

together»; 衲衣 *na-i*, as a designation of the Buddhist garb, anciently occurs as 納衣 *na-i*, for instance in 寒, x, 16 a, and in 爲, VIII, 166 b; cf. also SOOTHILL and HODOUS, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms*, 336, 339; under the Yüan, the tribute from Fu-chien included 200 *na* robes [衲襖 *na-ao*], according to WANG Ch'i's *Hsü Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 32, 16 a). In his lost commentary on the *Ch'ien-Han shu* entitled *Han shu yin-i*, Mêng K'ang, who lived in the first half of the 3rd cent., had a note saying that «*ta-pu* is 白疊 *po-tieh*» (cf. also *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 691, 1 a; in spite of the *Chêng-tzū t'ung*, s. v. 棉 *mien*, Mêng K'ang of course does not yet speak of «*chi-pei*»). In the first half of the 7th cent., Yen Shih-ku opposed this view, saying (*Ch'ien-Han shu*, 91, 3 b): «[*Ta-pu*] was a coarse cloth; it was cheap, and that is why it had to be delivered [in paying taxes] in the same weight as leather; it is not *po-tieh*. As to *ta*, [it expresses] the idea of 'thick and heavy' (厚重 *hou-chung*), but readers have foolishly given it the sound *t'a*, which is not correct.» Later authors have quoted Yen Shih-ku's text, more or less accurately, in particular Chang Shou-chieh, who, in his commentary on Ssü-ma Ch'ien, dated 736 (not «737», as said by CHAVANNES, *Mém. histor.*, I, CCXVI, and TP, 1907, 183, followed by LAUFER, *The Story of the Pinna*, 115), added on his own account (TAKIGAWA ed., 129, 35): «*Po-tieh* is woven from cotton (*mu-mien*), which does not exist in China.»

Yet Yen Shih-ku's dogmatic assertion is not conclusive. The *Tz'ü-yüan*, under *tu-pu*, maintains that the *tu-pu* of Ma Yüan's biographical notice is the same as the hempen light material known in Kuang-tung as 絡布 *lo-pu* or 都落 *tu-lo*, which is worn in summer, and, at the same time, under 苔 *ta*, says that *ta* in *ta-pu* is the same as *tieh*, «to duplicate», and expresses the idea of «thickness». But, in view of the alternation of *ta-pu* and *tu-pu* in the *Hou-Han shu* and the *Tung-kuan Han chi*, it seems probable that both designate the same textile and are doublets of the same term. On the other hand, this double form would almost imply that both represent a foreign southern term borrowed twice at different stages of phonetic evolution; the relation between *ta* (**táp*) and *tu* (**tuo*) would be practically the same as between *chieh* (**kjǝp*) and *ku* (**kuo*) in the transcriptions *chieh-pei* and *ku-pei* of **kappāi* < *kappāsī* (cf. above, p. 441). Yü Chêng-hsieh (*Kuei-ssü lei-kao*, 14, 4 a) accepts Mêng K'ang's view that the *ta-pu* was *po-tieh*, «cotton». FUJITA has also hypothetically connected with *ta-pu* the puzzling term 打布 *ta-pu* which occurs several times in the *Tao-i chih-lio*, written in the middle of the 14th cent. (*Tao-i chih-lio chiao-chu*, Hsüeh-t'ang *ts'ung-shu* ed., 15 a); on this late *ta-pu*, cf. ROCKHILL, in TP, 1915, 86, 237, where *ta-pu* is supposed to be some cotton fabric (but the reference to a term 達布 *ta-pu* in Chao Ju-kua must be suppressed, since Chao Ju-kua actually speaks of 于達布 *yü-ta pu*; cf. HR, 160). I feel very sceptical about FUJITA's hypothesis. The interval in time is so great that the proposed connection remains *en l'air* unless the expression can be traced in some southern dialect. Moreover it may not be necessary. In his *Chên-la fêng-t'u chi*, «Description of the customs of Cambodia», Chou Ta-kuan, also a writer of the Yüan period, speaks of the rules which decided the kind of «cloth» (布 *pu*) which everyone was entitled to «put on» (打 *ta*), and also of the brahmans, who, besides the «cloth put on» (*ta-pu*) by everybody, wore a band (*Ku-chin shuo hai* ed., 6 a, b, 8 a; BEFEO, II, 146-148). It may be that the *ta-pu* of the *Tao-i chih-lio* was a term of the spoken language, designating a cheap cotton fabric, a «cloth to wear». One might be also tempted to see the same