Newly Discovered Chinese-Khotanese Bilingual Tallies
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Since 2005, the National Library of China has acquired in succession a group of 35 Chinese-Khotanese bilingual wooden tallies. These (Set I below) are all records of tax collection, dated in the 10th year of the Kaiyuan era of the Tang dynasty (618-907) = 722 CE.

In 1998, Aziz Abdurashit of the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Khotan published the Chinese texts of four other bilingual tallies (Set II below);¹ which were also noticed by Yutaka Yoshida.² Aziz Abdurashit's readings, however, contained many errors which we have endeavoured to correct using new photographs. These tallies are very similar to those in the National Library collection and date from 727, only five years later. We therefore thought it would be appropriate to publish them together.

In addition to the Chinese and Khotanese inscriptions, the tallies all contain notches indicating the amount of grain delivered. Deep notches indicate the number of shuo (a measure) while shallower ones indicate the number of dou (originally in the vernacular form dou) or samgakha. Every deep notch has a small ink dot, and every tenth is painted black, no doubt to facilitate counting. The use of tallies with such notches was common practice in pre-modern Asia, and similar tallies have also been discovered in the Bactrian language.³ However no such tallies have been found in China proper, at Dunhuang, or at Turfan after the eighth century, when paper was most widely used as means of recording. The use of tallies in Khotan may therefore have followed a Central Asian tradition.

The information on the tallies is contained in the Chinese and Khotanese texts and in the system of notches. The Chinese text is written (vertically) from the top of one side of the tally (recto) and then continued on the opposite side (verso). Where there were already deep notches, the Chinese scribe avoided them. The Khotanese text was written (horizontally) where the Chinese ended and in some cases, when there was no room on the recto or verso, on the narrow side of the tally (to the right or left of the Chinese recto). Tally no. 14 was cut square on the recto or verso, on the narrow side of the tally (to the right or left of the Chinese recto). Tally no. 14 was cut square and has four flat sides, with the texts written on adjacent sides. The notches were presumably carved first, then the Chinese text was added, and finally the Khotanese. On each tally, a hole was drilled, perhaps for attaching it to the containers in which the grain was delivered. There are still short strings in the holes of tallies 24, 35, and 36-39.

The grain was delivered by local Khotanese, and, in the tallies of Set II, the deliverer bore the title chi ban (with variant chu ban 處半),⁴ Khot. chau pam.⁵ From the tallies and other documents, it appears that one of the major responsibilities of a chi ban was to collect tax from local villagers, which he would then hand over to higher officials in the government of Khotan and in the Chinese army of Khotan Garrison.⁶ Local Chinese officials played key roles in the recording process. In both sets of tallies we have two kinds of officials belonging to the Tang administrative system of the Garrison of Khotan. The title guan (here: "official") is short for panguan (an administrative assistant), a term attested in Khotanese as phani-kvani.⁷ In Tang bureaucracy, the position of panguan is higher than that of dian (a subordinate clerk; here: "clerk"), although the panguan is mentioned after the dian in the Chinese text on the tallies. The reason for this is that most of the Chinese texts were written by one and the same person, presumably the clerk, while the administrative assistants added their signatures later for authorization. In Set I, there were apparently two administrative assistants who signed the tallies at different times. Their handwritings was very cursive, so our readings of their names, especially the character bing (with variant peng) in Zhang Bing 張並 and xiang in Xiang Hui 相恵 and Xiang Daohui 相道惠 are tentative.

The Khotanese text was written after the Chinese by an anonymous scribe or other official, who, in some cases, was not aware of the content of the Chinese, as suggested by the discrepancies between the Chinese and Khotanese texts. One important aspect of these tallies are their relative antiquity, as they are among the oldest dated Chinese documents discovered in the Khotan area.⁸ Another is the involvement of Chinese officials in the local tax-collection of Khotan at this early period, indicating that Chinese influence was greater than was previously thought.

TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION

The tallies in Set I were recently acquired by the National Library of China. They are still being conserved and have not yet been assigned library numbers. The tallies in Set II are in a private collection in Khotan, and we have only pictures of them.
The following transcriptions and translations are arranged chronologically. To facilitate understanding, punctuation marks are added in the Chinese texts. A single slash / marks a second line below the first line.

SET I

1. Dimensions: 35.9 x 2.6 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽不道遇，送小麥叁穀柒扱。開元十年八月四日，典
- v. 何仙，官張並、相惠。

“Buraoju of Bajia delivered 3 shuo 2 dou of wheat on the 4th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan (= 722). Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

Note: The amount of grain is less in the Khotanese. This may be an error on the part of the scribe.

