

century, and preserved in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (SAKAKI ed.). The Tibetan name of the cowry is *mgron-bu* or *'gron-bu*.

Here are the terms of interest for the present inquiry :

No. 9375 : «Skr. *kākaṇi*; Tib. *ka-ka-ni*; is worth 20 cowries (*mgron-bu*).» Skr. dictionaries give *kākaṇi*, also with the value of 20 cowries. A Japanese Buddhist work also speaks of the *kākaṇi* and of its value of 20 cowries (*Bongo jiten*, 454). Pali texts have *kākaṇa* (and *kākaṇikā*), but the commentaries do not seem to have retained any exact recollection of its value.

No. 9376 : «Skr. *māṣakaḥ*; Tib. *Ma-ša-ka*; is worth 80 cowries.» *Māṣaka* (Pali *māsaka*) is identical with *māṣa*, «bean», and became the designation of a small coin; in the present case it plays the same part as *paṇ* in the modern reckoning of cowries. Our «mace» comes from *māṣa*, through Javanese and Malay *mās* (the derivation from Mal. *mās* > *amās*, «gold», proffered in the second edition of *Hobson-Jobson* and accepted by FERRAND in *JA*, 1920, II, 296, is a failure). The *kārṣāpaṇa* (cf. *infra*) was divided either into 16 *māṣa* or into 20, and finally was identified with the ounce or tael of silver (cf. the important Chinese and Japanese texts quoted in *Bongo jiten*, 114-115 and 454-455). In the sixteenth century, the tael of Malacca was divided into 16 «mace», and it is generally believed that the reference of the word «mace» to the *ch'ien*, i. e. the tenth part of a Chinese tael, is to be ascribed solely to early European traders in China. But it seems just as possible that, in the *lingua franca* of Indonesian trade with China, this designation had already been adopted, and that the Europeans took it from the Malay traders (cf. *infra* for the analogous case of «cash»). This would not be without some consequence in the present case. If we suppose that the *Māṣa* > *mās* > «mace» may have been identified with the Chinese *ch'ien* at an early date, and since the *māṣaka* = *māṣa* was 80 cowries, Polo would in a way be justified in stating that 80 cowries have the value of one *saggio* of silver, i. e. one *ch'ien*; and on the other hand we must remember that *sa* = *so*, i. e. originally a «string» of 80 cowries, is given as the term for one *ch'ien* in a modern Lolo vocabulary. The *māṣa*, which was in principle a certain weight, could also be the designation of a small gold «ball» (*wan*) which, according to Hui-lin, ch. 60 (爲, IX, 152 a), was «about the size of a seed of *wu-t'ung* (*Sterculia platanifolia*)». Hui-lin valued it at about 80 Chinese copper cash (*t'ung-ch'ien*); this is surprisingly little.

No. 9377 : «Skr. *kārṣāpaṇaḥ*; Tib. *kar-sa-pa-na*; is worth 1600 cowries.» Skr. *kārṣāpaṇa* is well known, and is generally explained as being a coin (*paṇa*) of the weight of one *karṣa*, the *karṣa* itself being a weight of 16 *māṣa*; but Pali *kahāpaṇa*, may rather be a sanskritization of an old dialectical form (cf. PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*, 263; RHYS DAVIDS, *Pali-English Dictionary*, s. v. *kahāpaṇa*). In the scale used for cowries in India in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, four *paṇ* (of 80 cowries each) made one *āna*, and four *āna* one *kāhan*; the *kāhan* was thus worth 1280 cowries, and the word is merely the modern representative of the earlier *kārṣāpaṇa* (*kāhāvaṇa*) of 1600 cowries.

The *kārṣāpaṇa* repeatedly occurs in Chinese Buddhist texts, and there are various glosses of T'ang times about it. According to SOOTHILL and HODOUS, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhism*, 315, it was worth «400 candareens», which, in modern reckoning, would mean four Chinese silver taels; but «candareens» must be a mistranslation. In Hui-lin, ch. 13 (爲, VIII, 97 a), we are told that the *kārṣāpaṇa* was a piece of gold of the value of 400 *ch'ien*; it was round