

one at the 'Tati' of v. As a reference to Appendix B will show, all these are *Wu-chu* pieces probably of the Later Han dynasty or uninscribed and clipped coins ascribed to the same period. Not a single T'ang coin was discovered at the site. In order to emphasize the significance of this fact it will suffice to point out that among the coins actually found in the course of my exploration at the Khādalik site not less than 98 belonged to T'ang issues and only 5 were *Wu-chu* pieces.¹⁷ Thus the numismatic evidence as to the earlier date of the remains at Farhād-Bēg-yailaki appears to me very strong.

The same is the case with the clay sealings. All three found were manifestly once attached to wooden documents, and the impressions on them are from gems showing either late classical workmanship or its immediate influence.¹⁸ Their type is closely allied to that of the clay seal impressions found at the Niya Site. Some value must be attached also to the architectural evidence of the double-bracket from F. II, which, as we have seen, represents a development of the form familiar from the Niya Site, but one decidedly older than that seen in the corresponding wood-carvings of Khādalik.¹⁹ Our knowledge of Buddhist pictorial art in the Khotan region is far too imperfect as yet for any safe conclusion to be drawn from the style of the few painted panels found at F. II. But my general impression is that they show the influence of Indian models more closely than the similar panels from Dandān-oilik or the fresco fragments recovered from Khādalik. On the other hand, there seems little or no difference in style between the latter and the wall-paintings found in the shrine F. XII.²⁰ Finally, attention may be called also to the marked distinction in material and character between the written remains found at the Farhād-Bēg-yailaki ruins and those from Dandān-oilik and Khādalik. At both the latter sites paper appears as the regular writing-material, whereas at the Farhād-Bēg-yailaki site the number of paper fragments is insignificant and wooden tablets predominate. Nor should it be ignored that all the written remains recovered from the latter are in Brāhmī script, while both Dandān-oilik and Khādalik have yielded up Chinese pieces also, and the second Tibetan pieces in addition.

Evidence of clay sealings, wood-carving, etc.

Regard for all these indications combined makes me inclined to conclude that the Farhād-Bēg-yailaki site must have ceased to be occupied a considerable time earlier than the settlements of Dandān-oilik and Khādalik, which, as we have seen, were abandoned towards the very end of the eighth century or very soon after.²¹ It is impossible at present more definitely to indicate the actual time when the site became deserted. But two observations should be taken into account as likely to help in fixing an approximate chronological limit. One is purely negative—the total absence of written remains in Kharoṣṭhī, a script which, as we know, continued in use within the Tārīm Basin down to the fourth century, if not even somewhat later. The other indication is of a topographical character and supplied by Sung Yün's narrative. This traveller, passing in A. D. 519 from Charchan towards Khotan, mentions the town of Mo 末城 at a distance of 22 li to the east of Han-mo 捍摩. Of this place M. Chavannes has proved that it was identical with Hsüan-tsang's P'i-mo 婢摩, and for its location at the site of Uzun-tati, north of Ulūgh-ziārat (or Ulūgh-mazār, Map No. 27. D. 4), I believe that I have advanced strong and convincing reasons after my first exploration of the site.²²

Earlier abandonment of site.

When recording this view I had already suggested that 'Sung Yün's town of *Mo* which was 22 li east of his *Han-mo* would . . . have to be looked for somewhere about "Old Domoko" or a little to the north of it'. A reference to the map (No. 31. A. 4) shows that the Farhād-Bēg-yailaki site corresponds to this location as closely as we can reasonably expect. Its northernmost 'Tatis' lie

Sung Yün's 'town of *Mo*'.

¹⁷ Cf. above, p. 159; also Appendix B.

¹⁸ See above, pp. 1247, 1250.

¹⁹ See above, p. 491.

²⁰ Cf. above, pp. 165 sqq.

²¹ Cf. *Ancient Khotan*, i. pp. 277, 283 sq.; above, p. 159.

²² See *Ancient Khotan*, i. p. 463, note 9.