

In 1923, because of Hui-lin's remark that these «Mo-lu *tieh*» were «in fact woollen cloth», I referred to them as «Mo-lu fine woollen cloth». But it is clear that Hui-lin himself felt that there was there a contradiction in terms, since Hsüan-tsang spoke of woollen textiles, and he, Hui-lin, knew that *tieh* or *po-tieh* was cotton; hence his remark, which would imply that «Mo-lu *tieh*» was a misnomer. I think that the solution lies in another direction, and that the «Mo-lu (*Muât-luk) *tieh*» have nothing to do with Bharuka (Aqsu); if Hui-lin brought them together, it was merely because he wrongly identified the two names on account of some phonetic analogy.

Already in Han times, the Chinese knew of the existence on the eastern part of An-hsi (= the Parthian Empire), of a city called 木鹿 Mu-lu, which has already been identified with Merw by HIRTH (*China and the Roman Orient*, 142-143) and VON GUTSCHMID (*Geschichte Irans*, 66); cf. CHAVANNES (*TP*, 1907, 177). LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 187) objected that Mu-lu was *Muk-luk, and could not regularly represent Mouru, the form in which Merw occurs in the *Avesta*. But Mōuru, or Mōurv — rests on old-Persian Margav —, young-Avestik Maryav- (cf. BARTHOLOMAE, *Altiran. Wörterbuch*, 1147, 1169), to which we find corresponding forms in «Margiana» and in Armen. «Marg» (cf. HÜBSCHMANN, *Armen. Grammatik*, I, 51). The geographical equivalence Mu-lu = Merw can hardly be doubted, and, to make it phonetically acceptable, we have only to suppose that 木 *mu* (**muk*) is corrupt for 末 *mo* (**muât*), as already suggested by SCHLEGEL (*TP*, 1901, 6). This corruption seems to have occurred in pre-T'ang times since, when the old geographical names were artificially used in 656-660 for a new administrative organization of the Western countries, the region of Buḥara became the government of Mu-lu (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 138, 273, 347). Yet it may be that the Mu-lu form in the *Hsin T'ang shu* is itself not original. We read in the section devoted to the Arabs in the *Hsin T'ang shu* (221 B, 8 b) that «a man of 木鹿 Mu-lu in Ḥorasān, called 並波悉林 Ping-po-hsi-lin, rose against the Khalif Märwān (this passage had been misunderstood by BRETSCHEIDER, *On the knowledge possessed by the ancient Chinese of the Arabs*, 9). From the *T'ang hui-yao* (100, 12 b) and the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* (186, 13 b), we are certain that in this case the source of the *Hsin T'ang shu* is the lost 四夷述 *Ssü-i shu*, «Memoir on the four Barbarians (= on all foreign countries)», by 賈耽 Chia Tan (730-805). There can be no doubt that «Ping-po-hsi-lin», in which the first two characters are corrupt (the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi*, 186, 14 a, gives Li[立]-po-hsi-lin, which is no better), transcribes the name of the well-known Abū Muslim. As to his place of origin, it is written 木麤 Mu-ts'u in the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* (186, 14 a), but 末麤 Mo-ts'u in the *T'ang hui-yao* (100, 13 a). It is quite certain that *ts'u* is corrupt for *lu* (the intermediary form being the 麤 variant of *ts'u*); but the *mo* reading of the *T'ang hui-yao* may be correct. Even if it is not, it shows how easily a confusion can take place between 木 *mu* and 末 *mo*.

But 木鹿 Mu-lu, or 末鹿 Mo-lu, is not the only transcription of the name of Merw in T'ang times. The *Hsin T'ang shu* (221 B, 8 b-9 a) has a notice on the «small kingdom» 末祿 Mo-lu (*Muât-luk), located east of the Ta-shih (Arabs), in which many people have the surname 木 Mu (cf. LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*, 381, 399, 402, without identification). Here again, the source of the information is not doubtful; it is the 經行記 *Ching-hsing chi*, i. e. the account written by 杜環 Tu Huan, who had been made a prisoner by the Arabs at the battle of Talas in 751,