

by women of the same country according to the reports of K'ang T'ai and Chu Ying, and this was certainly cotton. Although, at first, *tieh*, as the equivalent of the *ta* or *t'a* of «*ta* cloth» or «*t'a* cloth», may have referred to cotton of the cotton tree as well as of the cotton plant, I maintain that it has always been the name of a fabric of vegetable, not of animal origin.

In I-ching's translations of the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, there is a passage, however, in which *tieh* is used in a wider sense. Speaking of fine textiles, the translation says (ch. 44; 張, IX, 89 b): « [Of fine textiles], there are four sorts, which are called 'Chia-shih fine *tieh*' 加尸細疊), 'ch'u-mo fine *tieh*' (芻摩細疊), 'chu-ma fine *tieh*' (紵麻細疊), and 'ku-ch'ê-po-chia fine *tieh*' (孤沾薄迦細疊). The «Chia-shih fine *tieh*» is the «Kāśī (= Benares) cotton muslin», which presents no difficulty; but *ch'u-mo* transcribes Skr. *kṣauma*, «flax», «linen», *chu-ma* is «ramie», and *ku-ch'ê-po-chia*, **kochavaka*, can be no other than Skr. **kaucapa*, a kind of «woollen blanket» or «carpet» (cf. *infra*, p. 492). So only the first of the four fine *tieh* is really a cotton stuff (the same may be said of the use of Tib. *ras* in *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 9160-9163). My impression is that this is due to the loose value of Skr. *paṭa* («strip of cotton stuff», but also a designation of strips of other textiles), which was probably the word used in the Sanskrit original which I-ching translated.

I may add that there were many mixed textiles, one-half or one-third of which was cotton; a descriptive list of such fabrics has been preserved in ch. 2 of NANJĪŌ, No. 1107 (寒, x, 16 a-b). The *Hsien-yü ching* (ch. 12, § 50; NANJĪŌ, No. 1322; 宿, IX, 70 b) mentions «a piece of gold coloured *tieh*» (一端金色之疊) made by Mahāprajāpatī. The *K'ang-hsi tzū-tien*, quoting this (s. v. *tieh*), adds that, according to a gloss of the text, this was the designation of a 織成大衣 *chih-ch'êng ta-i*, «great garment in *chih-ch'êng*». As a matter of fact the quotation in the *K'ang-hsi tzū-tien* is second hand, and is drawn from the *Fa-yüan chu-lin* (ch. 41; 兩, VII, 78 b), where the gloss is an addition. We cannot check the T'ang interpretation of the passage from the Tibetan translation, because, in the latter, there is no section corresponding to ch. 12, § 50 of the Chinese text. But there is no reason to doubt the gloss of the *Fa-yüan chu-lin*, which goes back to the 7th cent. Now, the important point is that *chih-ch'êng*, as it is used in the gloss, must be the technical designation of a fabric with designs and ornaments, a kind of brocade without a uniform coloured «ground» (cf. *infra*, p. 507). Mahāprajāpatī's textile recurs in CHAVANNES, *500 Contes*, III, 46 (cf. also PRZYLUKI, in *JA*, 1919, I, 397), where «un vêtement complet tissé en fils d'or» renders 金縷織成衣 *chin-lü chih-ch'êng i*, more accurately «a garment of gold thread brocade» (cf. also *ibid.* I, 281, «vêtements faits en tissu d'or», which really are «gold brocade garment»). The very fact that the said *tieh* was «gold coloured» precludes the possibility that it should have been a strip of plain cotton stuff. So we must be prepared to find *tieh* used in a number of cases with a wider meaning than the one I have deduced as original and fundamental.

Early in the Sung dynasty, a new character 疊 *tieh* was formed to write the *tieh* of *po-tieh*; it occurs for the first time in the 集韻 *Chi-yün*, a dictionary published by Ting Tu (990-1053), and is mentioned in the 夔牖間評 *Wêng-yu hsien-p'ing*, a miscellaneous work written by 袁文 Yüan Wên (12th cent.; *Wu-ying-tien chü-chên-pan ts'ung-shu* ed., 4, 3 a). But it never met with general acceptance, and I know of no actual example of it in a text.