Ho-po, ho-pao "pouch" = Turkic qap, xap

Henry Serruys, c.i.c.m.

In an article entitled "Remains of Mongol Customs during the Early Ming" published in 1957, I made a brief remark on the Turko-Mongol origin of the word ho-po [1], later ho-pao [8], in China 1.

The ho-po (→ pao) was an ornamental pouch hanging on the belt. The term ho-po entered China as a loan word during the Yüan period, but the custom itself of wearing ornamental pouches is much older. Long before the Yüan, the T'ang and the Sung knew similar customs, dating back in fact to antiquity. The Han called those ornamental pouches by such expressions as p'an-nang [3 or 4], p'ang-nang [6], ch'i-nang [6], and shou-nang [7]; after the Han we find the expression tz'u-ho [8] which will be briefly discussed at the end of this paper; the T'ang and the Sung knew the yü-lai [8] "fish-pouch attached to the belt". All kinds of articles or valuables used to be carried in them.

It is after the Mongol conquest that the word ho-po entered China. Long before the conquest of China the Mongols were used to carry a pouch or bag with them, but it was more a utility bag than an ornament. The Mongols no doubt were only following an age-old Central Asian custom. Jean de Joinville who accompanied (1248—1254) St Louis of France, speaking of the "Tartars" says that "they put the raw meat between their saddles and the lappets of their clothing, and when the blood is well pressed out, they eat it quite raw. What they cannot eat, there and then, they throw into a leather

---

bag; and when they are hungry they open the bag and always eat the oldest bits first... and when he opened his bag we held our noses, for we could not bear it, because of the stink that came out of his bag. It was William of Rubruck who about the same time described the bag carried by the Mongols and noted its name: "if he cannot eat it all he carries it off with him, or gives it to his servant if he be present, who keeps it; otherwise he puts it away in his captargac, which is a square bag which they carry to put such things in, in which they store away bones when they have no time to gnaw them well, so that they can gnaw them later and that nothing of the food be lost." If, as we shall see, this utility bag was later largely displaced by a more ornamental variety, the old functional bag did not entirely disappear, and W. W. Rockhill in a note quotes from the report of a Dutch ambassador who in 1654 in Peking attended an imperial banquet together with some Mongol visitors who "filled their leather pouches or skins with the hair still on".

Undoubtedly, those bags were used to store other things than food; or special bags may have been used for food and other bags for more refined purposes.

As to Rubruck's captargac, most modern dialects and dictionaries have qabtaya (in its written form, disregarding modern pronunciations), or qabtarya. A question which will be left unanswered is whether the final clusile in Rubruck's captargac is correct; whether Rubruck himself actually wrote it that way. At any rate, it is interesting that at least one dialect, Ordos, has the form with -r-, so that Rubruck's -r- cannot be called into question.

Evidently, qabtaya ~ qabtarya is an expanded form derived from qab, or in Turkic qap, or yap, having the general meaning of "bag, purse, pouch." -tarya as an element of derivation in Mongol seems to be very rare; I found only qantarya "lien qui retient quelquechose, qui l'empêche de pencher, de tomber". -taya is better represented: we have such words as untaya "error, illusion", ētuyaya "lien qui sert à tirer à soi ou à retenir"; nalṭaya "viscosité"; kütege "tourterelle"; kelṭege "crucian (fish)", kemtege "bones near the hoof". A few other words where final -taya, -tege of the written word yields -t'ā, -t'ē in the spoken dialects probably are of different origin.