2. Dimensions: 39.5 x 2.4 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽勃邁道才，送小麥拾穀。開元十年八月四日，典
- v. 何仙，官張並、相惠。

“Boluodaocai of Bajia delivered 7 shuo 1 dou of wheat on the 4th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

3. Dimensions: 36.1 x 2.6 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送小麥貳。
- v. 拾穀壹扱。開元十年八月五日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。

“Yilisangyi of Bajia delivered 20 shuo 1 dou of wheat on the 5th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

4. Dimensions: 28.5 x 1.8 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽不道遇，送小麥伍穀柒頂。開元十年八月六日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
- v. 拴觀，官張並、相惠。

“Buraoju of Bajia delivered 5 shuo 7 dou of highland barley on the 6th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

Note: The amount of grain is less in the Khotanese.

5. Dimensions: 41.7 x 2.8 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送小麥貳拾陸穀。開元十年八月六日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
- v. 十年八月六日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。

“Yi[li]sangyi of Bajia delivered 26 shuo of highland barley on the 6th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

Note: The amount of grain is less in the Khotanese.

6. Dimensions: 43.5 x 1.9 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽本捌，送青麥貳拾陸穀。
- v. 十年八月七日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。

“Bennuo of Bajia delivered 2 shuo of highland barley on the 7th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

Note: The amount of grain is less in the Khotanese.

7. Dimensions: 31.9 x 2.5 cm.

Chinese:
- r. 拔伽勿尷莽，送青麥壹穀拾扱。
- v. 十年八月八日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。

“Wuxiang of Bajia delivered 1 shuo 1 dou of highland barley on the 8th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:
Note: The ma of marṣi is at the end of line 1 and was erroneously repeated in line 2.

8. Dimensions: 36.6 x 2.5 cm.
Chinese:
r.  "[He]xina of [Bajia] delivered 3 shous 2 douis of wheat on the 9th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
| birgamdarajā haskadattā ganam hauđi kūsa 3 ʂamgā 2 ʂo / marṣi salya  || |
"Haskadatta of Birgamdara delivered 3 kūsa 2 ʂamgās of wheat in the year of ʂau Maṛṣa."
Note: ʂo instead of ʂau at the edge, here and elsewhere (POS).

9. Dimensions: 34.0 x 3.0 cm.
Chinese:
r. "Aliangyu of Bajia delivered 1 shuo 2 douis of highland barley on the 22nd day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
birgam dara aryaṃgula rrusa hauđi kūsa 1 kha 2
"Aryangula of Birgamdara delivered 1 kūsa 2 kha of highland barley."

10. Dimensions: 28.0 x 1.8 cm.
Chinese:
r. "Sang[... ] of Bajia delivered 8 douis of highland barley on the 28th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
birgam dara samgatā rrusa hauđi kha 8
"Sāṃgata of Birgamdara, delivered 8 khabas of highland barley."

11. Dimensions: 41.7 x 2.0 cm.
Chinese:
r. "Wuxi xin of Bajia delivered 4 shous of highland barley on the 22nd day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
| birgamdarajā samauna āysam bodā kūsa 1 ʂamgā 8 ʂau marṣi / salya  || |
"Samauna of Birgamdara delivered 1 kūsa 8 ʂamgās of millet in the year of the ʂau Maṛṣa."
Note: The character song 送 was erroneously repeated.

12. Dimensions: 39.5 x 2.0 cm.
Chinese:
r. "Ximuna of Bajia delivered 1 shuo 6 douis of millet on the 28th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
birgam dara visaramr rrusa haud āysam 8 / s ̣o mars ̣i salya
"Visara of Birgamdara delivered 8 ʂamgās of millet in the year of the ʂau Maṛṣa."
Note: Xinamu  hảo has a transposition sign between na  hảo and mu  hảo and should be read Ximuna  hảo.

13. Dimensions: 41.7 x 2.5 cm.
Chinese:
r. "Ximuna of Bajia delivered 8 douis of millet on the 28th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
birgamdarajā samauna āysam bodā kūsa 1 ʂamgā 8 ʂau marṣi / salya
"Samauna of Birgamdara delivered 1 kūsa 8 ʂamgās of millet in the year of the ʂau Maṛṣa."
Note: Ximuna 感木 has a transposition sign between na 感 and mu 感 and should be read Ximuna 感木.

14. Dimensions: 26.9 x 1.7 cm.
Chinese (written on two adjacent sides of the square cut tally):
side I. "Bajia delivered 8 douis of highland barley on the 22nd day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
| birgamdarajā samauna āysam bodā kūsa 1 ʂamgā 8 ʂau marṣi / salya  || |
"Samauna of Birgamdara delivered 1 kūsa 8 ʂamgās of millet in the year of the ʂau Maṛṣa."
Note: ʂo for ʂau presumably because the scribe thought there was too little room below bi (POS).

15. Dimensions: 41.7 x 2.5 cm.
Chinese:
r. "[W]uxi xin of Bajia delivered 8 douis of highland barley on the 22nd day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui."

