

The Location of the Capital of Lou-lan and the Date of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions⁽¹⁾

By ENOKI Kazuo

I Lou-lan 樓蘭 and the Capital of Shan-shan 鄯善

In the 4th year of Wên-ti 文帝 of Han (176 B.C.), Mo-tu Shan-yü 冒頓單于 of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 sent a message to the Han, in which he reported of his conquest of the Yüeh-shih 月氏, Lou-lan 樓蘭, Wu-sun 烏孫, Hu-chieh 呼揭, and the 26 states in the neighbourhood of these tribes. This is the first appearance on record of the name Lou-lan. The *Hsiung-nu-chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記, Bk. 110 (= *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. 94a), records it as follows: "Now, I (Mo-tu Shan-yü) punished Yu-hsien-wang 右賢王 for the reason of violation of promise (with the Han) by (his) petty officials and made him march westward to locate and conquer the Yüeh-shih 月氏. By divine providence, officials and soldiers (fought) well and horses were strong enough to destroy the Yüeh-shih. We have killed them and conquered them, (which resulted in) the surrender of Lou-lan, Wu-sun, Hu-chieh and twenty-six countries in their neighbourhood, all of which have become (subjects) of the Hsiung-nu. (Thus,) all the people who use the bow have been unified into one family."⁽²⁾ The conquest seems to have

(1) The gist of chapters I and II of the present article have already been published in *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher*, XXXIII, 1/2, 1961, pp. 52-65, under the title of *Yü-ni-ch'êng and the site of Lou-lan*. The present article is a fuller exposition of the author's opinion about the subject, with a study of the date of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions discovered in the sites of ancient kingdom of Shan-shan. In chapter I, the Kharoṣṭhī Document No. 696, another piece of evidence of the Kroraina-Loulan Site identity, is studied, which the author failed to deal with in the former article.

(2) 今以小吏之敗約故，罰右賢王，使之西求月氏擊之，以天之福，吏卒良，馬疆力，以夷滅月氏，盡斬殺降下之，定樓蘭烏孫呼揭及其旁二十六國，皆以為匈奴，諸引弓之民，并為一家。Here the twenty-six countries seem to be a scribal error of thirty-six countries 三十六國 which is a general appellation of the so-called Western Region or Hsi-yü. As for the Thirty-six countries as synonym of the Western Region under the Former Han, Professor Dr. S. KAMATA 鎌田重雄 orally communicated the idea to the author of the present article. The same explanation is also given by Professor Dr. S. ISE 伊勢仙太郎 in his *Saiki Keieishi no Kenkyū* 西域經營史の研究 (A Study of History of the Chinese Control of Western Countries), Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai, 1955, pp. 21-37. There are some variants of characters in the letter recorded in the Han-shu, but no difference in meaning.

been made in 176 B.C. or 177 B.C.⁽³⁾ Since then Lou-lan, as a tributary, had been under the sway of the Hsiung-nu; but as the situation of the Western Region was known as the result of the report of CHANG Ch'ien 張騫, Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 frequently dispatched envoys to Ta-wan 大宛 and some other countries. Both Lou-lan and Ku-shih 姑師 (*i.e.* Ch'ê-shih 車師) being so situated as to serve starting points for the travellers to the Western Countries, they suffered much from receiving the Han envoys, and attacked and robbed the envoys and their suites; otherwise they, conspiring with the Hsiung-nu, made Hsiung-nu soldiers intercept the Han envoys. Therefore, Wu-ti in the 3rd year of Yüan-fêng 元封 (108 B.C.) dispatched CH'AO P'o-nu 趙破奴 and made him subjugate both Ku-shih (or Ch'ê-shih) and Lou-lan.⁽⁴⁾ When Lou-lan was thus conquered by the Han, the Hsiung-nu sent troops to reconquer Lou-lan. This made Lou-lan send hostages to both the Han and the Hsiung-nu as a tributary to both. Since then, according to circumstances, Lou-lan sometimes for Han's interest spied on the Hsiung-nu's secret movements and at other times served the Hsiung-nu as an agency to kill Han envoys. This was repeated from time to time. As Wei-t'u-ch'i 尉屠耆, brother of the king of Lou-lan, surrendering to the Han, revealed the fact that Lou-lan had been acting against the Han in the 4th year of Yüan-fêng 元鳳 of Chao-ti 昭帝 (77 B.C.), Fu Chieh-tzŭ 傅介子 slew Ch'ang-kuei 嘗歸 (also written An-kuei 安歸⁽⁵⁾), king of Lou-lan, and, sending his head by relays to Chang-an, hung it under the northern gate of the palace, and enthroned Wei-t'u-ch'i as king and made Lou-lan a protectorate of the Han. This incident is recorded in the chronicle or *pên-chih* 本紀 of Chao-ti 昭帝, *Ching-Wu-Chao-Hsün-Yüan-Ch'êng Kung-ch'ên-piao* 景武昭宣元成功臣表, biography of Fu Chieh-tzŭ, and chapters on Hsi-yü 西域 of the *Han-shu* 漢書. The so-called Chü-yen Tablets 居延漢簡, discovered by the Sino-Swedish Expedition, contains the following account: (The emperor) ordered CHANG 章 who is titled I-lu-hou 夷虜候 to dispatch soldiers, saying "Take the head of the king of Lou-lan to Tun-huang 敦煌, leaving twenty soldiers and two female interpreters (at Lou-lan) in order to take charge of business (after your departure)." Here it is written that the head of the king of Lou-lan was

(3) T. FUJITA, *Tōzai Kōshōshi no Kenkyū. Seiki-hen* 東西交渉史の研究, 西域篇, 2nd ed., Tokyo: Ogiwara Seibunkan, 1943, p. 59.

(4) Cf. 景武昭宣元成功臣表 (under 從票侯趙破奴, *Han-shu*, Bk. 17) and *Hsi-yü-chuan* (under Shan-shan, *Han-shu*, Bk. 96a).

(5) The name is given as Ch'ang-kuei in *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96a, while the *Pên-chi* (*Han-shu*, Bk. 7) and the biography of Fu Ch'ieh-tzŭ (*Han-shu*, Bk. 70) as An-kuei. The fact that the same name is written either *Ch'ang-kuei* or *An-kuei* may mean that, in the language of Shan-shan not only intervocalic *c* and *j*, as is pointed out by BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, § 17, but also initial *c* and *j* can become *y* and that, consequently, *ca* (*c'a*) or *ja* (*j'a*) was heard by the Chinese as *a* or *'a*. *Ch'ang-kuei* and *An-kuei* may represent **Chāngi* or **Chāṅgi* and **Āngi* or **Āṅgi* respectively. Compare *Caṅḡila* in No. 200.

carried as far as Tun-huang 敦煌 by guards in the district of Chü-yen.⁽⁶⁾

On this occasion, the Han changed the state title of Lou-lan to Shan-shan 鄯善, had the seal engraved for the king of Shan-shan, and, bestowing on him a princess as his wife, sent Wei-t'u-ch'i 尉屠耆, the new king, to his homeland. Fearing the antipathy of his countrymen, he requested that the Han government should send officers and officials to support him. The Han complied with his request and sent one *ssü-ma* 司馬 or military governor and 40 officers and officials to be stationed in the garrison of I-hsün-ch'êng 伊循城. This is recorded in *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 in the *Han-shu* as follows: "The king himself made a request to the Emperor and said; 'I stayed in the Han for a long time. When I have come back (to Shan-shan), I shall be standing alone and powerless. To make the matter worse, the son of the former king is still alive and he may kill me. It is, therefore, earnestly desired that the Han would send a general who would stay at I-hsün-ch'êng 伊循城 (or a walled town named I-hsün) in the country (Shan-shan), where the place is very fertile and beautiful, to farm and to store cereals there (for the permanent station), so that I can make myself important, authorized by the influence of the Han.' According to the request, the Han stationed one *ssü-ma* 司馬 and forty officials and soldiers at I-hsün, where they cultivated the land, and commanded the country in peace. Later, a *tu-wei* 都尉 was stationed there (on top of *ssü-ma*). In this way, was started the Chinese administration at I-hsün."⁽⁷⁾

The *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 in the *Han-shu* says that, in Shan-shan, besides the king, such official as *Fu-kuo-hou* 輔國侯, *Ch'i-hu-hou* 卻胡侯 (*Hou* for rejecting the Hsiung-nu), *Shan-shan tu-wei* 鄯善都尉, *Chi Ch'ê-shih tu-wei* 擊車師都尉 (*tu-wei* for attacking Ch'ê-shih), the Left and Right *Chieh-ch'ü* 左右且渠, *Chi Ch'ê-shih chün* 擊車師君 (*Chün* for attacking Ch'ê-shih) and *I-chang* 譯長 (Head interpreter)

(6) 詔夷虜候章發卒，曰，持樓闐王頭，詣敦煌，留卒廿人，女譯二人，留守就 (303. 18). LAO Kan 勞幹, *Chü-yen Han-chien* 居延漢簡 (*Documents of the Han Dynasty on Wooden Slips from Edsin Gol*), Pt. I: Plates, Volume I, Taipei: Academia Sinica, (Special Publication No. 21), 1957, p. 10: Pt. 2, Transliterations and Commentaries, Taipei: Academia Sinica, (Special Publications No. 40), 1960, K'ao-shih 考釋, p. 5 and K'ao-chêng 考證, p. 23. Professor LAO gives two different transliterations to the last character of the edict, that is to say, 證 in K'ao-shih and just 就 in K'ao-chêng. Referring to the photograph of the original as given in the Plates, I take the latter as to be correct. I-lu-hou 夷虜候 or the head of I-lu group of watchtowers was under the control of Chü-yen tu-wei 居延都尉 and stationed at the watchtower of I-lu, of which the location is not known. (See LAO Kan, K'ao-chêng, pp. 23, 37-39). This is not the original edict, but a copy of it. So it is not clear whether Ch'ang received the edict in Chü-yen or in Lou-lan. I take it provisionarily as received in Lou-lan. The family name of Ch'ang can not be identified.

(7) 王自請天子曰，「身在漢久，今歸單弱，而有前王子在，恐爲所殺，國中有伊循城，其地肥美，願漢遣一將屯田積穀，令臣得依其威重」，於是漢遣司馬一人吏士四十人，田伊循，以填撫之，其後更置都尉，伊循官置，始此矣。(Here, *t'ien* 填 means an 安 "to pacify".)

were appointed.⁽⁸⁾ This was probably in the 4th year of Yüan-fêng 元鳳 (77 B.C.) or not much later than that. Moreover, the passage 其後更置都尉, 伊循官置, 始此矣 in the above quotation from the *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu* refers to the addition of a *tu-wei* 都尉 to the farming troops of Han at I-hsün-ch'êng. This is an officer entirely different from the *Shan-shan tu-wei* 鄯善都尉. According to the biography of FENG Fêng-shih 馮奉世 in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 79, when FENG Fêng-shih reached I-hsiu-ch'êng 伊脩城, which should read 伊循城⁽⁹⁾, escorting the envoy of Ta-wan, heard *tu-wei* SUNG Chiang 宋將 tell of the murder at Sha-ch'ê 莎車 of their king Wan-nien 萬年 whom the Han had enthroned, as well as that of the Chinese ambassador stationed there, and attacked Sha-ch'ê, killed the new king, and enhanced the Han's prestige in the Western Region. As the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Han-shu* assigns this to the 1st year of Yüan-k'ang 元康 of Hsüan-ti 宣帝 (65 B.C.), the appointment of the *I-hsün tu-wei*

(8) It should be noticed that all of these titles, except *Fu-kuo-hou* and *i-chang*, are military ones, which will show the military nature of Chinese administration in Shan-shan. The same thing is said with Chinese titles held in other countries in the Western Region. This is because of the policy of the Han government to organize the countries in Chinese Turkestan ready for mobilization to attack their strongest enemy which was the Hsiung-nu. In the case of Shan-shan, which was situated on the way to Ch'ê-shih 車師 in the Turfan basin, it was also intended to mobilize its army for the occupation or protection of Ch'ê-shih which had been a point of scramble between the Han and the Hsiung-nu. This is shown by the establishment of 擊車師都尉 and 擊車師君. These titles may have been held by members of royal or some influential families, but it is unlikely that these titles had anything to do with the native titles which were quite independent from Chinese ones. In other words, Chinese titles given to the countrymen in the Western Region had been "Chinese" titles established for the convenience of the government of Han. From this point of view, the late Professor F. W. THOMAS' comparison of Chinese titles with native ones (*Acta Orientalia*, XIII, 1934, pp. 72-77) may not be accepted. Professor THOMAS also tried to identify the title of *Fu-kuo-hou* with one held by the king of Shan-shan, considering it as a translation of *rajadharaḡa*, Skt. *rājadhāraka*, which means "supporter of the kingdom". (F. W. THOMAS, *The Early Population of Lou-lan-Shan-shan*, *Journal of the Greater India Society*, XI, 2, 1944, pp. 52-53.) However, the title given to the king of Shan-shan by the government of Han was *Shan-shan-wang* 鄯善王 or the King of Shan-shan and the title of *Fu-kuo-hou*, which is the title next to *wang*, should have been held by a man next to the king in his influence. Actually, *Fu-kuo-hou* was a title held in many other countries in the Western Region under the Han. *Rajadharaḡa* can be identified with *chu-kuo* 主國 of Lou-lan 樓蘭 in a Chinese document excavated by Hedin (A. CONDARY, *Die chinesischen Handschriften, etc.*, p. 97-98: Tafel XXII, 19. 7:). *Chu-kuo*, which means "ruler or minister of country", is not found in any other Chinese records concerning Lou-lan Shan-shan. Seeing that the title was held by a Chün-na-hsien 均那羨 (Kumnaḡena), which is undoubtedly a Lou-lan name, *chu-kuo* is considered to be a Chinese translation of *rajadharaḡa*. See p. 159-160.

(9) *Hsün* 循 and *hsiu* 脩 are easily confused as is demonstrated in WANG Nien-sun 王念孫, *Tu-shu tsa-chih* 讀書雜誌, Bk. 35 (cf. FUJITA, *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû, Seiki-hen*, p. 262) and in CHU Ch'i-fêng 朱起鳳, *Tz'u-t'ung* 辭通, p. 1644 under *hsün-shih* 循事. Here, *hsün* 循 is taken as the right character because I-hsün, which should be read I-t'un, is to be looked upon as the same name as I-t'un 一屯 or Ch'it'un 七屯 in later records. See K. ENOKI, *Yü-ni-ch'êng and the site of Lou-lan, Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*, XXXIII, 1961, p. 59.

伊循都尉 took place some time between 77 and 65 B.C.⁽¹⁰⁾

Now, the *Hsi-yü-ch'uan* in the *Han-shu* describes the capital, the area, and the population of Shan-shan as follows: "The country of Shan-shan was formerly called Lou-lan. Their king rules at Yü-ni-ch'êng 扞泥城, which is situated at the distance of 1,600 *li* from Yang-kuan 陽關 and 6,100 *li* from Chang-an 長安. The total number of families amounts to 1,570, of population 14,100, and of brave soldiers 2,912.... In the north-west, it is 1,785 *li* to the government of (Hsi-yü) *tu-hu* (西域) 都護 and 1,365 *li* to (Mo-) shan-kuo (墨) 山國 and (also) in the north-west it is 1,890 *li* to Ch'è-shih 車師."⁽¹¹⁾ These figures, as judged from the distance to Wu-lei-ch'êng 烏壘城, the government seat of the *Hsi-yü tu-hu* 西域都護, prove themselves of a time later than the 2nd year of Shên-chüeh 神爵 of Hsüan-ti 宣帝 (60 B.C.) when the *Hsi-yü tu-hu* was established.⁽¹²⁾ The passage which says that Shan-shan 鄯善 was originally called Lou-lan 樓蘭 definitely proves that this country named Lou-lan prior to the 4th year of Yüan-fêng 元鳳 (77 B.C.) was then renamed Shan-shan.

- (10) Professor LAO Kan dates the establishment of *I-hsün tu-wei* in the 4th year of Yüan-fêng 元鳳 (77 B.C.) in his article on 漢代的西域都護與戊己校尉 (歷史語言研究所集刊, Vol. 28, 1956, p. 487) and later on, the same author asserts that *tu-wei* had been established at I-hsün as early as the day of *i-hai* 乙亥 of the 2nd month of the 4th year of Yüan-kêng 元康 (March 23, 62 B.C.) on the strength of the name 都尉□重 mentioned with 使鄯善以西校尉鄭吉 in a wooden plate found in Chü-yen (118.17), taking this *tu-wei* as an abbreviation of *I-hsün tu-wei*. (*Chü-yen Han-chien*, Plates I, p. 95: Pt. II, *Transliterations and Commentaries*, p. 40 of *K'ao-shih* and p. 23 of *K'ao-chêng*).
- (11) 鄯善國, 本名樓蘭, 王治扞泥城, 去陽關千六百里, 去長安六千一百里, 戶千五百七十, 口萬四千一百, 勝兵二千九百十二人, ... 西北去都護治所千七百八十五里, 至[墨]山國千三百六十五里, 西北至車師千八百九十里。
- (12) It is generally believed that *Hsi-yü tu-hu* 西域都護 was established in the 2nd year of Shên-chüeh 神爵 (February 13, 60 B.C. to February 1st, 59 B.C.) when CH'ENG Chi 鄭吉, accepting the surrender of Jih-chu-wang 日逐王 of the Hsiung-nu, was appointed *Hsi-yü tu-hu*. (Biography of CH'ENG Chi in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 70, and *Li-tai chih-kuan-piao* 歷代職官表 Bk. 70, f. 13v. ed. Chung-hua Shu-chü). According to the chronicle of Hsüan-ti 宣帝 (*Han-shu*, Bk. 8), the surrender was reported to the court sometime before the 9th month of the 2nd year of Shên-chüeh (October 7 to December 4, 59 B.C.) and it seems that the appointment of CH'ENG Chi was made at that time or a little later. (Professor ISE, *Seiki Keiishiki no Kenkyū*, p. 25, puts it under 59 B.C., but no reasoning is made.) However, the biography of FENG Fêng-shih in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 79, states to the effect that CH'ENG Chi had already been appointed *tu-hu* when FENG visited I-hsiu (read I-hsün)-ch'êng. According to the *Hsi-yü-chuan* (*Han-shu*, Bk. 96 b, under Sha-ch'ê 莎車), FENG's visit of I-hsiu-ch'êng was just before his conquest of Sha-ch'ê, which was made in the 1st year of Yüan-k'ang 元康 (February 9, 65 B.C. to January 27, 64 B.C.). This may mean that CH'ENG's appointment could be dated back as early as 65/64 B.C. This presumption is confirmed by the wooden tablet discovered at Chü-yen and cited in note (10), in which the title of *tu-hu* is inscribed under the date of the day of *kuei-wei* 癸未 of the 5th month of the 2nd year of Yüan-k'ang (June 9, 64 B.C.). cf. *Chü-yen Han-chien*, Plates I, p. 95 [118. 17]: Pt. II, *Transliterations and Commentaries*, p. 40 of *K'ao-shih* and of *Kao-chêng*. Under the circumstances, the date of establishment of *Hsi-yü tu-hu* is subject to reconsideration.

