

XI

KHOTAN STUDIES

By STEN KONOW

ABOUT twelve years ago Dr. Hoernle published¹ a series of ancient documents written in Brāhmī characters and an Iranian language. There was and is some uncertainty about the exact spot or spots where they were found. Some of them had been bought "from a Khotan trader Badruddin, who could or would give no information". Others were said to have been dug out from a buried town near Kuchar. The interpretation of these documents has not advanced much since they were edited, though we now know that they are written in the same tongue which is used in numerous fragments and MSS. found in Eastern Turkistan, and which has been variously designated North Aryan, East Iranian, Tokhari, and Khotanese. The alphabet in which these documents are written, on the other hand, is much better known now than twelve years ago. Dr. Hoernle has published² tables found in Central Asia and containing complete alphabets, so that we are now relatively well informed about the value of the different signs. Moreover, a comparison with other manuscript finds from Turkistan has shown that some signs were not from the beginning correctly transliterated. In the present connexion it is of importance that we now know that two different signs were originally confounded and invariably transliterated *ñ*. One of them, however, denotes an *r*-sound, and is now usually transcribed *rr*.

¹ *A Report of the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia*, pt. ii, pp. 30 ff., Calcutta, 1902.

² JRAS. 1911, pp. 447 ff.

Several of the Iranian documents are dated, but it has not hitherto proved possible to interpret these dates. Together with them were found Chinese documents carrying dates ranging from A.D. 768 to 790. Dr. Hoernle inferred from this fact that the Iranian documents belonged to the same period, and he was of opinion that they might have come from the buried site of Dandan Oiliq. The Chinese documents have since been published by M. Chavannes,¹ and it is curious to see that one of them mentions a petition written in "barbaric" language and hailing from the Khotan country. This statement seems to show that the home tongue of the Khotan people was used in public documents in the last half of the eighth century A.D. Moreover, one of the Chinese documents which is stated to have been dug out near Kuchar, and which is a certificate of payment of taxes, contains three Brāhmī akṣaras, *rā-hau-de*, which show that they hail from a part of the country where the Iranian language of the documents was used. *Haude* is a well-known word belonging to that form of speech and meaning "gave". *Rā* is therefore probably an abbreviation of the name of the person who did pay. I hope to be able to prove that Dr. Hoernle was right both in thinking that the documents belong to the Khotan country and that they should be dated in the second half of the eighth century A.D.

Two of the Iranian documents, Hoernle's Nos. 1 and 12, have an almost identical beginning. If we substitute *rr* for *ñ* in its proper place, No. 1 begins—

*om salī 10 7 māšto Skarhvāro hadā 5 hvam-no-rrum-
do-vi-śa-vā-ham ;*

and No. 12—

*om salī 20 māstā Cvātaja hadā 10 3 mye hvam-nā-
rrām-dā-vā-śa-vā-ham.*

¹ See M. A. Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, vol. i, pp. 521 ff.

The words containing the actual dates are quite clear and mean "year 17 (20), month Skarhvāro (Cvātaja), days 5 (13th)". The remainder has not yet been translated.

If we compare the two texts, we will at once notice that we in No. 1 often find *o* where No. 12 reads *ä*; cf. *māsto* and *māstä*, etc. An examination of the context of No. 1 will reveal the fact that the sign *ä*, which is so common in all other Turkistano-Iranian texts, does not occur a single time, but is always replaced by *o*. Thus, *ttoña beḍa* instead of *ttäña beḍa*, at that time; *ci-buro* instead of *ci-burä*, as many as. Now an examination of the plate will show that the sign which has been transliterated *o* is a simple curve above the akṣara. In the alphabet published by Dr. Hoernle, on the other hand, there is always an indenture in the middle. I therefore feel convinced that the curve does not denote *o* at all, but is a cursive way of writing *ä*, which is in other documents denoted by means of the curve with a dot to its left. In fols. 7 and 8 of the Aparimitäyuhṣūtra, which are written in cursive Brāhmī,¹ the sign of *ä* has in this way become almost like an anusvāra, so that e.g. the word *väsūde* was misread as *vaṃsūde* in the first edition of those leaves.

