

## THE DATE OF THE STAEL-HOLSTEIN ROLL

by EDWIN G. PULLEYBLANK

Professor H. W. Bailey recently asked me if I could interpret the references to China in a certain Khotanese text. In the course of attempting to uncover the background of this I had occasion to consider the question of the date of the Staël-Holstein roll on which the late Professor G. Haloun had promised an article. Although his untimely death prevented him from bringing this to completion, he had contributed a note to Professor Bailey's article on the miscellany in *Asia Major II* (1951) in which he stated that the scroll dated from 865 A.D. With the aid of information from other Khotanese documents, some at least of which was unknown to Haloun but has now been made available to me by Professor Bailey, I have come to a different conclusion and because the matter seems to be one of considerable interest I should like to make it known here briefly at the earliest opportunity. There can be no doubt that the true date is 925.

"Of the Lion King *Viṣa Sambhava* the Fourteenth Regnal Year, Cock Year".

Thus begin the first two Khotanese documents on the scroll. Until we can discover the date of *Viṣa Sambhava's* accession this is not very helpful but we are at least limited to one year in each twelve year-cycle. Assuming that the Khotanese animal cycle was in step with the Chinese—a reasonable assumption since it is known that this was true of the Tibetan and Turkish animal cycles as well as of those of other peoples who used this method of dating—we have the series . . . 853, 865, 877 . . . 913, 925, 937 . . . giving us possible years. Now if the fourteenth year of a reign is a cock year the first year must be a monkey year. Do we know of the reign of any Khotanese king beginning in such a year? It happens that we do.

A Chinese embassy left for Khotan in the third year of T'ien-fu of Later Chin (938). A member of the party who wrote an account afterwards stated that they were two years on the journey and that when they arrived the "year name" (*nien-hao*) of the Khotanese king Li Sheng-t'ien 李聖天 was the twenty-ninth year of T'ung-ch'ing 同慶.<sup>1</sup> Taking this to be the Chinese year

<sup>1</sup> *Hsin Wu-tai shih* 74, Yü-t'ien kuo. The 于闐國行程錄 by 高居晦 is listed as a work in one *chüan* in the *Sung-shih I-wen-chih*, 157.17.b (where the author's name is incorrectly given as 平居晦) but now exists only as quoted in *HWTS*. This was translated by Abel Rémusat in *Histoire de la ville de Khotan*, pp. 75-81, from the *Pien-i-tien* of the *T'u-shu chi-ch'eng*. Rémusat correctly identified the twenty-ninth year of "Thoung-king" with 940. See also Aurel Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, p. 179, where T'ung-ch'ing is taken not as a Chinese style *nien-hao* but as a local era. It would be strange if Haloun had not taken into account this point of contact

corresponding to 940 we find that the period T'ung-ch'ing began in 912, a monkey year. If the Khotanese system of year periods corresponded to the Chinese system of that time we could not simply assume from this that Li Sheng-t'ien's reign began in 912, for Chinese emperors usually had several year periods during their reigns and not one only as became the accepted practice in Ming and Ch'ing times. Li Sheng-t'ien, however, lived (as I shall show below) until 966, so it is unlikely that he should have come to the throne much before 912. There is moreover a document dated in the thirtieth regnal year of a reign beginning in a monkey year<sup>2</sup> and it seems reasonable to suppose that this belongs to the same long reign, *viz.* that of Li Sheng-t'ien. As we shall see there is some reason for thinking that the use of Chinese style *nien-hao* or year periods was simply superimposed on the native system of dating by regnal years and that there was only one *nien-hao* per reign.

We may, therefore, equate the period T'ung-ch'ing with the reign of Li Sheng-t'ien and say that he came to the throne in 912. May we go further and equate Li Sheng-t'ien with *Viṣa Sambhava*, who, on the evidence of the Staël-Holstein scroll, also began his reign in a monkey year? There is happily ample confirmation for this view.

