

reduced to *-pāi* should have retained the consonantic group *-rp-* of Skr. *kārpāsī*, instead of assimilating it in *-pp-* as in Pali *kappāsī*. On the other hand, *kupāi* and **kappāi* can easily be reconciled, since we have only to suppose a retrogressive action of the first *-p-*, finally melting into the new labial vowel. This is possibly what occurred in quite a different part of Asia with the modern form *gupas* of Burušaski. My conclusion is that the Indian name of the cotton which the Chinese received in the 5th cent. from the southern seas reached them neither through the intermediary of Jav. and Malay *kapas*, nor of an Indo-Chinese form similar to the modern Bahnar *kōpaih* (where *-h* < *-s*, as in Cham), but as **kupāi* < **kappāi*, itself < *kappāsī*. It may be that **kupāi* is to be traced to the Chams. In Cham, many words with a first *-a-* vowel have a doublet in *-u* : cf., for instance, *kabav* and *kubav*, *kubau*, « buffalo » (Jav. *kěbo*, Mal. *kěrbav*, Khmer *kreběi*, etc.), and, in the case of the word for « cotton », it is *kapah* among the Chams of southern Annam, but *kupah* among those of Cambodia (CABATON, *loc. cit.* 57, 74). But I am far from being certain that *kupah*, the final *-h* of which, like that of *kapah*, goes back to an earlier *-s*, can be ancient enough to provide the prototype of **kupāi* (which moreover does not really represent *kupah* [< **kapas*], but is < **kappāi* < *kappāsī*). As to the *chi-pei* of the *Liang shu*, and any other which might be traced, they must be the result of scholarly corrections, after a graphic error had, in early Sung times, substituted in current use *chi-pei* for *ku-pei*. If Jučen **kubu*, Manchu *kubun*, Mongol *kübüing* and Goldi *kufa* are borrowed from *ku-pei*, we must not be surprised not to find *kübüing* in Mongolian during the Mongol dynasty, since the Mongols were then under the influence of Uighur culture, and adopted, as we have seen, the Uighur word *käbäz*. But *ku-pei* must have been borrowed from the Chinese at an early date, before *chi-pei* became the only form in use in southern China. So it may be surmised that the **kubu* which so far we know only in late Jučen was already in use when the Nü-chên ruled over northern China, even if it does not go back to the time of the Ch'i-tan.

PO-TIEH. — We have seen that the *Liang shu* mentions cotton as existing in the Turfan region in the first part of the 6th cent., and gives it the name *po-tieh-tzū*, *tzū* being a substantival affix of the spoken language; on the other hand, *po-tieh* can theoretically be conceived either as being a transcription (**b'ok-d'iep*), or as simply meaning « white *tieh* (**d'iep*) ». That the term was used at least by the numerous Chinese inhabitants of the country is expressly stated in the middle of the 7th cent. by Hsüan-ying, in a gloss repeated almost *ad nauseam* by himself and by Hui-lin; according to that gloss, which has a bearing on the various transcriptions of Prâkrit forms of *karpāsa*, « the people of Kao-ch'ang (= the Turfan region) call [cotton] 疊 *tieh* » (Tōkyō *Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, VI, 2 b, 33 a, 59 a; IX, 147 a); 疊 *tieh* (**d'iep*) is merely another graphic form of 疊 *tieh*. Of course, the use of *tieh* instead of *po-tieh* by Hsüan-ying is not in favour of the view that *po-tieh* is a transcription; it is, however, not conclusive, since it may be a scholarly abbreviation. In the same way, the author of the *Hsin T'ang shu* (222 c, 1 b), copying a passage in which the less literary author of the *Chiu T'ang shu* (197, 1 b) explained the difference between *ku-pei* and *po-tieh*, merely speaks of *pei* and *tieh*, although *ku-pei* is admittedly a transcription.

The main Western exponent of the theory according to which *po-tieh* would be a transcription was HIRTH (*HR*, 218), who proposed to see in this term, « certainly borrowed from one of the Turki languages » (this has passed into COULING, *Encyclopaedia Sinica*, I, 134), an old form similar to the