The beginning of No. 1 must accordingly be read: *om salī 10 7 māstä Skarhvārä haḍā 5 hvām-nä-rruṃ-dä-vi-ṣa-vā-haṃ*. It will be seen that the only difference in the last part of the legend from No. 12 is that the latter reads *rrām-dä* while No. 1 has *rruṃ-dä*, for *vi* and *vä* are, as we know from numerous examples, interchangeable.

Now *rruṃdä* is a well-known word. It is the genitive singular of *rre*, king, and it becomes probable that *rrāmḍä* in No. 12, which does not look like any known word in the language, is miswritten instead of *rruṃdä*. This supposition will be proved if it can be shown that the dates in Nos. 1 and 12 are, in fact, what the word *rruṃdä* seems to show, given in regnal years.

¹ See Hoernle, JRAS. 1911, p. 468 f.

If *rruṃḍä* means "of the king", we would naturally expect to find a nearer designation of the king in the word *hvaṃṇä* preceding it. We may compare *kalä rri*, the Kali king or, the king of Kali, in the Vajracchedikā. The form *hvaṃṇä* itself may stand for *hvannä* and for *hvanä*, for the anusvāra is in the documents commonly used instead of other nasals before consonants, and, on the other hand, it is quite common to add an anusvāra before other nasals. Now the T'ang-shu¹ and Hūan-tsang² inform us that, in the days of the T'ang dynasty the colloquial form of the name of the Khotan oasis was *Huan-na*. It seems evident that this *Huan-na* is identical with the word *hvaṃṇä* occurring in documents Nos. 1 and 12, and that they are accordingly dated during the rule of a Khotan king, and that this is actually the case will be proved when we consider the word following after *rruṃḍä*, viz. *visāvāhaṃ* or *vāśāvāhaṃ*. If I am right in translating *hvaṃṇä rruṃḍä* as "of the Khotan king", we would expect to find the name of the king in the next word, and if we remember that the name *Huan-na* of Khotan is only known from the T'ang annals and from Hūan-tsang, we would naturally think of a Khotan king during the T'ang period. Now the T'ang-shu informs us³ that the name of the royal family in Khotan was Wei-chih, and it has long been recognized that this Wei-chih must represent the word *vijaya*, which occurs as the first component of the names of Khotan kings in some lists which have been preserved in Tibetan literature, and which have been published by Mr. W. W. Rockhill,⁴ with additions by Dr. Thomas,⁵ and by Babu Sarat

¹ Ed. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*, p. 125, St. Petersburg, 1903.

² Stein, loc. cit., p. 153.

³ Chavannes, loc. cit., p. 126.

⁴ *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order*, pp. 230 ff. London, 1884.

⁵ Stein, loc. cit., pp. 581 ff.

Chandra Das.¹ If we now look at these lists we will find a name which seems to correspond to *viśavāham* in the documents, viz. the king whom Sarat Chandra calls *Vijayavahana* and Dr. Thomas *Vijayabohan chen-po*, i.e. the great. The letter ś in Turkistano-Iranian is sometimes used instead of j in Indian loan-words. Professor Leumann² mentions such instances as *pūśa* = *pūjā* and *rrāśa* = *rājā*. The curve under śa may well denote some shortening, so that *viśa* would naturally represent a Skr. *vijaya*. Finally, *vāham* is the natural representative of a Skr. *vāhana*; cf. *āysam* = Skr. *āsana*, seat. *Viśavāham* is therefore as near an approach to the sound in Skr. *Vijayavāhana* as we could expect, and there can be no doubt that we have here a welcome proof that the Tibetan lists must have some foundation in fact. Moreover, we must infer that the two documents refer themselves to Khotan, to the times of King Vijayavāhana.