Furthermore, the passage which says "The king rules at Yü-ni-ch'êng 扞泥城" evidently means that the capital of Shan-shan was situated at Yü-ni-ch'êng. If one reads these passages as they are, one will understand that it was only the name of the country that was changed in 77 B.C. and that the capital was not. All the Chinese commentators and researchers from YEN Shih-ku 顏師古 to Hsü Sung 徐松 seem to take both the capital of Lou-lan and that of Shan-shan as located at Yü-ni-ch'êng 扞泥城. They say nothing about the removal of the capital. This would show that such a view is not mistaken. And, as to the location of Yü-ni-ch'êng, the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注, Bk. 2, says: "The Ch'ieh-mo-ho 且末河 River flows north-eastward, passes the north of Ch'ieh-mo 且末 and goes as far as the point where it flows into the Nan-ho 南河 River on the left side. The two rivers thus joint together flow eastward and are called the Chu-pin-ho 注濱河 River. The Chu-pin-ho River again flows to the east and passes the north of Shan-shan-kuo 鄯善國. (The king of Shan-shan-kuo) rules at I-hsün-ch'êng 伊循城, which is the territory of the former Lou-lan.... The water (of the Chu-pin-ho River) flows into a lake. The lake is situated to the north of the kingdom of Lou-lan, (of which the capital was at) Yü-ni-ch'êng 扞泥城. The inhabitants call (Yü-ni-ch'êng) Tung-ku-ch'êng 東故城 or Eastern Old Town.... Therefore, the inhabitants name the lake Lou-lan-hai 牢蘭海 or the Sea of Lou-lan."⁽¹³⁾ Based on this description, people tried to locate Yü-ni-ch'êng in the district including Charklik and Mirän to the southwest or south of Lake Lop-nor or Lake Kara-koshun-kul, into which flows the Chu-pin-ho 注濱河 River, the conflux of the two rivers Cherchen-Darya and Nan-ho 南河.

However, S. HEDIN, on March 28th, 1900, discovered the ruins of farm-houses at a spot, at lat. 40°31'34''N. and long. 89°50'53''E., to the southwest of Altyinish (or Altmish)-bulak, and, in the light of the contents of the Chinese documents excavated there, he inferred this to be the site of the capital of Lou-lan.⁽¹⁴⁾ His inference was at once supported by a large number of scholars. It is now considered perfectly evident that the so-called Lou-lan site is that of Lou-lan, the capital of Lou-lan-kuo, and that Yü-ni-ch'êng is the centre of Shan-shan-kuo. It is also believed evident that, as Lou-lan became a perfect protectorate of the Han in 77 B.C. and the name of the country was changed to Shan-shan,

(13) 且末河東北流，逕且末北，又流而左會南河，會流東逝，通爲注濱河，注濱河又東，逕鄯善國北，治伊循城，故樓蘭之地也，(中略)，其水東注澤，澤在樓蘭國北，扞泥城，其俗謂之東故城，(中略)，故彼俗謂是澤爲牢蘭海也。As for the reading of the passage concerning Yu-ni-ch'êng, see the interpretation given on pp. 132-133.

(14) S. HEDIN, *Scientific Results of a Journey in Central Asia, 1899-1902*, Vol. II, Lop-Nor. Stockholm, 1905, p. 620 ff. The same site was inspected more in detail in 1906 and 1914 by A. STEIN who called it L.A.. STEIN also found and excavated twelve other sites (L.B. to L.M.) (Cf. *Serindia*, I, pp. 385-388; III, Plate 23: *Innermost Asia*, I, p. 180 ff.)

its capital was simultaneously removed and, therefore, Lou-lan, the capital of the kingdom of Lou-lan, and Yü-ni-ch'êng, the capital of the kingdom Shan-shan, were two different localities.⁽¹⁵⁾

The supporters of this view are surely not without other reasons. As Wei-t'u-ch'i 尉屠耆, the new king, was so much afraid of the revenge of his people that he requested the dispatch of Han troops, it might seem natural if he returned, not to the previous capital, but to a new one. It is inferred that I-hsün-ch'êng in which the Han troops settled down for farming was located in the Charklik and Mirân district to the south of the Chu-pin-ho River, according to the previously quoted account in the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注. Therefore, the capital which Wei-t'u-ch'i chose with Han's power in his background must naturally have been I-hsün-ch'êng or, at any rate, some place in its neighborhood. However, the so-called Lou-lan site being situated one hundred and several dozen kilometres to the north of Mirân and Charklik, it was a place too inconvenient for requesting rescue troops in time of emergency. On the other hand, Yü-ni-ch'êng, situated to the south of Lake Kara-koshun-kul, was near I-hsün-ch'êng, and more convenient for receiving relief troops in emergency. Besides, if the state title Shan-shan 鄯善 had been derived from Cherchen in Cherchen-Darya⁽¹⁶⁾, it is conceivable that the centre of Shan-chan-kuo was in the course of the Cherchen-Darya or, at least, a place in its neighborhood. If one considers these circumstances, it is reasonable that, as the state title of Lou-lan was changed to Shan-shan, its capital was also removed to Yü-ni-ch'êng.

According to the *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu*, Shan-shan had 1,570 families, 14,100 people, and 2,912 brave soldiers. The total population was slightly over 17,000, which is the total of 14,100 civilians and 2,912 soldiers. Though it is not known how many of the population inhabited the capital, the Han force of only 41 men could not protect the king in case of emergency. The Han

- (15) A. HERRMANN, *Die alten Seidenstrassen*, Berlin, 1910, p. 101-109: A. CONRADY *Die chinesischen Handschriften-und sonstigen Kleinfunde Suen Hedins in Lou-lan*, Stockholm, 1920, p. 1 ff.: A. STEIN, *Serindia*, p. 318-345: T. FUJITA, *Udei-jô to Ijun-jô 扞泥城と伊循城 (Seiki Kenkyû 西域研究, 1)*, in *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû, Seiki-hen*, p. 253-263: S. OTANI, *Zenzen Kokuto kô 鄯善國都考*, in *Ichimura Hakushi Koki-kinen Tôyôshi Ronsô 市村博士古稀記念記念東洋史論叢*, Tokyo, 1933, p. 251-272: H. MATSUDA, *Rôran* (Japanese translation of A. HERRMANN, *Low-lan: China, Indien und Rom im Lichte der Ausgrabungen an Lobnor*, Leipzig 1931), Tokyo 1963., p. 210 ff. Among Chinese authors, TAO Pao-lien 陶保廉 is the only one who looked upon Yü-ni-ch'êng as different from the capital of Lou-lan. He identified a site of old town, situated at the distance of three days' journey to the north of Abdal, with the site of Yü-ni-ch'êng and Charklik with that of old Lou-lan (*Hsin-mao shih-hsing-chi* 辛卯侍行記, Bk. V, f. 46r.: Bk. VI, f. 44v.).
- (16) J. HAMILTON, *Autour du manuscrit Staël-Holstein* TP., XLVI (1958), p. 121 and T. ABE's note (cf. K. ENOKI, *Yü-ni-ch'êng and the site of Lou-lan, Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*, XXXIII, 1961, p. 57 n. 1.)

troops were accompanied by their families and retainers⁽¹⁷⁾ and the number of the Han people must have been far more than 41. Even then, it must have been difficult for them to defend the king from a counter-attack of his own people. Since these Han troops were stationed in Shan-shan, as it were, as a mere symbol of the powerful Han government, probably it made little difference whether they were near or far from the state capital. What was important must have been that they were to be stationed where it was convenient for them to farm.

A greater question is whether Yü-ni-ch'êng was really situated to the south of Lop-nor (Lake Kara-koshun-kul). The most important ground for locating Yü-ni-ch'êng in this district is the following passage from *Ho-shui-chu* 河水注 in the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注, BK. 2, a part of which has been quoted previously. 其(注濱河)水東注澤。澤在樓蘭國北。扞泥城,其俗謂之東故城。去陽關千六百里。西北去烏壘千七百八十五里。至墨山國千八百六十五里。西北去車師千八百九十里。(中略)故彼俗謂是澤爲牢蘭海也。 If Lou-lan in "Lop-nor is situated to the north of the kingdom of Lou-lan" 澤在樓蘭國北 is taken to refer to Yü-ni-ch'êng, the capital itself, it would mean that Yü-ni-ch'êng was situated to the south of Kara-koshun-kul. However, 澤在樓蘭國北 might also be taken to mean that Lop-nor was situated in the north of the boundary of the kingdom of Lou-lan. And 扞泥城 in "Its inhabitants call Yü-ni-ch'êng Tung-ku-ch'êng or Eastern Old Town" 扞泥城,其俗謂之東故城 should really read 治扞泥城 because the character

(17) Here are some examples to show that the officers and soldiers stationed in the Western Region were accompanied by their families. When TAN Ch'in 但欽, *Hsi-yü tu-hu* 西域都護, was refused to get into Yü-mên-kuan 玉門關, when he tried to keep himself safe from the attack of T'ang-tou 唐兜, king of No-ch'ing 諾羌, he fled into the Hsiung-nu, accompanied by his wife and children, as well as by (Chinese) civilians, the total of which amounted to one thousand and odd. When TIAO Hu 刁護 who was *Wu-chi hsiao-yü* 戊己校尉 was killed by Ch'ên-liang 陳良 and Chung-tai 終帶 at the time of WANG Mang 王莽, his wives and children were spared, and Ch'ên-liang 陳良 and his followers then threatened and plundered the officials and officers (吏士) and men and women of more than 2,000 in total, and, together with these people, surrendered to the Hsiung-nu 匈奴. The Hsiung-nu, then, at the request of WANG Mang, sent 27 persons, including Ch'ên-liao and his subordinates in charge and their wives and children, to Chang-an 長安. (These two examples are in the last part of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96b). At the beginning of the reign of Emperor Kuang-wu 光武 of the Later Han dynasty, Sha-ch'ê 莎車 protected over 1,000 persons including officials, officers, and their wives and children, under the former *tu-hu* 都護 (*Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 88, under Sha-ch'ê 莎車). And PAN Chao 班超 was accused of his being accompanied by his wives and children (Biography of PAN Chao in the *Hou-han-shu*, Bk 47). Among the wooden tablets from Chü-yen 居延, some show that the officials and soldiers were in government offices and military duties with their wives and children (*Chü-yen Han-chien*, Pt. 2, p. 56 of K'ao-chêng 考證 and pp. 25-26 (Nos. 1273-1274) and 55 (Nos. 2744-2745) of K'ao-shi 考釋).

治 has been omitted.⁽¹⁸⁾ This passage and 去陽關千六百里 which follows it are nothing but copies of description concerning Shan-shan of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu*.⁽¹⁹⁾ If interpreted like this, it could not be absolutely asserted that Yü-ni-ch'êng was situated to the south of Lop-nor. And it is clear that the passage 其俗謂之東故城 is inserted by LI Tao-yüan 酈道元, author of the *Shui-ching-chu*, between (治) 扞泥城 and 去陽關千六百里, both of which are quoted from the *Han-shu*. This means that Tung-ku-ch'êng 東故城 was the name given by LI Tao-yüan or his contemporaries to an old town which was assumed to be the site of Yü-ni-ch'êng at the time of Han. LI Tao-yüan died in the 10th month of the 3rd year of Hsiao-ch'ang 孝昌 (November 11-December 10, 527) at the age of forty and odd and the *Shui-ching-chu* was compiled between 515 and 524.⁽²⁰⁾ So it is doubtful how far the assumption made at the end of the fifth century and at the beginning of the sixth can be trusted. This being the case, the description in the *Shui-ching-chu* cannot determine the locality of Yü-ni-ch'êng.

However, here is a piece of evidence to show that Yü-ni-ch'êng was only another name of Lou-lan, Yü-ni 扞泥, which should read *Kan-ni* 扞泥, being a transcription of *kuhani* or *khvani*, a Lou-lan or Shan-shan word which means "capital". 扞泥城 in all the current versions of *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu* is written 扞泥城. In his annotations, YEN Shih-ku 顏師古 says "扞 is to be pronounced *iu* or *yu* 扞音一胡反," which means that in the original text he adopted it was written 扞泥城. Moreover, the *Han-shu* quoted in the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽, Bk. 792, (ed. *Ssü-pu-ts'ung-k'an San-pien* 四部叢刊三編) con-

- (18) Three masters of *Shui-ching-chu* study, CH'ÜAN Tsu-wang 全祖望, CHAO I-ch'ing 趙一清 and TAI Chên 戴震, all read 澤在樓蘭國北扞泥城 as one continuous passage and seem to have understood that Lop-nor was situated at Yü-ni-ch'êng which was at the north of the kingdom of Lou-lan. It was HSIUNG Hui-chên 熊會貞 who correctly divided the passage into two parts (澤在樓蘭國北 and 扞泥城) and placed character 治 between them. HSIUNG rightly pointed out that it does not make sense to say "Lop-nor is situated at Yü-ni-ch'êng" and that, according to the way of quotation of LI Tao-yüan, there should be a character 治 after the name of kingdom. However, HSIUNG seems to have interpreted that the passage shows that Yü-ni-ch'êng was situated to the south of Lop-nor, which quotes as the interpretation of TUNG Yu-chêng 董祐誠 without any objection. See YANG Shou-ching 楊守敬 and HSIUNG Hui-chên 熊會貞, *Shui-chu-ching su* 水經注疏, Bk. 2, f. 19a-b.
- (19) Compare the quotation from the *Han-shu* of p. 129 note 11. The *Shui-ching-chu* has replaced 都護治所 (the government of *Tu-hu*) of *Han-shu* by Wu-lei 烏壘. As the *tu-hu* governed at Wu-lei, there is no change in the meaning.
- (20) As to the years of the birth and death of LI Tao-yüan 酈道元, see the *Li-tao-yüan shih shêng-tsu nien-kao* 酈道元之生卒年考 by CHAO Chên-hsin 趙真信 in *Yü-kung* 禹貢, Vol. 7, No. 1-3, p. 284, and CHIANG Liang-fu 姜亮夫 and T'AO Ch'iu-ying 陶秋英, *Li-tai jên-wu nien-li pei-ch'uan tsung-piao* 歷代人物年里碑傳綜表, Peking: Chung-kua-shu-chü 1959, p. 107. According to *Ying-yin Shui-ching-chu-su ti shuo-ming* 影印水經注疏的說明 by Ho Ch'ang-ch'ün 賀昌群 attached to the *Shui-ching-chu-su* 水經注疏 by YANG Shou-ching 楊守敬 and HSIUNG Hui-chên 熊會貞, the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注 was compiled in the eras of Yen-ch'ang 延昌 and Chêng-kuang 正光 (515-524).

tains the following passage: 漢書曰，鄯善國本名樓蘭，王治杆泥城。 The annotation on it says “杆 is to be pronounced *wu* 烏” (杆音烏) and again, the *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 8 (ed. *Wan T'ing-lan* 萬廷蘭), also gives 杆音烏泥城, both of which shows that 杆 and 扞 are scribal errors of 扞 which is pronounced *iu*, *yu* or *wu*. All editions of the *Shui-ching-chu* give it as 扞泥城, only the *Kuo-hsüeh chi-pên ts'ung-shu* 國學基本叢書 edition, (i.e. *Wan-yu-wên-k'u* 萬有文庫 edition), alone gives it as 扞泥, but it fails to mention its source. However, the *Pei-shih* 北史, Bk. 85, and the *Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk. 102, say 鄯善國，都扞泥城，古樓蘭國也, giving it as 扞泥城. 扞 (*kan*) and 扞 (*yu*) are so much confusable that it is difficult to say which is correct. But YUAN Hung 袁宏 (+376) writes in his *Hou-han-chi* 後漢紀, Bk. 15, f. 5a (ed. *Ssü-pu-ts'ung-k'an*) as follows: 鄯善國治驢泥城，去洛陽七千一百里, giving it as 驢泥城 *Huan-ni-ch'êng*. The *Hou-han-chi*, according to its preface,⁽²¹⁾ has been completed in 8 years, referring to several hundred volumes of books and documents concerning the Later Han, available at the time, and its accuracy is highly valued. The source of this statement is not to be ascertained today; nevertheless, this must have some ground. Therefore, it is evident that the correct name of the capital of Shan-shan was not *Yü-ni-ch'êng* 扞泥城 but *Kan-ni-ch'êng* 扞泥城.⁽²²⁾

On the other hand, a study of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions discovered at the Niya site shows that the king's capital Kroraina is represented *kuhani* or *khvani*. For example, Document No. 530 of the *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*, II, Oxford, 1927, compiled by E. J. RAPSON and others, is a written order requesting an immediate investigation as to the cereals which Sugnuta (who is here) (*iśa sugnuta*) several years before sold to Kuṣaya “at this place *kuhani*” (*iśa kuhaniṃmi*), at the command of the Great King to Cojhbō Soṃjaka⁽²³⁾ who was governor of Caḍ'ota, but for which no payment had been made. When one considers the contents of the order, one will readily understand that the phrase “at this place *Kuhani*” means “at Kroraina where the King lived.” Though this document contains no name of the Great King, the other documents, in which the same Sugnuta and Soṃjaka appear, extend from the 4th year (No. 584) to the 11th year (No. 568) of Mahiri, the fourth of the five kings who appear in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions. Therefore, he may

(21) The Preface by YÜAN Hung 袁宏 is also reproduced in *Chüan-chin-wên* 全晉文 by YEN K'o-chün 嚴可均 (ed. 1958, p. 1785b), but it differs in some characters from the preface in ed. *Ssü-pu-ts'ung-k'an*.

(22) There are two characters 杆 and 扞, which are pronounced in Mandarin *kan* and *han* respectively, but here, I take 扞 for the reason that it is composed of radical *手* as is seen in the current edition of *Han-shu*. Nothing definite is known about the pronunciation of 杆 and 泥 at the time of Han. But, if 扞泥 represents *kuhani* or *khvani*, as I state in the following passage, it shows how they were pronounced at the time.

(23) That Soṃjaka was invested with the full administrative powers of Caḍ'ota may be known from Document Nos. 272 and 371.

be considered the king in whose reign the document No. 530 was made. Document No. 526 is also a letter from the Great King to Soṃjaka requesting an investigation concerning the same affair. That its message is much simpler than that of No. 530 may be due either to the fact that it had been sent before No. 530 or to a fault on the part of a clerk who might have sent two written orders on one and the same case. At any rate, it is made clear by Document No. 526 that Kuśaya, the defendant, was in a government position or status called *kalu* and that, as to the plaintiff, Sugnuta came here (*sugnuta iśa aida*), *i.e.* he was in the capital (Kroraina). It is also confirmed that the place where the cereals were sold and bought was *at kuhani* (*kuhaniyaṃmi*). *Kuhani* is also written *khvani* and it means capital or citadel, according to the explanation of F. W. THOMAS.⁽²⁴⁾ Whether this explanation is correct or not, we cannot question the fact that this was used as another name for Kroraina. And one can not deny that 扞泥 is a transliteration in Chinese characters of *kuhani* or *khvani*, which refers to the capital of Lou-lan itself. As will be discussed in Chapter III, these Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions are documents connected with the kingdom of Shan-shan, and Kroraina, which appears in them, must be considered as the capital of the kingdom of Shan-shan. This means that the capital of Shan-shan was called Kroraina, *i.e.* Lou-lan 樓蘭, or *kuhani* or *khvani*, *i.e.* Yü-ni 扞泥 which should read Kan-ni 扞泥 and, as is discussed in Chapter III, it is located at the so-called Lou-lan site discovered by S. HEDIN in 1900 and visited by A. STEIN in 1906 and 1914. When we consider these circumstances, even after Lou-lan was renamed Shan-shan in the 4th year of Yüan-fêng 元鳳 (77 B.C.), its capital had still been situated at Kroraina.

