

is itself traced back by etymologists to Skr. *karpūra*, « camphor », BERNEKER saying that *kāfūr* is Persian, most others that it is Arabic. As a matter of fact, it is common to both languages, but, as a rule, the *-p-* ought to have been retained in Persian, whereas in Arabic, which has no *p*, the original *-p-* could be rendered only as *-f-* or *-b-*. So it seems that *kāfūr* is an arabicized form, which was adopted by the Persians at an early date; but it is somewhat surprising to find the arabicized form in Latin as early as c. 540.

As to Arabic *kāfūr*, LOKOTSCH explains its derivation from *karpūra* by saying that, already in Prākṛit, there was a form *kappūra* (it is the Pali form); but *kappūra* ought to have given in Arabic \**kafūr* rather than *kāfūr*. On the other hand, we must not forget that Skr. *karpūra* probably represents a pre-Aryan word, as the case must be also with Skr. *karpāsa*, « cotton » (see « Cotton »), and that in Javanese the word for « cotton » is *kapas* (Malay *kāpas*), just as the Javanese word for « camphor » is *kapur* (Malay *kāpur*). In the case of *karpāsa*, I have pronounced in favour of a derivation of *kapas* from *karpāsa* (Pali *kappāsa*), because I think that the cultivation of cotton is extremely ancient in India, but the case of camphor is different. In the past, it was primarily an Indonesian product, and it may well be that it is not *kapur* which is derived from *karpūra*, but *karpūra* which has been formed on a pre-Aryan word very close to an original Indonesian form of the *kapur* type. In any case, since there was in the first centuries of our era a maritime intercourse between Arabia and Indonesia, it would seem to be a natural solution to suppose that Arabic *kāfūr* does not represent Pali and Prākṛit *kappūra* (< Skr. *karpūra*), but was borrowed directly from the Indonesian *kafur*. GERINI's objections (*Researches*, 810) are of no value, since they are based on the assumption that the other Malay word *kāpur*, « lime », « plaster », most probably an Indonesian word [cf. CABATON, *Dict. Čam-Français*, 57], is to be traced back to Skr. *karpūra*, which never had that meaning. I leave, however, the question in abeyance, because some camphor was also gathered in southern India; moreover, most of the modern Indian dialects now have the form *kapūr*, in Mahārāṣṭrī *kāpūr* (cf. J. BLOCH, *La formation de la langue marathe*, 309), which also may account for Arabic *kāfūr*. Tibetan *ga-bur* (> Mong. *gabur*), which puzzled LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 591), is merely one of the many sonorized transcriptions in that language, of the same type as Skr. *keśara*, « pistil », > Tib. *ge-sar*, or Skr. *kuṅkuma*, « saffron », > Tib. *gur-gum* and *gur-kum*. KOVALEVSKIĬ's Mongol *gatbura* or *gadbury* (*Dictionnaire*, 2431) almost certainly rests on the usual misreading *d* instead of *r* in a Tibetan original which probably gave the correct Sanskrit form *karpūra*; LAUFER's explanation, based on a mistaken restoration of the ancient pronunciation of a Chinese transcription, is a failure.

The Indian word for « camphor » occurs in Chinese only in Buddhist texts, as 𑖑𑖦 𑖦𑖩𑖪𑖫 *chieh-pu-lo* (\**kjät-puo-lâ*; not with sonant initials as in LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*, 591) and 𑖑𑖦 𑖦𑖩𑖪𑖫 *chieh-pu-lo* (\**kjöp-puo-lâ*). The first form is the one employed by Hsüan-tsang (*Mémoires*, II, 123; *Vie*, 193) and, as usual with him, correctly renders Skr. *karpūra*. the second, clearly based on a Prākṛit *kappūra*, occurs in a translation made by Bhagavaddharma c. A. D. 650-660 (No. 1059 of *Hôbôgirin*) fascicule annexe; it is not listed in Nanjiō. A third form 𑖑𑖦 𑖦𑖩𑖪𑖫 *chieh-p'o-lo* (\**kjät-b'ua-lâ*) is given in GILES's *Dictionary* (No. 9412), STUART, *Materia Medica*, 157, and TARANZANO, *Vocabulaire*, I, 239; and is said by GILES to represent Malay *kāpur*. The source of this information is the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* (34, 58 b), where the form *chieh-p'o-lo* is ascribed to the *Pên-ts'ao yen-i*, and LI