It will be seen that the two Iranian documents thus conclusively show that the language in which they are written was the vernacular of the Khotan oasis. I think that it can be made almost certain that the same tongue has been spoken in Khotan since the beginning of our era. But then it will be difficult to adopt the ingenious theory of Professor Lüders,³ that the Turkistano-Iranian language was the home tongue of the Śakas. The Śakas do not seem to have been permanently established in Khotan. There are also, as I shall try to show in another place, some other features which militate against this theory. Provisionally, therefore, I shall stick to the name Khotanī suggested by Professor Kirste.⁴

¹ "Buddhist and other Legends about Khotan": JASB., vol. lv, pt. i, pp. 193 ff.

² *Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur*, p. 67, Strassburg, 1912.

³ "Die Śakas und die 'nordarische' Sprache": *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1913, pp. 406 ff.

⁴ *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. xxvi, p. 394.

The question now arises about the period when *Viśa-vāham-Vijayavāhana* lived. The historical information contained in the Tibetan list is so scanty that it is extremely difficult to arrive at any certain results, the more so because a comparison of the lists published by Messrs. Rockhill and Thomas on one side and by Sarat Chandra on the other shows that the Tibetan tradition is not quite certain. Still, we must try to arrive at some provisional result.

At the head of the Khotan dynasty the Tibetan texts place *Kustana* or *Salana*, who is said to have been born to the queen of Emperor Aśoka, and to have been carried off by Vaiśravaṇa to the king of China. Twelve years old, he then became king of Khotan 234 years after the Nirvāṇa. Though a similar legend is related by Hüan-tsang, and the story thus is evidently based on Khotan chronicles, it hardly deserves more credit than similar eponymous legends elsewhere. *Kustana's* son was *Ye-u-la*, who founded the capital of the kingdom, and he would consequently have to be dated at least two hundred years B.C. if the synchronism of *Kustana* and Aśoka could be accepted. The Annals of the Later Hans¹ inform us that, towards the end of the reign of Kuang-wu-ti (A.D. 25-57), the king of So-ch'e (Yarkand), having become very powerful, reduced *Yü-lin*, the king of Khotan, to the position of *li-kuei*. Now if we remember that both *Ye-u-la* and *Yü-lin* are not indigenous Tibetan and Chinese words, but attempts at rendering the sounds of foreign names, the striking similarity between the two words makes it extremely probable that they represent one and the same Khotanī name, and in that case *Ye-u-la* would belong to the first half of the first century A.D. This supposition is further supported by what the Chinese

¹ See for this and other statements in what follows Abel Rémusat, *Histoire de la ville de Khotan*, pp. 3 ff., Paris, 1820, and Stein, loc. cit., pp. 166 ff.

and Tibetan sources tell us about the successors of Ye-u-la and Yü-lin respectively.

The Han Annals tell us that during the period Yung-phing (A.D. 58-75) the Khotan general *Hiu-mo-pa* revolted and assumed the title of king of Khotan. He must accordingly be considered as the founder of the national Khotan dynasty. According to the Tibetan annals, on the other hand, Ye-u-la's son *Vijayasambhava*, who was born 165, or according to Sarat Chandra 65, years after the establishment of the kingdom, succeeded him. With *Vijayasambhava* begins a long series of Khotan kings whose names all begin with *Vijaya*. If there is any truth in the Chinese statement that *Wei-chih-Vijaya* was the family name of the kings, it is of interest to note that this *Vijaya* dynasty, according to Tibetan tradition, begins where the Han Annals place the foundation of the national Khotan kingdom. This constitutes one point of analogy between the Chinese and Tibetan sources. We hear of *Vijayasambhava* that in his fifth year Buddhism was introduced in Khotan. The Ārya Vairocana became the spiritual guide of the inhabitants and taught the ignorant cattle herders in the Li (i.e. Khotan) language and invented the characters of Li. Now there does not seem to be any reason for doubting that Buddhism, and I may add Indian civilization, was introduced in Khotan during *Vijayasambhava*'s reign. It is therefore quite natural that his predecessors have names which are not Indian. It seems also necessary to infer that *Vijayasambhava* or *Sambhava* is the translation of some Khotanī name which the king used before the introduction of Buddhism. If we remember that Khotanī *hamphuta* corresponds to Sanskrit *sambhūta* and *o* to *ava*, we would infer a Khotanī name *Hampfo*, and the Chinese *Hiu-mo-pa* can, so far as I can see, very well be an attempt at rendering such a name.