Khotanese:
| birgamdarajā samauna āysam bodā kūsa 1 ʂamgā 8 ʂau marṣi / salya  || |
"Samauna of Birgamdara delivered 1 kūsa 8 ʂamgās of millet in the year of the ʂau Maṛṣa."
Note: ʂo for ʂau presumably because the scribe thought there was too little room below bi (POS).
16. Dimensions: 33.9 x 2.3 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送床壹碩伍斗。開元十年八月廿八
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Yilisangyi of Bajia delivered 1 shous 5 dou of wheat on the 18th day of the 8th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| birgam darajä yilisangyä gausä būdi küsa 1 säsä mași salya |
|| yilisangyä of Bajia delivered 1 küsä 5 säsä of millet in the year of the sau Marsa.”
Note: The scribe was apparently dissatisfied with the 3a and wrote it once more (POS).

17. Dimensions: 46.0 x 2.7 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送床壹碩壹斗。開元十年九月三
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Buluodaocai of Bajia delivered 7 shous 1 dou of millet on the 3rd day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| istākajä bryadāysai yasam hauḍā küsa 1 sa saṃga 5 so mași salya |
|| yastāka yaṃgya of Ustāka delivered 1 kūsa 5 saṃgas of millet in the year of the sau Marsa.”
Note: The type of grain differs in the two languages. One of the two must be a mistake.

18. Dimensions: 29.6 x 2.1 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送栗壹碩伍斗。開元十年九月三
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Buluodaocai of Bajia delivered 1 shous 5 dou of millet on the 3rd day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| istākajä bryadāysai gausā hauḍā küsa 1 sa saṃga 5 sau maśli salya |
|| bryadāsaa of Ustāka delivered 1 kūsa 5 saṃgas of millet in the year of the sau Marsa.”
Note: The type of grain differs in the two languages. One of the two must be a mistake.

19. Dimensions: 28.1 x 2.8 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送栗壹碩壹斗。開元十年九月三日，典
v. 何仙，官張並、相惠。

Khotanese:

|| birgam darajä samauna gausā hauḍā saṃga 2 |
|| samauna of Birgandara delivered 2 saṃgas of millet.”
Note: The reading of sa 薯 is tentative.

20. Dimensions: 30.2 x 1.9 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送栗壹碩伍斗。開元十年九月三
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Peina of Bajia delivered 3 shous 3 dou of highland barley on the 3rd day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| istākajä puṇadatti rrusa hauḍā kū[sa 3] kha 3 |
|| puṇadatta of Ustāka delivered 3 kūsas 3 khās of highland barley.”

21. Dimensions: 32.2 x 3.0 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送栗壹碩伍斗。開元十年九月三
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Pennuo of Bajia delivered 1 shou 5 dou of highland barley on the 5th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| istākajä saṃmuṇḍa gau’sa hauḍā kū[sa 3] kha 3 |
|| puṇadatta of Ustāka delivered 3 kūsas 3 khās of highland barley.”

22. Dimensions: 45.0 x 2.7 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送栗壹碩伍斗。開元十年九月三
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Peina of Bajia delivered 3 shous 3 dou of highland barley on the 3rd day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| istākajä bām ḍakā saṃmuṇḍa hauḍā kū[sa 3] kha 3 |
|| saṃmuṇḍa of Birgandara delivered 3 saṃgas of millet.”
Note: The reading of sa 薯 is tentative.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽努讓道才，送栗壹碩伍斗。開元十年九月三
v. 日，典何仙，官張並、相惠。
“Peina of Bajia delivered 3 shous 3 dou of highland barley on the 3rd day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:

|| istākajä bām ḍakā saṃmuṇḍa hauḍā kū[sa 3] kha 3 |
|| saṃmuṇḍa of Birgandara delivered 3 saṃgas of millet.”
Note: The reading of sa 薯 is tentative.

Khotanese:

|| birgam darajä samauna gausā hauḍā saṃga 2 |
|| samauna of Birgandara delivered 2 saṃgas of millet.”
Note: The type of grain differs in the two languages. One of the two must be a mistake.
Khotanese:  
|| istākajā puñadattā gauśā hauḍā kūsa 1 śaṅga 7 sau marṣi’ salya ||  
“Puñadatta of Ustāka delivered 1 kūsa 7 śaṅgas of millet in the year of the sau Maṛṣā.”

23. Dimensions: 52.6 x 2.7 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送粟玖砃。開元十年九月七日，典何仙，官張。  
v. 休，相惠。  
“Yilisangyi of Bajia delivered 9 shou of millet on the 7th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese:  
|| istākajā īrasam gä gausä haud ̣ä kūsa 9 s ̣s ̣au mars ̣i’ salya ||  
“Īrasaṃ ga of Ustāka delivered 9 kūsa s of millet in the year of sau Marṣa’.”  
Note: The scribe presumably omitted the hook in gausä because there was no room at the edge (POS).