---

4 A. Mostaert, Dict. ordos, Peking, 1941-1944, p. 282b.
6 Dict. ordos, p. 334a.
Another expanded form derived from qap is qapçuq appearing only in some Turkic languages. As may be expected, pouches carried by the Mongols are mentioned in Yüan sources. The Chinese ho-po is a transcription of qab, an abbreviation of qabtaya ~ qabtarya, or possibly for Turkic qap which may well have been borrowed by the Mongols from some Turkic dialect. The earliest reference, I believe, occurs in the Yüan tien-chang where we read that Mongols convicted of some crime had their pouches, ho-po, taken away from them. It is evident that the Yüan tien-chang regulations concern ornamental pouches the wearing of which constituted a mark of distinction; it was no longer the foul utility bag described by Joinville and Rubrucc. But the term ho-po appears in the Yüan-shih, too: at the capital of the empire there was a government installation, called ho-po-chü where pouches were manufactured. The compilers of the Yüan-shih, in another place, speaking of the tribe of the Qamqanas or Qabqanas, derive this tribal name from the word for “cloth-bag”, but Pelliot doubted that qab was the origin of the name Qabqanas, and, instead he proposed a derivation from Tu. qabqan ~ Mo. qabqa “piège à attraper les oiseaux et les renards”. An author of the end of the Yüan period, Tao Tsung-i, says that boots and stockings, as well as pouches (ho-po), worn at the imperial burial ceremonies, were made of white fen-p'i, sheep skin the hair of which had been removed. Since ritual and regulations for solemn ceremonies are likely to be conservative, the ho-po described by Tao Tsung-i, probably is of a particular type from an earlier period.

We may mention in passing that the Mongols of the Golden Horde in South Russia wore ornamental pouches just like their congeners in Mongolia.

11 Yüan tien-chang 39.9b. This passage has been translated by P. Ratchnevsky, Un Code des Yuan, Paris, 1937, p. 318. The corresponding text in the Yüan-shih 103.10a employs the word nang “bag, pouch” instead of ho-po.
12 Yüan-shih 89.14a; 90.3b.
13 Yüan-shih 63.35b; see Fr. W. Cleaves, “Qabqanas ~ Qamqanas” in HIAS 19 (1956), p. 401: “Han-ho-na (Qamqana) is like saying pu-nang (cloth-bag) . . . .”
15 Cho-keng-lu (63) 30.7b. The term fen-p'i appears in the Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih 3.23b (§ 114) and in the Yüan-shih 78.10a. For an explanation of this expression see Ant. Mostaert, “Remarques sur le Paragraphe 114 de l’Histoire Secrète des Mongols”, in Central Asiatic Journal 2 (1956), p. 3. Fen-p'i occurs also in the Ming Shih-hu as late as 1441; see my The Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions: 1400—1600, Brussels, 1967, p. 250.
Proper, in China, and probably in Persia as well: Egyptian ambassadors to Cinggis-qan’s grandson Berke noted that he wore such a pouch; although no name is indicated there is little doubt that it was called qab.

In China, by the end of the Yüan period, new characters came to be substituted for the meaningless ho-po, namely ho-pao "lotus-pouch"; while the pronunciation remained largely unchanged, pao was better apt to convey the idea of a pouch, or bag, and ho “lotus flower” may well have been suggested by the flowers embroidered on the pouch. The earliest writer to use the expression ho-pao "lotus-pouch" seems to have been Ma Chih-yüan. Ho-pao “lotus-pouch” occurs also in Yeh Tzu-ch’i’s Ts’ao-mu-tzu: the author, speaking of the daruya “governors” of the Mongol administration, compares them with the na ~ nai-tzu on the mouth of a ho-pao (pouch). But the original transcription remained also in use; in fact it appears in the Shih-lu of the first Ming Emperor: the Ming ceremonial comprised the Dance of the Pacification of the Four Barbarian Regions performed by four groups of four dancers each, representing the Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western countries respectively, and dressed in attire supposedly associated with those regions: the attire of the Northern and the Western dancers, described in the Ming Shih-lu and the Ming-shih, comprised a ho-po attached to the belt. Ornamental pouches are mentioned a second time in the Ming Shih-lu, but under the new transcription, when on February 7, 1439, a list of presents sent by the Ming Court to the Mongol qayan comprised “two ‘lotus-pouches’ made of red ‘field-leather’ and painted with gold.” “Field-leather” (tien-p’i) was a kind of leather the exact nature of which seems to be no longer known; apparently it was a specialty of some Central Asian

