

the original passage where *shan-p'o* occurs; it looks as if the two characters followed each other in a *dhāraṇī*, and anyhow this has no bearing on the sense of the pseudo-*shan-p'o* as meaning *mu-mien*. Fa-yün's source is the other passage (ch. 2), where Hsüan-ying uses *shan-p'o* as a catchword and, after having given the pronunciation of *shan*, adds that «in [Chinese] translation, [the term] would be *mu-mien* ('cotton')» (*Tripit.*, *ibid.* VII, 5 b). But the work commented upon is the *Parinirvāṇasūtra*, ch. I (NANJIŌ, No. 113), in which the text (*Tripit.*, 盈, v, 6 a) speaks not of *shan-p'o*, but of a king of the *Asura* called 睒婆利 *Shan-p'o-li* (*Śjām-b'uâ-lji); the same form occurs in the so-called «southern» version (NANJIŌ, No. 114; *Tripit.*, *ibid.* VII, 7 b), and Hui-lin, in his *yin-i* of that «southern» version (ch. 25; *Tripit.*, 爲, VIII, 158 a) correctly gives *Shan-p'o-li*, with the explanation: «It is the God of cotton» (木綿神也; the 大 *ta* of our editions is a graphic corruption of 木 *mu*). So Hsüan-ying, who was mainly concerned with the pronunciation of *shan* and generally eschewed lengthy catchwords, was content, in writing the name of the king of the *Asura* *Shan-p'o-li*, with quoting only the first two characters of his name; Fa-yün blindly copied his note; and, as a consequence, the apocopate name of a king of the *Asura* has unduly become a pseudo-designation of cotton in Chinese and European lore.

Moreover, Hsüan-ying's and Hui-lin's explanations are most probably wrong, and *Shan-p'o-li* represents not a name Śālmali, but a Prākṛit form *Śambari of Śambara, the name of a well-known king of the *Asura* (cf. *TP*, 1921, 78). It is nevertheless clear that the error was only possible if the Chinese scholiasts knew the *śālmali* under a form of the name which was more or less like *Shan-p'o-li*. I have discussed at some length the transcriptions of *śālmali* in a paper (*TP*, 1921, 79-81) to which I shall now have much to add; in particular, I have collected a number of Buddhist texts which associate the *garuḍa* with the *śālmali* or *kuṭaśālmali*, whereas in 1921 I could quote on this point from the *Rāmāyaṇa* only (in CHAVANNES, *500 Contes*, II, 288, «çambara?» is to be corrected «śālmali»). Without entering into a detailed examination of the problem, I may now state with certainty that the «cave of 苦婆羅 *Shan-p'o-lo* (*Śjām-b'uâ-lâ), the places 睒婆梨 *Shan-p'o-li* and 苦摩羅 *Shan-mo-lo* (*Śjām-muâ-lâ), and the tree 苦末羅 *shan-mo-lo* (*Śjām-muât-lâ) of my paper all represent, if not *śālmali*, at least a word the correspondent of which, in a Sanskrit text, would be *śālmali*. To these I can add 設拉末梨 *shê-la-mo-li* (*śjât-lât-muât-lji; *Bongo jiten*, 251), 舍摩利 *shê-mo-li* (*śja-muâ-lji; *ibid.* 223), 舍婆利 *shê-p'o-li* (*śja-b'uâ-lji; *ibid.* 223), 睒摩羅 *shan-mo-lo* (*Tripit.*, 昃, IX 103 a), 賒摩利 *shê-mo-li* (*śja-muâ-lji; *ibid.*, 辰, I, 30 a, 74 a), 奢摩離 *shê-mo-li* (*śja-muâ-lji; *ibid.* 46 b, 90 b). In Sanskrit, apart from *śālmali*, there is also a Vedic word *śimbalá*, said to mean the flower of the *śālmali*; the Prākṛit forms of the latter word are *sāmalī*, *sāmarī*; Sanskrit scholars are agreed to attach to Vedic *śimbalá* the Pali name of the *śālmali*, *simbali* (cf. UHLENBECK, *Kurzgefasstes Etymol. Wörterbuch*, 306, 310; PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*, § 109; T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, *Pali-English Dictionary*, 170). The modern Hindustani form is *sāmal* or *sāmbhal*, hence the Anglo-Indian *seemul* (cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson* ², 807; for other forms of modern Indian dialects, cf. J. BLOCH, *La formation de la langue marathe*, 420, 426; contrary to SCHLEGEL, *Siamese Studies*, Supplement to *TP*, 1902, 62, 83, 84, I doubt that Siamese *sāmlī*, «carded cotton», is traceable to *śālmali*, because the change in meaning would be hard to explain). Apart from *shê-la-mo-li*, it is clear that the Chinese transcriptions are based neither on *śālmali* itself, nor on