*Viṣa Sambhava, Viṣa Śura, Viṣa Darma*

The document which Professor Bailey asked me to help to elucidate is dated, according to him, as follows: *thyenä tcūnä sühye: bādä tcürmye kṣuṇā aśā salya paḍauysye māsti nāmye haḍai*, "the T'ien-tsun fortunate time, fourth

between Chinese and Khotanese chronology and in fact it is clear from the notes which he left behind that he had done so. It appears, however, that he took T'ung-ch'ing twenty-ninth year to correspond to 941, not 940. This seems to be because the embassy left in the twelfth month of T'ien-fu 3 which corresponds to the beginning of 939 according to the western calendar. If we now add two years for the journey we arrive at the year 941. To bring the western solar calendar into consideration is, however, irrelevant in this context and only leads to confusion. The embassy set out in the twelfth month of a dog year and took two years (二歲) to reach Khotan. The statement is imprecise but it is most natural to assume, as did Rémusat and others after him, that the party arrived in the second following lunar year, *i.e.* in the year corresponding to the greater part of 940, a rat year.

I should like to state here the use that I have made of the notes on this question left by Haloun after his death which are now on deposit in the Cambridge University Library. These notes were first shown to me by Mr. A. R. Davis early in 1952. They contain a large amount of material on the history of Sha Chou and adjoining regions and of the nomadic tribes connected with the Staël-Holstein documents, mostly in the form of references or quotations left in the original Chinese. There is unfortunately very little in the way of argument or narrative to show what conclusions he proposed to draw from the material. After a cursory examination of them I felt that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to write anything from them which could pretend to represent his intentions and I therefore had to decline the task offered me. After examining the question of the date of the Staël-Holstein scroll *ab novo* and coming to my own conclusion about it I again looked at these notes with a good deal more comprehension than before and much profit, especially in regard to bibliographical references. Further references to these notes will be found below.

<sup>2</sup> Bailey, *Hvatanica I*, *BSOS* 8 (1937), p. 934, quoting Ch. 00275 (Hoernie, *Manuscript Remains*, pl. V, fol. 1).

regnal year, horse year, first month, ninth day'.<sup>1</sup> He informs me that it contains among other things references to China, to the leading of the army to Kashgar and to the presentation of various gifts, including an elephant. In reading through the records of relations between Khotan and China one finds that the last embassy to the Sung court before the fall of Khotan to the Moslems brought a letter from the king in which he told of a victory over Kashgar and offered to present a dancing elephant captured there.<sup>2</sup> This was in the year 971, a sheep year, but the previous year 970 was a horse year. Considering the length of time it took the Chinese embassy to reach Khotan in 938-40 and that even in the middle of the seventh century, when the whole route was under the unified control of the T'ang empire, it took seven or eight months,<sup>3</sup> the Chinese record and the Khotanese document seem to correspond very well. If we assume that 970 is the date of the document, the period \*T'ien-tsun must have begun in 967, a hare year.

This date for the beginning of a new king's reign fits very well with what we know from Chinese sources. The last mention of the long-lived Li Sheng-t'ien is in connection with an embassy which arrived from him in 966.<sup>4</sup> It will have taken some time to come all the way from Khotan but we can still be sure that he was on the throne as late as, say, 965. Although the Chinese sources do not mention his death or give the name of his successor, the king whose offer to send the elephant came in 971 must clearly have been this successor.

We know the name of the Khotanese king who reigned with the *nien-hao* \*T'ien-tsun. Bailey informs me of the following date from his *Khotanese Buddhist Texts*, p. 151: *thyena tcūnā sūhye bādī pūhye kṣuāṇā pasa sālya ttaujiṛā māstā hāḍūsamyē haḍai . . . viṣa sūṛā*, "the \*T'ien-tsun fortunate time, fifth regnal year, sheep year, Ttumjāra month, seventeenth day . . . of Viṣa Śūra". Furthermore there is evidence that Viṣa Śūra was the successor of Viṣa Saṃbhava, whom we wish to identify with Li Sheng-t'ien. Bailey writes the following: "*Khotanese Buddhist Texts*, p. 135, and *Khotanese Texts* II, p. 123. A colophon in which the writer shares his merit with two kings: (1) *rradāna rrada viṣa sabava jsa habrrīhe ḥaysāsta brruva*, 'I share it with the king of kings, Viṣa Sabava, who has attained to illumination'. Hence the king has 'become a Buddha', that is, is deceased. (2) *rrada viṣa śūra jsa habrrīha jsana hūṣaya*, 'I share it with the king Viṣa Śūra for the lengthening of his life'. Hence the

<sup>1</sup> *Khotanese Texts* II, p. 129, line 80. I need hardly say that all explanations of Khotanese texts are due to Bailey.