According to the biography of PAN Yung 班勇 in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 77, in a conference held in the presence of the Empress Dowager Têng 鄧皇太后 in the 6th year of Yüan-ch'ü 元初 (119) or in the 1st year of Yung-ning 永寧 (120), PAN Yung expressed his opinion concerning the necessity of reinforcement of Chinese military power in the Western Region (Chinese Turkestan) to check the southern advance of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 which had conquered the kingdom of Ch'ê-shih 車師 in the Turfan basin. PAN Yung suggested to station a *Hsi-yü chang-shih* 西域長史 or Governor General of the Western Region, with 500 soldiers under his command, at Lou-lan which was situated on the shortest high way to Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Karashar) and Kuei-tzŭ 龜茲 (Kucha) in the west and near Tun-huang in the east, in order to encourage Shan-shan and Yü-t'ien 于闐 (Khotan) in the south, as well as to check the advance of the Hsiung-nu

(24) F. W. THOMAS, *Some Notes on Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, *Acta Orientalia*, XII, p. 61; T. BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, Cambridge 1937, p. 84; *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein*, III, Index. BURROW points out that in No. 489 *khūānemei bhīchhu-saṃgha* is used for the meaning of the "community of monks in the capital."

in the north.⁽²⁵⁾ To a casual reader, this may seem to mean that Shan-shan was a different place than Lou-lan, being situated to the south of the latter. However, here Lou-lan meant the capital of Shan-shan which was used as the general name of the kingdom. Shan-shan was the first country on the Nan-tao 南道 or Southern route which leads to the Western Region from China.⁽²⁶⁾ So, PAN Yung meant that, if the Chinese military forces were stationed at the capital of Shan-shan, it would encourage the kingdom of Shan-shan on the Southern route. That my interpretation is right is proved by the fact that, when PAN's programme was carried out and he was appointed *Hsi-yü chang-shih* and stationed at Liu-chung 柳中 or Lukchun in the Turfan basin, he went to Lou-lan in 124 and gave to (the king of) Shan-shan three ritual ribbons as a special prize to his subjugation to the Later Han.⁽²⁷⁾ This shows clearly that the king of Shan-shan stayed at that time at Lou-lan which was undoubtedly his capital. In this way, I quite agree to Mr. Hsü Pin-ch'ang 徐炳昶 when he states that Yü-ni-ch'êng, the old capital of Lou-lan, is to be located at the ruin of an old town, discovered by S. HEDIN in the year kêng-tzū 庚子 of Kuang-hsü 光緒 (1900).⁽²⁸⁾

II. The Location of Lou-lan

The reasons for assuming the so-called Lou-lan site as the site of the capital

- (25) 元初六年, 敦煌太守曹宗, 遣長史索班, 將千餘人, 屯伊吾, 車師前王及鄯善王, 皆來降班, 後數月, 北單于與車師後部, 遂共攻沒班, 進擊走前王, 略有北道, 鄯善王急求救於曹宗, 宗因此請兵五千人, 擊匈奴, 報索班之耻, 因復取西域, 鄧太后召勇, 詣朝堂會議, (中略), 勇上議曰, (中略), 又宜遣西域長史, 將兵五百人, 屯樓蘭, 西當焉耆龜茲徑路, 南疆鄯善于闐心膺, 北扞匈奴, 東近敦煌, 如此誠便. The date of the conference is not clear, but it is certain that it was before the death of the Empress Dowager Têng, which took place on the day of *kuei-sü* 癸巳 of the 1st year of Yung-ning 永寧 (April 21, 120), and after the destruction of the Chinese garrison at I-wu 伊吾 (Hami) in the 6th year of Yüan-ch'ü 元初 (119).
- (26) *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, Introduction.
- (27) 延光二年 (123) 夏, 復以勇爲西域長史, 將兵五百人, 出屯柳中, 明年正月 (Feb. 12~March 13, 124), 勇至樓蘭, 以鄯善歸附, 特加三綬. The last two sentences may also be taken as to mean that *san-shou* 三綬 was given to PAN Yung by the Emperor as a prize to his subjugating Shan-shan. However, this is not right because the subject of the sentence is PAN Yung whose managements are described here. The meaning of *san-shou* is not clear. It may mean three ritual ribbons, as translated here, or a ritual ribbon in three colours. *Shou* was different in its colour, length and the way of weaving, according to the rank of people who wore it. Under the Later Han, *shou* in three colours was worn by nobles and prime ministers of countries of feudal lord, as well as by nine ministers (*chiu-ch'ing* 九卿) of the Central Government. As for *shou*, see *Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 40 (120) under *shou* and Dr. Yoshito HARADA 原田淑人, *Kan Rikuchô no Fukushoku* 漢六朝の服飾 (*Toyo Bunko Ronsô*, Series A, XXIII, 1937), pp. 138-140, Plates 20-22 and English Summary, p. 27.
- (28) 辨鄯善國在羅布泊南說 in *Yü-kung* 禹貢, IV, 9, pp. 6-7.

of Lou-lan are the following two;

1. Because its geographical position coincides with the site of the capital of Lou-lan based on the various records: and
2. Because this is endorsed by the documents excavated.

To begin with, the capital of Lou-lan stood on the shores of Lake Lop-nor. According to *Ta-wan-chuan* 大宛傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記, Bk. 123, it is said the town of Lou-lan 樓蘭 and that of Ku-shih 姑師 are walled and commanding Yen-tsê 鹽澤 or Lop-nor (樓蘭姑師, 邑有城郭, 臨鹽澤). Now, the so-called Lou-lan site is a almost trapezoid walled-town⁽²⁹⁾ on the northeastern corner of the ancient lake-bed of Lop-nor formed by the Kum-darya River which flowed into the lake. This site certainly had faced a yen-tsê or the Salt Lake.

Again, Lou-lan was a state situated at the farthest east among all the Western countries, and adjoined Po-lung-tui 白龍堆, as is described in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96a,⁽³⁰⁾ and the chapter on Western countries of the *Wei-liao* 魏略 quoted in the commentaries to *Wei-chih* 魏志, Bk. 30.⁽³¹⁾ Po-lung-tui was a dangerous point situated between Kuruk Tag and the present Lop-nor, and the so-called Lou-lan site is located at a spot adjacent to it exactly on the west.⁽³²⁾ These facts show that the so-called Lou-lan site completely coincides geographically with Lou-lan in the period of the Former-Han and the Three-Kingdoms.

Then, among the fragments of letters in Chinese collected by S. HEDIN and A. STEIN from the so-called Lou-lan site, there are several in which the name Lou-lan appears.

- No. 1: 三月一日, 樓蘭白書, 濟暹白, 違曠遂久, 思企委積, 奉十一日書, 具承動靜. (The following omitted) (I. 2) (Hedin)
- No. 2: (The foregoing missing) 言, 將朱游, 私使羌驢, 以爲阿要務, 又迫薺鋤,

(29) See the Site Plan of Ruined Station, L.A., Lou-lan site with additions of 1914 (*Serindia*, 1 p. 385-388, III, Plate 23: *Innermost Asia*, 1, p. 214 ff.). The walls, made of stamped clay, are of about 1049 ft. (319 m.) in width and 1094 ft. (334 m.) in length.

(30) "However, Lou-lan had to guide the envoys of Han to send them off (to further western countries) and accept them (on their way home), carrying for them water and food, because it was situated at the farthest east end (of Chinese Turkestan) and nearest to the Han and because in its neighbourhood there was Po-lung-tui 白龍堆 (White Dragon Heap of Sand) where there was no water and grass." 然樓蘭國最在東垂, 近漢, 當白龍堆, 乏水草, 常主發導, 負水備糧, 送迎漢使.

(31) "From Yü-mên-kuan one goes westward ... and one turns to the north-west at Sha-hsi-ching or Well of the West of the Sand and one arrives at the Old Lou-lan, passing Po-lung-tui. Then, turning to the west, one goes as far as Kuei-tzu (Kucha)." 從玉門關西出(中略), 從沙西井轉西北, 過龍堆, 到故樓蘭, 轉西詣龜茲.

(32) As to the location of Po-lung-tui 白龍堆, see "Haku-ryû-tsui-kô 白龍堆考 (A Study of Po-lung-tui)" by Professor SHIMAZAKI Akira 嶋崎昌 (Bulletin: Dept. of History, Journal of Faculty of Letters, Chūō University 中央大學文學部紀要史學科, Nos. I and II, Oct. and Nov., 1950).

- 還樓蘭，堆……(The following missing) (The back side) [馬]厲白事。
(I. 5. 2) (Hedin)
- No. 3: 六月六日，樓蘭賤甥馬厲再拜白 (I. 15. 2) (Hedin)
- No. 4: 三月十五日，樓蘭卑白，尊兄阿□□前帳……不知所……(I. 15. 3) (Hedin)
- No. 5: 樓蘭主國均那羨 (Kumnaşena) (I. 19. 7) (Hedin) (The foregoing are on paper)
- No. 6: 史順留矣，□□爲大，涿池深大，又來水少，計月末，已達樓蘭 (II. 2) (Hedin)
- No. 7: 當□詣樓[蘭] (II. 34) (Hedin)
- No. 8: 出，長史白書一封詣敦煌府，蒲書十六封，具，十二封詣敦煌府，二詣酒泉府，二詣王懷顯頤，泰始六年三月十五日 (A.D. 270. IV. 22)，統(?) 樓蘭從椽位馬厲，付行書□□孫得成 (II. 107) (Hedin)
- No. 9: 白叔然敬奏，從事王石二君前，在樓蘭 (II. 117) (Hedin) (The foregoing are on wood)⁽³³⁾
- No. 10: 張主簿前，八月廿八日樓蘭白疏，憚惶恐白奉辭，□無□親省驚心東望 (The following missing.) (No. 922: LA. vi. ii. 065) (Stein)
- No. 11: (The foregoing missing.) 樓蘭以白 (The following missing) (No. 907. LA. ii. i. (4)) (Stein)
- No. 12: 帳下將薛明言，謹案文書，前至樓蘭□還守提兵廉□ (The following missing.) (No. 754: LA. iii. i. 16) (Stein)⁽³⁴⁾
- No. 13: (The following missing) 詣樓蘭 (The following missing) (No. 207. LA. VI. ii. 020) (Stein)
- No. 14: (The foregoing missing) ○○○卒…/…樓蘭耕種 (The following missing) (No. 227. LA. VI. ii. 045) (Stein)^(34a)

It is evident that, among all these, No. 8, which is dated, and No. 2 and No. 3, which contain the name 馬厲, belong to the T'ai-shih 泰始 era (A.D. 265. II. 3-275. II. 12); but the dates of the other documents are still unknown. However, the dated Chinese documents excavated by STEIN from the ruins and not containing the name Lou-lan cover the period from 景元四年八月八日 (262. IX. 27) (Stein No. 738: LA. ii. v. 3) to 建興十八年三月十七日 (330. IV. 22) (Stein No. 886: LA. i. iii. 1) and those collected by HEDIN, from [嘉平?] 二年正月戊寅 (250. IV. 16), or from [嘉?] 平四年三月 (252. III. 28-IV. 25)⁽³⁵⁾ to [永]嘉四年十月十二[日] (310. XI. 19.)⁽³⁶⁾ Moreover, the so-called LI Po 李稻 documents which Mr. TA-

(33) For Nos. 1-9, see A. CONRADY, *Die chinesischen Handschriften-und sonstigen Kleinfunde Sven Hedins in Lou-lan, Stockholm 1920.*

(34) For Nos. 10-12, see Ed. CHAVANNES, *Les documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein, Oxford 1913.*

(34a) For Nos. 13-14, see H. MASPERO, *Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie centrale, London 1953.* (Cf. also 漢晉西睡木簡彙編, ed. and deciphered by CHANG Fêng 張鳳, Shanghai 1931)

(35) A. CONRADY, *op. cit.*, I. 16. 1

(36) A. CONRADY, *op. cit.*, I. 22. 8

CHIBANA Zuichō 橋瑞超 collected from the same ruins, are attributed in the investigation by MATSUDA to the 3rd year of Hsien-ho (328. VI. 1), in that by HANEDA to some time around the 3rd, 4th, or 5th year of Hsien-ho 咸和 (328-330) and in that by WANG Kuo-wei 王國維 to about the 1st or 2nd year of Yung-ho 永和 (345 or 346).⁽³⁷⁾ For this reason, it would be probably right to determine the dates of the documents containing the name Lou-lan but bearing no dates as extending from 250 to 345/346.

The existence of the name Lou-lan in these Chinese documents had been considered to indicate that the spot of the excavation was Lou-lan itself. But WANG Kuo-wei, investigating the documents discovered by STEIN argued that a study of the forms of letters in those days showed that Lou-lan was the spot at which the letters were written; therefore the spot at which they were excavated could not be Lou-lan itself.⁽³⁸⁾ This certainly is a view worth attention. As long as one follows this view, one could not accept the Lou-lan site as Lou-lan. In order to establish WANG Kuo-wei's theory, it would be necessary to prove that these letters were received at the place of the excavation; but there is nothing to confirm it. They might be only draughts of the letters, or letters which were not sent out. Or they might be letters which their recipients had brought back from other places. If such possibilities are considered, WANG's view cannot be regarded as a final conclusion. Besides, No. 9 is a writing on the cover of a letter sent from Po Shu-jan 白叔然 to WANG Shih-êrh 王石二 (or WANG 王 and SHIH, two men) who was (were) in Lou-lan; No. 8 is a sort of memo of letters or documents sent by MA Li 馬厲, *ts'ung-yüan* 從掾 of Lou-lan, who made his subordinate SUN Tê-ch'êng 孫得成, who was *hsing-shu* 行書 or letter carrier, carry them to Tun-huang-fu 敦煌府, the provincial government of Tun-huang, Chiu-ch'üan-fu 酒泉府 or the provincial government of Chiu-ch'üan, etc. Don't these definitely declare that the place of the excavation was Lou-lan? Nay, not only that. Some of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions excavated at the same time with these Chinese documents definitely show that the place of their excavation was Lou-lan.

The number of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions which STEIN collected from the so-called Lou-lan site amounts to 42 (Nos. 666-707), of which two both from LA

(37) MATSUDA Hisao 松田壽男 *Kodai Tenzan no rekishi-chiriteki-kenkyu* 古代天山の歴史地理的研究, Tokyo 1956. p. 127-133. HANEDA Tōru 羽田享, *Otani Hakushaku Shozō Shinkyō-shiryō-Kaisetsu* 大谷伯爵所藏新疆史料解説 (Commentaries on Historical Documents discovered in Sinkiang by the Otani mission) in 羽田博士史學論文集, 上卷, p. 516 ff. and WANG Kuo-wei 王國維, 羅布淖爾北所出前涼西域長史李柏書稿跋 in *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin* 觀堂集林, Bk. 17, ed. June 1959, p. 871-876; *Serindia*, I, p. 377, 409; III, pp. 1329-1330. [See Additional Note.]

(38) WANG Kuo-wei, 流沙墜簡序 in *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin*, Bk. 17 (ed. June 1959, p. 826). HUANG Wên-pi 黃文弼 agrees to WANG's opinion and locates Lou-lan in the north of the Kuruk River (古樓蘭國歷史及其在中西交通上之地位, 史學集刊, 五期, 1947, pp. 121-123).

definitely show that the site is identical with Kroraina. One is Document No. 696, of the *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*.⁽³⁹⁾ This is a letter considered to have been sent by a man named Vasudeva to his father Bhatīga. It is written on a piece of paper, of which the opening section is perfectly preserved, but part of the middle section and the last part are missing. The translation by Professor T. BURROW is as follows: "Vasudeva pays his respects at the feet of the master, his dear father the great *guśura* Bhatīga, and asks after the health of his divine body, again and again, many hundreds of thousands of crores of times. My report is as follows. I came here from Krorayina and brought the *rete* camels. Up till to-day there has been no buying and selling. This I make known at your feet. I wish to return to Krorayina. Whatever news there is of you there, you should send me a letter. I will bring it to my father the *guśura* in Krorayina, at the time you have to go.⁽⁴⁰⁾ Also the royal dues (*harga*) from this village were granted to us from the feet of his majesty. Now the authorities are causing much pain to the slaves. For that reason, along with the *guśura* Puṃṇāṣa /...../ is to be made. This is the third time that I have sent a letter of information to the feet of the *guśura*. I have heard nothing from there. To my dear brother Bhatīsama/...../". From the style of the opening passage of this letter, it is regarded only as a letter from Vasudeva to Bhatīga, his father, but this is further confirmed by two lines of characters written slantwise on the back side of the letter:

bhaṭaragaṣa gu[ś]. (torn)/ [vasude] vaśa śi raśa viṇa....(torn)

The *viṇa* in this is necessarily a defective remnant of *viṇābemi* "I report".⁽⁴¹⁾ These two lines were originally:

bhaṭaragaṣa guśura bhatīgaśa/ vasudevaśa śiraśa viṇābemi.

It must have been a greeting written on the cover of the letter, which surely meant "To my master *guśura* Bhatīga from Vasudeva/ with my head (*i.e.* with my head lowered) I report." In the extant document, the word *śiraśa* is written in two parts, *śi* and *raśa*, but most probably this happened because the word was written on the cover of the letter after it was folded.

Thus the letter may be taken only as one sent by Vasudeva to his father. In it is written: *ahu krorayinade iśa agatemi* "I came here from Kroraina" and *ahu ichami krorayina nivartanae* "I want to go back to Kroraina." This shows that Vasudeva who came to a certain place from Kroraina where he sent a letter to his father telling him that he wanted to come back again to Kroraina. Therefore, it is evident that the place at which this letter was excavated was

(39) LA. vi. ii. 0234: *Serindia*, p. 436, Pl. XXXIX.

(40) T. BURROW, *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, London: The Royal Asiatic Society, 1940, pp. 141-141.

(41) See, for instance, an example in No. 89.

