were preserved together for some significance is fairly high, and the possibility that A and B were joined together in a scroll may also be considered high. At any rate, it would not be unnatural to suppose that for the reason that, until A and B were rearranged for the purpose of using the back side, they had been preserved together, the writings of the two kinds came to exist in a mixed-up state.

After thus investigating the relations between the two groups, let us now turn to an examination of the substance of the descriptions, especially the various regulations concerning the family members, tax corvée and land, and the facts concerning their enforcement. It is proper to proceed, treating Group A and Group B first as two separate pieces of material; yet it must be remembered that some facts might be clarified by studying both kinds simultaneously. Previously, in arranging the writings in Group B, I have made use of the account in Group A concerning *yüan-ché* 園宅 and *ma* 麻. In the following investigation, under various items in the legal regulations, I am going to treat en masse the accounts in Groups A and B. As Group A contains details of individual family members, naturally more emphasis will be placed on A than on B. (to be continued)

六十七斤良
新
上

九斤
下

八
兩

都合祖捌拾
新
新

件拾餅參
新
新

十石七升五升
上

九石
中

九石五升
下

四升
上
賤

六升
上
牛

參拾捌石折輸草柒陸園

六石七升五升折輸草十三園半上

廿一石七升五升折輸草卅三園半中

IV

六十七斤良
九斤
斤
上

廿九斤
斤
中

十斤
斤
下

都合祖捌拾捌餅參新

件拾餅參新輸祖

十石七升五升
上

九石
中

九石五升
下

四升
五升
賤

六升
牛

參拾捌石折輸草柒陸園

六石七升五升折輸草十三園半上

廿一石七升五升折輸草卅三園半中

V

廿一石七升五升折輸草卅九園下

15

14

13

12

11

10

9

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

1

口 一 頭 婢 新

牛 陸 頭

都合調布參拾參丈捌尺

冊三匹二丈良
四匹二丈上
十匹二丈中
九匹二丈下

一 丈 賤

八 尺 牛

都合麻陸陸拾柒斤捌兩

口 冊 一 女 年 一 已 上
口 一 老 實 妻 年 六 十 六
口 一 老 實 妻 年 六 十 六

5v

[VI] 2

牛 陸 頭
口 一 賤 婢 新

四 頭 受 田 課

二 頭 未 受 田 不 課

都合調布參拾參匹參丈捌尺

五 匹 臺 資

四 匹 二 丈 上

十 匹 二 丈 中

九 匹 二 丈 下

一 丈 賤

八 尺 牛

都合麻陸陸拾柒斤捌兩

VII

口 冊 一 女 年 一 已 上

口 一 老 實 妻 年 六 十 六



[VII]

3	2	1	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
							下 也? 朗?							口 作 拾 捌 課 見 輸			口 二 賤 小 婢 年 九	口 五 賈 妻 年 六 十 四 已 下
			口			口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口
						口 兩 拾 伴 妻 妾							口 卅 二 男					
			口			口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口	口
			三			廿 三	十	十	十	六	卅 一	卅 一	卅 一	五 十 三	五 十 三	五 十 三	二 賤 小 婢 年 九	五 賈 妻 年 六 十 四 已 下
			上			新 舊	下	中	上	上	新	舊	新	舊	新	舊	新	舊

VIII

一段十五畝正 舍東北一步 東北至渠 西至道 南至舍
 右件二段弟永業分 麻足 正少五畝
 一段一畝 居住蘭宅

戶主延天富壬辰生年參拾陸 白丁
 母白乙升水亥生年陸拾作 死
 妻劉吐陟丁酉生年參拾壹 丁妻
 息男黃口甲子生年肆 黃男
 息男黃口甲子生年兩 黃男
 計布一匹 凡口五
 計麻二斤 口四見在
 口二課見輸 口二不課
 口一黃年二
 口一課見輸 口一小男年四
 一丁男
 計受田口二 一石五升折輸草三圍
 一丁男
 一丁妻
 計祖三石五升 二石輸 祖
 一石五升折輸草三圍
 計受田口二 一丁男
 一丁妻
 應受田卅六畝 廿六畝已受 十五畝麻 正
 一畝 蘭 二分未足
 一段十畝麻 舍西一步 東至舍 西至渠 南至渠
 一段十畝正 舍東二步 東至匹知拔 西至舍 南至渠 北至渠
 右件二段 戶主天富分 麻足 正少十畝
 一段五畝麻 舍西廿步 東至天富 西至渠 南至鳥地拔 北至渠
 右件一段 妻吐陟分 麻足 正未受
 一段一畝 居住蘭宅

