

## Life in Third-fourth Century Cadh'ota:

A survey of information gathered from the Prakrit documents  
found north of Minfeng (Niyä)

by

CHRISTOPHER ATWOOD

Bloomington

In the text that follows '§' refers to the number of the document as transcribed in Boyer, Noble, Rapson, and Senart 1920–1929, and as translated in Burrow 1940. All translations are taken from Burrow 1940; I have only changed the translation of certain terms to fit that adopted in this paper (see Appendix II). Any date preceded by simply "Year ..." refers to the date in the combined chronology formed by assigning year 1 to the first year of Tajaka, the first king of Shanshan known from the documents, and adding on all the other royal dates noted on the documents. Since some years are probably missing from the ends of the various reigns, the combined chronology date is the minimum number of years elapsed since year 1 of Tajaka. The chronology can be put in a table below:

King	Combined Chronology	Known Dates of King
Tajaka:	1–3	3
Pepiya:	4–11	3–8
Aṃgoka:	12–49	5–38
Mahiri:	50–79	4–30
Yaṣmana:	80–90	3–11

Based on Brough 1965, 594–595, with modifications—see note 2.

All Chinese terms and place names are given in the Pinyin transcription, while modern Uygur place names are transcribed according to the current Arabic script spellings. All ancient names are given in their Prakrit or Sanskrit forms. 'Shanshan' is used

conventionally for the kingdom while 'Kroraina' is used for the capital city.

### Introduction

Since they were discovered from sites on the edges of the vast Tāklimakan desert, the Kharoṣṭhī script Prakrit documents of Central Asia along with other documents from the Tarim Basin, have had the potential to provide a rare perspective on the history of Asian societies. In no other area but Mesopotamia has archaeology discovered such an abundance of documents of basic socio-economic importance from so early a date.<sup>1</sup>

Yet, on the whole, the investigations of these documents have been monopolized by philologists. Their work has in fact been so successful that even those who have not gone through the arduous preliminary of mastering the languages, the scripts, the fragmentary texts, and even the scribal errors, can still hope, on the basis of existing translations, to make a contribution to the study of the world they reveal. Henning and others have worked on the Sogdian documents from Dunhuang (see Dresden 1983). The Prakrit documents of the third century CE from the Minfeng (Niyä), Āndirlānggār (formerly called Endere), and Lop Nur sites on the southern side of Tāklimakan Desert have been completely transcribed (Boyer, Noble, Rapson, and Senart 1920–1929; newer texts in Burrow 1937–1939), and all the continuous texts have been translated (Burrow 1940). Salomon has transcribed and translated some newly discovered Niyä documents (Salomon 1986, 1988). H. W. Bailey has extensively transcribed and partly translated the Khotanese texts in the Saka Iranian tongue (Bailey 1983 with bibliography). Tokharian and Sanskrit Kucean texts have been worked on by Sylvain Lévi (Lévi 1933). In the later period German workers have investigated the Uygur and Tokharian texts. Central Asia under foreign rule can be investigated with

1 The Egyptian documents come almost exclusively from the desert fringe of the Nile valley. Since the Egyptians built tombs, not cities, in the desert, the documents preserved are that type of writings one would put in, or write on, the walls of a tomb, that is, flattering obituaries, moralistic literature, and descriptions of the afterworld.

Chinese documents (Chavannes 1913) and Tibetan texts (Thomas 1935–1955, and Bacot, Thomas, and Toussaint 1940).

Of all of these documents the earliest from a Central Asian city, as opposed to Dunhuang, a Chinese town, are the Prakrit ones, primarily from a site in the desert north of modern Minfeng (Niyā in modern Uyghur). Being fully translated and illustrating the early Buddhist culture at the base of all the others in the Tarim basin, these documents form a good start for writing a social history of Buddhist Central Asia. Ratna Chandra Agrawala (see bibliography) has attempted some description of the contents of these documents but despite the diligent analysis found in his earlier papers (Agrawala 1952, 1953, 1953a), they all suffer to some extent from an overly “Indianizing” and methodologically naive viewpoint, faults which appear most strongly in his last paper, summarizing earlier research (Agrawala 1965). His claim that these documents are primarily valuable for their contribution to *Indian* social history assumes a level of Indianization of Tokharian society that is not supported by the evidence. In particular, his claim that the use of Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script shows that the Indians were “the most powerful group in contemporary society” (Agrawala 1965:275) is almost certainly false, as the personal names and other features of the Prakrit used demonstrate that the population was primarily Tokharian at all levels, up to the highest (see Brough 1965:605).

The dating of the Niyā documents has excited great debate. The chronology of Brough placing the documents around 240–340 CE, seems to be the most reasonable and has gained wide acceptance (Brough 1965). In fact more evidence can be adduced for it from the Kroraina documents. Through the internal evidence of regnal dating, Boyer, Noble, Rapson, and Senart placed the kings in relative order. The resulting list showed the time occupied by the documents was, at minimum, 90 years, and most probably about 100 (Boyer, Noble, Rapson, Senart 1929: Part III, 323–324).<sup>2</sup> The problem with this relative scheme is that no dates directly connect the documents with the known history of the sur-

2 Two years may be added to Mahiri's minimum reign beyond that which Brough assign to him, as § 123, dated year 30, undoubtedly applies to his reign, as it mentions *ṣoṭhamga* Ly'ipeya (see Appendix II). Similarly two may be added to Aṃgoka's (§ 676—see footnote 3).

rounding regions, either China or Sasanian Iran, to give us absolute dates. Dated Chinese documents have been found associated with Prakrit ones, not only in the Niyā site, but also in the Loulan ruins. They date from the Jīn dynasty's occupation of 'Loulan', the Chinese version of the indigenous name, Kroraina. Their dates range in continuous series from 263 to 270 CE, and with a few others dated from 312 to 330 (Chavannes 1913: iv; Brough 1965:602).

The contents of the Chinese documents, however, do not have any self-evident connection with those of the Prakrit documents; the Chinese documents refer to the affairs of the Chinese garrison in Kroraina which was relatively isolated from the main stream life of the province. Brough (1965:600–602) however noted that in Aṃgoka's year 17, he began to bear a title, *jīṭumgha*, which corresponds to the title, *shizhong*, that the Chinese court gave him in 263 CE, when Aṃgoka accepted its sovereignty. This fact thus gives us a basis for the absolute dating of the sequence of kings, which Brough begins at  $\leq 235/6$  CE. By adding the years of dated documents (including several which were previously undatable) we may say the documents run from  $\leq 235/6$  to  $\geq 324/5$  CE.

As an additional confirmation we may try a more "statistical" approach; by assuming the majority of dated Chinese documents in Kroraina (263–270 CE) ought to correlate with the time of the majority of the Krorainese Prakrit ones, we may date the latter. All the datable documents from Kroraina come from the reign of the king Aṃgoka.<sup>3</sup> Hence we may provisionally tie the date of

3 §677 is dated to Aṃgoka (the exact year has been effaced), §676 is dated to year 38 of some king, but Aṃgoka is the only one known to have had that long a reign (Mahiri's reign, the next longest, is only known to be 30 years long; an eight year gap is very unlikely). §706 is addressed by the king to *korī* Muldeya, who appears in a Cadh'otan document dated to Aṃgoka 34 (§574). Finally the title *kitsaitsa* is used for three people in the Kroraina texts (§666, §671). This office clearly marks the reign of Aṃgoka and his predecessors off from that of Mahiri and Yaṣmana, who come after. In all the documents dated to Mahiri's reign *kitsaitsa* occurs once, referring to the house of *kitsaitsa* Luṭhu, who is known to have been in office in Aṃgoka 34 (§§437, 652), and had certainly been replaced by *cojhbo* Somjaka by the first dated documents of Mahiri's reign. §701 and §678 cannot be from the reign of Pepiya, Aṃgoka's predecessor. §701 is dated too late and §678 probably prefixes *Jīṭumgha* to the king's name, a title, as Brough noted, held only by Aṃgoka and his successors. For all these reasons the Kroraina documents may be said to date to Aṃgoka's reign. The evidence is admittedly not very strong, but since it all points one way, it might be provisionally accepted.

Aṃgoka to the Chinese dates. The median date of the Chinese documents, 267 CE, may be connected to the median date of Aṃgoka, Kroraina year 29. The approximate dates of the Prakrit documents would then be  $\leq 239 - \geq 328$  CE. This accords well with Brough's dates which he arrived at through quite different methods.

The documents are written in Niyä or Shanshan Prakrit, a dialect most closely related to that of Gāndhāri Prakrit (Burrow 1935–1937), but the vernacular of the Shanshan people was a Tokharian language related to, but distinct from, the languages of that family found in later documents from the northern caravan route, Kucean and Agnean. At that time, Tokharian speakers dwelt in most of the oases of Eastern Central Asia, in Turpana (modern Turpan), Agni (Yanqi), Kuci (Kuça), and Baluka (Aksu) in the north, and in the south from Kroraina west to the border of Khotana (Hotan). Shanshan Prakrit, written in the Kharoṣṭhī script, was used as the language of administration, and the Tokharian substratum is revealed only by nouns, proper names, and official titles borrowed into the official language from the vernacular, as well as by characteristic errors in the spelling of Prakrit words (Burrow 1935). The Prakrit dialect of Shanshan differed in several features from the Prakrit dialect that was used in Khotana as represented in one document excavated in Sāca, or modern Ändirlänggär, and the differences seem to stem from the influence of differing vernaculars, a Tokharian language in Shanshan, and a non-Tokharian, non-Iranian one in Khotana, although the ruling dynasty of the latter kingdom may have been Iranian (Burrow 1933–1935:514–516; 1935–1937:430–431).

As noted above, the emperor of China, Jīn Wudi conquered the kingdom in 263 CE, in the reign of the king Aṃgoka, and placed a garrison in the capital, Kroraina. Chinese was then used in a limited fashion for royal business. Civil war tore though the Jīn dynasty from around 305 CE, and culminated in the great revolt of the Xiongnu settled in China (313 CE). These events apparently took place around the end of the reign of king Mahiri. Still the Chinese garrison in Kroraina lasts through most of the reign of Yaṣmana, farming the land as a military colony.

