

to doubt, an original «munshee» (an Arabic word!) was proposed by EITEL (*Handbook*<sup>2</sup>, 186) and repeated by LEGGE (*Travels of Fâ-hien*, 58); an impossible derivation from Pers. *hwāyah*, *hōyah*, «master», started many years ago by WATTERS (*Essays on the Chinese language*, 358), has recently again found its way into a memoir by TAKAKUSU (*BEFEO*, XXVIII, 441); and the new *Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms* by SOOTHILL and HODOUS (p. 253) still proposes «*vandya* (Tibetan and Khotanī *ban-de*)».

It must be admitted, however, that Chinese Buddhist scholars of early date were also puzzled by the transcription. I ought rather to say the transcriptions, since, apart from the two spellings of *ho-shang* which are used almost indifferently and go back to the beginning of the 5th cent. (for instance in Fa-hsien's travels, LEGGE, 58, or in the 1st chapter of both NANJIŌ, Nos. 1117 and 1125, with the corresponding *yin-i* by Hsüan-ying, reproduced by Hui-lin), there is also a form 和 闍 *oh-shê* (\**yuâ-d'z'ia*; with a purely graphic variant 惹 闍 *ho-shê*), occurring in NANJIŌ, No. 1082. The translation of the latter work is of uncertain date (there is a contradiction between what NANJIŌ says in his notice of No. 1082 and his statement in App. II, 79; cf. also BAGCHI, *Le canon bouddhique*, 375; the attribution of the translation to Guṇavarman may be due to a confusion with the work of similar title described by BAGCHI, 373-374, as No. 1), but certainly prior to the 7th cent.

Hsüan-ying, who wrote in the middle of the 7th cent., seems to have taken it for granted that *ho-shê* and *ho-shang* were corrupt forms of *upādhyāya* current in «the kingdom of Khotan and others» (cf. *Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, VII, 36 a, 58 a, 66 a, reproduced in Hui-lin's more comprehensive work, *ibid.* IX, 146 b, 173 a-b).

The pilgrim I-ching, towards the end of the same century, gives a different explanation in his *Nan-hai chi-kui nei-fa chuan* (translated by TAKAKUSU, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion*, 117-118). His text runs as follows: «*Upādhyāya* . . . In the Western countries (西方 *si-fang*), when recklessly addressing (汎喚 *fan-huan*) men of great learning (博士 *po-shih*), people always call them 烏社 *wu-shê* (\**uo-z'ia*); this is not a duly recognized term (典語 *tien-yü*). In all the Sanskrit texts of the *sūtras* and the *vinayas*, the term used is *upādhyāya*, the translation of which is «the master [giving] personal instruction». The kingdoms of the Northern countries (*pei-fang*) all address [the masters] as *ho-shang*, with the result that the translators became accustomed to that corrupt sound (訛音 *ê-yin*).» There is no doubt, from what follows in the text, that by «Western countries» I-ching means India, and by «Northern countries», the 胡 Hu countries of Central Asia, mainly Iranian, but also «Tokharian». A later work quoted in ODA Tokunō's *Bukkyō daijiten*, 1853<sup>3</sup>, although evidently based on I-ching's text, gives the Indian form 烏邪 *wu-hsieh* (\**uo-z'ia*); it goes on to deplore that a term referring to lay scholars should have come to be used for Buddhist masters, and insists that the proper form to be used is 拔底耶 *pa-ti-yeh*. As a matter of fact, this other apheretical form of *upādhyāya*, unknown or almost unknown in China, has been more or less in use in Japan, where it is pronounced *pateiya* (cf. ODA Tokunō, 1452<sup>2</sup>; *Hōbōgin*, 58).

The same Hui-yüan who wrote the note on \*Kharoṣṭrag, a contemporary of I-ching, has a note on *ho-shang* (*Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, X, 115 a, 135 a; reproduced by Hui-lin, *ibid.* VIII, 139 b; used by Hsi-lin, *ibid.* VIII, 16 a): «The refined language of the Five Indies says *upādhyāya*.