

in shape and of the size of a *chiang* bean (*dolichos sinensis*). *Ch'ien* means «cash», «copper coin», and is used by both I-ching and Li-yen to render Skr. *paṇa* (BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, 50, 229), but the *ch'ien* here intended must have been much below the *paṇa* in value. This is proved by another gloss of Hui-lin, ch. 26 (爲, x, 2b) : «*Paṇa* means a copper coin (*t'ung-ch'ien*); 16 *paṇa* make one *kārṣāpaṇa*.» So the modern scale of 16 *paṇ* (<*paṇa*) to one *kāhan* (<*kārṣāpaṇa*) goes back at least to the beginning of the ninth century. On the other hand the traditional equivalence of the *kārṣāpaṇa* to one *karṣa* of 16 *māṣa* is not in agreement with the scale adopted in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* where the *kārṣāpaṇa* is said to be worth 1600 cowries, and consequently to represent not 16 but 20 *māṣaka* (= *māṣa*) of 80 cowries each. This value of 1600 cowries to the *kārṣāpaṇa* is expressly stated by I-ching, in a note added to ch. 6 of his translation of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, to have been the one universally used in Magadha in his time, *i. e.* in the second half of the seventh century (cf. 黃, ix, 23b). The two values of 1280 and 1600 cowries for the *kārṣāpaṇa* have been known to Chinese commentators, and they are also given by Tibetan sources (cf. Sarat CHANDRA DAS, *Tibetan-English Dict.*, 300). Such variations in value may be partly due to fluctuations in the modes of reckoning with 4 or with 5 or, still more, to attempts to pass from the vigesimal reckoning expressed by the unit of 80 cowries to a purely decimal system based on a unit of 100. Other translators, probably misinformed, and because of the ambiguity of *ch'ien* (which is either 0.1 of an ounce, or a coin in general, or a Chinese copper cash) have understood the *paṇa* as being one copper cash (*ch'ien*) and the *kārṣāpaṇa* as being 16 *ch'ien*, or have even merely rendered *kārṣāpaṇa* as *ch'ien*. It must be owing to some misunderstanding of this kind that *grar-ṣa-pa-ni*, *i. e.* *kārṣāpaṇa*, is given as a synonym of *iba'u*, «cowry», in KOWALENSKI, 281. I-ching further remarks that, in the text which he translates and which speaks of «100 *kārṣāpaṇa*», one ms. gives «100 陳那羅 *ch'ên-na-lo*», *i. e.* «100 *dīnāra*» or «gold coins»; a substitution rendered possible by the fact the *kārṣāpaṇa*, being in principle a certain weight, could, theoretically at least, be used of gold as well as of silver. More details are available on the *kārṣāpaṇa*; but I cannot discuss them here, and must refer the reader to I-ching (*loc. cit.*), Hsüan-ying, ch. 22 (爲, vii, 86a), Hui-lin, ch. 13 (*ib.*, viii, 97a), ch. 29 (*ib.*, viii, 180a), ch. 71 (*ib.*, x, 2b), K'o-hung, ch. 2 (*ib.*, i, 21b), *Bongo jiten*, 114-115 and 454-455, and ODA Tokuno, 210.

The scale of the cowries in Yün-nan was 4, 16 (4 × 4), and 80 (16 × 5), but in modern India it was 4 and 80 (4 × 20). The «four» basis of the reckoning also occurs in other ways in the values attributed to the *kārṣāpaṇa* : for since it was worth 400 *ch'ien* or 1600 cowries, the «*ch'ien*» of the first text of Hui-lin must have been worth four cowries, and must render not of course *paṇa* as usual, but *gaṇḍaka* > *ganda*, *i. e.* four cowries. At the same time, the number «400» itself, *i. e.* 20 × 20, supports PRZYLUŚKI's view of a vigesimal reckoning, which also appears in the higher values : 400 *karṣa* make one *tulā* (> Hind. *tolā*; cf. *Hobson-Jobson*², 928; FERRAND, in *JA*, 1920, II, 293 [where I doubt that we should start from Pers. *tōlah*], 294). I do not know the authority for GILES's statement (*Glossary of Reference*, 63) that 200 cowries make «one *āna* or about three halfpence»; the *āna* was usually worth 4 *paṇ*, *i. e.* 320 cowries.

Both *paṇa* and *karṣa* have become usual terms in foreign trade.