

sufficiency of this explanation for the same use of a foreign administrative language might well be open to doubt.

Use of Prākṛit in Tārīm Basin.

In the present inadequacy of our historical data it is impossible to assert whether a better solution of the problem is to be looked for in the spread of Buddhism, which may have carried the language and script prevalent in the extreme north-west of India with it into common use throughout the Tārīm Basin; or whether in this adoption of a Prākṛit language, closely allied to that current on the Indus in Kuṣāna times, we ought perhaps to recognize a lasting impression left by that temporary extension of Indo-Scythian power from across the Pāmīrs of which we catch dim glimpses from Buddhist tradition in China.² But seeing the importance of the question raised, I feel all the more gratified by the fact that the conclusion first drawn on the spot as to the language and character of the Kharoṣṭhī documents from the Lou-lan Site is now fully confirmed by the careful examination which Professor Rapson has been able to make of them since my return in 1909.

Language same as in Niya documents.

The abstract of the contents of these documents with which Professor Rapson has very kindly supplied me embodies the main results of his decipherment down to December, 1916, and makes it perfectly clear that in character, language, phraseology, and other respects they show the closest agreement with the Kharoṣṭhī documents brought to light in so much greater numbers from the ruins of the Niya Site. Just as there, we have a variety of deeds, letters, official orders, lists, and the like worded in the same early Prākṛit dialect with an admixture of queer Sanskrit phrases in complimentary introductions, etc. Peculiarities of style, phonetics, and spelling leave no doubt as to identical standards having been followed by the *chancelleries* from Khotan to Lop at the period to which the records of both sites belong. Many, if not most, of the personal names which we meet in the Lou-lan Site documents occur also in the Niya series, though this does not, of course, imply identity of the individuals. Just as in the Niya series, we find numerous names of unmistakably Buddhist or Indian derivation, such as Anandāsena, Bhaṭiśāma, Bhimaya, Budhamitra, Dhamñapala, Kumudvati, Puṁñadeva, Caraka, Rutra, Sujada, Vasudeva, side by side with others which seem of local origin, e.g. Cauleya, Cuvalayina, Kapgeya, Kalpiśa, Kipṣa, Kitsaitsa, Lampurta, Maldraya, Porbhaya, Pulkaya, Signaya, Tasuca, Tameca, Varpeya. The official titles of Cojhbo, Guśura, Kori, Vasu are common to both Lou-lan and Niya records.

Personal Names.

Dates in regnal years.

The rectangular double tablets L.A. iv. ii. 1, 2, 3 contain deeds, and in accordance with the practice uniformly observed in such formal records are exactly dated in regnal years. But only in the case of L.A. iv. ii. 2 (Plate XXXVIII), which relates to a transfer of land by one Sigayita to a woman Kosena, can the name of the reigning king be made out with certainty. He is designated as *Maharaya Amgoka devaputra*. His name and style curiously recall the *Maharaya Jitu[m]gha Amkoṅga* [or *Amvaga*] *devaputra* mentioned in the dates of two rectangular tablets from Niya, N. xxi. 6. a, 7 + 4, full transcripts of which Professor Rapson's kindness has made available to me in the proofs of his and Messrs. Senart and Boyer's text publication now passing through the press. In view of what has been shown above as to the dependence of the territory of Ching-chüeh, of which the Niya Site represents the chief place, upon Shan-shan or the Lop territory,³ there is a temptation to assume that the same ruler is meant in the records of both sites.

Locality of Kroraina.

Though in L.A. iv. ii. 3 the year and name of the reigning king can no longer clearly be read, this document is of considerable interest. It contains a deed recording the sale of a piece of land by Camaka, a man of Kroraina settled at Calmadana,⁴ and conveying full rights of possession to

² Cf. *Ancient Khotan*, i. pp. 55 sq.; also above, p. 243. To the references there given may be added S. Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes* (reprint from *J. Asiat.* 1896-97), p. 63.

³ See above, p. 219. This dependence is attested by the *Wei li*, composed between A.D. 239-65, for a period which

immediately precedes that covered by the dated Chinese records of the Lou-lan Site.

⁴ For the identity of *Calmadana* with Charchan, cf. *Ancient Khotan*, i. p. 311, note; above, pp. 296 sq.