

« pairs » (cf. PRZYLUKI, in *JA*, 1919, 1, 406). Then comes the *Liang shu* (ch. 54), which always speaks of *chi-pei*, but the *Nan shih*, in copying it, always gives *ku-pei* (except once, 79, 7 b, where it gives *chi-pei* in the notice of K'o-p'an-t'o west of Khotan; but it may be a misprint), and so does the quotation from the *Liang shu* in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (788, 15 b). It is also *ku-pei*, and *ku-pei* alone, which we find in the *Sui shu* (82, 3 a) and in both *T'ang shu* (*Chiu T'ang shu*, 197, 1 a and b; *Hsin T'ang shu*, 222 c, 1 a and b), as well as in the great compilations of T'ang and early Sung times, such as the *T'ung tien* (188, 4 b), the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* (176, 3 a, 3 b-4 a, 12 a and b; 179, 19 a, in the section of P'o-ni [Borneo], while the later *Sung shih*, in an otherwise identical sentence, gives *chi-pei*), the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (ch. 788, sometimes with a corrupt form 古具 *ku-chü*, which is certainly a misprint) and the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* (959, 21 a). The statement in the *P'ei-wên yün-fu* (s. v. « *chi-pei* »), blindly followed by the *Tz'ü-yüan*, and also in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, that the *Nan shih* and the *Hsin T'ang shu* give *chi-pei* is nothing but an error. In a note in the *China Review*, XIX, 191, PARKER cites the 九域志 *Chiu-yü chih* as speaking of *ku-pei* in a notice on an Indonesian state which he supposed to date from the Sung dynasty (cf. also LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*, 471; FERRAND, in *JA*, 1921, II, 287). This would be the latest independent use of the form *ku-pei* found hitherto. Unfortunately, PARKER's information is certainly second hand, taken, it seems, from some dictionary or encyclopaedia which he did not trouble to mention. The only *Chiu-yü chih* I know of is the *Yüan-fêng chiu-yü chih*, dated 1080 (cf. *Ssü-k'u* . . . , 68, 7-9), but I can find in it no passage recalling the one mentioned by PARKER. In any case, the passage is not original, but, with a mistake in the name of the state 婆斯 P'o-ssü instead of 婆利 P'o-li), is merely copied from the notice of P'o-li in *Nan shih*, 78, 6 b; the true title may have been *Chiu-chou chi*, a work written prior to 527, on which cf. *infra*, p. 444. In the Buddhist scriptures too, I have found only *ku-pei*, occurring in Paramārtha's translations of the *Abhidharmakośa* (NANJIŌ, No. 1269; ch. 9; Tōkyō *Tripit.* of Meiji, 冬, 1, 54 b) and of the *Fo a-p'i-t'an ching* (NANJIŌ, No. 1108; ch. 2; 寒, x, 16 b) which are of the end of the 6th cent.; on that account, *ku-pei* is commented upon by Hsüan-ying in his *I-ch'ieh ching yin-i* (*ibid.* 爲, VI, 71 a; VII, 72 a), and Hsüan-ying's text has been taken over by Hui-lin in his ch. 70 (*ibid.* IX, 189 b). Of course, *chi* and *ku* are graphically so much alike that one could easily have taken the place of the other; moreover Chinese texts have often been revised by scholars, and we know cases of wrong forms which have been substituted wholesale for the correct ones, such as *t'ieh-lo* which always occurs in ancient Chinese texts instead of the correct *t'ieh-ch'in*, Avar and Turk. *tegin*. But, in the present case, the agreement of so many sources is the more impressive because it extends to Buddhist texts. Nevertheless, on account of the *chi-pei* of the *Liang shu* and of the later use of *chi-pei* under the Sung, I should have hesitated to express any definite opinion, if it were not that the correctness of *ku-pei* can be established, I believe, by comparison with another transcription.

The word *karpāsa* is of frequent use in Buddhist texts, so that it often occurs in their Chinese translations, though in different guise, once as 劫貝娑 *chieh-pei-so* (**kj̥p-puâi-sâ*; mentioned in connection with the flower of the plant; cf. Tōkyō *Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, VIII, 164 a), more usually as 劫波育 *chieh-po-yü* (**kj̥p-puâ-ïuk*; cf. *ibid.*, VI, 2 b, 33 a; VII, 2 b; VIII, 117 b) and 劫貝 *chieh-*