24. Dimensions: 29.1 x 2.6 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽□□，送床壹碕柒斗。開元十年九月  
v. 八日，典何仙，官張並、相道惠。  
“ [... of Bajia delivered 1 shuo 7 dous of millet on the 8th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Hui.”

Khotanese (on recto below the Chinese):  
|| istākajā viśa āysam h o d ̣ä kūsä 1 s ̣am ̣ga 7 s ̣s ̣au mars ̣a salya ||  
“Viśa of Ustāka delivered 1 kūsa 7 sams of millet in the year of sau Marṣa’.”  
Note: The reading of the second akṣara of Viśa is uncertain (POS).

25. Dimensions: 39.2 x 2.0 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽阿兩關，送粟貳碕叁斗。開元十年九月十九日，典何仙，官  
v. 張並、相道惠。  
“Aliangyu of Bajia delivered 2 shuo 3 dous of millet on the 19th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:  
|| birgam ̣ dara āysam ̣ h o d ̣ä kūsä 1 s ̣am ̣ga 7 s ̣s ̣au mars ̣a salya  
“Āryaṃ gula of Birgaṃdara delivered 1 kūsa s 7 sams of millet at the year of sau Marṣa’.”  
Note: The scribe presumably omitted the hook in āysam because there was no room at the edge (POS).

26. Dimensions: 28.8 x 2.5 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽阿兩隅，送青麥肆斗。開元十年九月十九日，  
v. 典何仙，官張並、相道惠。  
“Aliangyu of Bajia delivered 4 dous of highland barley on the 19th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:  
|| birgam ̣ dara āysam ̣ h o d ̣ä kūsä 1 s ̣am ̣ga 7 s ̣s ̣au mars ̣a salya  
“Āryaṃ gula of Birgaṃdara delivered 1 kūsa s 7 sams of millet at the month of Mūtcaca of the year of the sau Maṛṣa’.”  
Note: The scribe presumably omitted the hook in āysam because there was no room at the edge (POS).

27. Dimensions: 39.0 x 2.5 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送床拾碕。開元十年九月十九日，典何仙，  
v. 官張並、相道惠。  
“Yilisangyi of Bajia delivered 10 shuo of millet on the 9th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:  
|| @ birgam ̣ dara āysam ̣ h o d ̣ä kūsä 10 s ̣s ̣au marṣi’ salya mūtcacaji māśtä  
“Īrasaṃ ga of Birgaṃdara delivered 10 kūsas of millet in the month of Mūtcaca of the year of the sau Maṛṣa’.”

28. Dimensions: 28.0 x 2.7 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽不你俱，送粟肆斗。開元十年九月廿三日，典何仙，官  
v. 張並、相道惠。  
“Buniju of Bajia delivered 4 dous of millet on the 23th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:  
|| haksadati birgam ̣ dara  
“Haksadatta of Birgaṃdara.”

29. Dimensions: 33.3 x 1.7 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽不你俱，送粟肆斗。開元十年九月廿三日，  
v. 典何仙，官張並、相道惠。  
“Buniju of Bajia delivered 4 dous of millet on the 23th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:  
|| puñekulī  
“Puñekula.”

30. Dimensions: 33.3 x 1.7 cm.  
Chinese:  
r. 拔伽賀悉難，送粟壹碕叁斗。開元十年九月廿四日，典何仙，官張並、相道惠。  
“Buniju of Bajia delivered 4 dous of millet on the 24th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:  
|| puñekulī  
“Puñekula.”
Khotanese:

haskadati birgada

"Haskadatta of Birganda[ra]."

31. Dimensions: 18.7 x 2.4 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽贺悉捺，送青麦壹斗。開元九年九月
v. 廿四日，典何仙，官張並、相道惠。

“Hexina of Bajia delivered 1 dou of highland barley on the 24th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan.
Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Note: The Chinese character hui 歪 is written upside down.

Khotanese (on recto below the Chinese):

haskadati birgada

"Haskadatta of Birganda[ra]."

32. Dimensions: 35.5 x 3.3 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送粟陆斗。開元十
v. 年□月□日，典何仙，官張並、相道惠。

“Yilisangyi of Bajia delivered 2 dou of wheat on the 24th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan.
Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:

istākajä īrasam ̣ gä gau’sä haud ̣ä kūsä 1 ṣaṃg ạ s of wheat in the year of the ṣaụ Marṣa’.

33. Dimensions: 41.5 x 3.3 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽伊里喪宜，送小麥貳斗。開元十年九月廿四日，典何仙，官張。
v. 並、相道惠。

“Yilisangyi of Bajia delivered 1 shou 8 dou of millet on the 11th day of the 9th month of the 15th year of Kaiyuan.
Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Note: mi 米 corrected into su 升. See below.