Kroraina itself where his father was. However, the following passage in Professor BURROW's translation: "(1) Whatever news there is of you there, (2) you should send me a letter. (3) I will bring it to my father the *guśura* in Krorayina, (4) at the time you have to go" may be read as if this letter was addressed, not to his father, but to some one else (his brother Bhatīśama?), as though it said that if the "some one else" wrote a letter to give his news to Vasudeva, the writer of this letter, he would take it to his (writer's) father. If this were the case, it would be possible that this letter was one received by the "some one else" at a certain place, not Kroraina, and the place at which the letter was excavated was the place where the "some one else" stayed, and not Kroraina. However, if this was a letter sent to some one else than the writer's father, it would be difficult to explain the passage "at the time you have to go," because "you" would refer to the "some one else", and, if the "some one else" had to go to Kroraina, it was not necessary for Vasudeva to ask for news concerning him to take it to his father. Thus, in this section this letter is not intelligible as a letter sent by Vasudeva to his father, while the rest is intelligible as a letter to his father. To solve this mystery, one may go back to the corresponding part of the original document, which runs as follows:

(1) *yo atra tahi paḍ'ivati bhav.yati emeva.* *yo* indicates a subordinate clause.⁽⁴²⁾ *atra* in Sanskrit means "here" and is used in contrast with *tatra* (there), but in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions *atra* is invariably used in reference to the place at which the recipient of public or private letters and communications is located.⁽⁴³⁾ *tahi paḍ'ivati* means "your news". So Professor BURROW is right when he translates the passage as "whatever news there is of you there," but as it is, this may read "If there is news concerning the recipient." However, if one takes this *tahi paḍ'ivati* "your news" to mean "news of your need" and understands this sentence to mean "If news wanted by you (namely the recipient) should be there (on your side)," it will mean "If you let me know what is news needed by you, I will take it to my father the *guśura*, i.e. you" and it will agree with the opening passage and also the writing on the cover of the letter.

(2) *mahi lekha viśarjeyasi* "I want you to send me a letter." This simply means that Vasudeva asked for a letter which would tell him of what he is wanted to inform. This sentence contains no special difficulty.

(3) *pitu guśura krorayinaṃmi anisyami* "To father *guśura* in Kroraina I shall take it." This means that he intended to take the information to *guśura*, the sender's father, who was in Kroraina.

(4) *yaṃ kalaṃmi tahi gaṃḍavya bhavati.* Professor BURROW translates this

(42) BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, § 127.

(43) *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, p. 325, 330c.; F. W. THOMAS, *Two Terms employed in Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, BSOS., VI (1930-32), p. 542.

passage as “when you have to go.” *yaṃ kalammi* (= *yaṃ kala*) means *when* as is explained by Professor BURROW.⁽⁴⁴⁾ *gaṃdavya*=*gaṃtavya* is the gerundive (future passive participle) of *gaṃ-* “go”, which means “shall be forced to go” or “shall have to go.” *tahi* is the genitive case of *tuo* (you) and here it is used as instrumental and it is to be taken to mean that you are caused to go, *i. e.* you have to go. So, Professor Burrow’s translation is quite right from the grammatical point of view. However, if we translate the sentence like that, it means that the sender of the letter, *i. e.* son, is ordering the recipient, *i. e.* father, to go. This is not only awkward, but also it does not make sense to say that “To father *gušura* in Kroraina I shall take it, *i. e.* the news, when I shall let you go.” In this way, I am of the opinion that *yaṃ kalammi tahi gaṃdavya bhavati* should read either “when by you⁽⁴⁵⁾ (*i. e.* by your instruction) (I) shall have to go (to Kroraina)” or “when to you⁽⁴⁶⁾ (*i. e.* to your place) (I) shall have to go.” If taken like this, the sentence means that “the sender (son) will take the news to the recipient (father) when he (son) is instructed by the recipient (father) to go back to Kroraina.”

If thus interpreted, No. 696 is a letter sent to his father at Kroraina from his son Vasudeva, dispatched from Kroraina to a certain place, which says that he would prepare a report about the camel trade; that he would collect, if necessary, informations concerning the place; that he would return to Kroraina as soon as he is so ordered; and that he would take home the informations with him. In other words, the place where this letter was excavated should be considered as no other than the place where the recipient was, namely, Kroraina.

The second Kharoṣṭhī inscription which demonstrates the identity of the so-called Lou-lan site with Kroraina is Document No. 678.⁽⁴⁷⁾ According to Professor BURROW’s English translation, it runs as follows:

“In the/.../year of his majesty the great king/...../. There is a man of Kroraina called Camaka domiciled in Calmadana. This Cimaka sold to Yapḡu *kurora* land with a capacity (for seed) of three *milima* (situated) on the south side (*dāc’h’ina śitiyaṃmi*) of the great city. The document (containing) the price which was received has been stolen (?). (?) Camaka sold well. Yapḡu bought well. From now on in that land the sons of Yapḡu, Lamputra, Puṃṇadeva, Dhaṃṇila, and Dhaṃṇapāla have ownership/...../to mortgage, to sell, to give to others as a present/...../”⁽⁴⁸⁾

This proves that Camaka (Cimaka), a man of Kroraina, namely, Lou-lan, who was reared at Calmadana or Cherchen, sold his land of Yapḡu; that though

(44) BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, § 127.

(45) *tahi* is taken as instrumental.

(46) *tahi* is taken as locative.

(47) LA. iv. ii. 3: *Serindia*, 1, p. 435: *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, II, p. 255.

(48) BURROW, *A Translation*, p. 139.

the sales document was stolen, the process of the sales had been completed; that the ownership of this land now belonged to the four sons of Yapǵu; and that the four sons were entitled to mortgage, sell or donate it, but the part of the document which gave the names of witnesses and the clerk who had prepared the document is missing.

The part of this document which gives the name and the date is so indistinct and illegible that Professor BURROW's translation leaves it blank, but the text edited by RAPSON and others reads: (1) *saṃwa* ... [4 2] *mahanuava maharaya* [*jiṭugha*].— (The note says that the dash here represents some 24 letters which are missing.) The letters in brackets are only those inferred. According to this, it would read "in the 6th year of Great King [*Jiṭugha*] (so and so)." *Jiṭugha* is one of the titles of the king of Lou-lan, but its meaning is not known. Among the five kings of Kroraina appearing in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, there are three kings entitled *jiṭugha*, namely, Aṃgoka, Mahiri, and Vaṣmana. So the king referred to in this document must be one of them. RAPSON assigns Vaṣmana for this and the date of the inscription for the 6th year of this king for some reason unknown to me.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Yapǵu and Camaka are also found in the documents excavated from the Niya site. First, the name Yapǵu is found several times.⁽⁵⁰⁾ One is in Document No. 169 which is dated the 10th month of the 26th year of king Mayiri, which precedes the 6th year of king Vaṣmana at least by seven or eight years. However, Yapǵu in the documents excavated from the Niya site was, as shown by the fact that a letter addressed to him was found similarly at the Niya site⁽⁵¹⁾, a man who was living in Niya district. So is Camaka (Cimaka). Men of this same name are found in the documents excavated from the Niya site (Nos. 244, 338), one of which is found in a letter (No. 338) directed to *cojhbo* Soṃjaka⁽⁵²⁾ who had been governing Caḍ'ota, the district in what is now the Niya site, during the reign of King Mahiri. This means that Camaka was a contemporary of Soṃjaka. However, there being no evidence to assert that the two men Yapǵu and Camaka at the Niya site are identical with the men of the same names found in the documents excavated from the Lou-lan site, nor is there any proof to deny that, it is not certain if the Document No. 678 is to be assigned for the reign of King Mahiri.

This being the case, the date of this document cannot be ascertained, but, as to the location of the land which Camaka (Cimaka) transferred to Yapǵu, it

(49) *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, Oxford 1929, p. 328.

(50) Pt. III, Index p. 364.

(51) *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, Pt. II, p. 172, No. 476: N. xxii. iii. 10a, b.: *Serindia*, I, p. 254: BURROW, *A Translation of Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 93.

(52) Cojhbo Soṃjaka was invested with the full administrative powers over the Caḍota district by the King. (Nos. 272, 371.) It is established by RAPSON that he was a contemporary of King Mahiri to whom he took service (*Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, p. 323).

says *kroraiṇṇaṇmi mahaṇṭa nagaraṣa dāchi'na śitiyaṇmi bhuma* “the land in Kroraina, on the south side of the great town.” This definitely tells that the place where this document was excavated belongs to a part of Kroraina. Professor BURROW's translation somehow omits the word *kroraiṇṇaṇmi*, which is the very key-word to demonstrate the place where the document was excavated is Lou-Lan. The phrase in question most probably means “the land on the southside of the great town, namely Kroraina.”

To begin with, the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions excavated from the Niya site, Endere and the so-called Lou-lan site are all written contract prepared at the place where they were excavated, written communications and orders sent to the place of excavation from the central government, namely the king and high officers, letters received by the men who lived at the place of excavation, and other documents related to the place of excavation, and by no means documents brought on some occasion in one lot from other districts to the places of excavation for preservation or storage. Especially, the written contracts or law-suit documents concerning land-transactions are without exception related to the places of the excavation. Judging from these circumstances, the ruin of walled town (LA), where the document No. 678 concerning the transaction of land was excavated, cannot but show that it can be the site of the “great city” or Kroraina.

The investigations conducted so far of this site are not so complete that there are so many details which remain to be investigated in future. But, the fact that the site is a ruin of walled town situated at the northern shore of the lake Lop-nor which was dry in 1900–1914 when the site was investigated,⁽⁵³⁾ well fits, as I previously pointed out, in the description of *Tawan-chuan* in the *Shih-chi* 史記, Bk. 123: “Lou-lan 樓蘭 and Ku-shih 姑師, (capital) town is walled and commanding Yen-tsê 鹽澤 or Lop-nor,”⁽⁵⁴⁾ as well as that of *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. 96A: “Shan-shan-kuo 鄯善國 (The country of Shan-shan) was formerly called Lou-lan-ch'êng 樓蘭城 (or walled town Lou-lan)”.

WANG Kuo-wei argues, on the basis of the phrase “On the 2nd day of the month, I came to Hai-t'ou” 月二日，來海頭 of the LI Po 李栢 documents, excavated at the site LA, that the place where the documents were discovered is not Lou-lan, but a place called Hai-t'ou. According to him, Hai-t'ou is an abbreviation of P'u-ch'ang-hai tung-t'ou 蒲昌海東頭 which means a place at the

(53) S. HEDIN *Scientific Results of a Journey in Central Asia, 1899–1902*, II, pp. 621 ff., A. STEIN, *Serindia*, I, Oxford, 1921, p. 385–388; III, Plan 23: *Do.*, *Innermost Asia*, I, Oxford, 1928, p. 180 ff.

(54) 樓蘭姑師，邑有城郭，臨鹽澤：鄯善國，本名樓蘭城。RICHTHOFEN is not right when he wrote that Lou-lan and Ku-shih are “unmauerten Städte und Ortschaften (*China*, I, Berlin 1877, p. 450: PREJEVALSKY, *From Kulja across Tian-shan to Lob-nor*, London 1879, p. 149–150).

eastern corner of P'u-ch'ang-hai or Lop-nor.⁽⁵⁵⁾ However, Hai-t'ou which means the seashore or the seaside can also be looked upon as an abbreviation of Lou-lan-hai-t'ou 牢蘭海頭 or a place at the seaside of Lop-nor, which may be so named because the place was on the shore of Lop-nor. Lop-nor had been called either Yen-tsê 鹽澤 (Salt Lake) or P'u-ch'ang-hai since the time of Han.⁽⁵⁶⁾ It was also called Lou-lan-hai 牢蘭海 in *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* 釋氏西域記 quoted in *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注, as well as in *Shui-ching-chu* itself.⁽⁵⁷⁾ The author and the date of *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi* is not clearly known, though it is usually attributed to TAO-AN 道安 (+385).⁽⁵⁸⁾ If TAO-AN's *Hsi-yü-chih* 西域志 was utilized as a source of information for the compilation of *Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi*, it must have been compiled at the end of the 4th century or at the beginning of the 5th. As the LI Po documents were written at the middle of the 4th century,⁽⁵⁹⁾ it is quite likely that Lop-nor was called Lou-lan-hai at his time. And it may be for the reason that the city of Lou-lan was situated near the seashore of Lop-nor.⁽⁶⁰⁾ So the name Hai-t'ou of the LI Po documents is considered as a piece of evidence to prove that the place where the documents were discovered was Lou-lan itself or in the vicinity of Lou-lan.^(59a) WANG Kuo-wei did never notice the fact that Lop-nor changed its location from time to time and he was confident that it had always been at what is now Kara Koshun Kul, which is the most important reason why he refused to accept the identity of the so-called Lou-lan site and the city of Lou-lan.

WANG Kuo-wei identifies the so-called Lou-lan site with Chü-lu-ts'ang 居廬倉 of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96b, p. 2377 (1169) and *Hsi-jung-chuan* 西戎傳 of the

- (55) WANG Kuo-wei's Introduction to *Liu-sha chui-chien* 流沙墜簡 which is also reprinted in *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin* 觀堂集林, BK. 17, fols. 5a-b (pp. 827-828 of edition 1959). Also see *Haneda Hakushi Shigaku Ronbunshū*, I, pp. 522-523. The name 海頭 is also seen in another fragment of letter excavated at LA. (LA. VI. ii. 062. MASPERO, *Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition, etc.*, No. 252)
- (56) *Shih-chi*, Bk. 123, p. 1137 (ed. *Small Po-na-pên* of 1958) and *Han-shu*, Bk. 28 b, p. 1615 (407) under Tun-huang-chün 敦煌郡 and Bk. 96a, p. 2364 (1156). Pelliot writes that the name "Sea of Lou-lan" appears in the time of Han (*JA*, 1916, I, p. 119 note), but I do not know the source of his information.
- (57) *Shui-ching-chu*, Bk. 1, pp. 19-20 (ed. 國學基本叢書).
- (58) See Ed. CHAVANNES (*BEFEO.*, III, 1903, p. 430), R. HADANI (*Saiiki no Bukkyō*, Chinese translation by HO Ch'ang-ch'ün, Shang-hai, 1956, p. 6), S. LÉVI (*JA*, 1913, II, p. 447), Pelliot (*JA*, 1934, I, pp. 76-77) and L. PETECH (*Northern India according to the Shui-ching-chu*, Roma, 1950, p. 5) [Now see MATSUDA Hisao 松田壽男 *Shakushi Saiiki Shūchū* 釋氏西域記集註, Jubilee Volume to Dr. IWAI Hiroto, Tokyo 1963, pp. 635-655.] A passage of Tao-an's *Hsi-yü chu-kuo-chih* 西域諸國志 is quoted in *Liang-chih-kung-t'u* 梁職貢圖 under Po-ssu or Persia (see photographic reproduction published by Mr. CHIN Wei-no 金維諾 in *Wên-wu*, 文物 1960, 7) and that in *Kōdansha's Sekai Bijutsu Taikei*, VIII, Tokyo 1963, pp. 114, 124-126.
- (59) See p. 139.
- (59a) See Additional Note. (60) See Note (54).

Wei-liao 魏略 (*San-kuo-chih*, Bk. 30, p. 4530 (418)), as well as with Ch'iang-lai 姜賴 and Lung-ch'êng 龍城 of the *Liang-chou i-wu-chih* 涼州異物志 (*T'ai-ping yü-lan*, Bk. 865) and the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注, Bk. 2.⁽⁶¹⁾ The *Han-shu* says: "The Han entitled Hsin Wu-hsien 辛武賢 *P'o-chiang chiang-chün* 破羌將軍; gave him 15,000 soldiers and sent him to Tung-huang. Hsin, arriving at Tun-huang, ordered his agents to survey the land to the west of Pei-t'i-hou-ching 卑鞞侯井 well and set up pillars to mark the place where a canal was to be constructed. This was because he intended to transport cereals to be stored at Chü-lu-ts'ang or a storehouse at Chü-lu, in order to facilitate the conquest (of WOU-CHIU-T'U 烏就屠, king of the Wu-sun)."⁽⁶²⁾ According to the commentary of MENG K'ang 孟康, Hsin Wu-hsien planned to connect six big wells flowing out at the foot of the sand hill which made the eastern part of Po-lung-tui 白龍堆.⁽⁶³⁾ This means that Chü-lu-ts'ang was situated somewhere not to the west, as WANG kuo-wei explains, but to the east of this huge range of sand dunes, named Po-lung-tui. The location of Chü-lu-ts'ang is described by Wei-liao as follows: "One goes westwards from Yü-mên-kuan 玉門關 and, starting from Tu-hu-ching 都護井 well (which is the same as Pei-t'i-hou-ching 卑鞞侯井 of *Han-shu*⁽⁶⁴⁾), and passing round the northern end of San-lung-sha 三隴沙 desert, reaches Chü-lu-ts'ang. Then, turning to the northwest at Sha-hsi-ching 沙西井 well and passing (Po-) Lung-tui, he arrives at the Old Lou-lan."⁽⁶⁵⁾ So, Chü-lu-ts'ang was located

- (61) Introduction to *Liu-sha chui-chien* (*Kuan-t'ang chi-lin*, BK. 17, fols. 5b-6a; pp. 828-830, ed. 1959).
- (62) 漢遣破羌將軍辛武賢，將兵萬五千人，至敦煌遣使者案行，表穿卑鞞侯井以西，欲通渠轉穀，積居廬倉，以討之，(*Han-shu*, BK. 96b, p. 2377 (1169))
- (63) 孟康曰，大井六，通渠也，下泉流湧，出在白龍堆東土山下。A tradition during the T'ang attributes to General Hsin the construction of a lake named Ta-ching-tsê 大井澤, situated 15 li to the north of Sha-chou 沙州 or Tun-huang, quoting the same passage of *Han-shu*. See *Sha-chou-chih ts'an-chüan* 沙州志殘卷 ed. *Tun-huang shih-shih i-shu* 敦煌石室遺書, p. 5a (also ed. *Ming-sha shih-shih i-shu* 鳴沙石室佚書). Actually, this is one of the earliest evidences of the existence of *karêz* or *qanat* in Chinese Turkestan. See *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin*, BK. 13, p. 621, ed. 1959, and *TP*, XXVI, 1929, p. 123.
- (64) WANG Kuo-wei, Introduction to *Liu-sha chui-chien* (*Kuan-t'ang chi-lin*, BK. 17, fol. 6a: p. 829, ed. 1959).
- (65) Cf. CHAVANNES, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei-liao*, *TP*, 1905, pp. 529-531.. Here the Old Lou-lan 故樓蘭 was so named in contrast to the country of Lou-lan (Lou-lan kuo 樓蘭國) situated to the west of Ching-chüeh 精絕 in the itinerary of Southern route of Wei-liao, which runs as follows: 南道西行，且志(末)國小宛國精絕國樓蘭國，皆并屬鄯善也，(cf. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, pp. 535-537.) The country of Ching-chüeh was located in the neighbourhood of what is now the Niya site and this Lou-lan may be a translation of *Rauruka which is transcribed as Ho-lao-la-chia 曷勞落迦 in the *Hsi-yü-chi*, Bk. 12 (p. 38-39 of ed. Kyoto University). The *Hsi-yü-chi* says that Ho-lao-la-chia was situated to the north of P'i-mo 婁摩 which was 200 and odd li to the west of Ni-jang 尼攘 or Niya. On this point, see *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*, XXXIII, 1/2, 1961, p. 57 and note 3. Niya is Nina of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions and is considered to have been under the rule of Shan-shan or the kingdom of Lou-lan. (As for Nina and Niya identity, see *Ancient Khotan*, pp. 311, 326.) H. LÜDERS, *Zu und aus den Kharoṣṭhī-Urkunden*, *Acta Orientalia*, XVIII, 1940, pp. 35-37, regards, on the basis of document No. 14, Niya as

between San-lung-sha desert and (Po-)Lung-tui, that is to say, to the east of (Po-)Lung-tui. If the so-called site of Lou-lan is identical with Chü-lu-ts'ang, as WANG Kuo-wei insists, Po-lung-tui should be located to the west of the site of Lou-lan. But this is quite unlikely because, as is stated in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 28b, under Tun-huang-chün 敦煌郡, Po-lung-tui was situated not so far from Tun-huang, but just outside of the western barrier of it.⁽⁶⁶⁾ And, if the city of Lou-lan, which is the same as Old Lou-lan of *Wei-liao*, is to be located to the west of the so-called Lou-lan site, it is impossible that the city was commanding the sea of Yen-tsê 麗澤 or Lop-nor, as is stated in the *Shih-chi* 史記.