What now follows is an investigation of some of the areas of life in Cadh'ota and Shanshan, intended to display the type of results

that can be obtained when the documents are approached with a view to their contents, not merely their language.

### Geography

The kingdom as shown by the documents extended on the south caravan route from the Lop Nur Lake up to the Keriya River. Its main centers were Kroraina (the Loulan ruins), Calmadāna (modern Qiemo or Čärčän), Sāca (modern Ändirlänggär, formerly called Endere), Niña (probably modern Minfeng or Niyä), and Cadh'ota, a site now in the desert north of Minfeng (see Brough 1965, 585–587, and § 14, for example). These main centers were not the only towns, though. We have, to take only a few, Peta-nagara, Bhoti-nagara, and Pusali, around Cadh'ota (§§ 25, 69, 291, respectively), and Tryakṣi around Kroraina (§§ 685, 686).

The five major towns, Kroraina, Calmadāna, Sāca, Niña, and Cadh'ota, are, however, the administrative centers. They are the capitals of the five provinces, *raya*,<sup>4</sup> into which the Shanshan kingdom was divided. 'Cadh'ota *raya*' is a fixed phrase in these documents, (§§ 272, 415), but since almost all our documents come from Cadh'ota, it is quite often called simply 'the province'. Presumably if we had a large set of documents from Sāca or Calmadāna, we would find similar use of the phrase, 'the province of Sāca' or 'the province of Calmadāna'. The capital and seat of the whole kingdom was Kroraina, known as the great city, *mahaṃta nagara* (§ 155).

Within the Cadh'ota province there was a division into outer provinces and the central province. One document (§ 714) speaks of gathering all the tax officials from the exterior provinces and central province (*rajyide rajarajade*) for a big day of reckoning, to crack down on officials who were not delivering their taxes.<sup>5</sup> The

4 *raya* really means kingdom but in view of its ambivalent usage for both the Shanshan kingdom as a whole, and the constituent parts, I have translated the former as 'kingdom' and the latter as 'province.'

5 The document mentions Ly'ipeya as an *ag'eta* or minor tax official. Now since Ly'ipeya had been promoted to *v'asu* or county administrator, a higher post, during the governorship of Somjaka, it is likely that Takra is one of Somjaka's weak co-governors, and that the document and the assembly of all tax officials is a response to the royal pressure to collect arrears in taxes (see §§ 275, 305, 725).

documents occasionally use the word 'Cadh'ota' to mean only the central area and not the outlying counties (§ 532). Cadh'ota, the town, probably had some form of fortification. The king writes to Somjaka, the great governor of all the Cadh'ota province, "since last year you have been in great danger from the Supis and you settled the people of the province inside the city (§ 272)."

The various provinces seem to have had their own traditional legal system. Some differences in Cadh'otan law seem to be implied in a letter from the king on a dispute about adoption: "Whatever law of the kingdom/province and what family(?) law the rest of the Cadh'otans observe, in such a way these people must act (§§ 31, 764)." There thus seems to be two systems of law, that of the kingdom/province (?written, see also §§ 24, 423, 435) and family (?customary). It is a moot point whether the kingdom/province law, as well as the family law is specific to each province. Yet it seems that if this written law applied throughout Shanshan, the king would know what it was. We may provisionally assume that Cadh'ota at least had its own system of law. This assumption raises another question of whether these various kingdoms had their own separate existence previous to the time of the documents, and whether this law was inherited from a time of independence. The Chinese histories may decide this point one way or the other.

The overwhelmingly rural nature of the society pictured in the Cadh'ota documents is striking. It is unlikely that the actual central town has been discovered in the excavations, but even so the almost complete absence of artisans, for example,<sup>6</sup> must reflect the truly very rural nature of the society. Rugs (*koj'ava*, *akiṣdha*), felts (*namatae*), garments (*thavaṃnag'a*) and wine are expected as taxes from ordinary taxpayers (see for example §§ 207, 714, 382; also Agrawala 1965:279) yet there is no mention of any professional producers of these things. We must postulate that these goods were produced in the home by unspecialized labor. As we will see

6 With one exception, that of the goldsmiths of the people of the mountain (§ 578). In dealing with the settlement of fugitives the letters often insert a clause stating that such a fugitive to be settled ought not to be an artisan (§ 217). This tells us artisans must have existed but nothing else substantial. Agrawala mentions several terms for craftsmen, but they seem to come mostly from literary fragments (1965:279).

below, commerce was carried mostly by Chinese merchants and was largely restricted to the capital.

The three main agricultural pursuits were growing grain, mainly wheat (§72), barley (§83) and millet (§703), growing grapes, and herding sheep and cattle (see also Agrawala 1965:275). More specialized goods include various fruits: pomegranates (§207, 295, 617), pepper, ginger, cardamom and sugar (§702), high quality animal fodder, such as lucerne and madder (§§272, 295, 387), camels, and horses (on animal husbandry see Agrawala n.d.). Occasional texts also mention rice and betel (Agrawala 1965:280). Horses and animal fodder seems to have been largely a concern for the administration. Grain was presumably the people's main food but meat was considered the best of everyday foods; "Thousands of jars of ghee and hundreds of jars of oil are not worth a sixteenth of one piece of meat, in my opinion (§514)," declares the anonymous author of a literary fragment.

The documents describe cultivated grain fields with various, often obscure, terms, such as *mith'i*, *akri*, *ciraĩnta* (§587), *kuthala*, and *kurora*. *Akri* seems to mean arable but uncultivated land, *miši* then being cultivated land (see §582, also Burrow 1937: s.v. *akri* and *miši*). *Kuthala* refers to land cultivated in strips. Sometimes only some of the strips in such a field are bought or sold (§§327, 419, also Burrow 1937: s.v. *kuthala*). *Kurora* seems to refer to land with raised borders prepared for cultivation (§490, Burrow 1937: s.v. *kurora*). As Agrawala notes (1965:278–279), cultivation was done in spring (§450), while plowing, sowing, and tilling vineyards was thought to be especially fruitful in the *Pig Nakṣatra* or *Pig* month (§565).

A normal farm had both a field for growing grain and a vineyard. Vineyards often are described as having various 'trees,' presumably meaning vines, on them. These vines were often cut out by the roots and replanted. Thus vines could belong to someone other than the owner of the field (§574). There was even a set legal penalty for stealing vines in this fashion: one horse (§482—cutting off the branches carried a fine of a cow).

The pastures were divided apparently into two sorts, the open land and the bounded lands, *laṭhanami* and *kabhodaṃmi*. The latter seems to be some kind of fenced off pastures, within the kingdom. These are the best pastures, used for sick camels, at least



where there is enough man power to care for them and ensure that they don't wander about (§392). These lands are broad enough to hunt in (§13). The open lands seems to have been considered outside any particular province. "We conducted [the camels] from this province to the open lands (*laṭhanami*).” It was apparently not considered necessary to watch the beasts in the open lands (§392). These open places thus may be oases out in the desert, from which animals cannot wander away, as described by Marco Polo in Čärčän or Calmadāna (Polo 1958:83). In any case, the documents do mention sandy (*sigata*) and waste (*vyartha*) land (§713; Agrawala 1965:278).

Another region outside the regular administration of the provinces is 'the mountains' (*parvata*). This region, presumably the Tibetan plateau to the south, was the kingdom's only known source of gold (§§140, 578). Some mountaineers, as individuals, were apparently integral parts of the Krorainan kingdom; they served as witnesses in court along with Cadh'otans (§§12, 43), they were agents in the service of one of the higher officials of the Cadh'otans (§140), and in a document from Sāca, the mountaineers took two rolls of silk (§660). As other single people on the list took or bought anywhere from 1 to 7 rolls, it is clear that at most ten or so mountaineers are meant.

The most intriguing and yet the vaguest reference to the mountaineers is found in a letter from the king to the great governor of Cadh'ota, Somjaka: "Also the Cadh'otans are to be prevented from doing injustice to the mountaineers." We can deduce that the king had no regular administrators in the mountains (or else such injustice would be their responsibility, not Somjaka's), that the mountaineers had some commodity the Cadh'otans valued, probably gold (or else there would be no relations, let alone exploitation), and that the acquisition of these resources was a private matter (or else the king would tell Somjaka to restrain the appropriate officials, not just Cadh'otans in general). Finance officer (*ṣoṭhamga*) Ly'ipeya seems to have been involved in these private dealings (§140). Yet as said above the mountaineers are probably the real miners and smiths of the gold. They were not just savages in the hinterland.

## Gender and Kinship

The structure of the family in Cadh'otan society was highly authoritarian; "So from now on the elder brother shall beat the younger brother, and the father shall beat the son (§187)," reads one document. The long titles with which sons, in letters, address their fathers reflects this authoritarian bias (Agrawala 1954a:52–54; Agrawala 1965:277), while to their mothers they merely wrote, "dear mother" (Agrawala 1952:333). As we will see below, with reference to slaves, Cadh'otan society tended to accord rights to heads of separate households, regardless of their legal status. This would imply the converse, that those who lived within a single household, had, under normal circumstances, no enforceable rights against the head of the household; we have, for example, no documents that indicate married women could act publicly in distinction from her husband.

Still, the kinship system in Shanshan seems to have been formally less constraining on women than in Middle Eastern and East Asian cultures. The queen had her own household, with royal horse and cattle herds and counties specially hers (§§439, 193), which is not as surprising, as that she went as an envoy to Khotana (§§27, 432, 637). She evidently had an active voice in policy. Women could appear in courts as witnesses (§420; Agrawala 1952:333, 339), and widows could buy land and own slaves (§677, 415; Agrawala 1952:338–339). The case in §677 is especially instructive as widow Kosenaya's sons opposed her exchange of land with the other party, but the authorities dismissed their objections. This freedom for poor widows, however, often amounted to freedom to starve: the documents give an example of a widow selling a girl into slavery and there can be little doubt that this girl was her own daughter (§589). In other cases widows ended up as slaves themselves (§§415, 528, 538).

