

Peninsula, II, 566 : Těmbi *kabu*, Jělai *kabu'* [*kabuk*]; but Marathi *kapūs*, Guzrati *kāpus*, Singhalese *kapu* are attached to *karpāsa* in BLOCH, *loc. cit.*, and so is Maldiv. «capa» [PYRARD DE LAVAL, GRAY transl. II, 416] now *kafa*). Apart from the fact that the hypothesis of a **ḍās* root is arbitrary, my main objections to PRZYLUSKI's theory are that the cultivation of cotton began more probably in India than in Indo-China, and that all the forms of the *kāpas* type can easily be accounted for by starting from the Pali *kappāsa*, the *-pp-* of which is regularly the outcome of the *-rp-* in the Skr. *karpāsa*. As to another word, *karpāṭa*, which PRZYLUSKI introduces by the side of *karpāsa*, and which he says means «cotton stuff», the only meaning known for Skr. *karpāṭa*, Pali *kappaṭa*, is «tattered rag», and it is perhaps satisfactorily explained from the Indo-European root **kerp-*, «to cut» (cf. UHLENBECK, *loc. cit.*, 46).

To decide whether the Chinese term represents a form with or without *-r-* depends on the choice we are to make between *chi-pei* and *ku-pei*, since in *chi-pei* (**kĭēt-puāi*) the final *-t* (> *-ḍ*) of the first character would regularly render the *-r-* of the *karpāsa* type, whereas there is nothing similar in *ku-pei*. It seems evident that one of the two forms 吉貝 *chi-pei* and 古貝 *ku-pei* is a graphic corruption of the other; taken in themselves, each of them is possible, since both *chi* and *ku* occur before the T'ang period in the transcriptions of words or names of Indo-China and Indonesia. About the end of the 16th century, Li Shih-chên considered (*Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, 36, 12 b) that it was *ku-pei* which had been altered to *chi-pei*, and this may be the reason why LAUFER spoke of *ku-pei* only. But the *Chêng-tzŭ t'ung* of 1570-1572 (s. v. 棉 *mien*) is in favour of *chi-pei* against Li Shih-chên, and 俞正燮 Yü Chêng-hsieh (1775-1840), in his 癸巳類稿 *Kuei-ssŭ lei-kao* (Ch'iu-jih-i-chai ed., 7, 21 a; 14, 4-5), declares that *ku-pei* is nothing more than a misprint in the Sung editions for *chi-pei*. WATTERS, *Essays on the Chinese language*, 440, started from *chi-pei*, just as I did in *TP*, 1933, 332.

Li Shih-chên, in his turn, may have based his opinion on a passage of a Sung work completed in 1085, the 文昌雜錄 *Wên-ch'ang tsa-lu* of 龐元英 P'ang Yüan-ying. Our texts of the *Wên-ch'ang tsa-lu* are not satisfactory, and the passage in question does not occur in the complete edition, in six chapters, of the *Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan*. I have found it, however, among the extracts included in ch. 47 of the *Shuo fu* in 120 chs., and it seems evident that this has been the source of the quotation in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 303, *tsa-lu*, 1 b. It is a matter of surprise that neither the Commissioners of the *Ssŭ-k'u*..., 120, 14 b-16 a, nor the editor of the *Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan* should say anything about this paragraph, or about others which are only to be found in the *Shuo fu* extracts; the reason may be that the *Wên-ch'ang tsa-lu* is given by mistake in the *Shuo fu* as the work of a man other than P'ang Yüan-ying; it seems, however, that neither the authorship of the book, nor the authenticity of the present passage can be doubted. It says that in Fu-chien, Kuang-tung, and south of these regions the people make cotton (*mu-mien*) goods, which they call *chi-pei*; but that, reading the *Nan shih*, P'ang Yüan-ying found there the description of the *ku-pei* plant, which certainly was the same as *chi-pei*; his conclusion is that «it must be that *ku* was vulgarly pronounced as *chi*» (this is of course an error; the case is one of graphic, not phonetic corruption). But, while the *Nan shih* (ch. 78) speaks of *ku-pei*, the earlier *Liang shu* (ch. 54) always gives *chi-pei*. *Chi-pei* alone was heard in southern China by P'ang Yüan-ying, and also evidently by 程大昌 Ch'êng