Moreover, according to the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注, Bk. 2, P'u-ch'ang-hai or Lop-nor was situated to the southwest of Lung-ch'êng: Lung-ch'êng was so called because of the dragon shaped heap of sand, made by the wind outside the range of city wall built up on the cliff (of P'u-ch'ang-hai), which faced Lop-nor in the west. These statements show that Lung-ch'êng was situated to the northeast of Lop-nor and that the western part of its city wall was dominating the sea. This means that Lung-ch'êng can not be identified with the Lou-lan site which was situated at the northwestern corner of Lop-nor, facing the sea to the south or east. The *Shui-ching-chu* also states that the foundation work of the city wall still existed (at the end of the 4th or at the beginning of the 5th century, when the book was compiled): that it was so large that one who started from the Western Gate in the morning could not reach the Eastern Gate until the evening⁽⁶⁷⁾. If this is true, the Lou-lan site A, which is of trapezoid shape, about 1047 ft. (319 m.) in width and 1094 ft. (334 m.) in length, can not be identified with such a large site as Lung-ch'êng.

In this way, from every point, the view of WANG Kuo-wei concerning the location of Lou-lan can not be acceptable, while the opinion of A. STEIN who identified the site L.A. with Lou-lan on the basis of tentative translation of the two Kharoṣṭhī documents discussed above is to be definite.^(67a)

belonging to the territory of Khotan in the time of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, but, as far as the content of document is concerned, nothing shows definitely it as belonging to the Khotan territory. The document concerns the guard given to Sameka, king's envoy, in Calmadana, Saca and Nina. And it says that from Nina to Khotan a guard should have been provided from Caq'ota. As are known from many inscriptions, Caq'ota was under the rule of the king of Kroraina, which obviously shows that Nina was in the territory of the same kingdom.

(66) 敦煌郡, (中略), 正西關外, 有白龍堆沙, 有蒲昌海.

(67) (蒲昌海) 水積鄯善 (here means the new capital of Shan-shan in the region of Mirān or Charklik) 之東北, 龍城之西南, 龍城, 故姜頰之虛, 胡之大國也, 蒲昌海溢, 湯覆其國, 城基尚存而至大, 晨發西門, 暮達東門, 滄其崖岸, 餘溜風吹, 稍成龍形, 西面向海, 因名龍城, (國學基本叢書本)

(67a) As for STEIN's identification on the basis of the two documents, see *Serindia*, I, pp. 414-415. I regret that I did not notice of his opinion until recently. Professor MORI Shikazō also rejected WANG Kuo-wei's opinion about the Lou-lan site. See *The site of Discovery of Li Po Documents* (李柏文書の出土地), *Ryūkokū Shidan*, 45, 1959, pp. 9-22.

III The Period of the Prosperity of Kroraina and the Date of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions

It is now evident from the foregoing demonstration that the so-called Lou-lan site represents Kroraina; therefore, at the latest date indicated by the Chinese documents excavated from there, namely at A.D. 328–330, Kroraina still enjoyed prosperity.⁽⁶⁸⁾

On the other hand, the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions cover 88 years (or 96 years) in total of the reigns of at least five kings. According to RAPSON, these kings are arranged in the following order:

Names of Kings	Regnal Year in the Inscriptions	Total Years
1. Pepiya	3—8	1—8
2. Tajaka	3	9—11
3. Aṃgoka	5—38—46 (or 36)	12—49—57 (or 47)
4. Mahiri (Mayiri)	4—28	50 (or 58)—77 (or 85)
5. Vaṣmana	3—11	78 (or 86)—88 (or 96)

The first column gives the names of the kings; the second column the smallest and the greatest numbers of their regnal years which appear in the Inscriptions; the third column the total numbers of years in case the greatest number of regnal years in the second column are supposed as the final year of the reigns of the kings. As to the final year of the reign of king Aṃgoka, RAPSON is not sure if 38 of No. 676 belongs to Aṃgoka or not, as there is no name of the king in the inscription. However, we may take it as belonging to his reign, because there are no other kings whose regnal years amount to more than 30. The greatest number of regnal years which is certain to be of Aṃgoka's is 36 of No. 418, but this 36 can also be read as 46. So I have figured such a case as represented in parentheses.

As for the first two kings, no account of their capitals is found, but that the capital of Aṃgoka, the third king, was located in Kroraina is evident from Document No. 706 excavated from the so-called Lou-lan site (L. B. iv. v. 1+vi. I.). On the cover of this document is inscribed: "Addressed to *kori* (a government office) Muldeya and Monk Anaṃda"; and the message reads: "The Great King, to *kori* Muldeya and Monk Anaṃda, writes (*i. e.* declares). We, the Great King at Kroraina (*mayā maharayene kroraṃṇaṃmi*), etc." Though the name of the king and the date are missing, as Document No. 574 of the 34th year of King Aṃgoka (excavated from the Niya site) contains the name *kori* Muldeya, and Document No. 417 of the 28th year of King Aṃgoka (excavated from the Niya site) also

(68) See p. 139 and note 37.

contains name Anamda, it may be admitted that Document No. 706 which contains both the names also belongs to the reign of the same king.

Under the reign of the next King Mahiri, Kroraina was still in existence. This is known from the letter of *ogu* Alpaya, included in Document No. 370 addressed to *cojhbo* Somjaka, governor of Caḍ'ota during the reign of the king, which reports that some Kroraina men sojourned at the former's place; and that they were Alpaya's debtors; and that under the screen of night they had fled to Caḍ'ota. And Document No. 383, excavated from the Niya site, after recording the result of counting the camels in the possession of the royal family, says "This document should be carefully preserved by *kala* Cuḡapa and (*kala*) Larsu" and, towards its end, says "This has been recorded on the basis of the dictation of *vasu* K'uṃṣena [—] witnesses of Kroraina [—] witness." Though this is a document prepared in the Niya district, from the fact that a witness from Kroraina is mentioned, it is seen that on the occasion of counting royal camels witnesses were dispatched from Kroraina. And that would show that Kroraina itself was the seat of the king, namely his capital. This document is undated, but it is probably of the reign of King Mahiri or King Vaṣmana for the following reasons. Document No. 420 excavated from the Niya site, dated the 27th year, the 1st month, 14th day in the reign of King Mahiri, gives the names of *kala* Cuḡape, Ṣamayamna, and Larsu as witnesses for transference of camels owned by a certain person and Document No. 345, excavated from the Niya site, dated the 9th year, 3rd month, 5th day, in the reign of King Vaṣmana, contains a passage concerning the claim on monk Anamdaṣena by both Larsu and Cuḡopa. Cuḡapa and Cuḡape and Cuḡopa must surely be one and the same person. However, Document No. 345 fails to give the status of Cuḡapa, but gives Larsu as *cojhbo* Larsu. *Cojhbo*.Larsu must have succeeded the status of *cojhbo* after the death of his father, *cojhbo* Ṣamasena.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Document No. 243 records a report of Larsu of the death of his father Ṣamasena and of taking over of a royal horse by Caklava who presented it to Ṣamasena, but, no date being given, it is not known when Larsu became a *cojhbo*. However, as the name *cojhbo* Larsu first appears in Document No. 343 of the 8th year of King Vaṣmana, his appointment as a *cojhbo* must have been after the 27th year, 1st month, the 14th day, in reign of King Mahiri, when he was a *kala*, and in or before the 8th year of King Vaṣmana. It follows, therefore, that the date of Document No. 383 concerning the camels in the possession of the royal family, which *kala* Larsu was ordered to preserve carefully, must be the time when Larsu was still a *kala*, namely, in or before the 8th year of King Vaṣmana. Then, it may be considered that during the reign of King Mahiri, or in the first years of King

(69) *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, p. 323.

Vaṣmana, the capital of the country (the residence of the King) was still at Kroraina.

The capital during the reign of King Mahiri was also called Mahamta nagara (Great town). This may be inferred from Documents Nos. 296 and 469. Document No. 296 is an instruction given to *cojhbo* Somjaka by the Great King who is to be identified with King Mahiri and Document No. 469 is an instruction given to *ṣoṭhamga* Lpipeya⁽⁷⁰⁾ by the Great King who is also to be identified with King Mahiri for the reason that *ṣvaṭhamgha* (*ṣoṭhamga*) Lpipeya appears in Document No. 33 which is an instruction given to *cojhbo* Somjaka by the Great King or King Mahiri. During the reign of the same king, the capital was also called *kuhani* as is evident from Documents Nos. 526 and 530, which are both instructions given to *cojhbo* Somjaka by the Great King (Mahiri), and *khvani* from Document No. 162 which is a report to the Great King from *ṣoṭhamga* Lpipe and others.

That the capital during the reign of King Vaṣmana was called *khvani* may be seen from the passage in Document No. 478 *khvaniyade seniye ayitaṃti* (Soldiers came from *khvani*) in reporting about distribution of food among six soldiers and their families dispatched from the *capital* to Caḍ'ota on the 10th day, 6th month, the 10th year of the same king. There is neither a piece of evidence, which positively proves that the capital was Kroraina, nor that which denies it. But, as Document No. 478 (N. xxii, iii, 13) was excavated at the Niya site, it will follow that the capital of this king was not located at the Niya site or Caḍ'ota where the soldiers came from the *capital*. And it means that in the 10th year of King Vaṣmana the capital was situated at Kroraina. As the last regnal year of this king is the 11th (Document No. 760, collected at the Niya site by Ellsworth Huntington), we may probably say that Kroraina was the capital of King Vaṣmana up to the end of his reign.

Of all the Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions excavated from the so-called Lou-lan site only three bear the names of the kings or dates:

(1) Document No. 676 dated the 38th year, the 12th month, 2nd day of (King ?),

(2) Document No. 677 dated (?) year, the 4th (or 7th) month, 6th day of King Amgoka.

(3) Document No. 678 dated the (6th ?) year of King (?).

Among these, only (2) bears the name of the king, but not the years. That (3) is regarded as belonging to one of the reigns of King Amgoka, Mahiri,

(70) In Document No. 469 it appears as *Lpipe..sa/ /..[davo]*. Though it is not certain how many letters are missing between *Lpipe* and *sa*, as well as before [*davo*], it is quite likely that it reads *Lpipeyasa dadavo* "To be given to Lpipeya". Actually, both *Lpipe* and *Lpipeya* appear in the Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions, of which the identity is yet to be established.

and Vaṣmana has already been pointed out.⁽⁷¹⁾ The name of the king for (1) is not known; but, as far as the excavated documents are concerned, the reign which extends over 30 years is only that of King Aṃgoka; therefore (1) which is dated the 38th year may well be attributed, as inferred by RAPSON, to King Aṃgoka.⁽⁷²⁾ This will confirm that Kroraina was prosperous under the reign of Aṃgoka and shows the possibility that it was under Mahiri or Vaṣmana.

If we take all these into our consideration, it is evident that the so-called Lou-lan site represents the capital of the country at least under the reign of both King Aṃgoka and King Mahiri and it is probable that Kroraina was still the capital in the 8th or even in the 10th year of King Vaṣmana. So we shall not be in the wrong to regard the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered up to this day as the documents of the period when the capital was at Kroraina.

Now these kings had had such a lengthy compound title as *maharaya rayatiraya mahamta jayamta dharmia sacadhamāsthida mahanuava maharaya devaputra* (Great King, King of Kings, Greatness, Victory, Right Law, Staying at the Truth, *mahanuava*, Great King, Son of Heaven) and invariably had the king's real name before *devaputra*. In the 17th year of King Aṃgoka⁽⁷³⁾, the title was shortened to read *mahanuava maharaya jīṭugha (ciṭugha or jīṭumga) [the king's name] devaputra*, and, thereafter, this title was invariably employed. In this new title, a new name *jīṭugha* was inserted between *maharaya* and the king's name. Now, THOMAS suggests that this might be the name of a new palace, a royal family name, or a new capital.⁽⁷⁴⁾ However, as we realize that the other titles are all abstract euphemisms, it will not be proper to take this as the name of a palace. Moreover, as no previous king is found with this title, it can not be taken as the family name of the king. Again, as the capital during the reign of this king was Kroraina which had always been the capital, it can not be taken as the name of a new capital. The real meaning is yet to be decided.

If the Chinese documents excavated from the so-called Lou-lan site are attributed to the period from about A. D. 250 to 330, and Lou-lan (Kroraina) was the capital of the five kings, who are Aṃgoka, Mahiri, Vaṣmana and their two predecessors Pepiya and Tajaka, what would be the chronological relations between these Chinese documents and the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions? This would

(71) See p. 143. (72) See p. 148.

(73) Documents Nos. 571 and 590. Both of these documents are dated the 17th year of King Aṃgoka (*Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, II, pp. 211 and 223; III, p. 326.). BURROW gives the date of No. 571 in two ways, the 15th in *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 114, and the 17th in *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 92. However, the 15th is a misprint for the 17th.

(74) F. W. THOMAS, *Some Notes on the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, 1935, p. 50. BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 92, supposes that the title is of foreign origin because there is no *j* sound in the native language of Lou-lan. Compare BURROW, *A Translation*, p. 149 under *cozbo*.

be the most important question in determining the date of the period at which Lou-lan prospered and also in determining the date of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions themselves.

That these Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions were related to Shan-shan 鄯善 and the five kings were those who should be called the kings of Shan-shan may firstly be inferred from the fact that the three documents, excavated from the Niya site No. 571 (N. xxi. viii. 74: *Serindia*, I, p. 260 and Pl. XX), No. 590 (N. xxiv. viii. 93; *Serindia*, p. 262), and No. 640 (N. xxxvii. i. 2: *Serindia*, I, p. 266 and Pl. XXIII) have a mud-seal stamped by the seal 鄯善詣尉.

Almost all of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions are written on wooden tablets and those conveying royal orders are in the form of knives, and small holes are bored on the left hand side; strings run through the holes bind the top and bottom tablets respectively inscribed with the address and the body. On the other hand, for the letters of people other than kings, reports, contract on concluding purchases or sales, etc.) and judgments of civil and penal trials, square wooden tablets are used; a mud-seal is applied to each one and it is stamped by seals of the men involved in preparing the document. As far as the extant seals are concerned, most of these seals are representing human images and various figures, and only four are of ideographs which are taken to be Chinese characters (N. xv. 167; *Ancient Khotan*, p. 406, Pl. LXXII; *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, No. 332), and the rest of distinctly Chinese characters. The three documents above-mentioned bearing the seal of 鄯善詣尉 are all the three bearing distinctly Chinese characters. The characters on this seal has been deciphered as 鄯善郡印 *seal of shan-shan-chün* by CHAVANNES and reported that L. C. HOPKINS also confirmed this decipherment (*Serindia*, p. 230, 260, 329). FUJITA Ryōsaku 藤田亮策 also read this 鄯善郡印 and attributed it to the T'ang period.⁽⁷⁵⁾ However, a careful inspection of the plate of the mud-seal on Document No. 590⁽⁷⁶⁾ makes it clear that the fourth character 印 is certainly a misreading of the character 尉 and that the third character is written as 詣 of which the reading is not certain.

According to *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Han-shu*, the Han government had appointed for Shan-shan-kuo, besides Wang or the King of Shan-shan, such officials as Fu-kuo-hou 輔國侯, Ch'üeh-hu-hou 卻胡侯, Shan-shan tu-wei 鄯善都尉, Chi Ch'ê-shih tu-wei 擊車師都尉, the Left and Right Ch'ieh-ch'ü 左右且渠, Chi Ch'ê-shih chün

(75) *Chōsen Kōkōgaku Kenkyū* 朝鮮考古學研究 (Studies on Korean Archaeology), Tokyo: Kōtō-shoin 1948, p. 304.

(76) These three documents are stored in the Central Asian Antiquities Museum in New Delhi, which now makes a part of the National Museum. F. H. ANDREWS, *Descriptive Catalogue of Antiquities*, Delhi, 1935, pp. 24-26, just describes the general character of writing materials, including the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, and does not give an inventory of these inscriptions. But in 1955-57 when I visited the Museum, they could not locate Nos. 571 and 640. So, among the three No. 590 was the only one I could inspect.

擊車師君, and I-chang 譯長. These had been bestowed on Shan-shan King and other influential people. It goes without saying that Shan-shan itself had its own official system of administration and of social standing.⁽⁷⁷⁾ At the beginning of the Western Chin 西晉 (265–316), king of Shan-shan was appointed 晉守侍中大都尉奉晉大侯親晉鄯善王, which is known from a wooden tablet excavated from the Niya site (N. XV. 93a. 6: *Ancient Khotan* p. 537, Pl. CXIII). According to WANG Kuo-wei, *Hsi-yü ta-tu-wei* 西域大都尉 was first bestowed on K'ang 康, the king of Sha-ch'ê 莎車王 in A. D. 29 and this was a title ranking as high as *Hsi-yü tu-hu* 西域都護 and *Ch'i-tu-wei* 騎都尉, but later the two characters 西域 were omitted and the title became just *Ta-tu-wei* 大都尉.⁽⁷⁸⁾ As to whether offices other than those referred to in the foregoing were adopted by Shan-shan, no record has been found.