Among the serfs, men alone were supposed to do the onerous public duties, such as watching camels, but in practice women often did these public duties (§§46, 19; Agrawala 1952:336, 338). When women did these duties they were supposed to also receive clothing, food, and wages, just as a man did, but in one case it took a royal decree to get the woman her due. Thus, women's participation in public labor paradoxically resulted from their subordina-

tion to the men in the county; they performed the corvée labor, leaving the men to pursue the presumably more lucrative tasks of private cultivation.

The Cadh'otans conceived of marriage as groups of men exchanging women (Burrow 1937:116; Agrawala 1952:332–333). The usual units found in the documents were counties paying taxes directly to the king (*av'ana*), or appanages (*kilme*) paying taxes to one or another of the aristocracy. They conceived of even a single marriage, at least legally, as a group affair.<sup>7</sup> We can thus read sentences such as this: "... in Yav'e County ... there she was taken in marriage by people belonging to the appanage of the *ogu* Aśog'a ... (§254)." Other units recorded are Ajiyama County and Yav'e County, Ajiyama County and Sāca, Catisa Devi County and Yav'e County, and finally, an unnamed appanage and 'outsiders'. There is one example where the documents treat the partners as individuals. This case might even describe a case of marriage within the village (§32). These exchanges were all affairs of the county administrator and other officials supervising the counties and appanages (§§279, 573, 474, 338).

In marriages some form of bridewealth (*lote* and *mukeṣi*) had to be given. The usual form of this bridewealth was to give in turn one's own sister or other kinsman to one's new wife's brother (§32).<sup>8</sup> In one case the giving of a wife had to take place in the next generation (§279; Agrawala 1952:332–333). If one partner makes no exchange then the child is illegitimate and inherits only from his mother. Saṃgapala, a monk and serf from Catisa Devi County,

7 Were the appanages and counties based on lineages, so that marrying outside of the county or appanage might be similar to the lineage exogamy systems of the Chinese or the Turco-Mongol nomads? Documentation is unfortunately lacking on this interesting possibility, but the fact that lineages themselves are not mentioned in the documents makes it more likely that we are dealing with unnamed locally based descent groups. The close marriages mentioned by Agrawala were repeated marriages between two families of affines (1952:332).

8 Agrawala calls this bridewealth "buying and selling girls," and indignantly rebuts the idea that it might be Indian, ascribing it solely to the "locally born people" (Agrawala 1965:277; cf. Agrawala 1952:329, 331–332). Agrawala is mistaken both on the nature of the transaction—as the examples below show, bridewealth is not purchase—and in his pretension that bridewealth is not found in India. On this see Goody and Tambiah 1973: 59–160 *passim*.

married Sug'numae, the sister of Yapg'u, a serf from Yav'e County, without giving any exchange to Yapg'u or his people. She bore Samgapala two sons Dharmapri and Sumudata. Upon their father's death their inheritance was in doubt. As it turned out, they inherited from their mother her tax duties at least (§§ 474, 481). We can now see why if bridewealth was not given in the first generation why it might be given in the second. Giving bridewealth, however long after a marriage, legitimized the fruit of that marriage.

Such was the marriage of the serfs. As for that of the free officials, we simply cannot say anything, as we have no documents that discuss it. However the lack of documents itself shows that, among the official stratum, marriage not only was not a matter of exchange between administratively defined units, but also that officials avoided settling disputes arising from it in the courts.

Adoption forms the subject of many of the documents. Sometimes the purpose of it seems to have been to simply make up the lack of a male heir—the birth of a son was an occasion of great rejoicing (Agrawala 1952:328–329, 338; Agrawala 1965:277, and § 702). In many other cases though, the adopted girls and their descendants became housed servants of the adopters, higher than slaves but not free (see below). The adopter had to give the parents of the adopted child a milk-payment (*kuth'akṣira*) to pay for the natural mother's suckling of the child. The milk-payment usually consisted of a horse or camel (§§ 39, 45, 331, 415, 569). Disputes over adoption usually centered over whether the milk-payment had been made or not (§§ 39, 434). The natural parents of the child were often forced by poverty to give up the child. "There is a man called Priyapata belonging to the appanage of the son of the great king Puṁṇabala. To him a daughter was born. They wanted to expose her on the ground. Kacana took her up from the ground (§ 331)." Thus reads a story of adoption. The adopters had to be able to give a horse or camel as payment; they must have been well off.

Yet, they must also have sometimes wanted not a daughter but a slave. In one document the woman Tsinae, who had been captured and given to a rich woman as a present along with her children (§ 415), gave a son of hers to Kuṇita, who paid the milk-payment. Then she apparently feared her son was to become a slave,

and took him back. Kuñita had the law on his side because he had paid the milk-payment, and got the authorities in Cadh'ota to give him back her son. The officials included, however, at the end of the legal document an injunction that Šamamnera, her son, "is not to be made a slave, nor sold, nor pledged. He is to be treated as an adopted person (§ 569 cf. 553)." Thus the status of an adopted family as housed dependants, not slaves, was often precarious.

Inheritance laws had no strict pattern, but rather gave weight to the will of the deceased. The documents record cases of brothers apparently holding property in common, so that, for example, when two went to make a legal complaint, another farmed the land (§§ 298, see also 422). This common inheritance usually occurred among people of the serf estate where communal property between brothers may have been more common. One farm which had been inherited through two generations was divided up by the heirs after a bitter inheritance battle, in which the brothers eventually came to blows (§ 187). In the higher estates of the officials and the aristocrats, the parent could apparently make a will dividing up the serfs and slaves (§ 538). The division of the deceased's people still commonly caused disputes between brothers (§§ 18, 31, 764, 528, 538, 542, 256, 260, 734). Daughters could also inherit property, if the deceased so willed it (§ 21).

### Buddhism

The people of the Shanshan kingdom followed Buddhism, after their fashion.<sup>9</sup> Faxian, who visited Kroraina in 399 CE, described the official faith as Hīnayāna (Legge 1965, 13–14) and this seems to be born out by the few religious texts which speak of honoring "the pratyekabuddhas ... who delight alone in their mountain caves, devoted to their own aims ..." and do not mention Boddhi-sattvas (§ 511). Yet one of the great governors of Cadh'ota, Šama-

<sup>9</sup> Animal sacrifice, however, persisted and was supported by the state (§§ 109, 157, 195). Animal sacrifice, with animals provided by the state, was offered at a bridge, to the god Bhatro. The sacrifice probably was a sort of foundation rite. Interestingly, it had to be done over when *ari* Kung'eya dreamed that the god did not accept the sacrifice (§ 157).

sena, at any rate, had “set forth in the Mahāyāna (§390).” The two sects co-existed; there is no trace of any doctrinal religious conflict.

The monastic community of Shanshan was organized in parallel with the kingdom’s secular organization. Each province had its own community of monks (*bhikṣusamgha*). The king, in at least one instance, issued regulations for the community in Cadh’ota. Each community in turn had its own responsible heads, who were its elders, confirmed by the king and the community of Kroraina (§489). Like the provincial governorship, the office of elder of the community was often a dual one. In year 59, the king confirmed the authority of two elders, Śilaprabha and Pamñasena, but in another document, a legal decision, one monk alone, Budharakṣi, occupied the office of Elder of the Community (§419).

These regulations do not diverge greatly from ordinary Buddhist practice. Yet the fact that the monks owned individual property, married, and had children, does (see Agrawala 1954b). We possess a record of two monastic marriages: the monk (*śramamṇa*) Śariputra gave his adopted daughter to the monk Budhavarma as wife. Budhavarma’s daughter was given to the monk Jivalo Aṭhamo (§418). We also have a record of how two of Aṭhamo’s sons, Budhila and Budhaya, sold land to a man named Anamda (§419). Monkish households included slaves, as well as servant monks (§§345, 506; Agrawala 1953:107). When one monk Tatig’a took the servant-monk of Śamca, Tatig’a gave him in replacement one of his own slaves. As it turned out, this slave fled to Khema with one of Śamca’s slaves.

The dispersal of the community in separate households led to problems of apathy: Among the regulations for the community of Cadh’ota was the imposition of fines of one roll of silk for not participating in the affairs of the community, not attending the *posatha* ceremony or attending it in householder’s dress (§480). Agrawala (1965:280) notes this document but does not seem to have realized that the “monks” were not actually living in monasteries.

Although the households of the community did not differ substantively from those of ordinary people, they enjoyed a great respect from the pious population of Cadh’ota. All monks were ex officio free men (§§436, 507, 388), although the documents do not record their social origin. Serfs who became monks were some-

times released from their obligations, making them free men (§§ 417, 425). Donations were quite common. Namarajhma sold a royal cow so that the head of the community in Pisalyi, an outlying area of Cadh'ota province, could receive the price. Governor Larsu bought a meal for the monks, as did a relative of the *gušura* Lešvaṃna (§§ 122, 343, 703). One long list records the amounts given by thirty different donors (§ 345). The donations were divided up among the various monks (§ 343) and when Opg'eya and Pug'o donated a Khotanese refugee, the community gave the man to County Administrators Sp'irta and Kumnasena, because a slave cannot be divided up like a parcel of corn.

The community also held a degree of independence from the secular authorities. A land-sale document supervised by the community carried the seals of the monastic authorities; all similar documents not involving monks carried the stamp of the secular officials (§ 419). In a fugitive slave case the community, not the secular authorities, examined the case and made the decision (§ 506). The strong feeling that involving a monk in a law case was a wicked act reinforced the effective immunity of the community. Anamdasena owed corn and wine to Larsu and Cug'opa, and his slave had stolen silk, felt, even sheep, from them. "Now ... the monk Anamdasena made representations with Larsu, and made efforts. So Larsu desirous of acquiring merit, together with Anamdasena, they came to an agreement with each other outside of court (§ 345)." This desire for acquiring religious merit strongly separated the monk from secular society even though the community dwelt within that society.

