

more extended use is in agreement with the use of *tūlā* in Sanskrit texts, but it is with reference to special kinds of cotton goods that *tou-lo-mien* has long survived in Chinese lay texts of the Southern Sung, Yüan, and Ming dynasties (cf. *HR*, 219; *TP*, 1933, 429-430; 1934, 306). Chao Ju-kua makes of *tou-lo-mien* the name of the best quality of cotton goods (*HR*, 218); at the beginning of the 15th cent., it was the designation of cotton velvets (Ar. *mahmal*). WANG Kuo-wei's attempt to connect with *tou-lo-mien* the *t'u-lu-ma* of Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un's *Hsi-yu chi* (cf. his edition, I, 24-25) is decidedly a failure (cf. *infra*, p. 514). *Tou-lo-mien* is given as a product of Burma in *Ming i-t'ung chih*, 87, 35 a (it is altered into *tou-lo-[錦]chin* in the corresponding passage of the *T'u-shu pien*, 85, 51 a) and of Bengal in WANG Ch'i's *Hsü Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* (33, 14 a). The *Ming shih* (324, 10 a) mentions in Sumatra 兜羅被 *tou-lo-pei*, «*tou-lo* blankets», for which I doubt whether GROENEVELDT's «blankets of woollen cloth» (*Essays relating to Indo-China*, 2nd series, I, 193) is a correct rendering. These are, moreover, certainly the same as *tou-lo-chin pei* mentioned among the objects of tribute offered by the states of Sumatra in *Hsü Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* (33, 12 a, 13 a); here again I suspect that *tou-lo-chin pei* is a corrupt reading of *tou-lo-mien pei*.

The *tou-lo-mien* of the Ming dynasty must have been a strong fabric, since the author of the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao*, after mentioning the *tou-lo-mien* of Siam (2, 13 b), adds: «瞿睿夫 CH'ü Jui-fu says: 'As to the *tou-lo-mien*, neither sword nor arrow can pierce it'». Jui-fu is the *tzü* of both 瞿智 Ch'ü Chih of the Yüan, and 瞿九思 CH'ü Ch'iu-ssü of the Ming; the one here meant is almost certainly CH'ü Ch'iu-ssü (c. 1550-1620; cf. *Ming shih*, 288, 3 a).

WATTERS (*Essays on the Chinese language*, 439) says that *tou-lo* was used as a «general name» when European velvet, plush, and woollen goods were first introduced into China, and that we thus find «兜羅呢 *tou-lo-ni* (now *to-lo-ni*) and 兜羅絨 *tou-lo-jung*, for woolens and velvets respectively». I doubt the existence of both *tou-lo-ni* and *tou-lo-jung*, or at least I can find no authority for these forms. But it is true that a kind of woollen velvet imported into Canton in European vessels is mentioned in the dictionary 正字通 *Chêng tzü t'ung*, first published in 1670-1672 [cf. COURANT, *Catalogue*, Nos. 4464-4512; I do not know why WATTERS says (*Essays on the Chinese language*, 87) that it was first published in 1705], as 多羅絨 *to-lo-jung* (s. v. 髹 *t'a*; cf. also *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*, s. v. 髹 *t'a*). On the other hand, broadcloth has been known in China, in modern times, as 哆囉呢 *to-lo-ni*, the origin of which is obscure, and there is a still more obscure 廣東哆囉嗎 «*to-lo-ma* of Kuang-tung», said to be a fabric of hemp or ramie manufactured in Kuang-tung (cf. KIUNG and COURTOIS, *Quelques mots sur la politesse chinoise* [*Var. Sin.*, No. 25], 33 and 109, where the transcription «*tou-lou-ma*» is not correct). I do not know the origin of *ma* in *to-lo-ma*. As to the *ni* of *to-lo-ni*, it enters into a number of names of European cotton and woollen textiles, such as 大呢 *ta-ni*, «great *ni*», another name for «broadcloth»; 小呢 *hsiao-ni*, «small *ni*», «cassimeres, flannels»; 俄呢 *O-ni*, «Russian *ni*», «Russian cloth», etc. The authors of the *Tz'ü-yüan* (s. v. 呢) say that *ni* was originally written 尼 *ni*, and cite a poem of Huang T'ing-chien (1045-1105) in which already this 尼 *ni* occurs. But the chronological gap is a large one, and moreover Huang T'ing-chien does not speak of a cotton stuff, but of camel-hair; and the identification cannot be accepted unless intermediary and more decisive examples are discovered. Pending this, one might suppose that 呢 *ni* in «great *ni*», «small *ni*», etc., is nothing more than an aphoretical abbreviation of *to-lo-ni* itself. As to *to-lo-ni*, HIRTH has already called attention (*JNCB*,