Khotanese:

istākajä irasamg̣ạ gau’sạ̄ hauḍạ̄ kūṣạ 1 ṣaṃg ạ ṣ of millet in the year of the ṣaụ Marṣa’.

34. Dimensions: 35.2 x 2.0 cm.

Chinese:

r. 拔伽表捺，送小麥貳斗。開元十年九月廿四日，典何仙，官張。
v. 並、相道惠。

“Boliangdāocai of Bajia delivered 1 shou 3 dou of millet on the 26th day of the 9th month of the 10th year of Kaiyuan.
Clerk: He Xian. Officials: Zhang Bing, Xiang Daohui.”

Khotanese:

gau’sä

“Millet.”

SET II

36. Second tally from top, dimensions not known

Chinese:

r. 屋悉貴叱半伊里桑宜，納小麥肆斗。開元十五年九
v. 月十一日，典劉德，官李賢賓。

“Yilisangyi, chi ban of Wuxigui, paid 4 dou of wheat on the 11th day of the 9th month of the 15th year of Kaiyuan (=727 CE).
Clerk: Liu De. Official: Li Xianbin.”

Khotanese:

birgam ̣ dara śudam ̣ gulä rrusa kha 4 śyeye ṣaụ hvi ̣ṃ̣ dụ̄ s second year.

Note: The type of grain differs in the two languages. One of the two must be a mistake.

37. Bottom tally

Chinese:

r. 屋悉貴叱半里桑宜，納青麥柒斗。開元十五年九
v. 月十三日，典劉德，官李賢賓。

“Yilisangyi, chi ban of Wuxigui, paid 7 dou of highland barley in the 9th month of the 15th year of Kaiyuan.
Clerk: Liu De. Official: Li Xianbin.”

Khotanese:

birgam ̣ dara śudam ̣ gulä rrusa kha 7 śyeye ṣaụ hvi ̣ṃ̣ dụ̄ s second year.

38. Third tally from top

Chinese:

r. 屋悉貴叱半桑倗(t), 納小麥伍斗。開元十五年九
v. 月十二日，典劉德，官

E賢賓。
"Yilisangyi, chi ban of Wuxigui, paid 5 dou of wheat on the 24th day of the 9th month of the 15th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: Liu De. Official: Li Xianbin."

Khotanese:
birgamḍara śudamgula ganam kha śyyeye śau hvim salye
"Śudamgula of Birgamḍara [delivered] 5 kha of wheat in the śau Hvimū’s second year."

39. Top tally
Chinese:
"Yilisangyi, chi ban of Wuxigui, paid 6 dou of millet on the 10th day of the 10th month of the 15th year of Kaiyuan. Clerk: Liu De. Official: Li Xianbin."

Khotanese (pictured upside down):
śidam ḡula — śūresa
"Śidaṃgula (to?) General Śūresa"

Note: Cf. śau śūresa in M.T. i.0028 [Mazar Tograk], year 22 (POS).

COMMENTARY
To facilitate further discussion, the basic information in the tallies is tabulated in Table 1.

### Table 1. Places, people, dates, and commodities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I. Tallies of the year 722</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toponyms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The type and amount of grains here tabulated follow what was recorded in the Khotanese. Any slight differences in the Chinese are noted in the transcriptions.*
referred to in the Chinese as Bajia and Wuxigui or "hamlet" or "village." with the meaning "house," corresponds here to Chinese "villagers of Phaṅsa," and, elsewhere, the inhabitants of Birganḍa are called birganḍaraṇa ayaḥ "villagers of Birganḍa." The relationship between Birganḍa and Uṣṭāka is further clarified by a Khotanese receipt for mūrā coins, where ustākajā māmattī "Māmattī of Uṣṭāka," who delivered 426 mūras, is listed under the heading of tīt būrī birganḍara saloka mūrā nātī "these many mūras Saloka received in Birganḍa." This is a clear indication that Uṣṭāka is a smaller place in the area of Birganḍa. Moreover, the short Or.12.6.17/13 contains the phrase ustākajāṇa biṣa chau pam arsā, which Skjærvø translated as "The Uṣṭākian Biṣa, Chau Pam (and) Arsa(?)." Since the title usually preceded personal names in Khotanese, in light of Duan’s discovery, biṣa is now seen to be the locative singular of biṣa-, and the phrase must be translated as "The chau pam official (Chinese chi ban 半) Arsa - in the hamlet of Uṣṭāka."19

