

twenty smaller ones, so that they could be accommodated on twenty camels, and were presented once in three years by the Arabs to the Kirgiz. The two nations had a treaty of mutual alliance, shared also by the Tibetans, and guaranteeing protection of their trade against the brigandage of the Uigur.<sup>1</sup> The term *hu kin* 胡錦 (“brocades of the Hu,” that is, Iranians) is used in the *Kwan yü ki* 廣輿記<sup>2</sup> with reference to Khotan.<sup>3</sup> The Iranian word for these textiles, though not recognized heretofore, is also recorded by the Chinese. This is 疊 *tie*, anciently \*džiep, dziep, diep, dib,<sup>4</sup> being the equivalent of a Middle-Persian form \*dīb or \*dēp,<sup>5</sup> corresponding to the New-Persian word *dībā* (“silk brocade,” a colored stuff in which warp and woof are both made of silk), *dībāh* (“gold tissue”), Arabicised *dībādž* (“vest of brocade, cloth of gold”). The fabric as well as the name come from Sasanian Persia, and were known to the Arabs at Mohammed’s time.<sup>6</sup> The Chinese term occurs as a textile product of Persia in the *Sui šu* (Ch. 83, p. 7<sup>b</sup>). At a much earlier date it is cited in the Han Annals (*Hou Han šu*, Ch. 116, p. 8) as a product of the country of the Ai-lao in Yün-nan. This is not surprising in view of the fact that at that period Yün-nan, by way of India, was in communication with Ta Ts’in: in A.D. 120 Yün Yu Tiao 雍由調, King of the country T’an 揮, presented to the Chinese emperor musicians and jugglers, who stated that “they had come from the Mediterranean 海西, which is the same as Ta Ts’in, and that south-west from the Kingdom of T’an there is communication with Ta Ts’in.” The commentator of the Han Annals refers to the *Wai kwo čwan* 外國傳<sup>7</sup> as saying that the women of Ču-po 諸薄 (Java) make white *tie* and ornamented cloth 花布. The character 帛 *po* (“silk”), preceding the term *tie* in the Han Annals, represents a separate item, and

<sup>1</sup> *T’an šu*, Ch. 217 B, p. 18; *T’ai p’in hwan yü ki*, Ch. 199, p. 14. Cf. DEVÉRIA, in Centenaire de l’Ecole des Langues Orientales, p. 308.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 24, p. 7 b. Regarding the various editions of this work, see p. 251.

<sup>3</sup> Likewise in the Sung Annals with reference to a tribute sent from Khotan in 961 (CHAVANNES and PELLIOT, *Traité manichéen*, p. 274). Regarding Persian brocades mentioned by mediæval writers, see FRANCISQUE-MICHEL, *Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l’usage des étoffes de soie d’or et d’argent*, Vol. I, pp. 315-317, Vol. II, pp. 57-58 (Paris, 1852, 1854).

<sup>4</sup> According to the *Yi ts’ie kin yin i* (Ch. 19, p. 9 b), the pronunciation of the character *tie* was anciently identical with that of 𪛗 (see No. 70), and has the *fan ts’ie* 徒賴; that is, *t’iap*, \*diab, d’ab. The *T’an šu ši yin* (Ch. 23, p. 1 b) indicates the same *fan ts’ie* by means of 徒協. The phonetic element 疊 serves for the transcription of Sanskrit *dvīpa* (PELLIOT, *Bull. de l’Ecole française*, Vol. IV, p. 357).

<sup>5</sup> A Pahlavi form *dēpāk* is indicated by WEST (*Pahlavi Texts*, Vol. I, p. 286); hence Armenian *dipak*.

<sup>6</sup> C. H. BECKER, *Encyclopædia of Islam*, Vol. I, p. 967.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Journal asiatique*, 1918, II, p. 24.