---

16 P. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, Paris, 1959, p. 94.
17 Chai Hao, T’ung-su-pien (1751) 25. 17a. Although Chai does not explicitly state that Ma was the earliest writer he is the only one he quotes.
18 Ts’ao-mu-tzu (1875) 38.10a: the phrase is quoted by Ts’ai Mei-piao (1890, Yüan-tai pai-hua-pei chi-lu [87]) Shanghai, 1955, p. 5, n. 2. Prof. Cleaves in his article “Daruya and Gerege” in HIAS 16 (1953), p. 251, translates (na ~) nai-tzu as “snap on the mouth of a pouch”. Could it not refer to the drawstring with which the pouch was pulled close?
20 Ming Shih-lu, Ying-tsung shih-lu, vol. 24, p. 970. Tamura Jitsuzô, Mindai Mammô shiryô, Minjitsuroku-shô, Môkohen 2, p. 533, where [70] is a misprint for [71].
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countries; at any rate, the Ta-Ming hui-tien\(^{21}\) tells us that two kinds of it used to be imported from Qamil, one kind made from ox skin, the other from sheep skin. The pouches of *tien-p'i* sent to Mongolia in 1439, and probably on other occasions not recorded in the *Shih-lu*, may well have been made with leather imported from such countries as Qamil.

The further fortunes of the term *ho-po*, *ho-pao*, in the Ming period are not easy to establish: the custom of wearing a pouch was not discontinued, but instead of wearing a pouch hanging from the belt, the general custom now seems to have become to wear a girdle made in such a fashion as to have a pocket or at least some empty space to put money or other valuables in. This new device was called *ta-po*\(^{25}\) (later *ta-pao*\(^{26}\)). The dictionary *Hsiao-shuo-tzu-yu hui-shih*\(^{27}\) describes the *ta-po* (~ *pao*) as a belt with a pocket in it. Later when under the Manchus the custom of having pouches hanging from the belt was revived or regained prominence, the *ta-po* may not have been entirely abandoned; at least the term *ta-pao*\(^{28}\) is listed in the *Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wen chien*\(^{29}\) (Pentaglot Dictionary) translated into Mongol as *köndei büse* "hollow belt".\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{21}\) *Ta-Ming hui-tien* (1587), T'aipei ed., 1964 (ch. 112. 3ab), p. 1654a. The kind made of ox skin was known as *pu-la-hsia-erh*\(^{79}\), a term still extant in Turkic and Mongol languages and designating one or other sort of leather: the word appears as *buliyar* "Leder" in *RADLOFF*, Versuch IV, 1850; in Mongol we find such written forms as *buliyar* (KOWALEWSKI 1187), *bulayayir* in the 1635 letter of the Northeastern Altan-qayan to the Tsar of Russia (see my article "Three Mongol Documents from 1635 in the Russian Archives" in *Central Asiatic Journal* 7 (1962), p. 26, where other references will be found). Besides Ordos and Caqar dialects, the word is also known in Buriat (K. M. ČEREMISOV, Buryat-Mongol'sko-Russkii Slovar', Moscow, 1951, p. 122a) and in Kalmuck (RAMSTEIN, Wörterbuch, p. 62a). Needless to say that what the various modern languages call *buliyar*, *buliyar*, etc. is not always the same type of leather, or the same as that known as *pu-la-hsia-erh ~ tien-p'i* in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The other type of *tien-p'i*, made of sheep skin, was called *pai-ma-ch'ih*\(^{73}\); the *Chung-hua ta tzu-tien* (Shanghai, 1936, vol. 3, p. 142) reads the first character *chia*, but otherwise offers no explanation except that "in foreign countries there is *chia-ma-ch'ih* which is the same as *yang-tien-p'i". As source of this information, the dictionary refers to Hsü Ying-ch'iu's [*T'an-hui*\(^{75}\) "Florescence of Conversations" but I was unable to locate the reference (this work in 36 chapters is listed in the *Ming-shih* 98.8a). Character \(^{79}\) indeed has the reading *chia* but in transcriptions of foreign words it often reads *pai* standing for *bai*, *be*, etc. As long as the original word cannot be identified, we cannot say with certainty whether to read *chia-ma-ch'ih* or *pai-ma-ch'ih*.

\(^{22}\) Lu Tan-an\(^{77}\), *Hsiao-shuo tzu-yu hui-shih*, Shanghai, 1964, p. 520.

I believe that ta-po of the Ming period is nothing but an attempt to sinicize the foreign expression ho-po whose sounds conveyed nothing intelligible to the Chinese, by replacing the first syllable ho with ta "to attach, to hitch." The visual element of the written characters may well have had is influence also: the very form of character suggesting an enlargement into and . However this may be, the second syllable po goes back directly to ho-po: qab of the Yuan period.