Hiroshi Kumamoto, in his 1996 discussion of the "Six Villages," stated: "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 Birganḍa, Āśura, Gayśā 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."20 This is, however, not the case. In Or.92.68A/b3 one finds birganḍara ayaḥ which no doubt means "in the village of Birganḍa." In the same document (line 3), we also have phamnāja auyā "villagers of Phamnā," and, elsewhere, the inhabitants of Birganḍa are called birganḍaraṇa ayaḥ "villagers of Birganḍa." This clearly shows that Birganḍa, Phamnā,
The local Tang administrative system may help us understand better the relationship between *au* and *biśā*. The Tang *Linian* 唐六典, the official compilation of legal documents, recorded that “One hundred households constitute a li 里 ‘village’ and five *li* constitute a *xiang* 郷 ‘sub-district.’ From the Two Capitals to various *zhou* 州 ‘prefecture’ and *xian* 縣 ‘district,’ cities are divided into *fang* 坊 ‘wards’ and the area outside the city into *cun* 村 ‘hamlets.’ In either *li* or *cun* and *fang*, a *zheng* ‘head’ is placed in charge of supervision.”

A Chinese monastery account book dated in the Kaiyuan era (c. 721 CE) discovered by Stein in Mazar-Tagh, a site to the north of Khotan City, records the *"chau pam" Boyaanuo of Zhengsheng Ward of the City* 市城政聲坊叱婆闌諾 (I 12), *"chau pam" Shemi of Anren Ward of the City* 市城安仁坊叱半蛇蜜 (II 12) and *"chau pam" Sadong of Juemigong Hamlet, Boningye Sub-district of Xihe* 西河勃寧野廈彌烘村叱半薩蠻 (III 13).

The fact that *chau pam* appeared after both ward and hamlet is in accordance with the Tang code which put both of them on the same administrative level. As proved by Duan Qing, the Khotanese *biśā* corresponds to the Chinese *cun*. In Or 12 575/13 we find *ustākajāña biśa chau pam* in which *chau pam* was used with *biśā*. This puts *biśā*- also on the same administrative level as *cun* and *fang*. We may also compare this *chau pam* with the *zheng* “head” which was said to have existed in both *cun* and *fang*.

According to the Tang administrative system, *xiang* “sub-district” was immediately above *cun*. Since Ustākā was a *biśa*- or *cun*, we may assume that the area of Birgandara, which was an *au* in Khotanese, may have been a *xiang* according to the Chinese system. We have had no direct evidence for this so far, but, by chance, an unpublished document in a private collection in Beijing, mentions *Jieixi Xiang* 僧西鄉, *Gaysāt xiang*. Judging from numerous Khotanese texts, Gaysāta must have been an *au*, just like Birgandara, so *xiang* and *au* may also be on the same administrative level. Moreover, as shown long ago, *kṣa au* equals Chinese *liucheng* 六城 “Six Towns.” The word *au* therefore corresponds to both Chinese *xiang* 鄉 and *cheng* 城. Note that, in previous studies, *kṣa au* is usually translated as “in the Six Villages.” With reference to the Chinese document, “in the Six Towns” may be a more appropriate translation.

The relationships discussed above can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khotanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>au</em></td>
<td><em>xiang</em> 郷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>biśa</em></td>
<td><em>cun</em> 村</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of this, the discrepancies in the use of the toponyms may tentatively be explained by assuming that Birgandara and Ustākā were adjacent to one other but that the term Birgandara, perhaps the larger of the two, also referred to the larger area comprising these two villages as well as others. Thus, in the tallies of Set I, people from both Birgandara and Ustākā were considered as from the greater area of Bajia in Chinese. In fact, in the Khotanese part, Bradāṣāa was regarded as being from Birgandara in no. 2, but from Ustākā in nos. 17, 18 and 34. Since these tallies are closely related to each other, Bradāsa and Aryangula, who can hardly be different people sharing the same names, should similarly be regarded as being from both Birgandara and Ustākā. This further proves that Ustākā must have been within the area of Birgandara. In the tallies of Set II, the *uxūgūi chi ban* (chau pam of Ustākā) Yilisangyi was, of course, also an inhabitant of Birgandara, indeed he may well have been the same Yilisangyi as the one in Set I, but perhaps, because *chau pam* was a lesser official of a *biśa*-, he could only be referred to as *uxūgūi chi ban* (chau pam of Ustākā) rather than *bajia chi ban* (chau pam of Birgandara, an *au*).

### Personal names

With the exception of tally 16, the Khotanese and Chinese proper names in Set I correspond and so provide further material for the study of Khotanese and Chinese phonetics. In tally 16, the Chinese has Yilisangyi 伊里桑宜, which corresponds to Khotanese Īrasa, while the Khotanese has Aryangula, which is Chinese Liangyu 阿亮隅 elsewhere. Here, one of the two may be mistaken. In the four tallies of Set II, the name Yilisangyi (伊里桑宜 or 一里桑宜) is used three times, and another name, which we tentatively read as 桑俱, appears once; but, here, the Khotanese has Sudaŋula.

