

dialects in which the ś- had passed to s- as in the known Prākṛits and in Pali, but on forms *śambala, *śambali, *śammala (?), *śāmalī, *śābalī (EITEL's restitutions of *shan-p'o-lo* as « djambalā » [a mistake instead of *jambīra*] and of *shan-mo-lo* as *cāmara*, the first of which has passed into STUART, *Materia Medica*, 117, are of course wrong, and I have already corrected them in *TP*, 1921, 76; nevertheless, they have since been repeated in SOOTHILL and HODOUS, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms*, 313 a). My own impression would be that these forms provide the necessary intermediates between Skr. *śālmali* and Pali *simbali*, and that perhaps it is on account of forms like Pali *simbali* that mediaeval Vedic scholars have explained the Vedic *simbalā* as meaning « flower of the *śālmali* »; but this is a point which I have no authority to decide (I may remark, however, that J. BLOCH [*loc. cit.*] says nothing of Vedic *śimbalā*, and connects Marathi *sāṃvar* and *śeṃvri*, as well as Pali *simbali* and all modern dialectical forms, directly with Skr. *śālmali*). What I wish to establish is that all the transcriptions occurring in Chinese translations begin with ś-, not with s-, and that, except in one case, they are based not on *śālmali* itself, but on forms without an -l- at the end of the first syllable.

SO-LO. — This last double characteristic has some bearing on the question of the interpretation of 娑羅 *so-lo* (*śā-lā), which occurs with four or five different meanings in Chinese texts. Its most ancient and frequent use is to render Skr. *śāla* or *sāla*, *Shorea robusta*, a lofty hard wood tree famous in Buddhism because Śākyamuni attained *parinirvāṇa* between a pair of them (cf. *Bongo jiten*, 217; ODA Tokuno, 428, 812; YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², s. v. « saul-wood »). SOOTHILL and HODOUS (pp. 242, 323, 363) give alternative forms 沙羅 *sha-lo* (*ṣa-lā) and 莎羅 *so-lo* (*suā-lā), and the latter also occurs in TARANZANO, by the side of the regular one (*Vocabulaire*, II, 575, 576). But these forms have no authority. *Sha-lo* has been taken over from EITEL's *Handbook*, p. 139, where it was a misprint or an error; it would suppose *ṣāla (*śāla) rather than *śāla*, and moreover all the Chinese transcriptions are based on *sāla*. The second *so-lo*, as far as I am aware, occurs only once in ancient texts, as a rendering of Skr. *sāla*, in Tuan Ch'eng-shih's *Yu-yang tsa-tsu* (c. A.D. 860; *Chin-tai pi-shu* ed., *hsü-chi*, 6, 12 a); but our texts of the *Yu-yang tsa-tsu* are often corrupt, and since Tuan Ch'êng-shih employs the usual form elsewhere (18, 4 b), there is little doubt that he had also done so in the present case. The only exceptions to the first form indicated above are the cases when, as is so common in Chinese texts, the 娑 *so* of the transcription has been graphically corrupted to 婆 *p'o*. For *so-lo* in non-Buddhist works, cf. *Ch'i-min yao-shu*, 10, 47 a; *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 961, 3 b; *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 309 (but no distinction is made there between the different values of *so-lo*, and even *to-lo*, *tāla* [cf. *supra*, p. 432], is thrown in with *so-lo*). It may be that the earliest extant occurrence of *so-lo* in lay works is in the fragments of the 魏王草木志 *Wei-wang ts'ao-mu chih* (« Botanical notes by the prince of Wei », 3rd cent. [?]; cf. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Botanicon Sinicum*, I, 39); but the quotation in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 961, 3 a (it is not included among the fragments of the *Wei-wang ts'ao-mu chih* in *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu-tien*, 5, 7-8), which is extremely corrupt, clearly amalgamates a quotation beginning with « *so-lo* tree » and another from another source, referring to quite another sort of tree or bush (the 絳相 *hsiang*), this second text being altered from that of the *Kuang-chou chi* quoted in *Ch'i-min yao-shu*, 10, 46 b. In fact, the first text of importance comes