

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The following is the letter referred to on pages 1 and 36 of our Journal for 1892]:—

Dec. 12, 1891.

DEAR PROFESSOR DAVIDS,—As regards the occurrence of Buddhist sects in inscriptions, I would call your attention to the following documents and names, in addition to those mentioned in your article : (1) *Mahāsaghiyas* Karle, No. 20, Arch. Rep. W.I. iv. 112, *Savasaka* i.e. *Sauvarshikā*,¹ *op. cit.* p. 113, Karle No. 21, *Bhadāyanīya* Kaṇheri, No. 4 (Arch. Rep. W.I. vol. v. p. 75) and *ibidem*, p. 85, Kaṇheri, No. 27 ; *Chetikas*, Arch. Rep. South I. vol. i. p. 100 (see also p. 85), *Chetiavadaka* *ibid.* p. 102, No. 13 ; *Āchāryāṇām Sarvāstivādīnam* (parigrahe) in a Kādambavana or Kāmari inser. to be published in Ep. Indica, vol. ii. Mathurā Inscrs. third series, No. 42 ; *āchāryāṇām Mahāsāsakānam*, Ep. Indica, vol. i. p. 240–41. Possibly the term Mahāvanasāliya, which occurs repeatedly in the Amrāvati inscs. as an epithet of teachers, may refer to a Buddhist school. There are also Buddhist schools mentioned on the *Vardak* vase (see Dowson's article) and on Dr. Bhagvānlāl's Lion-Pillar, at least, according to my readings, but you will have perhaps Bh.'s article on the latter. In the inscs. of the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., i.e. in those at Sanchi and Barhut, about 400 Nos., no schools are mentioned, whence I infer that the schools had no great importance. I send you my article on the Sanchi inscs., which will appear in the

¹ These are either the same as, or closely allied to, the Kassapikā.—R.H. D.

Ep. Indica, vol. ii. Kindly return these proofs. With respect to Barhut, see Hultsch, vol. xl. of the *Zeitschrift dr D. Morg. Ges.* With best regards and the compliments of the season,—Yours sincerely,

G. BÜHLER.

KIMBUM (LUSAR),
1st March, 1892.

MY DEAR RHYS DAVIDS,—Having been detained in this part of Kan-mu for a few weeks, waiting to complete my preparations for my journey westward, I availed myself of the opportunity to visit the Salar, a Turkish people living on the Yellow River, S.E. of here some eighty miles.

Robert Shaw published some years ago in the *J.R.A.S.* some interesting notes about this people (he had met a couple of Salar in Kashgar, if I remember rightly). Prjevalsky mentions them, but confounds them with the Tibetans. Potanin passed through their villages, but I do not know what he learnt, as nothing of his work has been published (as far as I am aware).

The Salar traditions (their Ahars say they have no written records) state that in the third year Ming Hung-wu, three or four men, driven from Samarkand, (*sic*) arrived at the Yellow River, and founded the present Salar head village of Kätzu-kun. They had been driven from their country by internal discords. They were rapidly followed by others of their countrymen, and soon the eight *kun* (or thousands, for the Chinese *chim* has that meaning) were founded, and these Turkish settlements were henceforth known in this part of China as Salar pa-kun. The villages the people now occupy are probably 75 to 100 in number, and the population is estimated at 8,000 families at the lowest.

In the forty-sixth year Ch'ien-lung they rebelled under a Ahar called Ma Ming-ching. A narrative of this rebellion is found in Wei Yuan's *Sheng wu chi*.