The proper names in these dated documents have other historical significance, as well. As noted by Skjærvø, of the four documents on two wooden tablets from the reigns of Viśa Śīhya and Viśa Dharma, three (IOL Khot Wood 1/1; IOL Khot Wood 1/2; Urumchī i) concerning legal matters in Birgandara “had been written by the same person, the kārīa (scribe?) Khuradatta.” Among names found in these documents, at least four proper names also appear in the two sets of tallies discussed in this article: Īrasa, Bradāṣāa, Puñadatta, and Virsa. As argued above, even those labelled as being from Ustākā are also inhabitants of the greater area of Birgandara, and it is tempting to compare them with those mentioned in the wooden tablets. Further study is needed for this, however.

The name of the *ṣau* official in Set I, Marṣā, Chinese *moshi* 末士, also occurs in Hedin 16 (Ms. 1941:16.13), line 23 with the title of *ṣātā*. But *ṣau* is usually regarded as a higher position than *ṣātā*, and Hedin 16 was written, according to Zhang Guangda and Rong Xinjiang, almost 80 years later (801) than the tallies of Set I. The two Marṣā can therefore not have been the same person.
The correct reading of the sau official in Set II as Hvindū was kindly pointed out by P. O. Skjærvø who also reminded us of the two other documents in which this name appeared, namely Or. 9268A which mentions his second year (viśa' dharmā ... se'yye sau hvindū salya) and Or. 12657/21.3a which also mentions his (first?) year (sali i i'ksupa yauvarāya gysta tye scye / sau hvindū salya). To this we may add another document, SI M 33 (sau hv[im]dū salya). As seen from these examples, sau was often used in the dating formula of Khotanese documents. Sau was a very high level official in the Khotan administrative system and we may assume, therefore, that a limited number of people held this position. Hvindū in Set II was in all probability the same official as the Hvindū of the three other documents mentioned above. From Set II we know that the second year of sau Hvindū is 727. Therefore the document Or. 9268A may be dated in the same year. This can help us to determine the date of the beginning of the reign of the Khotanese king Viśa' Dharma.

Terms of measurement

From the two sets of tallies it is clear that kūsa corresponds to Chinese shuo 劝 or shi 石, whereas samga and kha both correspond to Chinese dou 斗. This is probably the reason for the "complementary distribution" of these two terms noted by Skjærvø. Since śinga is usually regarded as the equivalent of Chinese sheng 青, we clearly have a threefold decimal system similar to the Chinese system:

1 kūsa = 10 khas = 10 samgas = 100 śingas.

The reason why both kha and samga denote the same amount deserves further discussion. Bailey considered kha to be cognate with Old Indic khāra and attributed an Iranian origin to samga. In the Kharoṣṭhī documents, however, the term kha denoted a relatively small amount of grain. If it is cognate with Khotanese kha, the difference between kha and samga may be a chronological one and kha a local term on the southern rim of the Taklamakan Desert used from at least the third century, when the Kharoṣṭhī documents were written, whereas samga may be later in origin. This hypothesis requires another table (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>samga</th>
<th>kha</th>
<th>Catalogue signatures</th>
<th>Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vikram year 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Or.12657/14.1</td>
<td>Catalogue, 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 CE</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Set II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vāham year 7</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hedin 26 (Ms. 1941.32.1)</td>
<td>KT 4, 38-39, 140-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vāham year 15</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI P103. 49</td>
<td>SDTV 3, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vāham year 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or.6592/1 (M.9) Hoernle 1</td>
<td>Catalogue, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vāham? year 20</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or.6596/1 (G.1)</td>
<td>Catalogue, 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vāham? year 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SI P103.23</td>
<td>SDTV 3, 144-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśa Vāham? year ?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or.6593/1 (M.9)</td>
<td>Catalogue, 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown king year 4</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI P 93.1</td>
<td>SDTV 3, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown king year 7</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>IOL Khot Wood 1.4</td>
<td>Catalogue, 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown king year 7 Year of the Hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IOL Khot 157/5</td>
<td>Catalogue, 352-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown king year 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IOL Khot 177/2</td>
<td>Catalogue, 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown king year 15</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>IOL Khot 201/1</td>
<td>Catalogue, 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown king year 21</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hedin 4 (Ms. 1941.36.4)</td>
<td>KT 4, 23-24, 74-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Cock</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>SI M 1</td>
<td>SDTV 3, 174-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Samga and kha in dated documents
From Table 3 we see no clear-cut chronological difference, except that, in documents generally regarded as from the Tibetan era, the use of *samga* is almost exclusive.38

Another difference between *kha* and *samga* was the context in which both terms were used. The term *samga* was very often followed by the smaller unit of *simga = Chinese sheng* 畿, which is never used with *kha*. Indeed, it seems that no terms indicating a smaller unit of weight was ever used with *kha*. For example, in IOL Khot Wood 58, 3.5 *khas* was represented by *kha* 3 1/2 rather than *kha* 3 *simga* 5.39 This may also imply an earlier date of *kha* since the wide use of *simga* was possible only after the Chinese occupation.

