

adopt a transcription 沙勒 Sha-lo (\*Ṣa-lək; cf. STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, I, 48). Various attempts have been made in China and in Europe to account for this name.

The oldest one is due to Hsüan-tsang, who, in a note of his *Memoirs* of 646, states that Shu-lo is an inaccurate rendering of the name of the capital, and that the correct form of the latter name is 室利訖栗多底 Shih-li-ki-li-to-ti (\*Śiṅṅ-lji-kjət-liṅṅ-tâ-tiei). JULIEN (*Mémoires*, II, 219) restored this as \*Śrīkrīṭati; if we abide by Hsüan-tsang's rules of transcription, the original ought to be \*Śrīkrīṭātī. Of course, Hsüan-tsang was himself mistaken when he tried to explain Shu-lo by the beginning of his \*Śrīkrīṭātī. The latter name, to judge from Hsüan-tsang's words, must be a sanskritized name of the capital, being some epithet beginning with śri-, «fortunate», though the second part remains unexplained. FRANKE's «Śrīkīrīṭadhi» (*SPAW*, 1903, 738; STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 50) is not acceptable. The variants mentioned by LÉVI (*BEFEO*, v, 261), and which have been taken into account by MARQUART, *Wehröt und der Fluss Arang*, 68, are valueless: the second 利 li is a wrong duplication of the first one, and 乾 ch'ien is a wrong duplication of 訖 chi.

Another explanation was proposed at the beginning of the 8th cent. by 慧苑 Hui-yüan, a priest of Hsi-an-fu, in his commentary on the *Avataṃsaka* (Lo Chên-yü is mistaken when, in his 丙寅稿 *Ping-yin kao*, 2 b, he identifies this Hui-yüan with a Tun-huang priest Hui-yüan for whom a document was written by Tu Mu c. 845; neither the date nor the place will fit). Finding the name Shu-lo in the new translation of the *Avataṃsaka* made in 695-699, Hui-yüan commented on it as follows (*Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, x, 121 a, 140 b): «The correct name is 怯路數怛勒 Ch'ieh-lu-shu-ta-lo (\*K'ja-luo-ṣju-tât-lək). This country (= China) has from old preserved it in the abbreviated form Shu-lo (\*Ṣi<sup>w</sup>o-lək), in which, moreover, the sound 數 shu (\*ṣju) was altered to 疏 shu (\*ṣi<sup>w</sup>o). This name, however, is the name of a mountain in that country, and the designation was made on account [of the mountain]. Moreover, the name is sometimes translated 'Kingdom of Wicked Nature'; it is because the nature of the people of that country is mostly savage and cruel.» The changes made to Hui-yüan's text in later compilations are few and unimportant.

S. LÉVI discovered this passage in 1902, and drew from it conclusions which were sharply opposed by O. FRANKE and PISCHEL (cf. *BEFEO*, II, 246-255; III, 339-341; IV, 543-579; *SPAW*, 1903, 184-196; 735-745; 1905, 238-248; J. HALÉVY, *Le berceau de l'écriture kharoṣṭrī*, in *Rev. sémitique*, 1903, reprint of 15 pp.). Two different problems were concerned: the restoration of the «correct» name proposed by Hui-yüan, and its application.

LÉVI had restored Ch'ieh-lu-shu-ta-lo to Kharoṣṭra. FRANKE and PISCHEL suggested \*Kaluṣāntara, or \*Kaluṣadhara, or \*Kaluṣottara, all entirely unlikely forms, which ought not to have been accepted, as they were more or less, in STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, I, 49. LÉVI's Kharoṣṭra is the regular original suggested by the Chinese transcription, except in two points: 怛 ta (\*tât) generally renders a form in -t-, not in -t-; 勒 lo (\*lək) is abnormal for -ra. LÉVI's explanation of the final character as rendering a locative Kharoṣṭre of the Sanskrit original is unfounded. My own view is that we have here to deal with an iranized form like \*Kharoṣṭrag. We can now appreciate better than thirty-five years ago the important part played by the Iranians in the diffusion of Hindu doctrines in China. The texts of the *Avataṃsaka* show a strong influence of