### Political and Social Structure

The essential social cleavage was between the officials on the one hand and the serfs on the other. Our documents name officials called free born (*ajhade jaṃna*): transportation officers (*tomgas*), border magistrates (*simici mahatva*), *tasucas*, scribes (*divira*), governors, county administrators, tax collectors (*apsus*), escorts (*arivag'a*), frontier guards, *aris*, and monks (§§ 436, 507, 588). The difference was often vaguely drawn, however; the scribe in Yav'e

County is called a serf of that county.<sup>10</sup> This no man's land of half free, half unfree status included all the hereditary offices and duties, such as scribes, animal overseers (*klasemcis*), frontier guards and escorts.

The chief official of the province was the great governor (§272), or before then, in the time of kings Pepiya and Amgoka, the elder (*kitsaitsa*).<sup>11</sup> The vast body of royal correspondance was directed to these head officials. The governorship was usually a dual office, though. Below the great governor was a swarm of lesser governors (see for example §§288, 507),<sup>12</sup> as well as functional offices, such as the finance officer, or the transport officer. One or another of these officials was usually associated with the great governor, both in royal and in private correspondance, making an apparent dyarchy. The amount of real power sharing, however, seems to have varied. The king appointed Somjaka to clean up the local corruption in Cadh'ota and made him sole authority in the province (§§272, 371, 396). Somjaka apparently tolerated no strong subordinates; several governors appear, each only briefly, with him. Šamasena, Yitaka, and Kranaya, on the other hand, each appear regularly with one particular subordinate, and in comparing Finance Officer Ly'ipeya with Governor Tsmaya, if we take the amount of royal correspondence as a guide, Tsmaya seems to have been a weak figurehead compared to Ly'ipeya (see Appendix III).

In the central administration of the province, the lowest office seems to have been the scribe, while above that lay the transport officer (*tomgas*) and the finance officer. The transport officers

10 The scribe Ramšotsa. We can document his career with unique accuracy through the titles attached to dated land titles. In year 17 he appears as a scribe but also a serf in Yav'e County (§581). Years 20 through 27 he is no longer a serf but a simple scribe (§§579, 590, 571, 586). Years 30 and 31 he was promoted to finance officer (§§580, 582). This assignment evidently did not work out; from year 32 until his last dated land purchase in year 53, he was again merely a scribe (§§587, 583, 574, 584).

11 On the meaning of the term, see Burrow 1937 s. v. *kitsaitsa*. The idea of the *kitsaitsa* being member of some council is clearly wrong; at any one time there was only one Elder. Moreover there is no evidence of any sort of council of elders, especially at the level of the province. The structure of government seems to have been thoroughly authoritarian. On the replacement of *kitsaitsa* with *cojhbo*, see note 3.

12 The minor governors were probably administrators of larger areas than the counties or appanages, thus standing between them and the central administration of the province (see §§120, 163, 507).



were responsible for moving goods, such as camels and corn taxes (§§ 357, 387, 622), as well as letters (§ 272, 357). They controlled a staff of attendants (*upastag'as* or *vaṭayag'as*) that usually numbered 10 to 20 men (§ 96). They traveled to the royal court with their attendants at regular intervals (§ 357). The finance officer, appointed by the great governor (§ 567) controlled the tax revenues from the countryside (§§ 165, 272, 567), as well as disbursement from the province storehouses (§§ 14, 19, 135). The right to enter the administration at the lowest level, that of scribe, may have been hereditary, as the sons of finance officers and a son of the great governor Somjaka become scribes (§§ 385, 507, 598). The office of scribe and finance officer could also be held concurrently, presumably because the scribe's job, writing down inlays and outlays of goods was very close to that of the finance officer (§ 520). Probably, all the free born men in Cadh'ota town had to be frontier-guards (*sp'asavamna*); this was not an office but a hereditary duty (§ 520). Only actual holding of office could exempt one from this duty. It thus resembled the army oversight and escort duties in the counties (see below).

For tax purposes the administration divided the countryside of Cadh'ota into royal counties and private appanages (Agrawala 1953:109–110). One document writes: "... the year's tax in Masina was assessed ... both from the [private] serfs and from the royal [land] (§ 374)."<sup>13</sup> The difference in the two appeared in their names; while the counties are called such-and-such county, the appanages are called appanage of such-and-such high dignitary.<sup>14</sup> Taxes were collected from both counties and appanages (§§ 16, 42, 162, 164, 165, 207, 275, 431, 432, 468, 713, 714 and §§ 307, 585) but while the counties paid taxes directly to the monarch, the appanages paid them to their owners (see § 585; on the mechanisms of

13 This area of Masina was probably unusual in containing a mix of appanages and counties. In general the appanages seem to have been in or near the Cadh'ota town itself (§§ 271, 437, 639, cf. 621). Of course it is hard to be sure when Cadh'ota is being used in the sense of the whole province or of the central area alone.

14 The term *kilme*, 'appanage' is used exclusively for the areas paying taxes to the aristocracy, while *av'ana*, county, is used exclusively for those paying taxes to the royal treasury. The term *kilmeci*, literally 'appanage-people,' is used indiscriminately for those in both *kilmes* and *av'anas*. Hence I have used a more general term 'serf' to translate *kilmeci*.

tax assessment and delivery see Agrawala 1953a:334–351). A Kroraina letter from the son of a *guśura* (high dignity) illustrates this fact as follows: “Also the royal dues (*harga*) from this county (*av’ana*) were granted to us from the feet of his majesty. Now the magistrates are causing much pain to the slaves (§ 696).” The second sentence presumably means that the local authorities refused to accept the new status of the county and insisted on still collecting royal taxes.<sup>15</sup>

Perhaps to avoid this sort of conflict, if the nobles dwelled outside of Cadh’ota, they would often put their appanages under the protection of its great governors (§§ 307, 271, 338, 585, 152). Still the local administration of the appanages was not the business of the state administration, especially when the proprietor of the appanage lived on it, so the internal structure of the appanages is a very obscure area.<sup>16</sup> One telling fact is that of the six subjects noted below who fled their homes, only one was a government serf – the other four were all appanage serfs (and one slave). This piece of information accords well with a few others, namely that one appanage holder, Yiharavala, was notorious for living at the expense of his serfs, even when he was (for other reasons) under house arrest (§ 358), and that one of the serfs of that very same man was a debtor to a government serf in Trasa County. Yiharavala may have been exceptionally exploitative, but clearly appanage serfs were considerably worse off as a group than county serfs.

A rather large group of officials, notably the county administrator (*v’asu*), royal camel keepers, the tax-collectors (*apsus*), the tax conveyers (*yatmas* and *ag’etas*), army animal overseer (*klasemcis*) and guides (*arivag’a*) administered and exploited these counties.<sup>17</sup> These men, being free officials, did not pay taxes along with the

15 The documents contain cases where people are transferred as individuals from a county to an estate. Prince Purnābala requested new serfs from the king who wrote to Governor Somjaka instructing him to take five people from a district head (*vuryag’a*) each year, and so in three years give into Purnābala’s hands fifteen men (§ 630). The districts (*pradej’as*) of which the *vuryag’as* were head, were subdivisions of royal counties (see below).

16 One feature of these appanages is that in inheritance they were divided up amongst the children. §§ 256, 260, and 734 describe a protracted legal battle between three sons over the division of the serfs of their father, *ogu Bhimasena*.

17 The translation have all been derived from the meanings in the index in Burrow 1937, except *v’asu*. *V’asus* deal with royal herds around the various

serfs and were not considered to belong to the county, but rather to be 'housed' (*uthidati*—for example §422) in them. But they retained special rights in their native counties, among which was the right to buy property. The army animal overseer and escorts had a special position, in that their jobs were not considered state offices but rather hereditary duties connected specially to the county they lived in (§§5, 438, 562—note how the army work is listed separately from keeping royal camels). Still as said above, escorts, and presumably animal overseers, were considered free men, not serfs (§507).

The whole range of county life entered into the duties of the county administrator. He sponsored marriage exchanges with other counties or appanages, represented the county in land disputes, supervised the royal herds pasture in his county, authorized payments from the county storehouses, and most importantly collected the taxes that filled those stores (see note 10). If the administrators were delinquent in this job of collecting taxes and forwarding them to Cadh'ota town, higher officials commonly threatened to make them pay the arrears from their own farms (§§42, 714). The other officials performed the specific jobs of each of their positions.

The higher offices in the county administration were probably filled from the ranks of animal overseers and guards. We can construct the *cursus honorum* of two of these officials as follows: Ly'ip-eya, animal overseer (§§10, 52), tax-conveyer (§714), administrator (§§46, 5, 32, 124, 45); Bhimasena, ?animal overseer used as escort (§438), tax conveyer and royal cattle keeper (§439), administrator (§§254, 474).<sup>18</sup>

The counties were subdivided in three different ways recorded in our documents: into 'hundreds' (*śatas*) into areas taxed by different tax collectors (§§431, 432), and into districts (*pradej'as*), run by, and named after district heads (*vuryag'as*). We can connect the 'hundreds', named after their heads, with the corvée duties of the

counties (§§180, 383, cf. 439), collecting taxes (§§42, 714), demarcating county boundaries (§37), paying out money from the county treasury (§25), reporting legal problems with county marriages (§§32, 254, 279). They clearly had to deal with all of the county's affairs, and is the main county official interacting with the province administration. County administrator is thus an acceptable translation.

18 On the chronology see Appendix III.

government serfs. Probably they were groups of one hundred men organized for *corvée*, especially watching camels (§§ 82, 46–cf. 19). The district was the regular division of at least Yav'e County (§§ 37, 163); moreover the district heads seem to have actually been tax collectors. In other words, the two terms *apsu* and *vuryag'a* name different offices of the same person. Yuru, who has a district named after him, is called district head (*vuryag'a*) in year 60, and tax collector (*apsu*) in year 64 (§§ 178, 569, 195). Calmasa also has his own district, and is known to be a tax collector (§§ 120, 163).

