

cloth» (or «*ta* cloth») the same connection which had already been asserted by Mêng K'ang.

From all the documentation already examined, the conclusion can be safely drawn that the *po* of *po-tieh* is not a necessary constituent of the term, and that *tieh* alone, often miswritten in the forms indicated above, was a sufficient designation of the textile; hence the many terms like 疊花 *tieh-hua*, 疊衣 *tieh-i*, 織氎 *chih tieh*, etc., tens of examples of which may easily be collected from the quotations in the *P'ei-wên yün-fu*, the *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien* and YAMATA's Index. *Tieh*, used alone, translates Skr. *paṭa* in *Tripit.* 藏, x, 7b corresponding to COWELL, *Divyāvādāna*. 405². From a T'ang source which I have not been able to identify, Fa-yün, in his *Fan-i ming-i chi* (ch. 18, *Tripit.* 兩, xi, 87a), has culled the following notice: «鉢吒 *Po-ch'a* (**puât-t'ia*; Skr. *paṭa*) means in Chinese 'a strip of *man*' (縵條 *man-t'iao*); it is a strip (幅 *fu*) of *tieh* without 'field marks' (田相 *t'ien-hsiang*, i. e. without lines similar to those separating one field from another); the three garments (of a monk) are all made out of the same *man*.» A note by I-ching (張, viii, 109a) also explains *po-ch'a* as meaning *man-t'iao*. In ordinary Chinese, *man* is a name of thin plain silk; but it is constantly used in T'ang and Sung times as the designation of the loincloth, or the sampot, or the sarong of Indo-Chinese and Indonesian native populations, which was certainly not made of silk. In Sanskrit, *paṭa* means a «strip of cloth», and is translated *snam-bu*, «woollen cloth», «serge», in Tibetan (*Mahāvvyutpatti*, No. 5864); it is clearly the word meant by Fa-yün's source and I-ching, and not *paṭṭa*, «silk» (cf. *Mahāvvyutpatti*, No. 5867), with which it is often confused (cf. LÜDERS, *Textilien im alten Turkistan*, 24-28, and my remarks in *Oriental. Literaturzeitung*, 1938, No. 3, 186). But the Tibetans had little knowledge of cotton, and I take Fa-yün's text as meaning that *tieh* was, in principle, the designation of a strip of plain cotton. Speaking of Kao-ch'ang, Hsüan-ying and Hui-lin always say that «cotton» is called there *tieh*; they never say *po-tieh*. The pilgrims Hsüan-tsang and Hui-ch'ao, when describing the cotton garments of the people of India and Central Asia, always use *tieh* alone; when we find once in Hui-ch'ao (FUJITA ed., 70b) the mention that the people of the present Russian Turkestan used to wear 白疊氎帽子 *po-tieh mao-tzū*, I have no doubt that he intended to indicate the colour, and that we must translate «caps of white cotton». This also explains that *po-tieh* should have been rendered *yürüng böz*, «white cotton stuff» in a Uighur translation made from the Chinese (cf. *supra*, p. 434). An identical case occurs in the Tibetan *'Jañs-blun*, translated from the Chinese *Hsien-yü ching*. In Tibetan, *ras*, «cotton stuff», is the exact equivalent of Turk. *böz*, and *po-tieh* of *Hsien-yü ching*, ch. 5, § 25 (宿, ix, 30b) is rendered *ras dkar-po*, «white cotton stuff», by the Tibetan translator (cf. SCHMIDT, *Der Weise und der Thor*, Tib. text, 120; transl., 149; the other passages in which *po-tieh* or *tieh* occurs in the *Hsien-yü ching*, 20a, 59b, 70b, belong to sentences or paragraphs missing in the Tibetan version).

In many languages, confusion has occurred in the meaning of words referring to cotton, woollen, and even silk fabrics; *tieh* is no exception to the rule. The *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*, followed by the *Tz'ü-yüan*, gives only one meaning for *tieh*, that of 細毛布 *hsi mao-pu*, «fine woollen cloth» (lit. «fine hair cloth»), and the *Tz'ü-yüan* gives «silken stuff» as the primary meaning of *po-tieh*. D'HERVEY DE SAINT-DENYS (*Ethnogr. des peuples étrangers*, Méridionaux, 539-540) thought that *po-tieh* could be «the *nippis* cloth of the Philippine Islands, although he admitted