Now, the phrase which most closely resembles that on the seal in question might be *Shan-shan tu-wei*; but the third character which is illegible differs from the character 都 of the *chuan* 篆 style, but rather resembles the character 郡 of the same style. Still it differs from either. Some time ago I, following the view of those who read this as *chün* 郡, stated that this belonged to the period of establishment of Shan-shan-chün 鄯善郡 in Shan-shan, which followed the conquest of T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾 by Sui in the 5th year of Ta-yeh 大業 (609) and that 鄯善郡尉 was probably an abbreviation of 鄯善郡都尉. Among the three documents which have the mud-seal, Nos. 571 and 590 are dated the 17th year of the reign of King Amgoka and No. 640 has no date. And it is in this 17th year that the title of King Amgoka was shortened and added by a new title *jitughā*, which I attributed to the change of king's position as the result of the conquest of Sui. In this way, I synchronized the 17th year of king Amgoka with the 5th year of Ta-yeh (609) and concluded that the date of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions extended from A. D. 580 to 667 or 675, that is to say, from the end of the Six Dynasties to the beginning of T'ang.⁽⁷⁹⁾ Indeed, some facts may be explained conveniently by adopting this view.⁽⁸⁰⁾ However, no relics distinctly

- (77) As to the native governmental titles or social status which appear in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, such as *kala*, *gušura*, *camkura*, *ogu*, *kitsaitsa*, *suwetha*, *tasuca*, see THOMAS in *Acta Orientalis*, XIII, pp. 61, 72–78 and BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, Index.
- (78) *Liu-sha chui-chien* 流沙墜簡 *Pu-i k'ao-shih* 補遺考釋, fol. 1b–3b. Also see 尼雅城北古城所出晉簡跋 in *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin* 觀堂集林, BK. 17, fol. 24b (ed. 1959, p. 866).
- (79) My address entitled “*Kharoṣṭhī Monjo no Nendai ni tsuite*” (カロシュテイ文書の年代について) or “*On the Date of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*”, delivered at the General Meeting of the Tōhō Gakkai 東方學會 in Kyoto on November the 4th, 1954.
- (80) I quote here two examples: (1) The Document No. 661 concerns a completion of transaction of a camel, which took place in the 3rd year in the reign of Hinajha Vijidasimha, the king of Khotan. This Vijida is to be compared to *Khot*. Vijittā, both of which are indianized forms of Viśa or Vijaya, the name of royal family of Khotan. (F. W. THOMAS, *Some Notes on Central-Asian Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, BSOS, XI, 1943–46, pp. 519–

belonging to the Sui and T'ang periods have turned up so far from the ruins from which the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions were excavated,⁽⁸¹⁾ and, at the beginning of the T'ang, as referred to in the following, several districts of the kingdom of Shan-shan had been reduced almost to perfect ruins through several invasions and conquests by foreign nations so that such prosperous civil life as supposed from the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions would have been impossible. So, today, I am of the opinion that I should put the date a little further back. Under the circumstances, the phrase on the seal in question is an important key to decide the date of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, but, unfortunately, we do not know how to read it. However, there is no doubt that this was a Chinese government title established in the kingdom of Shan-shan; a man with this title existed in the 17th year of king Aṃgoka, and stamped the mud-seal on the document. This shows that it is a document prepared in the kingdom of Shan-shan and that the king was no other than that of the kingdom of Shan-shan. In other words, the kingdom of Aṃgoka was under the suzerainty of China at the time of the documents.

Of the three documents in question, Document No. 571 is of the 8th day, 12th month, 17th year of King Aṃgoka, and Document No. 590 dated the 28th

521: H. W. BAILEY, *Kanaiṣka*, *JRAS*, 1942, p. 4 note 2). Now, the name Viśa or Vijaya appears for the first time in the *Sui-shu* 隋書, BK. 83 (p. 11705 or 827) as that of the royal family of Khotan and the King Pei-shih Pi-lien 卑示閉練 sent several embassies to the court of Sui during the period of Ta-yeh 大業 (605-606). Pei-shih is obviously a Chinese transcription of Viśa or Viji-(da) or Viji-(ttā) and there are no pieces of evidence to prove the existence of the family Viśa prior to this period, except Tibetan traditions which places the accession to the throne of Vijaya-Sambhava, the first king of Khotan, in about the year 215 B. C. or about 60 B. C. (F. W. THOMAS, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan*, I, pp. 75, 105) or a very dubious hypothesis to attribute the origin of the rule of Khotan by the Vijayas to the conquest of the country by Mu-li-yen 慕利延, leader of the T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾, in 445 (YAO Wei-yüan 姚徵元, *Pei-ch'ao hu-hsing-k'ao* 北朝胡姓考, Peking, 1958, p. 196). HADANI Ryōtai is of the opinion that the Vijayas had ruled Khotan as early as the 5th century (*Hsi-yü chih Fo-chiao* 西域之佛教, tr. by Ho Ch'ang-chün 賀昌群, Shanghai, 1956, pp. 226-228), which is subject to a further study as has been pointed out by HSIANG Ta 向達 (*T'ang-t'ai Chang-an yü Hsi-yü wên-ming* 唐代長安與西域文明, Peking, 1957 pp. 7-8). If the Vijayas in Khotan can not be older than the period of Sui, the date of Document No. 661 can not be earlier than that. (2) BURROW has pointed out some Tokharian elements in the language of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (*Tokharian Elements in the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, *JRAS*, 1935, pp. 667-675). If the date of the Kharoṣṭhī documents is brought down to the Sui and T'ang, the relationship between the Tokharian and the language of the Kharoṣṭhī documents will be better explained at least from the point of view of chronology, as the Tokharian documents now available belong to the period of T'ang.

(81) The Niya site is believed to correspond to Caḍ'ota of Kharoṣṭhī documents, which is identified with Ching-chüeh-kuo 精絕國 in the *Han-shu*, *Hou-han-shu* and *Wei-liao*. It is also considered to correspond to Tsādikâm in the Khotanese text of the Staël-Holsten MSS. written in 925. If so, the Niya site was still prosperous in the first quarter of the 10th century and one may expect that some relics of the Sui and T'ang be discovered there in future.

day, 4th month, 17th year of the same reign. Both documents are receipts (*pravamaṇaḡa*) confirmed by several witnesses and prepared on the occasion of the purchase of a farm and a woman respectively from Koṇaya and Śāmcā by Ramṣoṅka (Ramṣotsa), a scribe (*divira*) by profession, which certify that payment of money for them was completed, that the buyer, namely Ramṣoṅka (Ramṣotsa), is perfectly free to use or dispose of the lands or women and that the sellers are not allowed to interfere with them. The documents, from the beginning to the end, are complete. The other one (Document No. 640) is a similar certificate on a land which a man named Lustu has purchased, but the main half of the contract is missing.

The text of Document No. 571 is translated by BURROW as follows:

“This receipt concerning *miṣi* received from Koṇaya is to be carefully kept by the scribe Ramṣotsa.

“In the 15th [read 17th] year of the reign of his majesty the great king *Jiṭugha* Aṃguvaka [=Aṃgoka], son of heaven, in the 12th month, 8th day, there is a man called Koṇaya. He sold *miṣiya*-land along with trees to the scribe Ramṣotsa. The price taken was one camel two years old priced at fifty. Konaya received it. Other *atḡa muli* (supplementary payment) received was ten *khi* of wine. Koṇaya received in all a price of sixty from Ramṣotsa. In that land the capacity for seed is three *milimas juṭhi*. They agreed on equal terms. In that *miṣi*-land Ramṣotsa has ownership to plough, to sow, to give to another as a present, to exchange, to do anything he likes with it. Whoever at a future time shall bring the matter up before the *vasus* and *aḡetas*, his bringing up again of the matter shall be without any authority at the king's court. So they agreed in front of the magistrates. Witnesses to this are the *kitsaitsa* Ṃarpa, the *kala* Karamṭsa, the *kuhaneci cozbo* [*cojhbo*] Kuṁiṇeya, the *vasus* Acuṇiya, Caḡhiya, and Ṃapika, the *apsus* Śāmcā and Piḡa, the *tomgha* Karamṭsa, Taṃcgo, the *aḡetas* Lṽ[=p]ipatḡa, Kuuna, and Kuṁiṇeya, and the *yatma* Kuṁiṇeya. Whoever shall bring up the matter a second time shall receive a fine of one gelding and seventy strokes. This receipt has been written by me the scribe Moḡata, son of the scribe Tamaṣpa, at the command of the magistrates. Its authority is a hundred years, as long as life. It was written at the request of Koṇaya. The *tomgha* Śāmc[ā] by name cut the string.”⁽⁸²⁾

In Document No. 590 are enumerated the following names as the witnesses for the transaction: *kitsaitsa* Ṃarpa and the *kāla* Karamṭsa, the *tomgha* Kuṁaya and Capuḡa, the *apsu* Piḡa and ṽasu Ṃapika, the *aḡeta* Kuuna, the *yatma* Cato and Ṃapuḡa, the *karsenaḡa* Vuḡiḡa, the *śadavida* Pursavara, and the *karsenaḡa* Ricikḡa. And in Document No. 640, the witnesses are *kitsaitsa* Ṃarpa, *kala*

(82) BURROW, *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 114. As for the date which is the misprint for 17th year, see, p. 51 note (73). Piḡa is written Piḡa by RAPSON.

Karamtsa, *vasus* J...., Karsena'va and Suṭ[o]n[ǵ]a, and [aǵeta?] Arispa, *aǵeta* Lpipanga and *yalma* Ca...., so long as the extant text goes. It should be noticed that *kitsaitsa* Varpa and *kala* Karamtsa are common to the three documents as witnesses and that both Documents Nos. 571 and 590 were written by the scribe Moǵata. (The writer of Document No. 640 is missing.)

The formalities of a document which certified the completion of buying and selling in the presence of government officials are as follows:

- 1: First, it shows by whom the document is to be preserved. (In Document No. 571 it is the buyer.)
- 2: Then it tells by whom it has been sealed.
- 3: Then it gives the year, month and day on which the transaction was concluded, and the name, (status and occupation) of the buyer and seller.
- 4: Then, it explains the contents of transaction.
- 5: It tells in whose presence the transaction was concluded.
- 6: It enumerates the names of the witnesses.
- 7: It confirms that the seller has no right of claim in the future and shows the penalty for claim.
- 8: It distinctly tells at whose order or request this document has been written.
- 9: It adds an oath which declares that this contract will last forever.
- 10: At the end is added the name of the man who cut off the string which had sealed the document and concludes the whole writing.

The order of the items from 4 to 8 is not always uniform, but such contents are always given in the documents of this kind. In some cases, all or some of the following items, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, are omitted.

The Documents Nos. 571 and 590 say the transaction was written "at the command of the magistrates [*mahatvana* high officials]", but names of the magistrates who were in the presence of the proceeding are not given. However, there are three documents written by the same scribe Moǵata, which certify the conclusion of transaction by the same Ramṣotsa. These documents mention the names of the government officials who witnessed the completion of the transactions: Document No. 581 of the 6th year of king Amgoka says "in the presence of the high official *kitsaitsa* Piteya and *kala* Karamtsa"; Document No. 586 of the 16th year of the same king says "in the presence of the high officials *kitsaitsa* Varpa and *kala* Karamtsa"; and Document No. 587 of the 21st year of the same reign says "in the presence of the high officials *kitsaitsa* Varpa and *kala* Karamtsa." This being the case, it would not be wrong to suppose that, in the cases of Documents Nos. 571 and 590 which give the completion of transactions in the 17th year of king Amgoka, the transactions were concluded

in the presence of *kitsaitsa* Vārpa and *kala* Karaṃtsa, both of whom are among the witnesses. The *kitsaitsa* and *kala* may be supposed to have been among the highest ranks of this country, and Document No. 582 (20th year of king Aṃgoka) actually says that *kitsaitsa* Vārpa and *kala* Karaṃtsa were among the high officials administering the kingdom (*rajadareya mahatva*).⁽⁸³⁾ The reason why Documents Nos. 571 and 590 only say "So they agreed in front of the magistrates" and fail to mention their names is probably because of their presence among the witnesses.

Moreover, the two documents (Nos. 571 and 590) do not give the name of the stamper on the mud-seal which correspond to 2 of the above-mentioned items. The same thing happens with Documents Nos. 581, 586, and 587, all of which give no name of person who stamed on the mud-seal. As the mud-seals on these three documents are missing,⁽⁸⁴⁾ it is impossible to confirm if they are same with those of Nos. 571 and 590. However, when we examine six documents certifying the completion of buying and selling, in which it is clearly written by whom it was sealed, we find that two of them (Nos. 348 and 591) were sealed by the seller, another two (Nos. 328 and 574) by the witnesses and the rest (Nos. 419 and 425) by three and two monks respectively, whose names do not appear either as buyer and seller or as witnesses. In the case of Nos. 328 and 574, three people of five witnesses and all of three witnesses put respectively their seals on the documents. It follows, therefore, that most probably the seal of 鄯善詣尉 was that of either of Vārpa or of Karaṃtsa who were present at the conclusion of the transaction in connection with the scribe Raṃṣotsa and acted as witnesses, as seen in Documents Nos. 571, 590 and 640.

It may be considered that the man who used the seal of 鄯善詣尉 was either the *kitsaitsa* Vārpa or *kala* Karaṃtsa, both of whom were high officials or the chief administrators of the district where the three documents were prepared. The place at which these three documents were prepared is not stated definitely; but in the previously mentioned Document No. 586 of the 16th year of king Aṃgoka pertaining to the purchase of a vinery by the scribe Raṃṣotsa, it is written "They made a decision at the *paraṃpula* of here Caḍ'oda" (*te niḥeya kṛidamṭi iṣa caḍ'oda paraṃpulaṃmi*). According to THOMAS, *paraṃpula* means camp (παρεμβολή) in Greek.⁽⁸⁵⁾ At any rate, it is evident in this light that the transaction and preparation of the document took place at Caḍ'ota. Consequently, Documents Nos. 571 and 590 certifying the transactions by one and the same person and written by the same scribe Moḡata at the periods close to each other and Document No. 640 containing the names of the common witnesses as those

(83) T. BURROW, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 82.

(84) *Serindia*, I, pp. 261, 262, Pl. XXIII.

(85) F. W. THOMAS, *Παρεμβολή*, *Acta Orientalia*, XIV, 1936, pp. 109-111.

in the former were most probably all prepared at Caq'ota. We must also take into our consideration that these documents were excavated from the Niya site or what was Caq'ota at the time of the documents. This means that the seal 鄯善郡尉 was used by a chief administrator of Caq'ota or a high government official there.

Now, what are the relationships between these Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions and the Chinese documents excavated from the so-called Lou-lan site and Niya site? To begin with, from the so-called Lou-lan site not a few of Chinese documents have been collected by HEDIN and STEIN and TACHIBANA Zuichō 橘瑞超. These are fragments of memorandums and letters written by Chinese government officials who were stationed in these sites or in their neighbourhood and they have absolutely no relationships in the point of contents with the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions which concern the actual lives of the citizens of Shan-shan. For this reason, there is no clue in the contents of the documents of the two kinds for inferring the chronological interrelations. On the other hand, a fragment of paper document discovered by STEIN from the so-called Lou-lan site, with a remnant of Chinese letters on one side and with Kharoṣṭhī writings on the other⁽⁸⁶⁾ is an instance of utilizing the backside of Chinese letter and writing Kharoṣṭhī characters there, therefore this would make us infer that the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions excavated from the so-called Lou-lan site and the Chinese document excavated from the same ruins are roughly paralleled chronologically. The writings may be reprinted here. One side reads: ... 敦煌具書畔毗再拜... / 備悉自後日遂 / ... This is certainly a fragment of letter sent from Tun-huang by a man named Pan-p'i 畔毗. The other, in Kharoṣṭhī characters, says:

- (1) (torn) *daṣana paḍ'ivati nasti* ... [vi]ca ku[ḍi] .. [sti]la ne[ta] ... (torn)
 (2) (torn) *pa[ṭa]* ... (torn) ... ti ca o c. (torn) ... ha sti ta gi ne[e] ... (torn)
 (3) (torn) ... ta mi sa ti ye[o] (torn)

This is supposed to have been written on the *nasti* (not existing or absence) of *paḍivati* (report or explanation) concerning *daṣana* (slaves) and it should be considered that there is nothing to do with the Chinese letter on the front page. The fact that this document was a letter sent from Tun-huang clearly shows that the Kharoṣṭhī document on the front page was nothing but what had been made use of the backside of this letter. Though nothing has been found as to Pan-p'i 畔毗, in view of the fact that the paper documents excavated from the so-called Lou-lan site are of the period between the second half of the 3rd century and the first half of the 4th, the date of this letter must be in the same period.

The parallelism between Chinese and Kharoṣṭhī documents is also justified

(86) LA. vi. ii, 0059; *Serindia*, I, p. 439; CHAVANNES, *Les documents chinois*, p. 189, No. 918, Pl. XXVIII; *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, No. 699)

by another piece of evidence. Among the Chinese documents excavated by Hedin, there is a broken piece of paper with the following inscriptions: *Lou-lan chu-kuo Chün-na-hsien* 樓蘭主國均那羨 “Chün-na-hsien, governor [of the city] of Lou-lan” (I. 19. 7: CONRADY, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-98, Pl. XXII). *Chu-kuo*, which means one who holds the administration of country or city, can not be found in any Chinese record as a title,⁽⁸⁷⁾ but *Lou-lan chu-kuo* can not but mean the governor or magistrate of the city or the province of Lou-lan.⁽⁸⁸⁾ As has been suggested by the late Professor THOMAS⁽⁸⁹⁾, the kingdom of Shan-shan was divided into some provinces which had been independent kingdoms until they were annexed by Shan-shan. Caḍ’ota, Ching-chüeh 精絕 of Chinese records, was one of these provinces and it was administrated by a group of administrative heads which were called *rajadaraḡa(na)* or *rajadaraḡa mahatva(na)*⁽⁹⁰⁾. The existence of *rajadaraḡa* is attested only in Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions which came from the Niya sites or the ruins of Caḍ’ota, but it is quite likely that the same kind of officials was established in other provinces or cities of Shan-shan. And the title *Lou-lan chu-kuo* should be taken as a Chinese translation of *rajadaraḡa* of Lou-lan. Moreover, Chün-na-hsien is not a Chinese name, as there is no Chinese family name Chün or Chün-na⁽⁹¹⁾, while in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, which came from Niya sites, there are such personal names as Kuṃṃaṣena

- (87) In *Chou-li* 周禮 (under Ssü-i 司儀 of Ch’iu-kuan 秋官. *The Texts of Thirteen Classics* 十三經經文, reprinted in Tai-pei, 1955, p. 63) and *Li-chi* 禮記 (under P’ing-i 脾儀. *The Texts*, etc., p. 132), Prof. T. MOROHASHI explains that *chu-kuo* is used for the meaning of host country which receives ambassadors from other countries (*Daikanwa jiten*, I, p. 332). However, E. BIOT, *Le Tcheou-li* II, Paris 1851, pp. 421 and 426 translates *chu-kuo* by “*le chef de royaume supérieur*” and by “*prince hôte*”, while COUVREUR, *Li Ki*, II, Ho Kien Fou 1899, p. 692, translates it by “*le prince*”. In this case, both BIOT and COUVREUR seem to be right. As has been pointed out by Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武 in *Jih-chih-lu* 日知錄, Bk. 24 (under *Chu* 主), *chu* meant *ch’ing* 卿 and *ta-fu* 大夫 who took service to feudal lords during the period of *Ch’un-ch’iu* 春秋 (770-404 B.C.) and *chu-kuo* may have been the appellation of these *ch’ing* and *ta-fu* who administered the country of feudal lord. In Chinese, *chu* is used for two meanings: one for the meaning of head as in *chu-jên* 主人 or *chu-chün* 主君, and the other for that of one who takes charge of something or some business as in *chu-i* 主衣, *chu-k’o* 主客, *chu-pu* 主簿, *chu-yao* 主藥 and so on. I am of the opinion that *chu-kuo* means one who takes charge of the administration of country or city.
- (88) CONRADY, p. 98, translates the passage as “Kün Na-sien aus dem Reiche Lou-lan . . .” But I can not understand why such translation is possible. As I shall discuss in a moment, there is no such Chinese family name as Kün (Chün).
- (89) F. W. THOMAS, *The early population of Lou-lan-Shan-shan*. *The Journal of the Greater India Society*, Vol. XI, No. 2, July, 1944, pp. 57-58.
- (90) TOMAS, *Ibid.*, p. 57. See Index to *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, p. 365 under *rajadaraḡa*, *rajadareya*, *rajadharaḡa*, *rajadhāraḡa*, and *rajadhāreya*. No title equivalent to this is found in Indian history. See A. S. ALTEKAR, *State and Government in Ancient India*, 4th ed., Varanasi, Patna and Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962.
- (91) It is not only unavailable among family names of the Chinese, but also among those of foreign origin. See YAO Wei-yüan 姚徵元, *Pei-chao hu-hsing k’ao* 北朝胡姓考, Peking 1958.

or Kunaṣena which should be identified with Chün-na-hsien* *kjuén-nâ-züân/dz'üân*⁽⁹²⁾. So, *Lou-lan chu-kuo Chün-na-hsien* can be taken as a Lou-lan man named Kuṃnaṣena or Kunaṣena who took charge of administration of the city or province of Lou-lan. This shows not only the chronological but also the institutional correlation which exists between the Chinese and Kharoṣṭhī documents.