The serfs themselves were hereditarily tied to the land. As a rule this right and obligation of residence descended patrilineally. One royal rescript states "... (only) people who belong to Yav'e County on their father's side are to be employed in Yav'e County (§ 532)." People who wished to change this fact of birth had to take the law into their own hands. Flight was not uncommon (see §§ 216, 310, 403, 506, 532, 621, 632), but the officials of Shanshan guarded against these rebellious actions on the part of their subjects. One letter written by the king, on behalf of his treasurer Kuviñeya describes a desultory man-hunt: two serfs, fathers, had fled from an unknown place in Shanshan to Cadh'ota, where they found employment. Three royal letters about these two fugitives had been sent in the period of three years, and now in a fourth the king requested Somjaka, the governor of Cadh'ota, to close off the bridge leading out of the kingdom into that of Khotana, lest the fugitives escape to freedom (§ 310). The various kingdoms of the Tarim basin were only too glad to accept fugitives from each other's countries. Fugitives from Shanshan found safety in Kuci (§§ 621, 632 cf. 400), while fugitives from Khotana and war refugees from other parts of Shanshan were settled throughout the kingdom (§§ 136, 161, 216, 296, 355, 403, 471; Agrawala 1965: 278).

The serfs had a collective uniformity imposed on them. As we have seen, marriage contracts treated the partners as representatives of the collective county or estate. In their commercial dealings with the outside world the serfs were represented in just the same way as a collectivity. In border disputes the county alone is mentioned, never the individual serf whose land is in dispute (§§ 37, 326). Even when a county serf lent money to a serf on the appanage of *ogu* Yiharavala, our documents call the lender simply

Trasa County (§ 393). As a practical manifestation of this collective mentality, the county administrators were adamant that land of the county be neither sold nor rented individually to outsiders (§§ 366, 496, 498, 713).

Property, however, was not communally owned; we have two deeds of sale of property within Yav'e County (§§ 495, 581; Agrawala 1965, 278). When Yapg'u, a serf, had mortgaged his own field and vineyard to a monk, a royal edict returned it to him saying, "This ploughed field and vineyard, as his own property, is not to be abandoned by Yapg'u (§ 473)." When officials of the county encroached on one man's allotment in the estate, the royal decree again referred to the first man's property (§ 482). Moreover one document states "the powerful serfs do wrong to certain (other) serfs ... (§ 468)." Inequality was clearly well developed. Why then the pretence of common ownership vis-à-vis the outside world? The structure of appanages and counties were imposed by the state. The county land was in the eyes of the state, taxable land, *tout court*. The officials were little interested in the internal social dynamics. Any time land passed into the hands of an outside official, that represented a gain for the particular official at the expense of the county officials. As we will discuss below, the actual collected taxes furnished the officials with a lucrative source of income, and the officials of the county would be loath to give that income up. Hence they had an interest in doing anything they could to preserve the integrity of the county. Thus the collective structure grew out of the administrative needs imposed from above.

One major duty of county serfs was to go to the fields to supervise the royal herds, horses, cattle, and above all camels. The serfs, in return for their labor received clothing, food, and hire (extra grain paid above the food rations). If the serfs had not paid their taxes, however, then payment for this corvée labor might be withheld (§§ 19, 30, 350, 382). The royal animal officer (*kori*) held responsibility for all the herds in Cadh'ota (§§ 4, 40), but this responsibility was largely delegated to the county administrators, although other officials such as tax collectors and transport officers sometimes played a part (§§ 180, 383). The minor officials on duty were paid in grain (§ 476; Agrawala 1965, 277; Agrawala calls the serfs doing corvée "employees"). The animals were all fed from

grain that was provided from the county storehouses (§§ 146, 348). The officials used the camels locally mainly for envoys to Khotana and to transport taxes, but also occasionally for sacrifice (§§ 135, 52, 109, 383). The king often demanded camels be sent to the capital; what use they might be put to there we do not know (§§ 4, 152, 198, 358).<sup>19</sup> The royal cows and the queen's cows mainly produced ghee that was transported to the capital (§ 159). The horse herds, which had their own supervisor, the horse transport officer (*surva tomga*—§§ 509, 524), were used for envoys and also, we may presume, although it is never directly stated, for the army.

The appanages and counties did not include all the land in Cadh'ota, as we know the officials held a good deal of it themselves. Documents from Kroraína describe land that has neither *seni* nor *niściri* dues (§ 677), but the situation in Kroraína, which seems to have been a real town with much more developed commerce, may not be applicable to Cadh'ota.

In Cadh'ota an apparently small amount of land belonged inalienably to the officials as royal grants. Thus Sug'nita received his house and farm "from the feet of your majesty (§ 24, cf. § 696)." The king forbade a creditor of one of Sug'nita's slaves to seize this farm as payment. Ly'ipeya, as finance officer,<sup>20</sup> held a farm in Sāca by royal grant.<sup>21</sup> Finally there is a reference to "land from the office of Ly'ipatg'a, from the royal [property] (§ 640)." The royal property, in an example quoted above (§ 374) meant the counties of government serfs. Hence officials received grants of county property when they became officials. This land, usually part of county from which the official came, carried taxes with it but they no longer had to pay the county taxes (§§ 211, 450). We can assume that in fact most officials inherited their land from their ancestors who had been officials (§ 187), and that royal grants were given primarily to those whose ancestors had not previously been officials.

19 The royal administration occasionally sent animals out to the provinces for rest and recovery (§ 392).

20 "Governor" is probably being used in this letter in the loose sense described in Appendix III.

21 Ly'ipeya may have been granted a whole household, as other people in the king's favor were (§§ 375, 706). This would presumably follow upon the disgrace or crime of the household's previous owner.

These grants were not the only lands officials held. Ly'ipeya held his house and farm in Peta County, land granted by the king in Sāca, two other pieces of land in Peta County (§ 124), and rented in Catisa Devi County (§§ 496, 498). As we can see in documents § 422, and § 581, officials traditionally living in a county could indeed buy land from the serfs in that county (but not in any other). The land thus bought was generally worked by slaves.

The term 'slave-born' (*dajha jamna*) in Cadh'otan society was used occasionally for the appanage serfs (§ 696), but more usually for the members of two different social categories who were alike in being subject to private freeman, not the king or his nobles, that is, housed dependents or *upajiva* (§§ 33, 36, 327, 587), and real chattel slaves (§§ 590, 591, 592).<sup>22</sup> The housed dependents not only owned farms, but could also sell them (§§ 36, 327, 587; Agrawala 1953:105–106). To this extent, their status closely resembled that of government serfs. Two legal disputes seem to turn on whether a man is a government serf or a dependent. In one, Šamasena and Trasa County both claim a man named Karmaya's house and farm and land as their own (§ 326). Šamasena's claim meant that Karmaya was his hereditary dependent; Trasa County's claim meant that Karmaya was a government serf. In another, when Ly'ipeya tried to sell Saṃghadarma, the latter complained to the officials that he belonged to the king, that is, that he was a government serf, not a slave-dependent.<sup>23</sup>

Some dependents were probably granted along with the land by the king, and from then on inherited (see notes 14 and 20). As we have seen above, people could also acquire dependents through adoption. After Sug'nuta's mother adopted a woman, she and her family, dependents, and slaves were eventually divided up and inherited by the adopting woman's children (§§ 528, 538, 542). As housed dependants, they could not sold or evicted from their houses, as could be slaves, but the fact that women were adopted rather

22 The ambiguous usage is illustrated in §§ 31, 764 and in §§ 528, 538, 542, where slaves and dependents are sometimes distinguished and sometimes not.

23 Notwithstanding the fact that Ly'ipeya sold him, it seems difficult to believe that it was customary for a master to sell a dependent who presumably inherited his own house and land (or else how could his claim to be a serf not a slave gain any credence?). Ly'ipeya was probably acting against custom in selling Saṃghadarma, a housed dependent.

more often than men shows that it served primarily to acquire dependant labor, not heirs (Agrawala 1952:331).

Bought slaves, however, were chattels; this fact is clear from the contracts. "From now on the scribe Ramšotsa has ownership of that woman, to beat her, to bind her, to sell her, to give her to others as a present, to exchange her, to pledge her, to do whatever he likes with her (§ 590)," reads a typical one.<sup>24</sup> The great majority of these chattel slaves were women; in a randomly chosen section of the documents (§§ 400–650), there were references to the sale or exchange of eight women and only two men.<sup>25</sup> These unfortunates were either sold by their impoverished families, or kidnapped by slave traders (§§ 9, 415; Agrawala 1952:330, 336, 337–338). Debt slavery also existed, and since masters of housed dependants apparently expected their dependants to pay their share of the taxes on the land they farmed, failure to pay taxes led one master to repossess a family of his dependants, and make them again slaves in his household (§§ 450, 719; Agrawala 1952:338; 1953a:348). The work of slaves within the household is not mentioned in the texts but presumably included pounding the grain and pressing the wine, milking the cows and cooking the meat, weaving the rugs and sewing the garments, all the tasks that were taken for granted in the documents but never mentioned. Bought slaves formed only a small part of the field labor on private estates.

Cadh'ota had no plantation slave system such as in the Classical world. The farms of the officials and the appanages of the aristocracy were both aggregations of individual households. The seed however was provided from the central storehouse of landowner (§§ 225, 703), and a slight degree of rationalization could be achieved by allowing the dependents to buy or sell farms or by concentrating them on whatever type of produce the owner needed (§ 450). Most officials also had herds which were looked after with special care (§ 164). In autumn the landowner's share of the harvest of grain and wine would be collected into a common store, and they would try to organize it all for a profit with the primitive bookkeeping at their disposal (§§ 225, 140, 450).

The presence, under the single rubric of slave born, of two distinct statuses, one of household slaves who were the chattels *par excellence*, and another of housed or out-dwelling slaves who in their relations with the master often more resembled tenants than



slaves, has been found in Frankish Europe (Bloch 1961:255–260), and in Koryŏ dynasty Korea (Lee 1984:123–124, 159, 184, 188), among others. In these cases, the growth of a class of out-dwelling slaves has been explained as the result of the decline of plantation cultivation embedded in a commodity economy, and the rise of a manorial system. This explanation, which has been advanced to explain the peculiarities of Cadh'otan slavery (Ethnic Research Institute of the Xinjiang Academy of Social Sciences 1980:67–69; Li 1985:268–270), is plausible but in the absence of evidence of a previous existing plantation system must for the moment be speculative. More importantly, though, these differences in condition show that legal status and economic situation were by no means always identical; many of the chattel slaves, once married and sent to cultivate the master's out-lying fields must have entered, by insensible steps, into the status of housed dependants. Synchronically, this process shows that the Cadh'otan legal system in practice tended to accord the basic rights to own property, make contracts, and reject the arbitrary demands of other private individuals to all household heads regardless of their formal legal status.