17x

IX [VIII] 6 5 4 3 2 1 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4

a
c-b
e-d
i-h g-f

戶主延天富壬辰生年參拾陸 白丁
 課戶中
 母白乙升水亥生年陸拾作 死
 妻劉吐陟丁酉生年參拾壹 丁妻
 息男黃口甲子生年肆 黃男
 息男黃口甲子生年兩 黃男
 口一出除不課老女死
 口二不課
 口一小男年四
 口一黃年二
 口二課見輸
 一丁男
 一丁妻
 計受田口二 一石五升折輸草三圍
 一丁男
 一丁妻
 計祖三石五升 二石輸 祖
 一石五升折輸草三圍
 計受田口二 一丁男
 一丁妻
 應受田卅六畝 廿六畝已受 十五畝麻 正
 一畝 蘭 二分未足
 一段十畝麻 舍西一步 東至舍 西至渠 南至渠
 一段十畝正 舍東二步 東至匹知拔 西至舍 南至渠 北至渠
 右件二段 戶主天富分 麻足 正少十畝
 一段五畝麻 舍西廿步 東至天富 西至渠 南至鳥地拔 北至渠
 右件一段 妻吐陟分 麻足 正未受
 一段一畝 居住蘭宅

一馬一畝 舊行舊種
 戶主王皮亂己巳生年拾究 白丁
 妻那雷處姬辛卯生年參拾柒 丁妻
 息女之親辛丑生年兩拾柒 中女出嫁受昌郡民泣陵申安
 息女醜婢丙辰生年拾兩 中女出嫁効秦縣斯已奴黨王奴子
 息男買丁巳生年拾壹 中男
 息女子體己未生年究 小女
 口二出除不課中女年廿七已下出嫁
 口二不課 口一中男年十一
 口一小女年九
 口二課見輸 一丁妻
 口四見在
 口二課見輸 一丁妻
 凡口六
 計受祖三石五升 二石 輸 祖
 一石五升折輸草三圍
 計受田口二 一丁男
 一丁妻
 應受田卅六畝 廿二畝已受 十五畝麻
 一畝蘭 七分未足
 廿三畝未受

X
 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 14
 [IX]
 13 12 11 10 9 8 7

a
 c-b
 e-d
 i-h g-f

計受祖三石五升 二石 輸 祖
 一石五升折輸草三圍
 計受田口二 一丁男
 一丁妻
 應受田卅六畝 廿二畝已受 十五畝麻
 一畝蘭 七分未足
 廿三畝未受

計受祖三石五升
 計受田口二
 應受田卅六畝

口二出除不課中女年廿七已下出嫁
 口二不課 口一中男年十一
 口一小女年九
 口二課見輸 一丁妻
 口四見在
 口二課見輸 一丁妻

戶主王皮亂己巳生年拾究 白丁
 妻那雷處姬辛卯生年參拾柒 丁妻
 息女之親辛丑生年兩拾柒 中女出嫁受昌郡民泣陵申安
 息女醜婢丙辰生年拾兩 中女出嫁効秦縣斯已奴黨王奴子
 息男買丁巳生年拾壹 中男
 息女子體己未生年究 小女

興息女阿實甲子生年肆
 興息女莫甲子生年肆
 興息女續男乙丑生年兩
 黃女上
 計麻五斤
 計布二匹二丈
 計祖八石七升五升
 計受田口五
 計麻五斤
 計布一匹
 戶主劉文成己丑生年參拾壹
 妻任舍女甲午生年參拾肆
 息男子可乙卯生年拾參
 息男子義丁巳生年拾壹
 息女子黃口水亥生年仲
 息男子炭辛酉生年柒
 息男黃口甲子生年肆
 小男
 小女
 小男
 小女
 口五不稅
 口四男
 口二中年十三已下
 口二小年七已下
 口一小女年五
 口二臺資擔稅令課
 一丁男
 一丁妻

110v

XII 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 [XI]

a
 $c-b$
 $g-fe-d$
 $i-h$

興息女男莫甲子生年肆 小女
 興息女續男乙丑生年兩 黃女上
 計布二匹二丈
 計麻五斤
 計祖八石七升五升 五石輸祖
 三石七升五升折輸草七圍半
 計受田口五 三丁男
 二丁妻 卅畝麻
 戶主劉文成己丑生年參拾壹 蓋冠將軍 課戶上
 妻任舍女甲午生年參拾肆 臺資妻
 息男子可乙卯生年拾參 中男
 息男子義丁巳生年拾壹 中男
 息女子黃口水亥生年仲 小女 凡口七不課
 息男子炭辛酉生年柒 小男
 息男黃口甲子生年肆 小男
 計布一匹
 口五不稅
 口四男
 口二中年十三已下
 口二小年七已下
 口一小女年五
 口二臺資擔稅令課
 一丁男
 一丁妻