The later half of the 3rd century or the 30ies of the 4th century is to be looked upon as *terminus ad quem* of the date of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions. This is inferred from the fact that the names and duration of reign of the five kings of Shan-shan between 333/(or 35) and 445, which could be picked up from Chinese records, do not agree with the names and duration of reign of the five kings found in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, and that Shan-shan thereafter suffered repeated invasions and conquests by foreign troops and the prosperity of civilians' lives and their political unity as seen in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions could not be expected.

To begin with, the names and dates of those kings are as follows:

In the 1st year of Hsien-k'ang 咸康 (335), YANG Hsüan 楊宣, general of CHANG Chün 張駿 (324-346) of the Former Liang 前涼, conquered Kuei-tzü 龜茲, Yen-ch'i 焉耆, and Shan-shan 鄯善. Yüan-mêng 元孟, king of Shan-shan, offered a lady (his daughter?) to CHANG Chün.⁽⁹³⁾ Yüan-mêng is written as Yüan-li 元禮 in the *Shih-liu-kuo ch'un-ch'iu* 十六國春秋 which assigns the affair to the 12th month of the 8th year of CHANG Chün (331).⁽⁹⁴⁾

In the 7th year of T'ai-yüan 太元 (382), Hsiu-mi-to 休密駄, king of Shan-shan,

(92) One Kuṃnaṣena, 25 Kunaṣena and one Kunaṣenena appear in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (See Index to *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, p. 339). However, the title or social status of these Kuṃnaṣena or Kunaṣena are not clear except *ari* Kunaṣena (No. 80), *aṃru* Kunaṣena (No. 722), *kāla* Kunaṣena (No. 211), *truso* Kunaṣena (No. 631), *vasu* Kuṃnaṣena (No. 322) and *aṃsavara* Kunaṣenena (No. 133). *Ari*, *aṃru*, *kāla*, *truso* and *vasu* are titles, of which *kāla*, probably meaning prince (THOMAS in *Festschrift H. Jacobi*, p. 51, and *Journal of the Greater Indian Society*, XI, 2, p. 66, and T. BURROW, *The language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, p. 82) is the highest. *Aṃsavara* means horseman (T. BURROW, *A translation*, p. 24). Neither the date of these people nor their relationship with Lou-lan city is known. As to *na-hsien* which I have reconstructed to *naṣena*, compare Na-hsien 那先 for **Naasen* or *Nagasena* in Chinese translations of *Milindapañha* (See P. PELLLOT, *Les noms propres dans les traductions chinoises du Milindapañha*, *J.A.*, 1914 (ii), p. 389 and P. DEMIÉVILLE, *Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha*, *BEFEO.*, XXIV, 1924, p. 80.) The translation of *Nagasena* by *hsien* may suggest the possibility of shan-shan or Gandhāri origin of texts from which the Chinese translations of *Milindapañha* were made.

(93) *Chin-shu* 晉書, Bk. 86, p. 5413 (Biography of Chang Chün 張駿); *Tzū-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑, Bk. 95.

(94) *Shih-liu-kuo ch'un-ch'iu* 十六國春秋 (*Ch'ien-liang-lu* 前涼錄), ed. Ssü-pu pei-yao, fol. 3a. But, *Shi-liu-kuo ch'un-ch'iu* quoted in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 太平御覽, Bk. 124, writes Yüan-mêng.

came to the court of FU Chien 苻堅, king of the Former Ch'in 前秦.⁽⁹⁵⁾ In the same year (382)⁽⁹⁶⁾ or a year later than that (383),⁽⁹⁷⁾ when Lü Kuang 呂光 started on an expedition to Chinese Turkestan, Hsiu-mi-to was bestowed with a title 使持節散騎常侍都督西域諸軍事寧西將軍. The king died at Ku-tsang 姑臧 or Liang-chou 涼州.⁽⁹⁸⁾

In the 1st or 2nd year of T'ai-an 太安 (385 or 386), Hu-yüan-ch'ih 胡員叱, king of Shan-shan, cooperating with the troops of Fu P'ei 苻丕, fought with the troops of YAO Chang 姚萇 of the Later Ch'in 後秦.⁽⁹⁹⁾

In the 3rd year of Yung-ch'ü 永初 (422), Pi-lung 比龍, king of Shan-shan, came to the court of CH'IEH-CH'Ü Mêng-hsün 沮渠蒙遜.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

[At the beginning of the 5th century (?), Buddhist monk T'an-wu-ch'an 曇無讖 (Dharmakṣema) (385-433)⁽¹⁰¹⁾ stayed in Shan-shan for some time where he made friend with Man-t'ou-t'o-lin 曼頭陀林, sister of the king of Shan-shan.]⁽¹⁰²⁾

In the 4th year of T'ai-yen 太延 (438), on the day of *kêng-chên* 庚辰 (10th) of the 3rd month (April 11), Su-yen-ch'i 素延耆, younger brother of the king of Shan-shan, came to the court of the Northern Wei 北魏.⁽¹⁰³⁾

In the 2nd year of T'ai-p'ing-chên-chün 太平眞君 (441), CH'IEH-CH'Ü Wu-hui 沮渠無諱 in Chiu-ch'üan 酒泉 (Su-chou 肅州) made his younger brother CH'IEH-CH'Ü An-chou 沮渠安周 attack Shan-shan where Wu-hui intended to remove. Pi-lung 比龍 decided to defend by the advice of an ambassador of Northern Wei, who happened to stay there, and An-chou had to retreat to T'ung-ch'êng 東城 which he occupied.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

(95) *Chin-shu* 晉書, BK. 114, p. 5605.

(96) *Kao-sêng-chuan* 高僧傳, BK. 2, ed. *Tripitaka Taishô*, L, p. 331b (under Kumārajiva).

(97) *Chin-shu* 晉書, BK. 114, p. 5606: *Tzû-chih t'ung-chien*, BK. 105.

(98) *Chin-shu* 晉書, BK. 95, p. 5485.

(99) *Chin-shu* 晉書, BK. 115, p. 5615. T'ANG Ch'iu 湯球 assigns this to the 2nd year of T'ai-an. cf. *Shih-liu-kuo ch'un-ch'iu chi-pu* 十六國春秋輯補, BK. 39.

(100) *Sung-shu* 宋書, BK. 98, p. 7053.

(101) His name has wrongly been restored into Sanskrit Dharmarakṣya. See WATANABE Shôkô, *Bukkyô no Ayumi*, Tokyo; Daibôrinkaku, 1958, p. 183, Index, p. 9. However, this is not mentioned in his biography in *Kao-sêng-chuan*, BK. 2, ed. *Tripitaka Taishô*, L, p. 336a, which only states that he went to Kuei-tzû 龜茲 from Chi-pin 闐賓 and then to Ku-tsang 姑臧.

(102) *Wei-shu* 魏書, BK. 99, pp. 9667-68.

(103) *Wei-shu* 魏書, BK. 4a, p. 8448; BK. 102, p. 9696.

(104) *Wei-shu* 魏書, BK. 99, p. 9668. Also see *Wei-shu*, BK. 4b, p. 8450; BK. 102, p. 9696 and *Sung-shu* 宋書, BK. 98, pp. 7055-56.

In the 3rd year of T'ai-p'ing-chên-chün 太平眞君 (442), Pi-lung shifted to Ch'ieh-mo 且末 (Cherchen)⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ and his son had surrendered to An-chou. In the 4th month (April/May), ЧН'ІЕН-ЧН'Ў Wu-hui crossed the Moving Sands, which killed a half of his troops by thirsty, and established himself at Shan-shan. Wu-hui died from disease in the 5th year of T'ai-p'ing-chên-chün (444) and An-chou replaced him.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾

In the 6th year of T'ai-p'ing-chên-chün (445), WAN Tu-kuei 萬度歸, general of the Northern Wei, attacked Shan-shan and captured Chên-ta 眞達, king of Shan-shan.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Thus, Shan-shan was annexed to the Northern Wei.

In the 9th year of T'ai-p'ing-chên-chün 太平眞君 (448), Han-pa 韓拔 was appointed to 假節征西將軍領護西戎校尉鄯善王 to rule Shan-shan where the system of taxation and corvée, similar to that of *chün* 郡 and *hsien* 縣 in the interior of China, was applied to the people.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

Now, if Yüan-mêng 元孟 (or Yüan-li 元禮) (-335 or 331-), Hsiu-mi-to 休密駄 (-382 or 383-), Hu-yüan-ch'ih 胡員叱 (-385 or 386-), Pi-lung 比龍 (-422-), and Chên-ta 眞達 (-445), represented on this table,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ are compared with the five kings Pepiya (1-8), Tajaka (1-3), Aṃgoka (1-38 or 1-46), Mahiri (1-28), and Vaṣmana (1-11),⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ we notice that none of the names which are considered to be the transliterations of the original Kharoṣṭhi pronunciations such as Yüan-mêng 元孟 (or Yüan-li), Hsiu-mi-to, Hu-yüan-ch'ih is found. Moreover, from the point of regnal years, too, the five kings of the Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions can not be identified adequately with any of the five kings of Shan-shan in the table. For instance, if we compare Vaṣmana (1-11) with Chên-ta 眞達 (-445), the first regnal year of Aṃgoka (1-38/46) falls on A.D. 369 or 361, deducing the total of regnal years of Vaṣmana, Mahiri and Aṃgoka, which amounts to 77 or 85 from A.D. 445, the last year of Chên-ta. A.D. 369 or 361 is to be one of the regnal years of either Hsiu-mi-to 休密駄 (-382 or 383-) or Yüan-mêng 元孟 (-335 or 331-), which means four (Chên-ta, Pi-lung 比龍, Hu-yüan-ch'ih 胡員叱 and Hsiu-mi-to) or five (above four plus Yüan-mêng) kings of Chinese records should be identified with three kings of the Kharoṣṭhi documents. This can not be

(105) After the removal of Pi-lung, Ch'ieh-mo was annexed to Shan-shan (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 102, p. 9696). It seems that Ch'ieh-mo had been under the rule of Pi-lung who removed there for safety; but it was annexed to Shan-shan either by Ch'ieh-ch'ü family or by Pi-lung's son or by the Northern Wei which conquered Shan-shan.

(106) *Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk. 4b, p. 5854; Bk. 102, p. 9696.

(107) *Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk. 4b, p. 8455; Bk. 102, p. 9696.

(108) The figures represent the years of their actual participation.

(109) The figures represent the years of their reigns found in the documents.

acceptable. In other words, the five kings of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions are to be considered as to have ruled their country before or after these six Shan-shan kings of Chinese records.

The occupation of Shan-shan by the Northern Wei 北魏 seems not to have lasted so long. Then Tun-huang was repeatedly attacked by the Juan-juan in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th years of Yen-hsing 延興 (472-474)⁽¹¹⁰⁾, and, according to the biography of HAN Hsiu 韓秀 of the *Wei-shu*, Bk. 42, pp. 893-45, there was even a plan made to move the Tun-huang garrison to Liang-chou 涼州 during the Yen-hsing era. And when in the last years of the Emperor Hsien-wên 獻文 (465-471) Khotan was invaded by the Juan-juan and sought assistance to the Northern Wei, they only encouraged Khotan by saying that they would train their troops for a year or two and that the emperor himself, leading his brave officers, depart for the rescue of Khotan⁽¹¹¹⁾. This seeking assistance on the part of Khotan, when referred to the account in the Annals 本紀, may be dated at the 1st or 2nd year of Huang-hsing 皇興 (467 or 468)⁽¹¹²⁾. And Juan-juan's forces which invaded Khotan must certainly have passed through Shan-shan. Again, at the last part of *So-lu-chuan* 索虜傳 of the *Sung-shu* 宋書, Bk. 95, p. 7025, it is stated that the Jui-jui 芮芮 (*i.e.* Juan-juan) subjugated such countries in Chinese Turkestan as Yen-ch'i 焉耆, Shan-shan 鄯善, Kuei-tzū 龜茲, and Ku-mo 姑墨, which must be the situation prior to 478 in which Sung fell. When all these situations are considered, we may conclude that, in the 60ies of the 5th century, the Northern Wei 北魏 had already abandoned Shan-shan which was occupied by the Juan-juan. By the way, the Northern Wei 北魏 established Shan-shan-chên 鄯善鎮 at Hsi-p'ing-chün 西平郡 or what is now Hsi-ning 西寧 in the 5th year of T'ai-p'ing-chêng-chün 太平眞君 (444). This was renamed Shan-chou 鄯州 in the 2nd year of Hsiao-ch'ang 孝昌 (526), but this Shan-shan-chên is a locality entirely different from Shan-shan near Lop-nor.⁽¹¹³⁾

(110) *Wei-shu*, Bk. 7a, pp. 8473-74 (6th leap month, 2nd year), 8475 (7th month, 3rd year), 8476 (7th month, 4th year).

(111) *Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk 102, p. 9697 (under Yü-t'ien 于闐)=*Pei-shih* 北史, Bk. 97, p. 13844.

(112) According to the Annals of *Wei-shu*, an embassy from Khotan came to the Northern Wei on the day of *jên-tzu* of the 9th month of the 1st year of Huang-hsing 皇興 (Oct. 18, 467) and another embassy in the 4th month of the 2nd year of Huang-hsing (May/June, 462) (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 6, p. 8470). So it may have been one of these embassies who came to ask for help against the Juan-juan.

(113) See HSU Wên-fan 徐文範, 東晉南北朝輿地表, p. 81 (二十五史補編, Vol. V, p. 6797) and CHOU I-liang 周一良, 北魏鎮戍制度考, in *Yü-kung* 禹貢, II, 9, p. 9. The date of changing the name of Shan-shan-chên into Shan-chou is based on the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 151 under Shan-chou. Some authors, including myself, confused Shan-shan-chên or Shan-chou of Hsi-ning with Shan-shan by the side of Lop-nor. See MATSUDA Hisao, 古代天山の歴史地理的研究, p. 163 note: ENOKI Kazuo in UJ., XXXIII, 1/2, 1961, p. 55 note.

Shan-shan which was under the sway of the Jui-jui 芮芮 during 460-70 was conquered by the Kao-ch'ê 高車 which had gained independence from the rule of the Jui-jui. The chapter on the Jui-jui 芮芮虜傳 of the *Nan-ch'i-shu* 南齊書, Bk. 59, p. 7610-11, says that *I-chou tz'ü-shih* LIU Ch'üan 益州刺史劉俊 dispatched CHIANG Ching-hsüan 江景玄 to the Ting-ling 丁零, namely the Kao-ch'ê, 高車, which had newly declared independence, and had made him propagate the prestige of Nan-ch'i 南齊. According to this, Shan-shan was defeated by the Ting-ling and the people all fled. From I-chou, *i.e.* Ch'êng-tu 成都, CHIANG Ching-hsüan went to Shan-shan by way of the Tu-yü-hun 吐谷渾, and then to Yü-t'ien 于闐 or Khotan. The tenure of LIU Ch'üan 劉俊 as *I-chou tz'ü-shih* 益州刺史 was from *chia-wu* 甲午 of the 1st month of the 9th year of Yung-ming 永明 (Jan. 27th, 491) to *ping-wu* 丙午 of the 2nd month of the 11th year of Yung-ming (March 29th, 493)⁽¹¹⁴⁾.

Soon afterwards Shan-shan and Ch'ieh-mo 且末 were occupied by the Tu-yü-hun. The exact date is not known, but it was certainly at the end of the 5th century or at the beginning of the 6th. Sung-yün 宋雲 and Hui-shêng 惠生 who got through Shan-shan in 518 (the 1st year of Shên-kuei 神龜) report that the Shan-shan city, which had formerly been ruled by its own king, was conquered by the Tu-yü-hun 吐谷渾 which stationed there *Ning-hsi chiang-chün* 寧西將軍, the second son of the king of the Tu-yü-hun 吐(土)谷渾 and that he, organizing three thousand *pu-lo* 部落 or communities, was protecting themselves against the Hsi-hu 西胡 or Western savages⁽¹¹⁵⁾. As to the city of Tso-mo 左末 (Ch'ieh-mo 且末) or Cherchen, they report that the populace within the city numbered about a hundred families; that as no rain was expected there, the water was dashed from the reservoir for sowing barley seed and that paddies were cultivated with ploughs without using cows; and say nothing on the relations with the Tu-yü-hun⁽¹¹⁶⁾. However, occupation of at least Ch'ieh-mo 且末 later by the Tu-yü-hun may be guessed by the phrase "their territory covered Shan-shan and Ch'eh-mo 地兼鄯善且末" in connection with the account of K'ua-lü 夸呂 who, on succeeding Fu-lien-chou 伏連籌, stood up proclaiming himself as *k'o-han* 可汗. It was after the 12th month of the 5th year of Chêng-kuang 正光 (Jan. 12-Feb. 10, 525) and before *ting-ch'ou* 丁丑 of the 7th month of the 1st year of Hsing-ho 興和 (Aug. 27. 539) that K'ua-lü ascended the throne and assumed the title of *k'o-han* 可汗.⁽¹¹⁷⁾

(114) *Nan-ch'i-shu* 南齊書, Bk. 3, Annals of Wu-ti 武帝本紀, pp. 7127-7128.

(115) The Western savages may mean the people of countries in the west and north-west to Shan-shan.

(116) CHOU Tsu-mo 周祖謨, *Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan-chi chiao-shih* 洛陽伽藍記校釋, p. 96.

(117) *Wei-shu*, Bk. 101, p. 9687; *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 83, p. 11701; and *Pei-shih* 北史, Bk. 96, p. 13835. Jan. 12-Feb. 10, 525, was the time when a rebellion took place in Liang-chou 涼州 (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 9, p. 8532) and its governor asked Fu-lien-ch'ou 伏連籌 for

The Tu-yü-hun's domination of Shan-shan and Ch'ieh-mo was interrupted in the 5th year of T'ai-yeh 大業 (609) when Yang-ti 煬帝 of Sui 隋 conquered the Tu-yü-hun and established two provinces Shan-shan 鄯善 and Ch'ieh-mo 且末. Besides these two, Yang-ti established two more provinces on the central area of Tu-yü-hun in the upper course of the Yellow River⁽¹¹⁸⁾, and engaged himself in the development of the new territory. The idea of conquering the Tu-yü-hun and establishment of the four provinces had been suggested exclusively by PEI Chü 裴矩⁽¹¹⁹⁾. As to the development, the *Shih-huo-chih* 食貨志 of *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 24, p. 11207, only says that all the convicts in the whole country were distributed as colonial soldiers and made them cultivate a great number of paddies, and their food was supplied by western provinces. The details are not known. The occupation of Shan-shan and Ch'ieh-mo lasted only from the 5th year of T'ai-yeh 大業 (609) to about the 12th year (616) of the same era when the country was splitted into several parts torn by rebellions.