### Economic Dynamics

Such was the system as it existed on paper. The documents however give us the chance to explore the dynamics of the society, that is, how the push and shove of economic life went on in and around the static structure of legally defined estates. The legal structure was defined from the viewpoint of the central power in Kroraina. The division of the serfs into appanages and counties made no sense without reference to the royal family and the aristocracy situated largely, if not entirely, in Kroraina. The vast assemblage of royal herds, the whole tax-gathering apparatus existed to serve royal needs, not those of the 'people' however defined. But the distant king and his officials could not closely watch the officials on the spot. Hence the apparent royal ideal of a perfect non-market economy existing only for the state's needs was being constantly undermined by the officials' private interest.

The chief source of weakness in the structure lay in the official's guardianship of the taxes and royal animals. Outright theft from

the royal administration was common, especially in the royal horse herds. One horse transport officer sold his charges quite widely (§524). A herder was accused of giving a horse to a man for stag-hunting, which caused the horse's death (§509). Other examples of using royal horses to hunt are known (§13). Royal horses and cows are often given away by their supervisors as presents (§§122, 243). Theft from the corn and wine stores was not so common, but occurred. Finance Officer Sug'niya was accused of wasting 150 *milimas* of wine in his own house (§§272, 567). This sort of corruption passed the king's tolerance and he demanded that if the charges against Sug'niya were true he must be dismissed and a new finance officer be selected.

Few officials provoked the king to this extent. The wiser ones engaged in loaning out the tax goods, and paying the principal when the king requested it, but keeping the interest for themselves. This practice, neither wholly approved, nor wholly condemned, well illustrates the ambivalent nature of the relation between the king and his officials. They used the state collected taxes as capital for a wide ranging series of loans, thus reaping profit off of the administration. Their access to non-market resources (tax moneys) gave them a usually commanding position in the market economy.<sup>26</sup>

24 Although Ratna Chandra Agrawala accurately described the status and sufferings of chattel slaves in Cadh'ota in one of his earlier articles (1953:99–100, 101–104, 108), later the brutality of this formula of sale seems to have shocked him. When he quoted it in 1965, he omitted any references to beating and binding; evidently, such actions did not accord with his romantic view of Indianized life in Cadh'ota: "Life was no burden to the people in the contemporary Central Asian society which was dominated by Hindu thought and culture" (Agrawala 1965:277).

25 Females: §§437, 492, 551 (two), 578, 589, 590, 592. Males: §§575, 591. See also Agrawala 1952:329–330, 337–338.

26 A relatively free market in grain and other commodities existed but one should not form an exaggerated idea of its efficiency. There are a number of striking errors in arithmetical calculations. For example 350 *milima* of tax divided in three made 120 *milima* each (§291). According to one text, whose reading is admittedly uncertain, it seems that when an official owes five *khi* and pays two that means two are in arrears (§211)! When basic arithmetic cannot be trusted, even the simplest bookkeeping is of course impossible. The description of one private farm's calculations (§§100, 140) reveals that neither total receipts or debits were systematically recorded, rather the farm owner often relied on the memory of his slaves "As regards last year's corn in Campe's hand, Kuteya knows how much came off the threshing floor."

The royal government was quite aware that the in kind taxes collected in the storehouses were not being simply left idle. A royal letter clearly refers to corn and wine being lent out, while Great Governor Somjaka refers to this practice in his administration. A letter from the Prince Puṃṇabala ordered County Administrator Sag'amovi to collect the wine that is on loan, so we know the practice existed at that level as well (§§ 387, 244, 622).

While on loan the goods earned interest. One high official was required to send as tax ghee that he was earning interest on (§ 211). The documents also record interest payments on corn and wine taxes (§ 539). The interest regularly came due in autumn, and often amount to a good proportion of the principal. Thus in the example of ghee, the interest came to 2 *khi* out of a total tax sum of 5 *khi*. With wine the ratio was either 2:1 or 1:1 over a year period depending on how the fragmentary § 539 is interpreted. The higher officials never seemed to have demanded the interest on the loans, so it presumably went into the pockets of the immediate lenders, such as the finance officers.

The needs of administration, however, required the tax money to be all in one place. If the taxes (all in kind) were to be sent to the capital or disbursed locally, they needed to be collected in one place. Thus the king commanded Somjaka to pour all of this year's and last year's wine in one place, and to collect and deposit all the various corn taxes in one place (§ 272). In a royal rescript the king demanded that the *kuv'ana* corn and *śuki* wine lent out to various people be requisitioned and brought to the court (§ 387). Somjaka transmitted these demands to underlings, saying "orders are to be given that the wine which is on loan with (various) people, is to be delivered (§ 244)." Also around this time the Prince Puṃṇabala ordered County Administrator Sag'amoya to collect the wine that is on loan, and send it to the mountains where the Prince intended to make ?sacrifice or *vaṣḍhig'a* (§ 622). Nor were the monarchs and princes the only ones to regard this scattering of revenues as an evil. The royal animal officer had to send an assistant ahead of him to Calmadāna to get the grain all collected in the town, instead of being scattered in the various houses (§§ 547, cf. 291). In general, those officials responsible for disbursement such as the animal officers, who had to pay for guards, and often enough for hiring camels, were in favor of keeping the taxes all in

one place, while the scribes and finance officers especially would have an interest in loaning as much of it out as possible.

Theoretically the loans ought not to have interfered with the actual payment of the taxes. They were supposed to be paid back after a year (§§ 100, 539), but often the high interest could not be paid all in one installment. So the loans piled up for years. Meanwhile the taxes would, of course, have to wait to be paid (Agrawala 1953a:346, 348–349). The backlog in taxes often grew to staggering proportions. At the time of Somjaka's great governorship, Ajijama County had not paid any taxes for twenty years (§ 275). The officials must have resented the peremptory demands of the aristocrats to suddenly call in all their loans and pay out so much wine or corn to them quite a bit. When Prince Puṃṇabala made his demand, the *v'asu* Sag'imoya procrastinated as long as he could (§§ 622, 634, 635).

Paying taxes was an opportunity for profit even in the serf estate. Apparently the serfs of Yav'e County had bought a camel for the purpose of hiring it out (and who would receive the hire?). One year instead of simply sending their 15 *milima* tax the wealthy serfs sold the camel for an excessive price and apparently after paying the taxes, pocketed the balance. The king demanded that this money be confiscated as it was coming from rich serfs doing injustice to other ones (§ 468). The exact nature of the transaction is rather obscure but the fact that the wealthy serfs had no commonality of interest with their poorer brethren is clear.<sup>27</sup>

Private income, needless to say, was also used as capital for loans. Three letters from Kuṣṣimta, brother-in-law and agent of the finance officer Ly'ipeya, described their bustling business (§§ 83, 100, 140). In basic procedure it resembled those loans given out on tax moneys, but Ly'ipeya seems to have dealt in rather larger loans, lending 5 *milima* 10 *khi* (= 110 *khi*)<sup>28</sup> to a single debtor. He also charged a high rate of interest: one text speaks of a 100% interest rate on 21 *khi*. This short document also tells us that the loan was for food, instead of for seed or something else.

27 Not all the serfs even owned land. Vusmeka fled from an appanage in Cadh'ota to work in Yav'e County, for which work he was paid *sikhi* corn for hire. The hire probably means he was doing corvée labor for the county administration, though, not a farm laborer.

28 Burrow 1937: s. v. *khi*.

Even within the serf estate both debtors and creditors appeared. One of the serfs of Yiharavala owed 20 muli (a unit of value—20 muli equals about half the price of a good horse or camel and twice the price of a rug)<sup>29</sup> to a serf in Trasa county. A housed dependent of Sug'nita, named Sarpig'a, fell into debt of a horse. His creditor did not accept the horse that Sug'nita and Sarpig'a offered, but instead wanted Sug'nita's house and farm (§24). We can thus see that the customs allowed the creditor to decide what he considered fair payment. We have no evidence of debt slavery, but it is reasonable to conjecture that certainly Sarpig'a and even Sug'nita might have become dependents of the creditor, had he seized Sug'nita's home.

The whole conflict of debtor and creditor cut through the distinctions of legal status, showing the partial disjunction of social classifications with economic facts. In times of crises the conflict could grow sharp: "... the people of the province there are harassing each other on account of old debts. These well-to-do people are to be prevented from persecuting the debtor people. When there is peace and quiet from Khotana and the province is stable, at that time they will pay (§272)." Note that the royal letter speaks of well-to-do and debtors, rather than slave and free. This is not to imply that official status did not confer a tremendous economic advantage, but only that the two are analytically distinct. The base of the officials' wealth was their office but the office had to be actively translated into wealth.

The same point can be illustrated by looking at water and seed rights. Water was essential to cultivation on the edge of the desert and its supply was supervised by the state (§§368, 604, 722). Water rights as well as rights to state-supplied seed for sowing could be granted by the king either to refugees to encourage them to settle down (§292) or to favored officials. This right the officials presumably valued, but it did not make an air-tight distinction between the economic activity of officials and the other people. Ly'ipeya had received land in Sāca from the king, but whether he received right to free water and seed was in dispute. The alternative to having these rights was simple; Ly'ipeya could send money and have his agent *buy* water and seed (§160). Once again state

29 Burrow 1937: s. v. *muli*.

controlled resources formed the core of the local elite's wealth, but the income on the margin came from market-mediated activities.

The royal family and high dignitaries could, however, afford to dispense with the market. What they needed, they could, as a rule, requisition. We have a list of disbursements from the Cadh'otan treasury recording visits of two Princes Kirtaya and Pumñabala. To take only the first case, the Cadh'otan storehouse paid out goods when Kirtaya first came to Cadh'ota, when he went to the mountains to make a *vaṣḍhig'a* (?sacrifice), when he fell ill, when he returned to Cadh'ota, when he left for Kroraina, when he went on an embassy to Khotana, when he returned from the embassy, and when he felt generous and gave gifts to Cadh'otan officials. The total expenditure amounted to 2 *milima* and 2 *khi* of wine, 6 *milima* of grain, 1 *milima* and 5 *khi* of flour, 15 *milima* of provisions for his attendants, and 4 sheep (§ 637). The real elite of Shanshan, as opposed to the provincial elite of Cadh'ota, relied wholly on state-controlled resources.

