

probably the proper reading, the *sê* being due to the contamination of the next name, in which *sê* occurs. Now, Wên-su is the ancient name of Uč-Turfan (north-west of Aqsu), and it may be that the cloth manufactured in the Mediterranean Orient was called « Wên-su cloth » by analogy with the one really coming from Wên-su. The *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* readings are not to be neglected; for instance, for the name preceding that of « Wên-sê cloth » or « Wên-su cloth », our text of the *Wei lio* gives « 度代 *tu-tai* cloth » (or, in the Ch'ien-lung edition, 度伐 *tu-fa*), but, in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, it is « 鹿代 *lu-tai* cloth », and *lu-tai* (**luk-d'âi*) closely resembles the red brocade *lohtai* (or *luhtai*) of Kāšyārī (cf. *Brockelmann*, 119, where SCHINDLER's restoration into 絡帶 *lo-tai*, **lâk-tâi*, is valueless; *lo-tai* exists, but its meaning is quite different; cf. *TP*, 1929, 144). But, even if we read « Wên-su cloth » instead of « Wên-sê cloth », that would only bear evidence to the early renown of the textiles of Chinese Turkestan, without providing any indication as to their nature, wool or cotton.

Another case is more intricate. One of the textiles most often mentioned in the Kharoṣṭhī documents is *koj'ava* or *kośava*. LÜDERS (*Textilien im alten Turkistan*, 3-11) pronounced himself in favour of a Skr. original **kaucapa*, itself of foreign origin, and rejected a possible, but difficult derivation from Kuči, the ancient name of Kučā; **kaucapa* would be the designation of a woollen blanket or carpet. In my review of LÜDERS's paper (*Oriental. Literaturzeitung*, 1938, 184-185), I suggested that Ch. 毳毼 *ch'ü-shu* (**k'iu-siəu* or **g'iu-siəu*) might be a transcription of the same word (Hui-lin [爲, VIII, 93 b] says that *ch'ü-shu* was a foreign word of Central Asia [胡 Hu], and that the fabric was popularly known as 毛錦 *mao-chin*, « woollen brocade »), and remarked that the derivative form of **kaucapa*, *kaucapaka*, occurred in ch. 44 of the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin translated by I-ching, but in a form 孤沾薄迦 *ku-ch'ê-po-chia* which would suppose **kochavaka*. I added that I-ching, however, was not a very strict phonetician in his transcriptions. As a matter of fact, I have since found, in another *Vinaya* translation by I-ching (寒, v, 72 b), the same word transcribed 高禰婆 *kao-chê-p'o* (**kâu-t'šjāp-b'uā*), i. e. *kaucava*. A text of the *Kuang chih*, quoted by the *K'ang-hsi tzū-tien*, s. v. 毯 (equivalent of 毼 *shu*), seems to connect *ch'ü-shu* with *po-tieh*, i. e. in principle « cotton »; but the text is of doubtful origin, and need not detain us. More important is Hui-lin's gloss on I-ching's **kochavaka* (*kaucapaka*), which is said to be 細妙好白疊布名, « the name of a fine good *po-tieh* cloth » (such is the text in 爲, ix, 156 a, and in Tōkyō *Tripit.* of Taishō, 54, 713³; the omission of *tieh* in SAKAKI's *Mahāvvyutpatti*, No. 5861, is an error). Now, a note by I-ching himself, following his transcription *kao-chê-p'o* of *kaucava*, says that it was the name of a « carpet » (毯 *t'an*; I do not think that the variant 絨 *t'an* can be adopted here, except as a graphic equivalent of *t'an*, « carpet »). As a matter of fact, I-ching must have written on the authority of some dictionary; *kaucava* was the designation both of a blanket worn as a garment and of a carpet; in the text translated by I-ching, it could not be a carpet, since it was the first of the five garments allowed to the monks by the Buddha. But the word *t'an* used by I-ching implies that it was a woollen stuff. We should gain nothing by supposing that a confusion was made between **kaucapa* (*kaucava*, **kaucapaka*, etc.) and 高沾薄迦 *kao-t'an-po-chia* of Ch. 18 of the same *Vinaya* (張, VIII, 18 a), probably a transcription of **kauṭumbaka* (cf. *Divyāvadāna*, 559¹⁰ : *kauṭumba*; *Mahāvvyutpatti*, No. 9163; *koṭambakam*; Pali *koṭumbara*), since the definition of **kauṭumbaka*