

But in the vulgar practice of those countries (*i. e.* India), [the *upādhyāya*] are called 殭社 *wu-shê* (**uət-źia*; *yün*[殭]-*shê* in EITEL and LEGGE is a misreading). In Khotan and Shu-lo (Kāšyar), people say 鳥社 *hu-shê* (**yuət-źia*). Now this country (*i. e.* China), with a corrupt sound, says *ho-shang*. . . »

At the end of the 8th cent., the pilgrim Wu-k'ung came back from India; while in Kashmir, he had become a full monk. Speaking of his *upādhyāya*, the biography inserted at the beginning of the translation of one of the works he had brought back from India says that «at 安西 An-hsi, [for *upādhyāya*] people say *ho-shang*» (*JA*, 1895, II, 353); since the protectorate of An-hsi had its seat at Kučā, CHAVANNES concluded (*TP*, 1904, 380) that the form *ho-shang* had originated there.

A last text remains to be mentioned. Tsan-ning, who compiled by Imperial order the great collection of Buddhist biographies called *Sung kao-sêng chuan* (NANJIŌ, No. 1495), completed in 988, wrote a final dissertation to conclude the biographies of the translators. We find in it the following passage (*Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 致, IV, 81 a; cf. LÉVI, in *BEFEO*, IV, 562-563): «For instance, the Sanskrit says *upādhyāya*, Shu-lo (Kāšyar) says *hu-shê* (**yuət-źia*), and Khotan, *ho-shang*. . . » Here, a form is expressly stated to be the one used in Kāšyar, and this is the reason for the present notes on *upādhyāya*. But is the form *hu-shê* specifically Kashgarian?

First of all, I-ching was mistaken when he distinguished *wu-shê* from *upādhyāya*. If «men of great learning» (*po-shih*) were popularly addressed in India by a Prākṛit form of *upādhyāya*, it is the exact counterpart of what occurred in Central Asia when the same *po-shih* used in I-ching's text passed into Uighur as *baḥṣi* and became a designation of Buddhist masters (see «Bacsi»). Hui-yüan, who had not travelled in India like I-ching, had however in the present case a more correct idea of the real facts. I-ching's *wu-shê* (**uo-źia*) would suppose **ũjhā*, and Hui-yüan's *wu-shê* (**uət-źia*), **ũjhā*; that is to say, the reduction is stronger than in the ordinary Prākṛit form *uvaḥhā*; but *uḥhā* is precisely another attested Prākṛit form of *upādhyāya* (cf. PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*, pp. 116-117).

On the other hand, the note in Wu-k'ung's biography is not to be understood, as it was by CHAVANNES, as meaning that the form *ho-shang* started from Kučā. As it is clear from a following sentence concerning *karmācārya*, the biographer, when speaking of An-hsi, means the whole territory of An-hsi and the Four Garrisons, which include Khotan and Kāšyar as well as Kučā. As a matter of fact, the forms of *upādhyāya* known in «Tokharian I» are *ūpādhyā-*, *upādhyā-*, *opādhyā-* (SIEG and SIEGLING, *Tocharische Grammatik*, §§ 93, 121, 149), that is to say, are not based on the Prākṛit forms, and I see no reason why the case should have been different in the closely cognate Kuchean. All that we can conclude from the note in Wu-k'ung's biography is that the form *ho-shang* was current in part at least of western Chinese Turkestan. We naturally turn then to Kāšyar and Khotan.

We have no text in Kashgarian, and I do not find a form of *upādhyāya* in the published texts in Khotanese. The *hu-shê* (**yuət-źia*) which Hui-yüan gives as the form in Khotanese and in Kashgarian would suppose **uḥhā*, and *ho-shang*, which he gives as a Chinese corruption of *hu-shê*, would be **vahā*; in other words, the Chinese «corrupt» form would come nearer the classical Prākṛit *uvaḥhā* than the intermediate form from which it is supposed to have been