

in exchanging what they have for what they do not have, gold coins, silver coins, cowries (貝珠 *pei-chu*; cf. *supra*, p. 543), and small pearls.» But, in the notices of the various kingdoms, it is only in the one devoted to Kōngoda, a small country between Orissa and Kalinga on the eastern coast of India, that Hsüan-tsang makes the following remark (*Mémoires*, II, 91) : « Its currency consists of shells (*lo-pei*) and various pearls (*chu-chi*). » Drawing perhaps, as often, from Hsüan-tsang, but with a different wording, the *Chiu T'ang shu* (198, 8 b) says of India that « it employs cowries (*ch'ih-pei*; it may be a corrupt reading instead of the more usual *pei-ch'ih*, but it must have already been given in Sung editions) as currency ». This passage of the *Chiu T'ang shu* has been copied by Chao Ju-kua (*HR*, 111). The *Hsin T'ang shu* too (221 A, 10 b) copies the *Chiu T'ang shu*, but gives the usual form *pei-ch'ih*.

Although Chao Ju-kua's « P'êng-ch'ieh-lo of India » (西天 Hsi-t'ien; the bare translation « the West » in *HR*, 93, 97, 98, is inadequate) has been believed not to be Bengal (see BANGALA), two products mentioned there are less unindicative than was thought by HIRTH and ROCKHILL. One is *tou-lo-mien*, « *tūla* floss »; in the Middle Ages this term was really applied to Bengal cotton velvets (see COTTON). The other is the shell currency. The text says : 以白研螺殼磨治爲錢. In *HR*, 97, the translation runs : « They use (pieces of) white conch shells ground into shape as money. » This is almost unimpeachable, and yet I wonder whether it be the true rendering. In principle, the *ya-lo*, « polishing gastropod », ought to be the *tzū-pei* or « purple shell » (cf. *supra*, p. 542); but the text expressly says it was white, as Polo does for the cowries used in Yün-nan. In view of the very small value of the shell currency, I doubt whether the people in India would have taken the trouble to « grind them into shape ». We might perhaps think of grinding a hole to string the shells, a practice which did not obtain in ancient China alone, but which I have never found reported for India proper (cf. SCHILDER, 320). On the whole I am inclined to believe that Chao Ju-kua did not exactly understand what his informants told him at Ch'üan-chou, and that the sentence actually describes the usual cowry currency which was extensively employed in Bengal.

On the other hand it is certainly Bengal which Wang Ta-yüan, writing in 1349-1350, described in his *Tao-i chih-liao* under the name of P'êng-chia-la (cf. ROCKHILL, in *TP*, 1915, 435-436). ROCKHILL retained the often corrupt text of the current edition, and so did FERRAND (in *JA*, 1920, 83); but, as was already suspected by FUJITA, 98 a, the translation should read : « The government casts a silver coin called *t'ang-chia* (*ṭaṅka* > *ṭaṅga*, 'tanga'; on this word, which I shall not discuss here, cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 896-898 [but suppressing « *tangah*, 'fer-blanc' », which in fact should be read *tänäkä*]; *Y*¹, 54, 59, 63, 138; *JA*, 1920, II, 293; 1935, I, 239; MOOKERJI, *Harsha*, 68 [*ṭaṅkaka*]; *Bl*, II, 526 is absurd), every one of which weighs 2 mace (*ch'ien*) 8 candareens (*fên*); they are regularly used in trade. They are exchanged for 11, 520 odd cowries (*pa-tzū*), which are a substitute for small cash; this is convenient for the people and truly advantageous. » This text has passed into the *Ming i-t'ung chih*, 90, 9 b, and the *Shu-yü chow-tzū lu*, 11, 3 a, but curtailed and so corruptly divided that it is the « tanga » which is said to be used as « a substitute for small cash »; they still give to the *ṭaṅga*, however, the correct weight of « 2 mace 8 candareens », which has become simply « 8 candareens » in the current text of the *Tao-i chih-liao*.