息男息之甲子生年肆小男

才取良使

計布一匹二丈

計麻三斤

計祖六石

計受田口三

一丁妻

一丁六畝未受

一段十畝麻

舍南一步

東至曹四智拔

西至侯老生

南至揀

北至渠

一段廿畝正

舍西五步

東至麻

西至劉文成

南至元興

北至道

右件二段戶主老生分 麻正足

一段五畝麻

舍西卅步

東至老生

西至文成

南至老生

北至渠

一段十畝正

舍南一里

東至曹鳥地拔

西至文成

南至圻

北至老生

右件二段妻膺之分 麻正足

一段十畝麻

舍西一步

東至舍

西至渠

南至阿各孤

北至曹羊仁

一段八畝正

舍南十步

東至渠

南至豐席

南史敬香

北至渠

右件二段息阿顯分 麻足 正少十二畝

12v

[XIII]

息男息之甲子生年肆小男

牛一頭黑特大

計布一匹二丈

計麻三斤

計祖六石 三石七升五升祖

二石二升五升輪草四圍半

計受田口三

二丁男 一丁妻

廿五畝麻

卅六畝未受

一段十畝麻 舍南一步 東至曹四智拔 西至侯老生 南至揀 北至渠

一段廿畝正 舍西五步 東至麻 西至劉文成 南至元興 北至道

一段五畝麻 舍西卅步 東至老生 西至文成 南至老生 北至渠

一段十畝正 舍南一里 東至曹鳥地拔 西至文成 南至圻 北至老生

一段十畝麻 舍西一步 東至舍 西至渠 南至阿各孤 北至曹羊仁

一段八畝正 舍南十步 東至渠 南至豐席 南史敬香 北至渠

右件二段息阿顯分 麻足 正少十二畝

右件二段妻膺之分 麻正足

右件二段息阿顯分 麻足 正少十二畝

XIV

10

9

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

1

20

19

18

17

16

15

14

13

12

11

10

石片二版 息何頭云 屏足 勞志

一段一畝 居住蘭宅
 戶主其天婆門 羅戊辰陸拾 白丁
 課戶上 无誰若以何故取其異也

113v

息男 天婆門 羅戊辰陸拾 早
 息男 羅安水 丑生年拾俵 中男
 息女 頭葵 戊午生年拾 中女
 息男 廻安己未生年究 小男

XV [XIV]

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11

a
 c-b
 e-d
 i-h g-f
 k-j

一段一畝 居住蘭宅
 戶主其天婆門 羅戊辰陸拾 白丁
 課戶上 无誰若以何故取其異也

〔一〕 人 人 防 閣

二 人 虞 侯

參 拾 兩 人 定 見

六 丁 兵 卅 人

葉(乘) 二 人

都合 應 受 田 戶 參 拾 參

戶 六 足

口 六 男 隆 老 中 小

牛 一 頭

死?

口一出除不課中女年十三死

凡口六
 口二男 口一中年十五
 口一 口一小年九

口五見在
 口三不課
 口一 口一中年十

口二課見輸 二丁男
 一丁妻



XVI

[XV]

15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 15 14 13 12 11 10

$$\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 c-b \\
 g-f \quad e-d \\
 i-h
 \end{array}$$

口廿良	六	三	十	一	丁	男
右件應受田壹傾壹拾陸畝足	八	卅	十	畝	正	麻
戶	六	三	分	未	足	蘭

息男衆僧乙卯生年拾參 實年十八
 息男神和甲子生年肆 小男
 婢來花己未生年究 實年十八進丁
 息男黃口甲子生年兩 黃男上

凡口六	口二不課	口一小男年四
口四課見	口一黃男年二	
口一賤丁婢	口三良	一二丁妻

計布一匹三丈	一匹二丈良
計麻三斤八兩	三斤良
計祖六石四升五升	四石二升祖
	四升五升賤
	三石七升五升良
	二石二升五升折輸草四圍半



XVII [XVI]

16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 22 21 20 19 18 17 16

牛 兩 頭 特 大

應受田九十二畝

冊一畝已受
十畝正
一畝菌 二分未足

計受田口四

口三良 二丁男
口一賤丁婢 一丁妻

計布一匹四尺

一匹良
四尺牛

計麻二斤

計祖四石三升

二石八升輸祖 二石五升良
一石五升折輸草三圍 三升牛

計受田口二

一丁男
一丁妻

應受田八十六畝

七十一畝已受 十五畝麻
十五畝未受 一十五畝正
三分未足