<sup>2</sup> *Sung-shih* 490 *Yü-t'ien* kuo; *Yü-hai* 154.23.b. This embassy is briefly mentioned in *Sung Hui-yao Kao* 蕃夷七之一. In the commentary, which is evidently taken from the *Yung-lo ta-tien*, the *Yü-hai* is quoted and also the *Shan-t'ang K'ao-so* 山堂考索 (alias *Ch'ün-shu* 群書 *K'ao-so*), which I have been unable to consult. Cf. Rémusat, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, p. 178.

<sup>4</sup> *Hsiü tzu-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien* 7.16.a, Ch'ien-te fourth year. *Sung-shih* 490 and *Yü-hai* 154.23.b, which also record this embassy, do not mention the name of the Khotanese king, though the implication is that he is the same as in previous years. Cf. Rémusat, p. 85.

king still lives, and is likely to have been, in this context, the successor of Viṣa Sabava".

A full explanation of all the Chinese references in the document of 970 must await Professor Bailey's translation but one may mention one further matter. The document refers several times to a certain tteyi hyām, once connecting him with Sha Chou and once calling him tcau tteyi hyām, who is the brother of the mother of the writer, i.e. the Khotanese king.<sup>1</sup> This must refer to Ts'ao Yüan-chung 曹元忠 who was ruling in Sha Chou in 970. Tteyi hyām represents Chinese Ta-wang 大王 "Great King", a title frequently employed in Tun-huang documents to refer to rulers of the Ts'ao dynasty in that region.<sup>2</sup> Marriage relations between Khotan and the Ts'ao dynasty of Sha Chou are well known. The wife (or mother? or both?) of Ts'ao Yen-lu 曹延祿 was a Khotanese princess.<sup>3</sup> Professor Fujieda Akira has also inferred from various circumstances that King Li Sheng-t'ien had as his queen a princess from Sha Chou, who, he thinks, must have been the daughter or sister of Ts'ao I-chin 曹義金, the founder of the Ts'ao dynasty.<sup>4</sup> A cave at Tun-huang has a picture inscribed 大朝大寶子闐國大聖大明天子 This ruler of Khotan has been identified by Professor Fujieda and others with Li Sheng-t'ien. Pelliot's photographs of the cave do not reveal the other inscriptions beside the pictures but in Shih Nai's 史岩 *Tun-huang shih-shih hua-hsiang t'i-shih* 敦煌石室畫象題識 (cave 71), which was of course not available to Professor Fujieda, we find the king's consort called Ts'ao Shih 曹氏 "née Ts'ao". Evidently this queen was the daughter of Ts'ao I-chin

<sup>1</sup> *Khotanese Texts* II, p. 127, line 27.

<sup>2</sup> The earliest example seems to be of Ts'ao I-chin himself in 934 in "Ts'ao I-chin Shu" 曹義金疏 (Haneda and Pelliot, *Tun-huang i-shu* 9ff.) Cf. Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃 "Shashū Kigi gun setsudo shi shimatsu 沙州歸義軍節度使始末", Part 3, *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Kyōtō) 23 (1942) pp. 70 and 73, n. 137. Professor Bailey writes, "tteyi hyām is Chinese ta wang 'great king'. The two unusual spellings -eyi for -ai and hy- for w- retarded the interpretation. Professor Pulleyblank proposed from the contexts that these syllables should give ta wang.

"Chinese ta, t'ai (K952 from d'ai, t'ai) is written in Khotanese texts tai, t'ai, tta, tte, ttayi, ttāyā, and with th- thaya, thaiya, thai, thiyi, thyaya. Once, however, in Ch. 00267.56 (*Khotanese Buddhist Texts*, p. 148) occurs theyi with -eyi. In the Chinese Vajracchedikā written in Khotanese Brāhmī script (ZDMG 91.34ff.) keyi is found for 皆 K364 kie from kai; ḥeyi for 戒 K363 kie from kai; ḥeyi for 解 K366 hie from yai; tceyi, tseyi for 在 K1024 tsai from dz'ai. In Tibetan script we have similarly dzeḥi for K1024 tsai from dz'ai; deḥi for K952 ta, tai from d'ai, t'ai; leḥi 來 for K511 lai from lai (JRAS 1926, 525ff.).