I therefore think that we can put down as almost certain

that Buddhism was introduced in Khotan in the third quarter of the first century A.D., i.e. about the time when the power of the Kuṣaṇas, who spoke the same language as the Khotanese, was consolidated under Kadphises. I do not think that this coincidence is a mere matter of chance.

After Vijayasambhava follow eleven generations, only two of which are mentioned by name. No historical information is given which allows us to settle their date. Then comes king *Vijayadharmā*, who is said to have been a powerful king, who was constantly engaged in war. Later on he became a Buddhist and retired to Kashgar. We know from Chinese sources that Kashgar had formerly developed great power, but that it became dependent on Khotan during the epoch of the three kingdoms (A.D. 220–64). It is then probable that this was the time of the powerful king Vijayadharmā. He was succeeded by *Vijayasimha*, and he again by *Vijayakīrti*, who is said to have carried war into India and to have overthrown Sāketa, together with King Kanika, or the king of Kanika, and the Guzan king.¹ Guzan here evidently stands for Kuṣaṇa, but we have no means for establishing the identity of the Kuṣaṇa king alluded to.

No historical information is given about the next ten or eleven generations. We are only told that Khotan was frequently invaded by enemies. Thus the Drug-gu king A-no-śos invaded Khotan and destroyed the vihāras as far as 'Ge-u-to-śan. Drug-gu can hardly be anything but Turks. It is evident that these generations of kings ruled during the years when Khotan was oppressed by the T'u-yü-hun (A.D. 445), the Juan-juan (*circa* A.D. 470), the Hephthalites (*c.* A.D. 500–56), and the Western Turks (*c.* A.D. 565–631). Then the Khotan king *Vijayasamgrāma* is introduced, of whom we hear that he carried war into

¹ See Thomas, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxxii, p. 349.

the territory of the Drug-gu and caused great slaughter. That can only mean that he lived when the empire of the Western Turks fell to pieces about A.D. 630. We are thus reminded of a passage in T'ang-shu which has been translated by M. Chavannes: "The family name of the king (of Khotan) is *Wei-chih*; his personal name is *Wu-mi*. Originally he was subject to the Tu-küe. In the sixth year Cheng-kuan [632] he sent an envoy with presents [to the Chinese Court]. Three years later he sent his son." Now I am unable to see any way of identifying the names *Wu-mi* and *Samgrāma*, though I think we must identify the two kings. We will have to assume that Vijayasamgrāma had another Khotani name which the Chinese have rendered Wu-mi.

After Vijayasamgrāma follows *Vijayasimha*, of whom we hear that he was a contemporary of an Arhat Dharmapāla. If his predecessor was Wu-mi, Vijayasimha would be identical with *Fu-tu Sin*, who sent his son to China in A.D. 648 and later on went there himself. Dr. Hoernle, who has been good enough to consult Professor Bullock and Mr. Parker about the word *Fu-tu*, informs me that the correct transliteration is probably *Fu-ch'a*, which seems to be another rendering of *Vijaya*, or, rather, of *Viśa*. *Sin* I take to be the Chinese rendering of the Khotanese pronunciation of *Simha*. But then Vijayasimha must be the king who ruled in Khotan during Hūan-tsang's stay there in A.D. 644, and Dharmapāla can very well be the famous teacher in Nālandā of whom we hear in the Si-yu-ki, and whose fame Hūan-tsang could have propagated in Khotan.

