

would derive Turk. *pahta*, *bahta* (and from it Pers. *pāhtā*) from Ch. *po-tieh* (**b'vk-d'iep*) can hardly be thought of, because, at a time when the ancient final *-k* of **b'vk* was still heard, the *-p* of **d'iep* ought to have been represented in the transcription, and we should expect in Turkish **baqtap*, or rather **bäktäp*.

But the main point is that there is no reason to connect *po-tieh* with Central Asia, since it is not about Central Asia that the term makes its appearance in Chinese texts (PRZYLUKI's statement to the contrary in *JA*, 1919, I, 384, is an error). It is generally said to occur first in the *Hou-Han shu*, completed only c. 445, but based in principle on documents going back at least to the first quarter of the 3rd cent. There we read (116, 8a): «The land of the 哀牢 Ai-lao Barbarians is fertile and yields the five cereals, silkworms and mulberries. They know how to dye in colours and [make] embroideries with designs; [they have] woollen textiles 罽毼 *chi-to*, 帛疊 *po-tieh*, and fine *lan-kan* cloth the woven designs of which (織成 *chih-ch'êng*) have the appearance of damasked (綾 *ling*) and variegated silks (錦 *chin*). They have the 梧桐 *wu-t'ung* tree (*mu*), the flowers (*hua*) of which they spin to make cloth, every strip of which is five feet broad; it is clean and white, and does not get soiled. They first cover with it the deceased, and afterwards wear it». This passage is grammatically and technically difficult, and I am not certain that I have exactly rendered all its niceties. The meaning of *to* in *chi-to* is doubtful. Of course I have made use of the parallel text in the *Hua-yang kuo chih* (*Han hai* ed., 4, 18b). My addition «they have» between brackets is supported by the quotation in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (796, 10b) and by the *Hua-yang kuo chih*. HIRTH and ROCKHILL say (*HR*, 218) that, according to ch. 101 of the *Wei shu*, *po-tieh* «was a textile fabric of hemp, which was called in their language (= of the Ai-lao) *lan-kan*». But there is not one word of this in the *Wei shu*, which merely speaks, in the section devoted to the 獠 Lao Barbarians of south-western China (101, 10a; the Lao Barbarians were scattered in Yün-nan, Kuang-hsi and Tongking, according to the *Kuang chih* quoted in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 356), of their habitations built on trees (such was also the case with the aborigines in part of Hai-nan; cf. the *Kuang chih*, quoted in *Ch'u hsüeh chi*, 8, 41a), which habitations were called 干蘭 *kan-lan* (on which cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 171). HIRTH and ROCKHILL have certainly confused this passage with a note in which the commentary of the *Hou-Han shu*, completed in 676-678, quotes the *Hua-yang kuo chih* to the effect that *lan-kan* was the Lao word for 紵 *chu*, which, by the way, is not generally «hemp», but «grass cloth» made from the fibres of the ramie, *Boehmeria nivea*. The 華陽國志 *Hua-yang kuo chih*, or «Description of the kingdom of Hua-yang», is a work on the history of Ssü-ch'uan down to 347 A. D., and written shortly after that date; the passage in question occurs in ch. 4, 18b; *lan-kan* is clearly a transcription, but the original is unknown. As to *po-tieh*, it is written in the parallel passage of the *Hua-yang kuo chih* with the same characters as in the *Hou-Han shu* (the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi*, 179, 13a, quotes from the 九州記 *Chiu-chou chi*, a geographical work by 樂資 Yo Tzū, prior to 527 [cf. *Sui ching-chi-chih k'ao-chêng*, 6, 38a], a text which is exactly that of the *Hou-Han shu*, except that it includes the note on the meaning of *lan-kan* and omits the four words *chi-to po-tieh*). Now, we must not forget that, although the *Hou-Han shu* bears in principle on the period of the Hou-Han (25-220 A. D.), it was only written in the first half of the 5th cent., and the study of its chapter on western countries in particular has shown that its author has made great use of works dealing with somewhat later times, in particular