According to the *Tu-yü-hun-chuan* 吐谷渾傳 of *Chiu-t'ang-shu* 舊唐書, Bk. 198, pp. 15380-81, as the power of Sui waned in its last days, Shan-shan returned to the Tu-yü-hun's sway. And in the 9th year of Chên-kuan 貞觀 (635), MUJUNG Fu-yün 慕容伏允 was defeated by the expeditionary forces of T'ang and the T'ang forces, after driving Fu-yün across Shan-shan and devastating Ch'ieh-mo 且沫 (且末) on its western boundary, returned; then No-po 諾鉢, son of Shun 順, Fu-yün's son who had been the hostage child of T'ang, was enthroned under the protection of T'ang as the king of Tu-yü-hun; in the 15th year of Chên-kuan (641), through the rebellion of Chên-hsiang-wang 丞相王, his subject, fled to Shan-shan-ch'êng 鄯善城; and with the cooperation of Wei-hsien-wang 威信王 of Tu-yü-hun who was there and *Shan-chou tz'ü-shih* 吐蕃州刺史杜鳳 of T'ang, he defeated Chên-hsiang-wang. Though this Shan-shan-ch'êng is represented as Shan-ch'êng 鄯城 in the *T'ang-shu* 唐書, Bk 221a, p. 16965, it must have been not Shan-shan 鄯善, but Shan-ch'êng 鄯城 which was near the former Shan-chou 鄯州 or what is now Hsi-ning 西寧. At any rate, it is evident that during the T'ang's conquest of the Tu-yü-hun in the

help (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 101 p. 9687). Aug. 27, 539, was the time when Hsien-wu-wang 獻武王 was appointed the prime minister (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 12. p. 8567) and urged K'ua-lü 夸呂 to pay respect to the court of Wei (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 101, p. 9687). These dates are only dates clearly known in connection with K'ua-lü's reign. HUANG Wên-pi 黃文弼 is of the opinion that the occupation of Shan-shan by the Tu-yü-hun occurred some time after 453 when T'ai-wu-ti 太武帝 of the Northern Wei died and the Wei was in such a disorder as they could not take care of Shan-shan in the westernmost part of their dominion (羅布淖爾考古記緒論第二章 quoted by FAN Hsiang-yung 范祥雍, *Lo-yang chia-lan-chi chiao-chu* 洛陽伽藍記校注, Shanghai 1958, p. 264). Though I have not HUANG's book at hand, it seems that he has not given the exact date.

(118) *Sui-shu* 隋書 Bk. 3. p. 10918.

(119) *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 67 (Biography of PEI Chü), p. 11582.

9th year of Chên-kuan (635) Shan-shan and Ch'ieh-mo suffered for some time from the invasion of the T'ang expedition, but they were again placed under the influence of Tu-yü-hun. And later, like the other countries in the Western Region, they were placed under the influence of the Western T'u-chüeh 西突厥, and before the power of T'ang, which overthrew the Western T'u-chüeh, fully came upon them, they were absorbed into the Tu-fan 吐蕃. The Tu-fan 吐蕃 had gradually become estranged with Tu-yü-hun during the Lung-so 龍朔 and Lin-tê 麟德 eras (661-665); and with its mighty forces, the Tu-fan attacked Tu-yü-hun, and, defeating the relief-forces from T'ang, came to occupy the territory of Tu-yü-hun. This was in the 1st year of Hsien-hêng 咸亨 (670), but in the same year the Tu-fan, cooperating with Yü-t'ien 于闐, attacked and captured Po-huan-ch'êng 撥換城 or Barkhuan⁽¹²⁰⁾ in the Aksu area of Kuei-tzû 龜茲, and the T'ang was compelled to abolish An-hsi ssü-chên 安西四鎮 or the Four Garrisons in the West for some time. The T'ang expelled the Tu-fan from East Turkestan and recovered the Four Garrisons in the 10th month of the 1st year of Chang-shou 長壽 (Nov. 17-Dec. 5, 692).⁽¹²¹⁾ Therefore, for the intervening 22 years, the Shan-shan area had been under the control of Tu-fan.

Thus the Shan-shan area successively suffered from the expeditions by YANG Hsüan 楊宣, general under CHANG Chün 張駿 (327-330), by LU-Kuang 呂光 (383-384), by CH'IEH-CHÜ 沮渠安周 and Wu-i 無諱 (441-442), by the Northern Wei 北魏 (445), and by the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 (芮芮) (467 or 468), as well as from the control of the Kao-ch'ê 高車 (Ting-ling 丁零) (?-491-492), of the Tu-yü-hun 吐谷渾 (?-518-608), of the Sui 隋 (609-616), again of the Tu-yü-hun, of the T'ang (635), and of the Tu-fan (670-692). These invasions of foreign forces utterly exhausted Shan-shan. Hsüan-chang, 玄奘 who travelled these parts in the 18th year of Chên-kuan (644), proceeded eastward from Niya 尼壤城, which then formed the eastern boundary of Khotan, and passed through Tu-huo-lo ku-kuo 覩貨邏故國 or the site of Tu-huo-lo, which corresponds to the present Endere, says as follows concerning the state of devastation: "Going 400 *li* and odd, I arrived at the site of the country of Tu-huo-lo 覩貨邏. It was deserted and uninhabited since long time and its walled towns were all in ruin"⁽¹²²⁾. And as to Cherven to the east of it, he says: "Going eastwards 600 *li* and odd from this (*i.e.* the site of Tu-huo-lo), I arrived at the site of 折摩馱那 Calmadana, that is to say, Ch'ieh-mo 沮末.

(120) P. PELLIOU *La ville de Bakhouân dans la géographie d'Idrîçî*, TP., 1906, pp. 553-556.

(121) As for the above description, see Tu-fan-chuan 吐蕃傳 and Annals of *Old and New T'ang-shu*.

(122) 行四百餘里, 至覩貨邏故國, 國久空曠, 城皆荒蕪, (*Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記, Bk. 12, ed. Kyoto University, p. 40)

Though the city wall remained solid and high, there was no sign of human life."⁽¹²³⁾ Hsüan-chuang went further northeast to the present Charklik or Mirān area, of which he only says: "Again I proceeded one thousand *li* and odd to the north-east and arrived at the site of Na-fu-po 納縛波, that is to say, the area of Lou-lan 樓蘭."⁽¹²⁴⁾ As to Na-fu-po, he says nothing about whether it was a deserted land or not. At this point both *Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記 or the *Records of Western Countries* and *Tz'ü-ên-chuan* 慈恩傳 or the *Life of Hsüan-chuang* close their description of Central Asia.

This being the case, a general survey of the history of Shan-shan from the latter half of the 5th century to the middle of the 7th century shows a succession of invasions and controls by foreign tribes, and it is impossible to expect such an age of prosperity as represented in the Kharoṣṭhī documents when the king of Shan-shan had his capital at Kroraina, ruling the area of the Niya site to the west. Therefore, it would seem difficult to assign the Kharoṣṭhī documents to any time of this period.

Thus, the five kings found in the Kharoṣṭhī documents, either from their name or from the years of their reigns, cannot be identified with the five kings found in the Chinese document between 331 (or 335) and 445 and the state of things in the country of Shan-shan from 445 to 644 do not agree with those found in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions. So the date of the documents, nay, the dates of the five kings found in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions must be assigned to some time before 330.

In the meantime, Yüan-mêng 元孟 (or Yüan-li 元禮), king of Shan-shan who surrendered to YANG Hsüan 楊宣 in 331 (or 335), might be suspected as identical with Vaṣmana, the last of the five kings of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions. As to Yüan-mêng, the biography of CHANG Chün 張駿 of *Chin-shu* 晉書, Bk. 86, p. 5413, says: "(CHANG Chün 張駿) once more ordered YANG Hsüan 楊宣, his general, to lead an army, cross the Moving Sands and conquer Kuei-tzū 龜茲 and Shan-shan. (This was carried out successfully.) The Western Regions thus surrendered (to CHANG Chün). Yüan-mêng 元孟, king of Shan-shan, presented a lady to (CHANG who) entitled her *Mei-jên* 美人 and built Pin-hsia-kuan 賓

(123) 從此東行六百餘里，至折摩馱那故國，即沮末地也，城郭靡然，人煙斷絕 (*ibid.*)

(124) 復此東北行千餘里，至納縛波故國，即樓蘭地也 (*ibid.*). PELLIOU takes 那縛波 Na-fu-po, *Navapa, as a Sanskritization of *Nop, which is written Nob in Tibetan documents of c. 800. (*JA.*, 1916, I, pp. 117-119 note: [*Notes on Marco Polo*, II, p. 770]). Professor MATSUDA Hisao 松田壽男 explains this name as a Sogdian word na'w^a+âp^a which means new water. (*Chûô-Ajiya-shi* 中央アジア史 *History of Central Asia*, Tokyo 1939, pp. 33, 34: [*Rôran* 樓蘭 (A Japanese translation of A. Herrmann's Lou-lan), Tokyo, 1963, p. 207]). According to the *Life of Hsüan-chang* (ed. Kyoto, Bk. 5, fol. 27b), T'ai-tsung 太宗, on hearing of Hsüan-chang's arrival, ordered the governmental officials at Shan-shan to meet him at Chu-mo 沮末 or Cherchen. This may mean that Shan-shan at that time was not a town entirely deserted but some officials were stationed there.

遐觀 to accomodate her.”⁽¹²⁵⁾ The same event is recorded in the *Chin-pên Shih-lu-kuo ch'un-chiu* (Ch'ien-liang-lu) 今本十六國春秋 (前涼錄) says: “In the 12th month (of the 8th year of Hsien-ho 咸和, Jan. 23–Feb. 20, 334), Yüan-li 元禮, king of Shan-shan, presented a lady named Chu-hao 殊好. (CHANG) entitled her *Mei-jên* 美人 and built Pin-hsia-kuan 賓遐觀 to accomodate her.”⁽¹²⁶⁾ It is given as Yüan-mêng 元孟 and assigned to the 1st year of Hsien-k'ang 咸康 (335) in the *Tzū-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 Bk. 95. It is not clear whether 元孟 or 元禮 is correct. If 元孟 should be accepted, 孟 would resemble *mana* in Vaṣmana. 元 might be a probable corruption of 𠂔 (pronunciation 跋 *pa*, **pat*) and a transcription of *Vaṣ*. Or judging from the instance of translating Vasubandhu as 天親⁽¹²⁷⁾, Vasu meaning deity, perhaps *Vaṣ* was also translated 天 and 天孟 was adopted for Vaṣmana and then corrupted into 元孟. If 元孟 were identical with Vaṣmana, the last year of the actual reigns of the five kings of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions probably extended as late as 334 (or 335).

As for the theories of dating the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions presented so far, A. STEIN assigned them to the 3rd century⁽¹²⁸⁾, THOMAS held that they could be brought down to 441⁽¹²⁹⁾, and I held that they could be brought down to 582–667 or 677.⁽¹³⁰⁾ The view adopted by most men was STEIN's⁽¹³¹⁾. His grounds were:

(1) That the Chinese documents excavated from the same site as the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions or from its neighborhood were of a period between the latter half of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th century;

(2) That the decorations of the buildings in the site from which the documents were excavated are of the Gandhāra style;

(3) That the Chinese coins excavated from the same site as the documents also endorse such dating;

(4) That the distribution of the places from which the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions were excavated agrees with the districts represented as those of the territory of Shan-shan in the *Hsi-shih-chuan* 西戎傳 of *Wei-liao* 魏略.

That the patterns of the seals stamped on the mud-seals of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions closely resemble the patterns of the coins of the kings of Bactria and their descendants should be added as another ground for endorsing this

(125) [張駿] 又使其將楊宣, 率眾越沙, 伐龜茲鄯善, 於是西域並降, 鄯善王元孟獻女, 號曰美人, 立賓遐觀以處之。

(126) (咸和八年) 十二月, 鄯善王元禮獻女殊好, 號曰美人, 立賓遐觀以處之. *cf.* *Shih-lu-kuo ch'un-chiu* quoted in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, Bk. 124 under CHANG Chün, in which the name is given as 元孟. So 元孟 may be right. I am wondering if 孟 *mêng* was taken as Skt. *man*-“to honour” and translated in Chinese by 禮.

(127) *Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典. III, p. 2922 c.

(128) *Ancient Khotan*, pp. 369–370

(129) F. W. THOMAS, *Some Notes on the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, 1934, p. 48 ff., especially p. 51. (130) See note (30).

theory.⁽¹³¹⁾

THOMAS cites Document No. 713 (N. iii. x. 4: *Innermost Asia*, p. 194, Pl. XVIII) sent from *cojhbo* Tagira to *ṣvaṭhaṅgha* Lṛpipeya: "And thus as follows I inform you:—In very truth now here matters unwitnessed previously, unprecedented, have taken place. These unprecedented matters, again, have all been settled: to the soldiers' wives all have been handled (taken ?) over, both those whom they have killed in battle and those whom they have handled over alive; there has been a decision of all matters. Through the mere hearing of this you may be entirely at ease."⁽¹³²⁾ (THOMAS' translation.) The letter proceeds to say that "I inform you that too much land at that place (*adra=atra*) at *Aji[ya]ma Avana*" and say about the prepraation for taxes which each of the writer's own farms should pay. Thomas wonders if the unprecedented events to which No. 713 refers were perhaps connected with the invasion of An-chou and the expulsion of Pi-lung in A. D. 441, or were they rather connected with the establishment of Lung-hui's 龍會 hegemony over Shan-shan sometime between A. D. 285 and A. D. 335.⁽¹³³⁾

Cojhbo Tagira, the sender of Document No. 713, is not mentioned anywhere else, but *ṣvaṭhaṅgha* Lṛpipeya is a name found in a large number of documents. As a tax-officers (*ṣvaṭhaṅgha*, *ṣoṭhaṅgha*) in the Caḍ'ota district, he was active from the 21st year of king Mahiri (Document No. 576) to the 7th year of king Vaṣmana (Document No. 604). *Aji[ya]ma Avana*, as known from Document No. 422, for instance, is the name of village in the Caḍ'ota district from which the documents were excavated. "At that place, at *Aji[ya]ma Avana*" here are understood, according to the usage of *atra* "at that place" as in the case of the reports and letters in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, to refer to the place where the receiver is located. So, this is a report to *ṣvaṭhaṅgha* Lṛpipeya at *Aji[ya]ma Avana* in Caḍ'ota concerning a crisis which happened at some other place. It should, have been an important affair, but it was a local happening and did not

(131) Sten KONOW also accepted STEIN's view. He first assigned the 3rd year of King Vaṣmana to 129 A. D. (*The Royal Date in Niya Inscriptions, Acta Orientalia*, II, 1928, p. 140). Later, in his *Rauraka and the Saka Document, Acta Orientalia*, XII, 1934, p. 139, he writes that Lou-lan passed away at the beginning of the 4th century.

(132) BURROW translates as follows: "And thus I inform you. Now they have performed here an unprecedented action, unseen before. This unprecedented action has resulted in everything being decided. The warriors(?) have taken everything. What with the people they have slain in battle and those they have captured alive, everything has been decided. Only to hear this you will be exceedingly pleased."

(133) The date of Lung-hui, king of Yen-ch'i 焉耆, is not clearly known. He controlled Shan-shan sometime between 285 (the 6th year of T'ai-k'ang 太康), when his farther sent him or his brother, if any, to the court of Chin (*Chin-shu* 晉書, Bks. 3 and 97) and A. D. 335 (the 1st year of Hsien-k'ang 咸康), when YANG Hsuan 楊宣 conquered Shan-shan, Kuei-tzū 龜茲 and Yen-ch'i 焉耆. Actually, Lung-hui was killed by a man of Kuei-tzū sometime before 335.

upset the whole of Shan-shan kingdom or its central region. Therefore, it would be an error to take it as the invasion of Shan-shan by CH'IEH-CH'Ü An-chou 沮渠安周 or Wu-i 無諱 or the conquest of Shan-shan by the Northern 北魏. The best reason for this is that, in spite of such a crisis, the letter does say about the preparations for taxes. Furthermore, if this was an affair which involved the whole Shan-shan kingdom, L'pipeya, an important official as *soṭham-gha*, with many influential persons among his relative and friends, was in a position to be far better informed.⁽¹³⁴⁾

My view that the date of the Kharoṣṭhī documents could be brought down to the 6th or 7th century, in view of the last tottering days of Shan-shan as the result of the repeated invasions and controls by foreign powers, would hardly seem acceptable. Therefore, I have revised it in the present paper and stated that the date should cover some 90 years or a century between about the middle of the 3rd century and the 30ies of the 4th century. As a conclusion, I have come essentially to approve STEIN's theory, but I hope I have introduced some new views in the course of reaching my conclusion.⁽¹³⁵⁾

Additional Note (See p. 139 note 37 p. 145 note 59a and p. 158):

The so-called LI Po documents had been considered as to have come out from the site L. A., as is recorded in *Serindia*, p. 377, 409 and 1329-1330, until July, 1954, when Professor MORI Shikazō disclosed that they were excavated from the site L. M. situated some fifty kilometres to the south-west of the site L. A. The site L. M. is a ruin of watch-tower or citadel of about 170 m. in length (north-west/south-east) and about 110 m. in width (north-east/south-west). This is based on the photograph of the site which Mr. TACHIBANA claims to be their finding place. See MORI Shikazō, *Ri Haku Monjo no Shutsudochi* 李柏文書の出土地 (*The site from which the Li Po Documents were excavated*), *Ryūkokū Shidan* 龍谷史壇, No. 45, July, 1959, p. 9-22.

If Mr. TACHIBANA is right, the term *hai-t'ou* 海頭 of the LI Po Documents has nothing to do with the appellation of the site L. A. and it should have been applied to the site L. M. However, it must be noticed that another fragment of letter in Chinese was found in L. A. by A. Stein in his third expedition in Central Asia, in which the term *hai-t'ou* is inscribed. See H. MASPERO, *Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie centrale*, London 1953, p. 78 (No. 252): LA. VI. ii 002: Pl. XII). So long

(134) A number of documents mention the existence of a number of blood relations and friends of L'pipeya, who might be able to provide L'pipeya with more detailed informations (*Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, III, Index).

(135) NAGASAWA Kazutoshi 長澤和俊, *Kharoṣṭhī Monjo ni tsuite* カロシュティエー文書について, *Shigaku Zasshi*, LXXII. 12, (1963), pp. 1-26, ascribes the date of the documents to A. D. 112-267.

as we can see from the Plate XII, the second character *t'ou* is not clear, but Maspero transtaes the main part of the text "*Le 5 jour, je suis (ou il est) arrivé à Hai-t'ou.*" If Maspero's decipherment and translation is reliable, this is a piece of evidence to show that the site L. A. was possibly called *hai-t'ou*. Under the circumstances, I am rather doubtful how much we can rely on Mr. TACHIBANA who claims the photograph as that of the site from which he excavated the LI Po documents.