

Tun-huang and Khotan was no longer effective, and to the period of local military government led by Ts'ao clan (曹氏歸義軍) in particular, when the Ts'ao ruling family in Tun-huang established a marriage alliance with that of Khotan, the family Viśa !.

Many points are still open to discussion for want of more solid evidence, but it seems to be appropriate to make some differentiation between the Khotanese-Chinese documents so far discovered in Khotan and Tun-huang.

### The Senavarma's Inscription

by Akira SADAOKATA

Bailey published Senavarma's inscription in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1980. It records Senavarma's renovation of the stūpa which was erected by one of his ancestors. Senavarma belongs to the Iṣ-maho family, which is thought to be Iranian, and thus his inscription shows the ardent concern of Iranian invaders about Buddhism.

Bailey's publication has aroused the keen interest of world scholars. Articles were written by G. Fussman (in *BEFEO* 71, 1982), B.N. Mukherjee (in *Asiatic Society Monthly Bulletin* X, 1, 1981) and R. Salomon (in *IJ* 29-4, 1986). The content of the inscription has been admirably clarified by those eminent scholars, even though the inscription is filled with difficult problems of palaeography and context.

Still some problems remain unsolved. I myself tried to re-examine the text. The main arguments which I propose as solutions not yet fully attained by former scholars are as follows.

(1) The line No. 3a of the inscription has "Vasuseṇa, son of Utaraseṇa, King of Oḍi from the Iṣmaho line.....he establishes this Ekakūṭa." It is already said in the inscription, without mentioning the name of Vasusena, that the stūpa was established and was furnished with great height, and so on. Former scholars were perplexed, being unable to understand in what chronological order Senavarma, Vasusena and others committed themselves to the stupa. I think that the above-

mentioned statement could be the content itself of a *dedicatory inscription* (\* *pratiṣṭhāpanikā*). Accordingly I should like to take the preceding word "avaśita" to mean "left", "remained" (< *ava* √ *śiṣ*), in place of "jeté à bas, détruit (*apāsita*)" (Fussman) and "destroyed (< *ava* √ *śi* or *ava* √ *śṣ*" (Salomon), thus understanding that the dedicatory inscription deposited by Vasusena in former times was safely recovered by Senavarma after the falling of a thunderbolt.

(2) The first part of the line No. 5a is paraphrased by Fussman and Salomon as "sarvasa jhaṇa-aṇuśaṣa-" and translated as "entire[ly]... through the benefits of meditation" (Salomon's translation). I would like to paraphrase it as "sarva-saṃyojana-anuśaya-" (all fetter-proclivity-).

(3) The first word of the line No. 6e is read "avayido" and sanskritized "apajitaḥ" by Fussman, and is read "avayidro" and sanskritized "abhaya-indra" by Salomon. I take the word together with the following "gati" to correspond to sanskrit "apāya-durgati" (miserable existence).

### The Road to the Treaty of Kyakhta

—The prohibition of Russian trade and the embassy of Izmaylov—

by Akira YANAGISAWA

Since the publication of "Ch'ing tai Chung Ê Ch'ianhsi tangan shih-liao hstianpien tiipien 清代中俄關係檔案史料選編 第一編 (Selections from Archives on Relations between China and Russia in the Ch'ing Dynasty)" (1981), I have re-examined the period from the treaty of Nerchinsk (1689) up to the treaty of Kyakhta (1727), utilizing these newly published sources. This study brings into focus the policy of Ch'ing government at that time, which scholars hitherto have not taken into consideration.

From 1717, the Ch'ing stopped receiving Russian commercial caravans at Beijing. Although their ostensible reason was related to troubles over trade itself, the real reason was that the Russians were constructing forts along the present northwest frontier of Mongolia. In other