The relationship between *samga* and *simga* was assumed to be *samga = 4 simga* by Emmerick in his study of the medical text *Jivaka-pustaka,*40 and this equation was later adopted by Skjærve.41 But Emmerick’s conclusion conflicted with his argument since, as he mentioned, the relationship of 2.5 *simga* = 1 *prastha* was well established in proscript 5, 8, 18, 33, 39, 50, and 61 of the *Jivaka-pustaka,* making it impossible for *simga* to be “the equivalent of Sanskrit *prastha.*”42 Many instances in other secular documents contradicted Emmerick’s assumption as well.43 Since the number of *simgas* used included 7 and 8, it is only natural to assume that most secular documents, including the medical texts, adopted a system of measurements similar to the decimal ones established above.44

In addition to *simga* and *samga,* the term *thanga,* like *simga,* is a Chinese word *cheng* 程, as convincingly demonstrated by Yoshida.45 All three terms are frequently used in *Jivaka-pustaka,* but are conspicuously absent from the *Siddhasāra,* as noted by Emmerick.46 One may wonder why this is so, and, although we cannot discuss this complicated issue at present, suffice it to mention that this fact may provide evidence for when and where these two medical texts were composed and under what circumstances.

**Names of grains**

In Bailey’s *Dictionary,* the grains are identified as follows:47 *āysam:* millet, *Panicum miliaceum* *gau’sa:* wheat *rrusa:* barley

Bailey’s suggestion was largely accepted by later scholars. Yoshida has now identified *gau’sa* as 小麥, *rrusa* as 大麥, *gau’sa* as 穩, *āysam* as 秸 and *āysam* as 青,48 and, with the help of our bilingual tallies, Yoshida’s identifications may be further refined and corrected: *āysam:* millet 床 *Panicum miliaceum* *gau’sa:* wheat 小麥 *Triticum aestivum* *rrusa:* millet 格 *Setaria italicca* *rrusa:* highland barley 青麦

Since *āysam* (床) and *gau’sa* (粟) both denote millet, but of different kinds, they probably resembled each other and may have sometimes been confused, as in tallies nos. 19 and 21, where Chinese 床 erroneously corresponds to Khotanese *gau’sa.* However, the fact that in tally no.33, the scribe of the Chinese part changed the name of the grain from 床 to 穩, corresponding to Khotanese *gau’sa,* indicates that the difference was maintained and the correct relation between Chinese and Khotanese words was fully understood. Despite these scribal errors, the corresponding relations established above are still valid.49

**Notes**


This was already noticed by Chavannes, Les documents chinois, 221, n. 7.


110
This may be the cengām ʂ amalg (Chinese ʂ amalg) mentioned in Hedin 4 (Ms. 1941.36.4. Bailey, KT 4, 23-4, 74-9). But there is no reason to assume that ʂ amalg always represented this same value. In fact, in Or.1125/1, baudi cengām ʂ amalg (a ʂ amalg of 7 ʂ amalg) is mentioned (Skjærvø, Catalogue, 85-6). See also N. Sims-Williams and J. Hamilton, Documents turco-sogdiens du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-houang (London: Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, 1990), 31-32, who linked Sogdian ʂ nk, Tocharian B ʂ an and Khotanese ʂ amalg, regarding them all as loanwords from Chinese ʂ ng. They proposed that Khotanese ʂ ming, also from the same Chinese word, was borrowed into Khotanese early, perhaps in Han dynasty, and that the actual amount represented by it gradually dwindled. In the Tang dynasty, the use of both large ʂ ng and small ʂ ng (one third of the large ʂ ng) co-existed, and Khotanese ʂ ming represented the large ʂ ng, thus three times the amount of ʂ ming. This conclusion is apparently in line with Emmerick’s equation of 1 ʂ ming = 4 ʂ ming. But, as the present authors have (hopefully) demonstrated, the relation between these two Khotanese words was actually decimal, and there is no reason to regard ʂ ming as being earlier than ʂ ming, because they were usually used together. While ʂ ming was certainly borrowed from Chinese ʂ ng, ʂ ming may well in fact have a different origin.

Yoshida, Kōtango sezoku monjo, 156; Yoshida, "On the Taxation System of Pre-Islamic Khotan," 118.

We would like to thank P. O. Skjærvø who reminded us of these differences between the Chinese and the Khotanese.

Yōshida, Kōtango sezoku monjo, 156, note 20; Yōshida, "On the Taxation System of Pre-Islamic Khotan," 111-12.
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