the small colony of Öch-toghrak occupied by Bugur cultivators and receiving water from the same channel still farther away to the south. The above observations and the information I obtained at Bugur suggested that cultivation could even now be considerably extended to the south if over-irrigation from the supply of *ak-su* were prevented and adequate drainage below Bugur-bāzār provided. At the same time the moisture which the soil all over this area receives from the overflow of canals and through periodical inundations from the Kök-chöl marshes might explain why ancient occupation, if it extended so far, has here left no remains above ground. Conditions here, as well as below Kuchā, were altogether different from those to be found along the southern edge of the Taklamakān.

Identification of Lunt'ai and Ch'ü-li.

It appears desirable to record here in some detail such data as I was able to gather, on a necessarily rapid passage, with regard to present conditions and natural resources in these three oases of Chādir, Yangi-hissār, and Bugur, because a comparison of them may help us to arrive at some reasoned conclusion on a question of historical topography-I refer to the location of the ancient territories that the Han Annals mention by the names of Lun-t'ai and Wu-lei. Lun-t'ai 輪臺, which modern Chinese scholars identify with Bugur, does not figure in the special notices which the 'Notes on the Western Regions', in Book xcvi of the Former Han Annals, devote to different territories of the Tārīm basin and adjoining parts; but it is mentioned there several times in connexion with the earliest phases of Chinese political expansion into that region. In a passage to which I have repeatedly had occasion to refer before, we are told that immediately after Li Kuang-li's successful campaign against Farghana (101 B. c.) 'military posts were established from place to place from Tun-huang westwards to the Salt Marsh; there were besides in the region of Lun-t'ai and Ch'ü-li several hundreds of military colonists; an imperial commissioner was placed [there] to direct [these men] and to protect [their cultivation] in order to meet the needs of envoys sent to the foreign countries '.5 Ch'ü-li 渠 黎 receives a separate notice in Book xcvi of the Ch'ien Han shu, and the indications there furnished have enabled me to demonstrate, as I believe conclusively, that Ch'ü-li must be identified with the area comprising the riverine tracts between the Inchike and Yārkand rivers from below Shahyār to the Konche-daryā.6

Notice of Ch'ü-li in Former Han Annals.

We hear of Lun-t'ai again in the notice in the Ch'ien Han shu on Ch'ü-li where a memorial addressed to the Emperor Wu-ti about the year 90 B. C. is reproduced: 7 'From ancient Lun-t'ai eastward, Chieh-chih and Ch'ü-li are both ancient States. The land is broad and fertile, and water and herbage are everywhere plentiful. There are about 800 acres of arable land. The climate is genial, the soil is excellent, and might be improved by drains and watercourses.' After referring to the means by which a sufficient supply of food-stuffs could be secured to meet Chinese require ments, it is suggested 'that military colonies might be placed at ancient Lun-t'ai and eastward, and three Deputy Protectors be appointed, to divide the defence of the country between them'. Among the useful results likely to result from this proposal it is mentioned that among the indigenous people those apparently leading a semi-nomadic life 'would tend towards the cultivated fields; and following their original vocation of rearing cattle, they would also clear the irrigated land'. The rescript of the Emperor, also quoted at great length in the same notice, negatived this request 'for troops to be sent to cultivate Lun-t'ai' on grounds clearly indicating a reaction against the 'forward policy' previously pursued by him at the cost of heavy sacrifices.<sup>8</sup> We are told farther on in the same notice that the proposal was subsequently taken up by the Emperor Chao-ti

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Chavannes, T'oung-pao, 1907, p. 153, note 2, where the corresponding passage of Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien mentioning the territory under the slightly different name of Lun-t'ou

is also quoted and elucidated; see also Wylie, J. Anthrop. Inst., x. p. 22.

6 Cf. Serindia, iii. p. 1236.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Wylie, J. Anthrop. Inst., xi. p. 96.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. ibid., xi. p. 98.