It would be interesting to know what terms for girdle, girdle with packet, etc. appear in various Ming novels. Lacking familiarity with this field of Chinese literature, I must limit myself to a brief discussion. In the Shui-hu-chuan, the word ta-po occurs several times: since this particular piece of clothing was both a girdle and a purse, translators have to make a choice between the two meanings according to the context. For example, Pearl S. Buck employs such expressions as "girdle", "leather belt", or "woven girdle" for ta-po while in other places the context itself requires "money bag." It is strange that in the expression ta-po, the second character, meaning "arm" was not replaced with another one better apt to convey the idea of "pocket" or "bag"; however in the Ta-Ming hui-tien and thereafter in the Ming-shih, the whole expression ta-po was further sinicized by substituting new characters comprising the element "clothing." The spelling ta-pao, as far as I know, came into use only in the Manchu period: it is listed, as indicated above, in the Ch'ing-wen chien, and it occurs also in the novel Hung-lou-meng (hui 24): "so saying, he took a package of silver from his belt pocket."

At the same time, under the Manchu dynasty, the custom of wearing ornamental pouches hanging from the belt, was revived — if it had ever disappeared — and with it returned the expression ho-pao: qab, although

---

24 All Men are Brothers (Shui-Hu Chuan), translated from the Chinese by Pearl S. Buck, New York, 1933, pp. 37, 38, 50, 95, 103.
25 Ibid., pp. 43, 44. In the Chin-p'ing-mei I found the expression ch'ieh-tai "egg-plant pouch". The Hsiao-shuo tz'u-yü hui-shih, p. 400, explains it as ho-pao "lotus-pouch". See Chin-p'ing-mei tz'u-hua (2 vols., no place, no date), hui 3, pp. 38, 40. A. Waley (trsl.), Chin P'ing Mei, The Adventurous History of Hsi Men and his Six Wives, New York, 1947, p. 58 "pocket", and p. 61 "purse". The name ch'ieh-tai clearly implies a purse hanging down from the belt unlike the ta-po.
26 For example, Ta-Ming hui-tien (ch. 61, 36a), p. 1070b.
27 For example, Ming-shih 67.20b, 21a, 22a (three times on this page alone).
28 Dream of the Red Chamber by Tsao Hsueh Chin, translated by Chi-chen Wang, New York, 1958, p. 199, omits the word ta-pao; The Dream of the Red Chamber, translated by Florence and Isabel McHugh from the German Version by Franz Kuhn, New York, 1958, p. 181: "He put his hand in his belt pocket. 'Here are fifteen tael..."
or qabtay-a never entered the Manchu language as loan words. Ho-pao occurs frequently in the Hung-lou-meng, sometimes more than once on a single page, a sure indication that this little implement was widely used by the educated class. For example, in hui 17: ". . . present us with this ho-pao (pouch) . . . and all stripped him of his ho-pao (and other ornaments)." Chi-chen Wang summarizes: "so saying, he helped himself to the ornamental pouch on Pao-yu's sash."

Obviously, the ornamental pouch by the time of the Manchu empire had evolved a long way from the bags carried by the Mongols of the early Yuan period. The various polyglot dictionaries of the Manchus all list the word qabtay-a: ho-pao; in the Manju ügen-ü toli bičig a definition of qabtay-a is given in Mongol in the following terms: nükügesün-i dumdayur tögörig, dumdayur tegsi boylan eseqejü, egedeng türkin tolirayul-un dotorlaju, amasar-un eteged-i qabsur-un quniyasu kijü. yuduruul tataju jegüküi-yi qabtay-a kememüi. basa küü sang-un tükûgür ayulqu ba, jiçi bürçeg uči-y-a ayulqu-yi inu cóm qabtay-a kememüi: "if you cut a piece (of cloth) half round and half straight, and smearing glue (over it), stick a lining to it, then, bring the rim of the opening together into pleats and pull the (draw) string, and wear it, this is called qabtay-a (pouch); those in which one puts the key of a treasure, or a quiver or a little bag, are also called qabtay-a (pouches)." Admittedly the last part of the final sentence is a little unclear, but since those few words are not relevant to the pouches worn at the belt we may let them pass. The "round half" and the "straight half" in the description of the qabtay-a refer to what is to become the rounded bottom of the purse and the mouth respectively. Lu Tan-an describes the ho-pao in the following way: made of

---

29 Dream of the Red Chamber, trsl. Chi-chen Wang, p. 141. The Kuhn-McHugh translation, p. 132, has "purse". On the same page of the Chinese text, ho-pao occurs several times more and Kuhn-McHugh render it at least once incorrectly as "embroidered lotus-leaf purse", a translation obviously suggested by character hō. It is clear by now that ho-po ho-pao strictly speaking has nothing to do with lotus flowers.