"The hy- of hyām for 王 K1298 wang from jiwang shows a use found only once elsewhere, in the Chinese Vajracchedikā hyi: (beside gvi, uvi, and Tibetan ḥu) for 爲 K1313 wei from jwīe".

<sup>3</sup> Chavannes in *Serindia*, Vol. III, App. A iv, pp. 1333-1334; Pelliot, *BEFEO* 8, p. 504; Wang Kuo-wei 王國維, "Yü-t'ien Kung-chu kung ti-ts'ang p'u-sa hua-hsiang pa" 于闐公主供地藏菩薩畫象跋, in *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin* 觀堂集林 20; Fujieda Akira, *op. cit.*, pt. 4, pp. 235ff. A full discussion of the various points of view would take too much space here.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 234-235.

and sister of Ts'ao Yüan-chung, who ruled in Sha Chou in 970, and also the mother of Viṣa Śura.

We have thus established the dates of two successive Khotanese kings beyond reasonable doubt. A third can be added to the list. A name Cā Kimāśanā occurs in the immediate context of the date, fifth year of \*T'ien-tsun of Viṣa Śura, quoted above and also in the colophon of the *ġātaka-stava* dedicated to Viṣa Śura (here it is also written Kymś'n in Sogdian script).<sup>1</sup> This same name occurs in its original Chinese form 張金山 in a Chinese text which immediately precedes in a manuscript a Khotanese text in which the following occurs: *śe-tcūnā miḍām jāṭṭye viṣa darma baudasatvāṃ rāṃdā kṣuṇi ye pūha cū hīna kamala aśi rā bāsti salī haudama māścā*, "of the world-honoured gracious god Viṣa Darma, bodhisattva and king, it was the fifth regnal year, Cū hīna . . . horse-presided year, seventh month".<sup>2</sup> The Chinese text is dated according to the cycle of sixty in a *jen-wu* year (horse year). Assuming that the Chang Chin-shan is the same in all the documents, we shall want to place Viṣa Darma fairly soon after Viṣa Śura. The nearest *jen-wu* year is 982<sup>3</sup> which fits admirably. If then we take this as the fifth year of Viṣa Darma's reign, he must have come to the throne in 978 and is likely to have been the immediate successor of Viṣa Śura.

We may summarize the information thus established about the dates of the Khotanese kings as follows:—

912-66. Viṣa Sambhava (李聖天), T'ung-ch'ing 同慶 period (Khotanese: *thūkhī*).

967-77? Viṣa Śura, \*T'ien-tsun 天尊 period (*thyena tcūnā*).

978-82-? Viṣa Darma, \*Chung-hsing 中興 period (*cū hīna*).

#### *The-po, Tte-pū, T'ai-pao.*

The only evidence in support of the date 865 for the Staël-Holstein scroll published by Haloun in his note contributed to Bailey's article was the identification of the Khotanese *tte-pū*, Tibetan *the-po*, the word used for the ruler of Sha Chou in the documents, with the Chinese *T'ai-pao* 太保 "Grand Guardian". According to Haloun the *T'ai-pao* in question was Chang I-ch'ao 張議潮, the liberator of Tun-huang from the Tibetans, who had this honorific title bestowed on him. Chang I-ch'ao is frequently referred to by

this title after his death,<sup>1</sup> which is as we should expect for it was the posthumous title conferred on him when he died in Ch'ang-an in 872.<sup>2</sup> This might be taken as presumptive evidence that he had not been given the title while alive, for a posthumous title normally constituted a promotion. It would appear, however, from a text quoted by Demiéville (*Concile de Lhasa* I, pp. 35ff.) that Chang I-ch'ao was referred to by this title as early as 869, after he had gone to Ch'ang-an but while he was still alive. This suggests that he had assumed a higher honorific than that conferred on him by the Chinese court, setting an example which we know to have been followed by other successors at Sha Chou. (A jotting in Haloun's notes seems to indicate that after his note to Bailey, in which he refers to the title as "conferred", he adopted the opinion that Chang I-ch'ao had assumed it.) There is, therefore, no obstacle, as far as the title is concerned, to identifying the *po*, *tte-pū* with Chang I-ch'ao. He was not, however, the only ruler of Sha Chou to be called *T'ai-pao*.