We are further introduced to some generations of whom I cannot make anything. We are only told about the religious buildings erected during their rule. Then we hear of another *Vijayakīrti*, during whose reign Khotan is said to have been conquered by the Tibetans. Sarat

Chandra Das states that this happened under the

Tibetan king Sron-btsan-sgam-po (died 650). That must, however, be a mistake, as the first Tibetan invasion of Khotan took place in A.D. 665. Vijayakirti must therefore be the king whom the Chinese call *Fu-tu Hiung*, who went to China about A.D. 674 and was honoured on account of his merits in fighting the Tibetans. There is not, however, any similarity between the two names. Chinese *hiung* is said to mean "masculine".

Vijayakirti's son *Vijayasamgrāma*, or, according to Sarat Chandra Das, *Vijayagrāma*, was killed by the Drug-gu during a visit to China. Fu-tu Hiung's son, on the other hand, was *King*. During his times there was some trouble with the Turks, A.D. 705-6, when the Turkish chief K'ü-ch'uo attacked Khotan. Also, the Tibetans began to be troublesome. We hear about envoys from King during the period K'ai-yün (713-41), and especially in A.D. 717. If the Sanskrit form *Vijayagrāma* is the correct one, we might expect a popular form *Gām*; cf. the name *Puñā-gām* occurring in the Iranian documents, and *King*, which is elsewhere used to denote Skr. *gañ*, might well be a rendering of this *Gām*.

On Vijayasamgrāma's death his son *Vijayasamgrāma* or *Vijayavikrama* was a minor, and the minister A-ma-la-ke-meg ruled as a regent for twelve years. During this regency we would have to date the king T'iao, who was in secret alliance with the Western Turks, and was, therefore, executed by the Chinese in A.D. 725. We have seen that Vijayasamgrāma is said to have been killed by the Drug-gu. It seems natural to infer that T'iao entered into alliance with the Turks in order to remove Vijayasamgrāma, and that he actually succeeded in bringing about his death, but was prevented by the Chinese from ascending the throne. We are told that in A.D. 728 the Chinese court placed *Fu-shih Chan* on the throne, and he is then probably identical with Vijayasamgrāma's son.

Dr. Thomas kindly informs me that Chinese *chan* can be a rendering of *saṃgrāma*. It is therefore probable that the name of Vijayasamgrāma's son was likewise Vijaya-samgrāma. The name Vijayavikrama, however, also seems to be used about him, and it may be assumed that he adopted that name when he became king.

Fu-shih Chan's successor was *Fu-tu Ta* (about A.D. 736), and he is evidently identical with *Vijayadharmā*,¹ who built a vihāra together with a Chinese minister or envoy Ser-the-sī. Then, we are told, the Chinese minister or envoy Ka-the-sī and King *Vijayasambhava* built a vihāra and a stūpa called Su-stoṅ-ña. Then *Vijayabohan* the great rebuilt this stūpa. This is the last king in Sarat Chandra Das' list, and it is just possible that the next entries in Dr. Thomas' list refer to the queens of the kings already enumerated. And, at all events, every mention of China now disappears from the lists. It is, then, a curious coincidence, which adds support to the chronology here adopted, that the Chinese notices about Khotan only carry us down to the same point. We hear that Fu-tu Ta was succeeded by *Wei-chih Kuei*, whose wife *Ma* was granted the title of princess in A.D. 740. Kuei cannot have ruled long, for his successor *Sheng* assisted China on an expedition in A.D. 747. He married a Chinese princess, and in 756 he left Khotan for good in order to assist the Chinese. He died in China, and his brother *Wei-chih Yao*, who began his rule in A.D. 756, was still on the throne in 786. One of these kings must then be identical with *Vijayabohan*, who must further be the King *Viśavāham* of the documents. Document No. 12 is dated in his 20th year. Neither Kuei nor Sheng ruled as much as twenty years, and we are thus necessarily led to the conclusion that *Yao* must be identified with *Viśavāham*. That would mean that we would have to account for two kings Kuei and Sheng, where the Tibetan list only