30 For example, the Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wen chien, p. 3283. The Manchu equivalent is fadu (Hauer, Handwörterbuch, p. 265: "Beutel, Täschchen").

31 Chap. 15.62a. The Manju ügen-ü toli bičig, published in 1717, gives a definition both in Manchu and Mongol (only these two languages) of almost every term listed in the various Ch'ing-wen chien editions.

32 For the word quniyasu, see Dict. ordos, p. 369b "pli dans le genre de ceux qui se forment dans l'étoufe d'un sachet dont on a lié l'ouverture, ou dans une bourse qui se serre par des cordons; pli, ride, fronce." The same word appears in the description of a garment called telig, in Chinese known as nieh-che nü tičao-i "pleated Court dress for women": čuba degel-un adali boluyad. mangnuy-tur quniyasu tataysan-i inu telig kememü: "we call telig (a dress) with pleats in brocade resembling the čuba robe". Manju ügen-ü toli bičig 15.47a (Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wen chien, p. 3254). In my book Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions, pp. 245-246, 249, I have assumed that t'ieh-li [82] of the Ming Shih-ju was for telig, but now I have no doubt that the t'ieh-li dresses sent to Mongolia by the Ming Court were such telig as described by the Manchu-Mongol vocabulary. In fact, telig is also listed in Kowalewski's dictionary, p. 1719a.
satin and embroidered with flowers, oval in shape and pointed at the bottom, they are three or four inches wide and two inches deep. The author gives no reference for this description and it may well be based on actual observation of extant purses. In fact, his description fits well the photographs in I. Martin's paper: most of the pouches shown there are round, wider than they are deep; some, however, have pointed bottoms. But no two samples seem completely identical, and every single pouch may have been shaped, colored, and adorned according to the owner's fancy.

Here is how Prof. Schuyler Camman describes the Manchu attire with the ornamental pouches: "The belt ornaments were not merely buckles, as they have usually been described. They consisted of four circular, or rectangular plaques, their shape being as much a distinction of rank as their substance and settings. They were worn like the similar fittings on the belts of the Yuan Mongols, from which they seem to have been ultimately derived. One served as a buckle proper at the front of the belt, one decorated each side, and the fourth marked the middle of the back. As a Manchu innovation, the side plaques were also functional, having pendant loops from which hung small purses called ho-pao, long kerchiefs, knife sets, fan- or spectacle-cases, or even swords. In view of the origin and the long history of the ornamental pouches, it is a little doubtful that the Manchus introduced any substantial innovation.

As appears from the narrative of the Dream of the Red Chamber, it was the custom to present friends with one's ornamental pouches. We find a striking example of this custom in early Franco-Chinese relations: in 1845, at the end of lengthy negotiations between the French ambassador de Lagrené and the Manchu commissioner Ch'i-ying, when this official was introduced for the first time to the French ambassador's wife and daughters, "le Commissaire [Ch'i-ying] lui [i.e. Madame de Lagrené] fit un salut à la chinoise, et lui offrit d'abord l'éventail, puis une bourse brodée qu'il détacha de sa ceinture. Voyant ensuite les deux jeunes filles de M. de Lagrené auprès du sofa, il détacha deux autres bourses en soie jaune dont il leur fit aussi cadeau." Besides Manchus and Mongols, other peoples in the Manchu empire wore those ornamental pouches. In fact, as early as the first Ming Emperor, the ceremonial attire of the Western dancers, too, as we have seen, comprised

---

33 Hsiao-shuo tz'u-yü hui-shih, p. 534.
35 Louis Wei Tsing-sing, La Politique missionnaire de la France en Chine, 1842-1856, Paris, 1960, p. 444
such pouches hanging from the belt. The "Westerners" no doubt included the Tibetans. Indeed, about the same time as the Chinese commissioner Ch'i-ying presented the French ladies with his pouches, the French missionaries R. Ev. Huc and J. GABET, traveling from Mongolia to Lhassa, and back to Ssu-ch'uan Province, described the Tibetan attire in the following words: "a full robe fastened on the right side with four hooks, and girded round the waist by a red sash, red or purple cloth boots complete the simple, yet graceful costume of the Tibetan men. Suspended from the sash is a green taffeta bag, containing their inseparable wooden cups, and two small purses, of an oval form and richly embroidered, which contain nothing at all, being designed merely for ornament."

