

I have no doubt that for him « buckram » was actually a cotton-cloth. YULE may be right when he says that in many cases « buckram » was quilted cotton. This would be hardly reconcilable with the passage in which YULE makes Polo say that the Mutifili « buckrams » are so delicate that « they look like tissue of spider's web » (Y, II, 361). But this translation, still repeated by EVANS (*Pegolotti*, 415), must be abandoned; Polo speaks in fact of « linen-cloth of Rheims » (*telle de lino de Rens*; see « Rens »). I see no reason to favour MARSH's suggestion, quoted by YULE, that « probably two words have coalesced » in « buckram ».

The mediaeval forms which are at the basis of modern French « bougran », It. « bucherame », Engl. « buckram », are many. To judge from the finals, it would seem, as is said in MURRAY's *NED*, that the word was not adopted in English from the French, but from the Italian. The Spanish « bucarán » agrees with the French.

There is still some hesitation about the etymology of « buckram ». REISKE's *ابوقرام* *abū-qirām*, rendered « pannus cum intextis figuris », is an artificial compound, without any textual support. D'AVEZAC derived « bougran » from « Bokhara » (*Rec. de voyages*, IV, 524); this was accepted by HEYD (II, 703) and is adopted without reserve by LOKOTSCH (*Etym. Wörterbuch*, No. 342), and by BLOCH, *Dict. étymol.*, I, 92. YULE esteemed that « if the name be local, like so many names of stuffs are, the French form rather suggests *Bulgaria* » (Y, I, 48). According to MURRAY, neither « Bokhara » nor « Bulgaria » agrees with the early French forms. I do not see that any serious objection can be raised against « Bokhara ». The old French forms are « bouquerant » (not « bouqueraut » as in LOKOTSCH), « bouguerant », « boquerant », « boguerant » (to the forms already quoted by FRANCISQUE-MICHEL, add those in GODEFROY and TOBLER-LOMMATSCH), but the final *-t* does not seem to be etymological; the low Latin forms are « boquerannus », « bucaranum », « buchiranum » (DU CANGE), « buccaranum » (*W*y, 259), « bucheranus » in Z, « bocharanus » (in BRÄTIANU, *Actes des notaires génois*, 189), and even in French, Joinville writes « bouqueran », and F gives « bocaran ». YULE seems to have been influenced by the form « bougran », and it is true that French *bougre* (attested in 1178) comes from the name of the Bulgars, but, in the 13th cent., *bolyari* (> *boryali*) gave in French *borgal* (see « Bolgara »). The oldest French forms have *-qu-* rather than *-gu-*; on the other hand, the alternation of *-o-* and *-ou-* (pronounced as Latin *-u-*) is of no account, and we know both forms for the very name of Bokhara (see « Bucara »). Phonetically, the etymology with « Bokhara » seems to be unimpeachable, and I have no hesitation in adopting it. The name of another textile is supposed to be derived from « Bokhara ». It is that of the woollen material known in Osm. Turk. as *buhur čoha* (*čoqa* > *čoha*. « cloth »), adjectival form *buhurlu* (RADLOV, IV, 1808), *buhuraki*, « striped shawl » (BARBIER DE MEYNARD, I, 289), hence Rouman. *buhur*, « cashmere » (LOKOTSCH, No. 342).

YULE remarked (Y, I, 62) that RAMUSIO always wrote « boccassini » instead of « bucherami » and added that « bochayrani » and « bochasini » were coupled in a Genoese fiscal statute of 1339. Both words are used as synonyms in FRAMPTON's version from SANTAELLA (« Bochachims or Buckrams »; *Pe*, 26). This shows that RAMUSIO, like FRAMPTON, had no longer a true idea of the ancient value of « buckram », and knew it only as the coarse material which was also designated *bochasino*; the equivalence of the two words is given by MURRAY (*NED*, s. v. « buckram »).