¹ The Khotanese for *dharma* is *dā*.

mentions one, Vijayasambhava. Dr. Thomas informs me that Chinese *sheng* means "to be adequate", "to sustain", "to be worthy". It can therefore well be a translation of *sambhava*, and we would have to infer that Kuei is not mentioned at all in the Tibetan lists. I do not think, however, that this difficulty is great, because the Tibetan list only mentions such kings as built Buddhist sanctuaries. It is possible that the designation *chen-po*, the great, used of Vijayabohan in the Tibetan list, is a translation of a Khotanese surname, which the Chinese have rendered with *yao*, glorious. He seems to have been the last Khotan king who asserted his independence against the Tibetans. After his time Khotan passed under the rule of the king of Tibet, as mentioned in a "prophecy" handed down in Tibetan literature.¹

My analysis of the Tibetan lists of Khotan kings has thus led to the result that the documents of the 17th and 20th years of *Viśavāham* belong to the same time as the Chinese documents found together with them, as was supposed by Dr. Hoernle. It is probable that the remaining documents are about contemporaneous, as the same personal names occur in many of them. Thus, *Añjām* in No. 4 is evidently identical with *Añjai* in No. 9; *Arsāli* in No. 9 with *Arsalam* in No. 12; *Brīyāsī* in No. 1 with *Brīyyāsī* in No. 9; cf. further *Budaśām* and *Hatkam* in Nos. 1 and 13; *Jsaṣsakā* in Nos. 9, 11, 13; *Mahvetari*, No. 9, and *Mahvittarā*, No. 18; *Maiyadatā*, No. 9, and *Mayadattā*, No. 13; *Ñuhadattā*, Nos. 13 and 17; *Phemkruki*, Nos. 9, 13, 15, 17, 48; *Puñagām*, Nos. 1, 9, 15, 48; *Śalā*, No. 9, and *Śalām*, No. 17. We can, therefore, safely conclude that the remaining documents which mention a year (*salī*) also belong to the reign of *Viśavāham*. These are² the years 1 in No. 15, 5 in

¹ Sarat Chandra Das, JASB. vol. lv, pt. i, p. 199 f.

² Dr. Hoernle has been good enough to give me revised readings of the dates occurring in the documents. No. 15, which was originally

No. 14, 11 in No. 2, 17 in No. 1, 20 in Nos. 10, 12, 13, and 22 in No. 9. If *Viśavāham's* reign is dated from A.D. 756, these dates would range from 756 to 778, while the dated Chinese documents cover the period 768–90.

Some documents are not dated in years, *salī*, but in *kṣāṇas*, and one was originally said to be dated in both, viz. in the 19th *kṣāṇa*, and the 20th year. Dr. Hoernle, however, now informs me that this was a mistake, and that the following is the state of affairs :—

No. 8 is dated *17mye kṣāṇā śauṣacū salya*, where *śauṣacū* cannot be a numeral, and does not look like any Khotanī word which I know.

No. 10 consists of two parts: The first is dated “on the 20th day of the month *Ñāhaja*, in the 20th year”, and the second “*kṣāṇa* in the 20th year”.

No. 11 is dated “on the 23rd day of the month *Khaysāja*, in the 19th *kṣāṇi*”.

It will be seen from No. 10 that the two dates are referred, one to the 20th year and the other to *kṣāṇi* the 20th year. It here seems as if *salī* and *kṣāṇi salī* denote one and the same thing. In No. 11, which is dated in the 19th *kṣāṇi*, a person *Jsajsaka* is mentioned, who is evidently the same person who occurs in No. 9 from the 22nd year (*salī*) and No. 13 from the 20th. It therefore seems as if *kṣāṇi* in No. 11 signifies the same thing as *salī* in Nos. 9 and 13. It becomes impossible to think, as originally suggested by Dr. Hoernle, that *kṣāṇa* means some greater period, a kind of cycle.