### Commerce and the Peripheral Economy

The economy of Shanshan had little room for money. No coinage as such was known in the Cadh'ota kingdom. When used, gold, the only precious metal mentioned, was measured out in weights derived from the names of Greek coins, *sadera* < *stater* and *drakhma* < *drachma*. We know that these words signified only weights, not coinage, as a document from Kroraina speaks of two 'drachmas' of pepper, and four 'staters' of sugar (§ 702). As was said earlier, gold apparently came from the mountains of Tibet south of Shanshan. Finance officer Ly'ipeya apparently had a supply of it that he was seeking to sell at a good price (§ 140). A man named Pag'ina also sold the precious metal (§ 494).

Gold, however, seems to have been primarily used for purchasing goods only by travellers, that is, monks and merchants. The Chinese merchant Šg'isī<sup>30</sup> paid for a slave with gold, while a monk Anamda bought land with gold. The man to whom Pag'ina sold

30 The name is almost certainly a two syllable Chinese first name. The initial Šg<sup>2</sup> is the kind of initial cluster such as is found in the Ancient Chinese pronunciation of Loulan < ɣleou-lan < Krōrān (Brough 1965:591).

gold was Mokṣapriya, a monk (§494, cf. 502). When the queen went as an ambassador to Khotana, she demanded a stater of gold from Yav'e County but no gold was in the storehouse so she had to accept a carpet instead (§§431, 432). Gold was obviously convenient for travellers in that it combined high value with low bulk. At the same time it was rather cumbersome to use in everyday affairs, and, ironically, in a barter economy was not really suitable material for loans, as the debtor could not be sure of being able to convert the precious metal into goods (what if he lived in Yav'e County?). Gold was thus the traveller's check of ancient Central Asia.

International commerce, meaning essentially trade with China, stayed largely in the capital city, Kroraina (Loulan to the Chinese). Through most of the period of the documents Shanshan was a client kingdom of the Jīn dynasty. The Kroraina documents often mention the Chinese in Kroraina and the Chinese documents from Kroraina also reveal some dealings of the Chinese garrison with the natives. The Chinese records mention receiving iron spades and saws (Chavannes 1913, 168–169) and natives caring for donkeys (Chavannes 1913, 178). In a list found in Kroraina the Chinese appear as taking cows (§686). That same list mentions Chinese in Opimta (location unknown), Calmadāna, and ?Niyā. The mention of Chinese in Calmadāna is confirmed by a document that mentions how in year 53 (Mahiri 4), the Supis carried off a man and sent him as a present to Šg'aši, the Chinese. Honest Šg'aši eventually paid the owner back in cash (§324).

The Cadh'otan records also mention Chinese, but being in the westernmost section of Shanshan, they were understandably few. When, says one of the documents, a debt of silk came up there (in Cadh'ota), it could not be investigated right away because there happened to be no Chinese merchants in the area. Yet when they arrive, the whole matter will be investigated (§35). So Chinese merchants were the only silk suppliers, and although none dwelt in Cadh'ota they appeared regularly enough. One Chinese man tried, at least, to buy land in Cadh'ota but there was none to be found (§255). His name Aryasa is not Chinese, and could indicate he was a monk. Chinese clothes and turbans are the only other product from China mentioned (§§149, 353).<sup>31</sup>

31 In Kroraina silk seems to have actually been cultivated: "The westerner (*hu*) named Azong gives as tribute 10 rolls and 2 *zhàng* of white silk, one

In return, the Chinese merchants brought back the precious stones found throughout the southern caravan route. Marco Polo writes of the kingdom of Čärçän, which included the old Shanshan kingdom except for Kroraina or Lop, as it was then called: "There are rivers producing jasper and chalcedony, which are exported for sale in Cathay and bring in a good profit, for they are plentiful and easy to come by (Polo 1958: 53)."

The Prakrit documents have nothing to say on this subject, but there is a series of Chinese strip-like documents found isolated from the other documents, which record gifts of precious stones. They follow two standard forms: "So-and-so respectfully sends his/her greeting with a precious stone," for equals and "(Your subject) so-and-so, pressing his/her head against the ground, respectfully sends his/her greeting with a precious stone," for inferiors (Chavannes 1913, 199–200). The strips were made to be attached to the precious stone that would be presented. Now the donors are mentioned and the object of the respectful salutations is written on the other side. They include the *Dawang* 'Great King,' his wife, his mother, and mother-in-law, various *dazi*, 'hereditary princes,'<sup>32</sup> and one subject. None of them are Chinese yet the inscriptions on the strips are written with "remarkable clarity," says Chavannes (1913, 198). Why write to the royal family in Chinese? The reason might be that such precious stones were so generally handled by Chinese merchants that when the donors sought a precious stone as a gift, they expected its inscription to be in Chinese. The precious stone industry like the silk one was seemingly reserved for the highest officials, and the Chinese merchants.

roll of yellow silk, one roll of light silk, this last one counting as two rolls," reads one Chinese document from Kroraina (Chavannes 1913:186), while a list from Sâca records how a man returned from the capital and paid out various rolls, classed in various ways as either as gifts or for sales. Putting these two references together it seems that the silk was indeed produced in Kroraina, but that it was under some sort of monopoly, limiting production to the capital area. One of the categories in the Sâca document is royal silk, so there may have been some royal silk farms.

- 32 *Dazi*, literally 'great son,' is quite probably the Chinese equivalent of the Prakrit title *kāla*, 'prince.' The Chinese strips also include *xiao dazi*, 'little prince.' This title would indicate princes who are distantly descended from the king.



### Conclusion

The investigation of the documents discovered at Cadh'ota, demonstrates what a mine of information awaits anyone who spends some time to try to put the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle together. The information in the sections above contributes valuable perspectives to other historical issues. For example, the data on geography supplies information on the issue of dessication and climate changes in the Tarim basin (Hoyanagi 1975: 85–113). Marriage of monks in Buddhism has usually been considered a radical new innovation, a sort of East Asian Protestant Reformation (Bella 1985: 68–70). In Shanshan we have a very conventionally pious religious atmosphere, and yet married monks. What does this say about the history of Buddhism? Large issues of historical interpretation, such as the controversy over non-Western feudalism, Wittfogel's hydraulic theory of Oriental despotism, and the nature of pre-modern economies can all be tested in the light of the documents. Finally our knowledge of the famous Silk Route is expanded by a view of trade and commerce on an average spot in its path. Indeed the whole view of Chinese relations with Central Asia could be revised in light of these documents.

Further work on the documents could proceed by tying in the documents with the archaeology of the region. By relating the documents with what Aurel Stein's excavations tell us about the architecture and town layout, we could add tremendously to our knowledge of the material and economic side of Cadh'otan civilization. The documents can also be related to other ones found in the Tarim basin. Professor Thomas has shed much light on word meanings, by comparing the Prakrit and later Tibetan texts from Ändirlänggär and Dunhuang; were someone to compare the content, the results could be of tremendous value. History in Central Asia cannot be written from the top down. Due to the nature of the evidence, the affairs of royalty cannot occupy our attention, as they do elsewhere. Anyone working in this field has a unique opportunity to write history from the bottom up.

APPENDIX I:  
Terms and their Translation\*

appanage:	kilme
(army) animal overseer:	klaseṃci
community of monks:	bhikṣusaṃgha
district:	pradej'a
district head:	vuryag'a
dues:	harga
elder:	kitsaitsa
escort:	arivag'a
finance officer:	šoṭhamga
free:	ajhade (see Burrow 1937: § 22)
governor:	cojhbo
great governor:	mahaṃta cojhbo
horse transport officer:	surva toṃga
monk:	śramaṃna
prince:	kāla
royal animal officer:	kori
slave:	dajha (see Burrow 1937: § 22)
tax:	palyi
tax collector:	apsu
transport officer:	toṃga
tax conveyers:	yatma and ag'eta
county:	av'ana
serfs (applying to residents of appanages or counties):	kilmeci
(county) administrator:	v'asu/vasu

\* These translations are based on the implied function of the office, not on the usually obscure Tocharian etymologies. Should such etymologies become more certain, it would be useful to devise new translations attempting to fit the etymologies with the function. Some may be upset by the implied feudalistic terminology of 'appanage' or 'serf.' I should emphasize that I have no position one way or the other on whether the Cadh'otan society as I have described it above can be called feudalistic. 'Appanage' and 'serf' both have specific meanings that are not tied to the general form of feudal society. They can with justice be applied freely to any social forms that fit these meanings, regardless of the larger nature of the society. Nor should these remarks be taken to mean I think Cadh'otan society is *not* feudal, or even that feudalism cannot be applied outside of a European contexts. The terminology is neutral.

## APPENDIX II: Chronology

### A. Chronology of the Great Governors

Great governors (*mahaṃta cojhbos*), that is those who 1) decide or hear cases, 2) whose seal is authoritative, 3) who are addressed directly by the king in correspondence. Below is a listing of all officials called great governors in the documents:

*mahaṃta cojhbos*: Somjaka: §§ 585, 385  
                             Ṣamasena, § 390  
                             Yitaka, § 399  
                             Tamjaka, § 541, cf. § 130  
                             Kranaya, § 162  
                             Ly'ipeya, § 161

Some factors to consider: 1) the term *cojhbo* is trivalent. It can refer to the governor of a province = *mahaṃta cojhbo*, or a specific subordinate officer, or be used in a very vague sense meaning essentially official. Thus the people addressed in royal correspondence (cf. §§ 3, 11, 23, etc.) as *cojhbo* Yitaka and *tomga* Vuktosa (Governor Yitaka, and Finance Officer Vuktosa) are described on another document below their seals as *cojhbos* Yitaka and Vuktosa (§ 576). The two who appear in royal correspondence as *cojhbo* Kranaya and *soṭhamga* Ly'ipeya, also appear as *cojhbos* Kranaya and Lyipeya § 119. This confusion even affects royal correspondence—compare § 492 to § 494 (*cojhbo* Patraya is a lesser *cojhbo*). The loose sense of the term *cojhbo* accounts for the great number of people described as *cojhbos* described in the documents (Burrow 1937, s.v. *cojhbo*). To determine if any given *cojhbo* is one who ruled Cadh'ota, or a lesser official, it is necessary to look at the context.