There is no certain evidence from the Chinese side for the use of the title *T'ai-pao* by Ts'ao I-chin, who ruled in Sha Chou from 919 (?) to 935-36, but an undated fragment noted by Dr. Lionel Giles refers to Fu-chu *T'ai-pao* Ts'ao Kung 府主太保曹公.<sup>3</sup> A dated colophon of 920 has Fu-chu Shang-shu 尙書 Ts'ao Kung<sup>4</sup>, which must certainly refer to Ts'ao I-chin before he was officially recognized as Chieh-tu-shih by the Later T'ang court in 924.<sup>5</sup> Shang-shu, "President (of a Ministry in the central government)", is, of course, here used as an honorific title and it seems that after 920 Ts'ao I-chin raised his own honorific to *T'ai-pao*, which was more appropriate to his status as a ruler over a whole region. Unfortunately the term *Fu-chu*, not a regular title but simply "head of the prefecture", is not decisive, for it is occasionally found

<sup>1</sup> See for example "Sha Chou po-hsing shang Hui-hu T'ien-k'o-han shu" 沙州百姓上廻鶻天可汗書, published by Wang Chung-min 王重民 in *Bulletin of the National Library of Peking*, 9/6 (1935), pp. 18-21.

<sup>2</sup> The *Chang shih hsün-te chi ts'an-chüan* 張氏勳德記殘卷, published by Pelliot and Haneda in *Tun-huang I-shu*, rff., begins 卅安万年縣陽宜坊之私弟也 詔贈太保. The name of the man in question has been lost but it is clear from the context that it can only be Chang I-ch'ao, who died in Ch'ang-an in 872. Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 in his "Chang I-ch'ao chuan" 張義潮傳 (I cite the edition in the *Hsiieh-t'ang Ts'ung-k'o* 雪堂叢刻) did not know of this but guessed that Chang I-ch'ao had been posthumously created *T'ai-pao*. Cf. Fujieda, *op. cit.*, pt. 1, *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Kyōtō) 12 (1941), pp. 384 and 393, n. 32.

<sup>3</sup> *BSOS*, 7 (1934), p. 568.

<sup>4</sup> Several examples of the same colophon exist attached to different chapters of the sutra. See Giles (2 copies), *BSOS* 7 (1934), p. 568 and 10 (1940), p. 324; Lo Chen-yü, *Jih-pen Chü-shih Tun-huang chiang-lai ching mu-lu* 日本橋氏敦煌將來經目錄, 18a (*Hsiieh-t'ang ts'ung-k'o*); Hsü Kuo-lin 許國霖, *Bulletin of the National Library of Peking*, 9/6 (1935), p. 52. Cf. Fujieda, *op. cit.*, pt. 3, p. 72, n. 122.

<sup>5</sup> *Ts'e-fu yüan-huei* 972.12.b, T'ung-kuang 2/4/-; *Chiu Wu-tai shih* 32 (pen-chi) T'ung-kuang 2/5/ i-ch'ou. Cf. also *Ts'e-fu yüan-huei* 980.30.b. See Lo Chen-yü, "Kua Sha Ts'ao shih nien-piao" 瓜沙曹氏年表 (*Hsiieh-t'ang ts'ung-k'o*). Giles (*BSOS* 7, p. 568), following *Hsin Wu-tai shih* 5 (pen-chi), erroneously makes this date 926.

<sup>1</sup> *Khotanese Texts* I, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> *Khotanese Texts* II, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> It will be apparent that, apart from the arguments based on the dates already proposed for Viṣa Sambhava and Viṣa Śura, no other *jen-wu* year is possible. 1042 is long after the fall of Khotan to the Moslems. 922 cannot be both the fifth year of Cū-hīna and the eleventh year of T'ung-ch'ing. Any earlier date such as 862 or 802 would push Viṣa Śura and hence Viṣa Sambhava back into the time of Tibetan dominance in Sha Chou and Khotan. In spite of the efforts of Thomas and Konow to see the Staël-Holstein documents in this light, it is evident that they belong to a later time when the Tibetan power had declined, Sha Chou and Khotan were both independent and the Uigurs had arrived in Kan Chou.

of other rulers of Sha Chou,<sup>1</sup> even when they had been officially recognized, though of course it is more common in such cases to find the full title. An examination of the honorifics known to have been used by Ts'ao I-chin's successors at Sha Chou, however, shows that T'ai-pao seldom occurs and as the Staël-Holstein documents seem to prove that Ts'ao I-chin was known as T'ai-pao to the Khotanese envoys in 925, there is a good chance that the fragment noted by Giles refers to him.

