

THE RELATIVE MEANING OF KU-PEI (CHI-PEI) AND PO-TIEH. — SOOTHILL and HODOUS (*A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhism*, 232) say that Skr. *kārpāsa* is «cotton, *Gossypium herbaceum*», but that the Chinese transcriptions of the word refer «especially to *kārpāsī*, the cotton tree» (*i. e.* silk-cotton tree). I do not think that in the consideration of Indian sources such a strict line can be drawn between the values of *kārpāsa* and *kārpāsī*, while, on the other hand, Chinese texts certainly do not allow us to regard *ku-pei* (and later *chi-pei*) as referring to the silk-cotton tree. On the other hand, *kārpāsa* is «cotton» rather than «cotton stuff», while *po-tieh* has always been the designation of a cotton fabric. But the fact is that both *ku-pei* (*chi-pei*) and *po-tieh* soon came to be used as designations of textiles, and that a distinction was made between them. We have seen (p. 439) that, in 430, an Indonesian kingdom sent to China «*po-tieh* and *ku-pei* of the kingdom of T'ien-chu (India) and *ku-pei* of the kingdom of Yeh-po (Gandhāra)». By the way, if *ku-pei* were «silk-cotton tree», *Bombax malabaricum*, as seems to have been thought by SOOTHILL and HODOUS, the inferior fabric made out of the floss of the *Bombax* (if any could be made) would have travelled all the way from the north-western Indian frontier to Indonesia and China, which certainly does not seem to be probable. In *Sui shu*, 82, 3 a, we are told that, when holding his Court, the king of Chên-la (Cambodia) wore 朝霞古貝瞞 *chao-hsia ku-pei man*, «a sampot of dawn-rosy *ku-pei*»; in ordinary circumstances, he wore *po-tieh*. (I have refuted, *TP*, 1912, 480, HIRTH and ROCKHILL's mistaken explanation [*HR*, 218-219] of *chao-hsia* as a transcription of Skr. *kauśeya*, «silken stuff [from cocoons of wild silkworms]»; cf. also my review of LÜDERS's memoir *Textilien im alten Turkistan* [*Abhandl. d. Pr. Ak. d. Wiss.* 1936, Ph.-hist. Kl., No. 3], in *Oriental. Literaturzeitung*, 1938, No. 3, 186; as to *man*, more often written 縵 *man*, which also occurs as *kan-man*, *tu-man*, *ho-man*, it was another mistake of HIRTH and ROCKHILL, *HR*, 64, to derive it from Skr. *kambala*, «wool»; it represents the Chinese adaptation of an Indonesian word, the forms of which vary from Malay *kěmban* to Cham *aban*, Bahnar *habăn*.) So, in this case, the coloured *ku-pei* was a cotton stuff regarded as superior to the *po-tieh*, which must have been a plain white fabric. According to the *Chiu T'ang shu* (197, 1 a), the king of Champa (see «Ciamba») wore *po-tieh ku-pei* which covered the upper arm diagonally and went round the waist, while his consort donned *chao-hsia ku-pei*, which she arranged into a short skirt (短裙 *luan ch'ün*). On the next page (197, 1 b) in the notice of the kingdom of P'o-li (Bali?), we are told that «it has the *ku-pei* plant (*ts'ao*); [the people] take its flowers, and make cloth with [them]; that which is coarse is called *ku-pei*; that which is fine is called *po-tieh*». Practically the same indications are given in the *Hsin T'ang shu* (222 c, 1 a, b), except that, in the passage on the «*ku-pei* plant», the *Hsin T'ang shu* does not say that the coarse is *ku-pei* and the fine *po-tieh*, but merely that they are *pei* and *tieh*, respectively. Here at least, the *ku-pei* is certainly not a «cotton tree» in the sense of «silk-cotton tree», *Bombax malabaricum*, nor even, probably, what I call cotton tree, *Gossypium arboreum*, but a plant (*ts'ao*), the *Gossypium herbaceum*; it will be remembered that *tieh* is defined «a cloth made with the flowers of a plant of the Western countries» by Hui-lin (*Tripit.* 爲, ix, 72 b, 114 a). So, it would seem that *ku-pei* had different values: it was the name of the cotton plant, and of cotton itself, and was also used as a generic term for all cotton stuffs, so that a plain white variety could be called a *po-tieh ku-pei* and a gay-coloured one a *chao-hsia ku-pei*; but, as the specific name of a particular