

Hsiang-chin and Hsü Kuang-ch'i knew *chi-pei* only as a term found in earlier works. *Chi-pei* however, may have remained alive in southern dialects fairly late, since it is still used in explanatory glosses of the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao*, which was completed in 1617-1618 (1, 11 b; 5, 6 a; cf. also 3, 10 a). At any rate, neither *ku-pei* nor *chi-pei* seems to have survived in the modern dialects of Fu-chien and Kuang-tung (nor in Annamite, in spite of WATTERS, *loc. cit.* 440).

Thus *chi-pei* was the only form used in southern China from the 11th till the 14th cent., and perhaps later. Yet I believe that the balance of the argument is in favour of a primitive form *ku-pei*. If we could trust the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (*ibid.*, *hui-k'ao*, 1 b), *chi-pei* would already have been mentioned in the 南州異物志 *Nan-chou i-wu chih* («Cotton [*mu-mien*] is produced by the *chi-pei*...»); the *Nan-chou i-wu chih*, a work on the remarkable products of the southern countries, was written in the 3rd cent. (cf. *BEFEO*, III, 267; IV, 277-278; *TP*, 1923, 123; *Etudes asiatiques... de l'EFEO*, II, 255; I regret not to have at my disposal the recent edition of the extant fragments which was published by 陳運溶 CH'ËN Yün-jung, on which cf. *The Yenching Journal of Social Science*, II [1939] 127). But, in most cases, the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* has altered to *chi-pei* the reading *ku-pei* of the original texts; moreover the quotation, the origin of which I have been unable to trace, cannot, from its contents, go back to the 3rd cent. Part of the quotation, but without the sentence on *chi-pei*, is found in the *Nung shu* of Wang Chêng, dated 1313 (20, 16 a; on this work, cf. *infra*, p. 502); there it is said to be drawn from the *I-wu chih* (without «Nan-chou»); on the next page, another part of the quotation is given with the full title *Nan-chou i-wu chih*, and there *chi-pei* is mentioned; but this does not solve the chronological difficulties, and I believe that the text does not go farther back than the Sung at the earliest, which would account for the form *chi-pei*. In fact, the earliest mention of *ku-pei* or *chi-pei* which I can find occurs in the *Sung shu* (97, 2 b); there it is said that, in the 7th *yüan-chia* year (430), «the kingdom of 呵羅單 Ho-lo-tan (**χâ-lâ-tân*), which has its seat on the island (*chou*) of Shê-p'o, sent an envoy who offered such objects as diamond rings, red parrots, *po-tieh* and *ku-pei* from the kingdom of 天竺 T'ien-chu (an abnormal way of writing 天竺 T'ien-chu, India), and *ku-pei* from the kingdom of 葉波 Yeh-po». Shê-p'o transcribes Java, which may here designate Sumatra as well as Java proper; the kingdom of Ho-lo-tan, which seems to be erroneously duplicated as kingdom of 訶羅陁 Ho-lo-t'o (**χâ-lâ-d'â*) in the same chapter (2 a-b), remains unidentified; Yeh-po, or Yeh-po-[羅]lo (**lâp-puâ-lâ*) is an ancient name of Gandhâra (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 225, 322; *BEFEO*, IV, 272; *JA*, 1914, II, 406-408). Being for the moment concerned only with the term *ku-pei* or *chi-pei*, I leave for another paragraph the question of the juxtaposition of *po-tieh* and *ku-pei*; the text is identical in the quotation made by the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 787, 14 b. This example of *ku-pei* (or *chi-pei*) antedates by two and a half centuries the date given by Wells WILLIAMS (*The Middle Kingdom*, II, 36-37) for the introduction of the term, viz. «A. D. 670». In the *Nan Ch'i shu* (58, 5 a), two pairs of *ku-pei* are listed among the presents offered in 484 by Fu-nan (= Cambodia; cf. *BEFEO*, III, 260, where, however, «an elephant in white santal» is a slip for «an image in white santal»). *Shuang*, «pairs», is abnormal in the case of textiles, but I find it also used in connection with *tieh*, «cotton stuff», in 張, VIII, 117 a; it may be due to the fact that two strips of cloth were used as clothing, hence they are mentioned in Indian texts as *yuga*,