

of the lost *Wei lio* of Yü Huan, written in the second third of the 3rd. cent. In the paragraph we are here concerned with, either the *Hou-Han shu* has merely used the earlier *Hua-yang kuo chih*, or both have drawn from a common source, which may be Yü Huan's *Wei lio*. Whatever the case may be, there is no reason to suppose that the passage in which *po-tieh* occurs is older than the second quarter of the 3rd cent. The Ai-lao tribes lived in western Yün-nan and southern Ssü-ch'uan; their centre was in the region of Yung-ch'ang (between Ta-li and Bhamo). According to the *Hou-Han shu* (the *Hua-yang kuo chih* may have here a lacuna), the ears of the leaders of the Ai-lao descended three inches below the shoulders, while those of the commoners were on a level with the shoulders. These stories of «pendant ears» (儋耳 *tan-êrh*), which recur in the description of the island of Hai-nan (hence the *chün* of Tan-êrh under the Han, now Tan-hsien; cf. also the kingdom of Tan-êrh in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 790, 22 b), are a comparatively sober Chinese counterpart to the *Karṇaprāvaraṇa*, «Those who use their ears as a mantle», of Indian folklore (cf. S. LÉVI, in *JA*, 1918, 1, 17, 75). Yet these same barbarians, located on the direct land track from western China to India *via* Burma, clearly were well advanced in the technique of weaving. But this does not necessarily mean, of course, that *po-tieh*, or even *tieh* alone, should be a foreign word transcribed from one of their dialects; the *Hua-yang kuo chih*, which says that *lan-kan* is a Lao word, is silent on *po-tieh*.

Leaving *po* for a while, something has to be said on *tieh*. First of all, 疊 *tieh* means «to duplicate», «to fold» (it is in that sense that it is translated *uparāpara* in BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, 316; the editor ought not to have referred there to No. 536, p. 279, where *tieh* is used in its other sense of cotton textile), and has never been the name of a textile in the pre-Han texts, nor even in Han texts if we do not count that of the *Hou-Han shu* which seems to be actually of post-Han origin. As to 疊 *tieh*, which is the designation of a textile, either alone, or in *po-tieh*, it is also a post-Han creation. An attempt, however, has been made at an early date to connect *tieh*, in its meaning of textile, with a term occurring in Han texts. In Ssü-ma Ch'ien's chapter on goods and trade (129, 34-35, in TAKIGAWA Kametaro's critical edition *Shiki kaichu kōshō*), mention is made of a textile called 榻布 *t'a-pu* or 荅布 *ta-pu*, i. e. «*t'a* (or *ta*) cloth»; *t'a* is \**t'âp*, and *ta* is \**tâp*; the parallel text in the *Ch'ien-Han shu* (91, 3 b) gives *ta-pu*. When Ma Yüan was sent to Ssü-ch'uan c. 25 A. D., the local usurper presented him with a garment in 都布 *tu-pu*, «*tu* (\**tuo*) cloth» (*Hou-Han shu*, 54, 1 b); from a note of the commentary of 676-678, we learn that the lost 東觀[漢]記 *Tung-kuan [Han] chi* of the 2nd cent., in a parallel passage, gave *ta-pu*, and that *tu-pu* was mentioned as a name of textile by 何承天 *Ho Ch'êng-t'ien* (370-447). For the *t'a* or *ta* of *t'a-pu* or *ta-pu*, there are still secondary forms occurring in various editions or dictionaries, such as 翳 *t'a* (\**t'âp*) in the *Yü-p'ien* (and the *T'ang yün*, according to the *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*; cf. also TARANZANO, *Vocabulaire*, II, 576), 荅 *ta* (\**tâp*) in some copies of Ssü-ma Ch'ien (cf. TAKIGAWA's edition) and of the *Ch'ien-Han shu* (cf. *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*, and *Tz'ü-yüan*, s. v. *ta*), and 翳 *t'a* (\**t'âp*) in the *Shih-shuo hsün-yü* of Liu I-ch'ing (401-444; cf. *Tz'ü-t'ung*, 1760); to these, the *Tz'ü-t'ung* (*ibid.*) adds 納布 *na-pu*, «*na* (\**nâp*) cloth» of *Sung shu*, 71, 1 b, but the connection is doubtful (*na* seems to have been the name of a cloth [cf. the texts, often corrupt, quoted in *Ko-chih ching-yüan*, 27, 25-26, and in *Tz'ü-yüan*, s. v. *na*], but it may also perhaps be taken here with the value of 衲 *na*, «to piece