The fact that Ts'ao I-chin was officially given the honorific Ssu-k'ung 司空 in 924<sup>2</sup> need not be regarded as an obstacle to this argument for, as T'ai-pao was the superior title, he may very well have continued to use it in preference to Ssu-k'ung—even if we assume that news of his appointment had reached Sha Chou by the middle of 925, which is by no means certain. In 931 his official honorific was changed to Chung-shu Ling 中書令<sup>3</sup> and documents of 934 and 935 refer to him by this title in the form Ling-kung 令公<sup>4</sup>. At that time his heir Yüan-te 元德 was already using the title Ssu-k'ung.

*Byā-yūm sām-sī.*

Another person mentioned in the Khotanese portion of the scroll can be identified with a fair degree of probability. Lines 25-26 contain a list of five names, the last of which is byā-yūm sām-sī. This must represent Mu-jung Shang-shu 慕容尚書 (Anc.: \*muo-iwong zjang-sjwo).<sup>5</sup> Mu-jung is a well-known surname of Hsien-pi origin, common in later times among the T'u-yü-hun and also occurring as a naturalized Chinese family name. In 934 the Prefect of Kua Chou 瓜州, Mu-jung Kuei-ying 歸盈, sent an embassy to the Chinese court along with that of Sha Chou. It is recorded that he was promoted from the honorific rank of Hsing-pu 刑部 Shang-shu to that of Shang-shu Tso P'u-yeh 左僕射.<sup>6</sup> It seems entirely probable that he is the

<sup>1</sup> A colophon of 953 has 府主太保及夫人. This is mysterious because the ruler of Sha Chou at that time was Ts'ao Yüan-chung who was already using the higher title T'ai-fu in 947. Is it possible that Lo Chen-yü misread it? See Lo Chen-yü, "Fih-pen Chü-shih... mu-lu", 19b, under 說佛延壽命經; and in the "Kua Sha Ts'ao shih nien-piao", where he notes the anomalous character of the text.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 95 n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Chiu Wu-tai shih* 42 (pen-chi) Ch'ang-hsing 2/1/ping-tzu. Cf. Lo Chen-yü, *Kua Sha Ts'ao Shih nien-piao*.

<sup>4</sup> See *Ts'ao I-chin shu* cited above, p. 95 n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *si* for *sjwo* represents a peculiarity of the dialect of the Tun-huang region at this period which has been noted by Luo Charngpeir. He writes "The characters of the rime 魚 [-iwo] almost always entered the group 止 [-i]" (*The North-west dialects of T'ang and Five Dynasties*, Shanghai, 1933, p. ix, see also pp. xi, 43-46). Numerous examples occur in the Tibetan transcriptions of Chinese texts published by Thomas in *JRAS* 1926 and 1927—which formed part of the material on which Luo based his study.

Dr. Waley informs me that this peculiarity is also found in popular poetry from Tun-huang and he cites for me 去 rhyming with 彼 and 居 with 詞 from Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸, *Chung-kuo su-wen hsüeh shih* 中國俗文學史, pp. 135, 142.

<sup>6</sup> *Ts'e-fu yüan-kuei* 965.16a. Cf. Lo Chen-yü, *op. cit.* It may be of interest to note that the title p'u-yeh (Anc.: \*b'uk- or b'uok-ja) also seems to occur in Khotanese texts. Cf. puhā: ya (*AM* I, p. 50, note on line 91, and other examples there quoted by Bailey).

Mu-jung Shang-shu of the scroll and that the other four names also belong to high ranking subordinates of Ts'ao I-chin. Presumably it was into this Mu-jung family that one of Ts'ao I-chin's sisters and also one of his daughters were married.<sup>1</sup>

I shall refrain at this time from discussing further the implications which this revised dating will have for our understanding of the contents of the documents but they will clearly be considerable. If, as seems altogether likely, it now proves possible to establish still more correspondences between Khotanese documents and Chinese official sources or Tun-huang documents, we should be able to add a great deal to our knowledge of tenth century history.

<sup>1</sup> Shih Nai, *op. cit.*, cave 68.