

«Fu-tu». The character 闍 has two pronunciations, *tu* (**tuo*) and *shê* (**d'z'ia*), but it occurs in transcriptions thousands of times, and it has never been found to be used in these transcriptions with any other value than *shê*. Its regular value in transcription is *ja* (or *jä*); LÉVI was absolutely right on this point. There is something more. In the name of one of the Khotanese kings, the texts give as the first two characters not Fu-shê, but 伏師 Fu-shih (**B'juk-si*), which in all likelihood is the rendering of a dialectical pronunciation of the same name or title (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 127, 207, 273; *TP*, 1904, 48); but, although *shih* (**si*) has no *tu* reading, THOMAS adds *tu* between brackets as an alternative sound after *shih* (*Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 162); this is clearly impossible.

Although I agree with LÉVI that the second character must be read *shê*, with a transcription value *ja*, I am in great doubt as to his correction of the first character as 吠 *fei* (**b'iwvi*). It is true that this character occurs in transcriptions, but in rendering *ve* or *vai* rather than *vi*. What is more important is that Fu-shê, and for one king Fu-shih, occur in a number of Khotanese royal names, in both dynastic T'ang histories, in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, and in the *T'ang hui yao* (73, 23 a), and there is not one instance in which *fei* is used instead of *fu*. My conclusion is that we must retain Fu-shê. If this is, as I think, another transcription of Vijaya, Vi a or the like, we may imagine different solutions. One would be that the vowel of the first syllable was slurred and that the use of the first character with a final consonant chosen by a Court interpreter who was not, like Hsüan-tsang, a trained phonetician, was intended to render something like **Vijä* or **Viši*. Another hypothesis would be to read *fu* with its other and less usual pronunciation **b'iqu*. In such a case, **B'iqu-d'z'ia* or **B'iqu-si* would render **Vujä* or **Vuši*, both forms in which the initial labial consonant has developed after it a labial vowel as in Skr. *viṣaṇa* > Arab. *buṣan*. At the present state of our knowledge it would be premature to try to choose between the two explanations.

But, while I believe that Fu-shê and Fu-shih are only other transcriptions of the name Vijaya adapted somewhat earlier as Yü-ch'ih, a serious difficulty remains which LÉVI, KONOW and THOMAS have overlooked. Since both Yü-ch'ih and Fu-shê or Fu-shih represent Vijaya, we ought not to find names in which both forms occur simultaneously. We find, however, Yü-ch'ih Fu-shih (without the last character of the name, the one which is really personal) in *Chiu T'ang shu*, 198, 8 a, and in *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* (cf. *TP*, 1904, 48), Yü-ch'ih Fu-shih Chan in *Hsin T'ang shu* (CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 127), Yü-ch'ih Fu-shê Ta and Yü-ch'ih Fu-shê Hsiung in *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* (cf. *TP*, 1904, 23, 24; p. 56, CHAVANNES's index is misleading as it gives Fu-t'u [屠] as if it were the actual reading in both passages; but this *t'u* is only a clerical error for 闍 *shê* in the text translated, p. 23; in that of p. 24, the text has *shê* as usual; moreover, the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* correctly gives twice Fu-shê Hsiung in ch. 999, 8 b, 9 a, for two embassies of 674 and 687 respectively, overlooked by CHAVANNES). If we had only the case of Yü-ch'ih Fu-shih or Yü-ch'ih Fu-shih Chan, we might suppose that, in spite of what seems natural, Fu-shih is not the same as Fu-shê, and that Fu-shih or Fu-shih-chan really is the personal name of that king. But the solution would not be possible for the Yü-ch'ih Fu-shê Ta and the Yü-ch'ih Fu-shê Hsiung of the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*. I incline to the following explanation: since the current notices of Khotan give, from the beginning of the T'ang dynasty, the family