Now it seems evident that *kṣāṇa* means the same thing as the word *kṣum* which occurs in a series of documents

said to be dated in the 6th year, has the date *śśauṣacū salya paḍanyse*, i.e. in the first year *śśauṣacū*; No. 3, which was said to mention the third year, gives month and day and then goes on *Hvaṃ[n]ā rramdā* (i.e. *rrumdā*) *Vāśavāham śśauṣanirā salya*, in the *śśauṣanirā* year of the Khotan king *Viśavāham*, where *śśauṣanirā* must be connected with *śśauṣacū* in No. 15.

hailing from the neighbourhood of Kuchar and written in the language which most scholars have hitherto called Tokhari B, but which we now will have to designate Kucharī. In a masterly paper Professor Lévi has shown¹ that this *kṣum* denotes regnal years, counted from the beginning of the reign of a Kuchar king. The ordinary word for "year" in Kucharī is *pikul*, and *kṣum* does not seem to be a Kucharī word at all. Its use, however, seems to be exactly similar to the use of *kṣāna* in the Iranian documents, and this word must accordingly have a similar meaning. A suitable etymology, then, at once presents itself. *Kṣāna* must be derived from the base in Zd. *χšāy*, from which we have Soghdian *χšāvan*, might; *χšēvanē*, king,² Persian *šāh*. As pointed out by Professor Reichelt,³ Iranian *χš* is often written in the Indian way, *kṣ*; f.i. *kṣīra*, Zd. *šōiθra*. *Kṣāna* might be an ordinary present participle, just as we find *ṣtāna*, standing, being, from *ṣta*. But in that case we would expect an oblique singular *kṣānye*. It is, therefore, more likely that *kṣāna* is a noun meaning "rule", "reign", and *kṣānā salī* would then mean "year of the rule", "regnal year".

This reckoning by regnal years in a Chinese dependency is probably an imitation of the Chinese regnal periods, the *nien-hao*. It is also possible that we find traces of the use of devices of these periods as in Chinese. Thus we hear that the year A.D. 940 is designated as the 29th year T'ung-ch'ing, and Sir Aurel Stein⁴ has maintained that this designation relates to the use of some local era. It is, however, more likely that T'ung-ch'ing was the device of the period of the then ruling king Li Sheng-t'ien. Similarly the word *ṣauṣacū* in No. 8, which also occurs in No. 15, and the word *ṣṣauṣanīrū* in No. 3,

¹ *Journal Asiatique*, 1913, pp. 311 ff.

² See Staël-Holstein, p. 84, n. 2, above.

³ *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*, vol. i, p. 27.

⁴ Stein, loc. cit., p. 179.

which is evidently connected, may have been the device of Viśavāhaṃ's reign. I offer this explanation with considerable diffidence, the more so because I am unable to suggest any explanation of the words *ṣṣauṣacū* and *ṣṣauṣanīrā*. It seems, however, probable that *kṣāṇa* does not denote a cycle of any definite length, but "reign", "rule", and refers itself to regnal periods in imitation of the *nien-hao*. But if that is so the word is Iranian, and Kuchari *kṣum*, which is apparently used in the same way, is borrowed from *kṣāṇa*. This is not in itself improbable, for there are apparently also other instances of loans by Kuchari from Khotani. Thus Kuchari *ṣamāne*, a *śramaṇa*, has probably come to Kuchar through a language of the same kind as Khotani, where *ṣ* regularly corresponds to Aryan *śr* and where the word *ṣamana* is common, be it that this language was Khotani itself or the language of the Yüe-chi, from whom the Chinese are said to have received or heard of Buddhist sūtras in 2 B.C.¹

¹ See Franke, "Zur Frage der Einführung des Buddhismus in China": Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin, Jahr. xiii, Abt. i, pp. 3 ff.