2) There are governors from other provinces who write to the those of Cadh'ota and whose names thus appear in our documents. See § 119—*cojhbo* Kunala is probably from Calmadāna (see also § 305). Governor Cinyaśa and *ogu* Cinaph'ara also from another province, here Kroraina (§ 399).

3) Great governors, even after being dismissed, retained their title as governor, see §§ 49 and 226 (Ṣamasena) and § 222 (Somjaka).

Great Governor and Colleague (if any)	Combined Year, and Reign Year	Reference
1. <i>cojhbos</i> Somjaka, Vanamta:	53 (Mahiri 4)	§ 582
Somjaka:	53 (Mahiri 4)	§§ 584, 732
Somjaka, <i>cojhbo</i> Bhimbhasena:	60 (Mahiri 11)	§ 578
Somjaka:	60 (Mahiri 11)	§§ 568, 637
	62 (Mahiri 13)	§ 569

Royal correspondence addressed to Somjaka: §§ 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 20, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 143, 212, 219, 235, 244, 262, 275, 279, 286, 296, 297, 309, 310, 312, 329, 341, 349, 351, 352, 355, 356, 357, 358,

359, 364, 366, 367, 368, 374, 381, 386, 388, 389, 393, 396, 412, 473, 479, 480, 491, 520, 526, 530, 538, 542, 545, 551, 553, 562, 564, 567, 621, 629, 630, 632, 743, 750, 751, 764.

Other officials: *Ly'ipeya klasemci*, § 10; *Namarajhma*, *Yitaka* and *Ly'imsu*, minor *cojhbos*, §§ 507, 120.

2. <i>cojhbos</i> Šamasena, Pug'o	66 (Mahiri 17.6)	§ 593
	68 (Mahiri 19)	§ 436
	69 (Mahiri 20)	§ 577
	70 (Mahiri 21.1)	§ 235

Royal correspondence addressed to them: §§ 6, 16, 39, 47, 67, 68, 291, 308, 315, 362, 397, 482, 518, 528, 537, 580, 556.

Other officials: *v'asu* *Ly'ipeya* § 124, *tomgha* *Vukto*, § 436.

3. <i>cojhbo</i> <i>Yitaka</i> , <i>tomgha</i> <i>Vukto</i> :	70 (Mahiri 21.12)	§ 576
---	-------------------	-------

Royal correspondence addressed to them: §§ 3, 11, 23, 28, 37, 42, 44, 45, 49, 124, 189, 224, 226, 236, 375, 427, 451, 468, 470, 481, 516, 524, 540, 561, 720, 729.

Other officials: *kori* *Rutraya*: § 49, to whom the following royal correspondence is addressed: §§ 4, 5 (75–Mahiri 26), 32, 49, 223; *cojhbo* Šamasena: §§ 49, 226.

?4. <i>cojhbo</i> <i>Tamjaka</i> :	(no dated documents)
------------------------------------	----------------------

Royal correspondence addressed to him: §§ 1, 7, 15, 24, 26, 566.

Other officials: *šoṭhamga* *Ly'ipeya*: §§ 7, 97; *cojhbo* *Somjaka*: § 222–dated year 71 (Mahiri 22).

5. <i>cojhbo</i> <i>Kranaya</i> , <i>šoṭamga</i> <i>Ly'ipeya</i> : 83 ( <i>Vašmana</i> 4)	§§ 496, 498
---	-------------

Royal correspondence addressed to them: §§ 19, 22 (if contemporary with § 6 then year 75–Mahiri 26),\* 71, 134, 243, 265, 340, 344, 400, 403, 413, 430, 435, 438, 439, 497, 502, 503, 504, 554, 636, 638, 641.

Other officials: *tasuca* *Lapaya* and *cojhbo* *Patraya*: § 126 (different province) –addressed in royal correspondence: *cojhbos* *Patraya* and *Lapaya*: § 492. *tasuca* *Lapaya*, *cojhbo* *Patraya*: § 494.

\* In both § 6 and § 22, *Ly'ipeya* and *Ly'imsu* are let off from onerous duties. This is possibly due to *Ly'ipeya*'s promotion to *šoṭhamga*.

6. <i>cojhbo</i> <i>Lyipeya</i> , <i>ogu</i> <i>Kušanasena</i> : 90 ( <i>Vašmana</i> 11)	§ 193*
--	--------

Royal correspondence addressed to *Lyipeya*: §§ 136, 198.

\* This document is dated to the eleventh year of an unnamed king, but this king must certainly be *Vašmana*.

B. The chronology of great governors can be used arrange other people's offices in order. The following are two examples:

*Ly'ipeya*'s chronology:

Office held by Ly'ipeya	Contemporary Great governor	Reference
klasemci:	Somjaka	§ 10
	Somjaka	§ 52
v'asu: (official in charge of royal av'ana)	Somjaka	§ 46
	kori Rutraya, year 73 (Mahiri 26)	§ 5
	kori Rutraya	§ 32
	Samasena	§ 124
	Yitaka	§ 45
soṭhamga:	Tamjaka	§ 7
Bhimasena's chronology:		
Office held by Bhimasena	Contemporary Great governor	Reference
klasemci:	Kranaya and Ly'ipeya	§ 438
yatma, etc.:	Kranaya and Ly'ipeya	§ 439
v'asu suv'eṭha:	Ly'ipeya	§ 474
	Calma, Somdara	§ 532

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1952. "Position of Women as depicted in the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 4, 327–341.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1952a. "A Study of Weights and Measures in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Journal of Behar Research Society*, vol. 38, 364–365.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1953. "Position of Slaves and Serfs as depicted in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 2, 97–110.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1953a. "Form of Taxation as depicted in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 4, 340–353.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1953b. "A Study of Textiles & Garments in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Bhāratiya Vidhyā*, Bombay, vol. 14, 75–94.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1954. "Numismatic Data in the Niya Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Central Asia," *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*, vol. 16, no. 2, 219–230.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1954a. "Some Family Letters in Kharoṣṭhī Script from Central Asia," *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 1, 50–56.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1954b. "Buddhist Monks in Chinese Turkestan," in *Sarupa Bharati, or the Homage of Indology, being the Lakshmana*

- Sarup Memorial Volume*, ed. J. N. Agrawal and B. D. Shastri. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 175–183.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1955. "Professions and Persons in the Niya Society," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, vol. 30, no. 1, 17–27.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, 1965. "Indian Culture in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," in *India's Contribution to World Thought and Culture*. Madras: Vivekananda Rock Memorial Committee.
- Agrawala, Ratna Chandra, n. d. "Fauna as depicted in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol. 6, 111–124.
- Bacot, J., F. W. Thomas, G. C. Toussaint, 1940. *Documents de Touen-houang Relatif à l'Histoire du Tibet*. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Bailey, H. W., 1983. "Khotanese Saka Literature," in *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. III, ed. Ehsan Yarshater. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bella, Robert, 1985. *Tokugawa Religion: The Cultural Roots of Modern Japan*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bloch, Marc, 1961. *Feudal Society*, vol. 1, *The Growth of Ties of Dependence* (trans. L. A. Manyon). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyer, A. M., P. S. Noble, E. J. Rapson and E. Senart, 1920–1929. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*, Parts I–III. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brough, John, 1965. "Comments on third century Shanshan and the history of Buddhism," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental [and African] Studies*, 28, 582–612.
- Burrow, T., 1933–1935. "Iranian Loan-words in Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental [and African] Studies*, vol. 7, 509–516, 779–790.
- Burrow, T., 1935. "Tokharian Elements in Kharoṣṭhī Documents," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 666–675.
- Burrow, T., 1935–1937. "The Dialectical Position of the Niya Prakrit," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental [and African] Studies*, 8, 419–435.
- Burrow, T., 1937. *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burrow, T., 1937–1939. "Further Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Niya," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental [and African] Studies*, 9, 111–123.
- Burrow, T., 1940. *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents From Chinese Turkestan*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Chavannes, Edouard, 1913. *Les Document Chinoise Découverts par Aurel Stein dans les Sables du Turkestan Oriental*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dresden, Mark, 1983. "Sogdian Language and Literature," in *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. III, ed. Ehsan Yarshater. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ethnic Research Institute of the Xinjiang Academy of Social Science, 1980. *Xinjiang jianshi*, vol. 1, Ürümqi: Xinjiang People's Press.
- Goody, Jack and Stanley Tambiah, 1973. *Bridewealth and Dowry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoyanagi, Mutsumi, 1975. "Natural Changes of the Region along the Old Silk Road in the Tarim Basin in Historical Times", *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko (The Oriental Library)*, 33, 85–113.

- Lee, Ki-baik, 1984. *A New History of Korea* (trans. Edward W. Wagner with Edward J. Shultz). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Legge, James, 1965. *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Lévi, Sylvain, 1933. *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens*. Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 2. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Li, Taiyu, 1985. "Xinjiang Fojiao you sheng zhuan shuai he Yisilanjiao xingqi de lishi genyuan," in Ethnic Research Institute of Gansu Province, ed., *Xibei Yisilanjiao Yanjiu*, Lanzhou: Gansu Ethnic Press, 262–283.
- Polo, Marco, 1958, trans. R. E. Latham. *The Travels*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Salomon, Richard, 1986. "A New Kharoṣṭhī Document from Central Asia," *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*, 4, 341–351.
- Salomon, Richard, 1988. "Two New Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Central Asia," *Central Asiatic Journal*, 32 (Nos. 1–2), 98–106.
- Thomas, F. W., 1935–1955. *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Parts I–III. London: Royal Asiatic Society.