During the Manchu period, one of the numerous kinds of whistling arrows (shao chien) came to be named after the ornamental pouch. In 1953, Mrs. Kath. U. KöHALMI published an article devoted to the whistling arrows in which she has a few words to say about the particular arrow called ludu-jan in Manchu, qabtayan boroya in Mongol, and ho-pao shao-chien in Chinese. Mrs. Köhalmi quotes ZAKHAROV's definition of ludu-jan: "arrow with an iron in the shape of a duck's bill, and with four teeth and four holes in the head for the whistling (sound)." I do not know on what information Zakharov based his description, but let us compare it with the Mongol description of the qabtayan boroya as given in the Manju ügen-ü toli bićig: "qabtayan-u adali boluyad door-a du ni dörben qușuutai dörben tögörig ni quju nuşun-u qosoju temūr omkūnlügüsen-i inu qabtayan boroy-a kememūi. temūr-tür j-a ügei omkūnl-ūn üiledüsgen inu basa bui. Though easy enough to understand in its general lines, some sections of this text are harder to translate accurately. The Mongol does not seem to have been drawn up very carefully, but here is a tentative translation: "The pouch-whistling-arrow: (its head) is made in the shape of a pouch; below (the head) are four protuberances, and four round holes are drilled in which irons (in the shape of) a duck's bill are inserted; this is called the pouch-whistling-arrow; there are others with no irons inserted." The translation of the last few words strictly speaking cannot be grammatically justified, but at least the meaning leaves little doubt. KOWALEWSKI (760a) lists the ex-

---


37 K. U. KöHALMI, "Über die pfeifenden Pfeile der Innerasiatischen Reiternomaden", Acta Orientalia Hung. 3, 1953, pp. 45—71, esp. p. 51. In the preceding pages of the present paper ho-pao is always in Chinese. The transcription as far as I know, occurs only in the Sino-Uighur vocabulary of the Ming (see above, note 10) and in the name of the arrow of the Manchu period.

38 I. ZAKHAROV, Polnyi Maińčurško-Russkii Slovar', St Pbg., 1875. Not seen by me.
pression qabtayan boroya and gives the following explanation borrowed from the Jesuit (J. J.) Amiot (usually spelled Amiot): "Espèce de flèche qui est faite comme une bourse; au bas de la pointe il y a quatre angles, sur chacun desquels il y a un trou rond; c'est dans chacun de ces trous que l'on met un fer; il y en a aussi auxquels on n'en met point." This paraphrase is probably based on the Manchu version of the Mongol text cited above. Mrs. Köhalmi also quotes Amiot's translation but without further comment. Let us only note here that contrary to Zakharov's statement, according to the Mongol description of the qabtayan boroya, it is not the arrow head that has the shape of a duck's bill, but the iron pieces going into the four holes. The arrow head itself has the form of a pouch.

It is clear that this particular arrow head, named after its shape, was not pointed, but flat with a broad edge curved more or less like the bottom of a pouch. On p. 71 of her article, Mrs. Köhalmi provides pictures of fifteen types of arrows after an article by V. J. Tomachine from 1937, which I have not seen, and the original title of which is indicated only in its German translation "Chinesische Bogenpfeile aus der Zeit der Da-Tsin Dynastie". Mrs. Köhalmi identifies arrow Nr 2 as the qabtayan boroya which indeed has a broad flat head with a curved edge and a protruding angle at both ends of this curved edge. Below the head, the shaft ends in a round bulb with holes in it. The technical question of how those irons in the shape of a duck's bill were to be fastened in them, I must leave out of consideration. Neither does Mrs. Köhalmi explain how this was done.

What I have spelled boroya in the foregoing lines is translated by Kawalewski (1214b) as "bouton en corne au bout d'une flèche". Probably boroya means a complete arrow not just the arrow head. But Mrs. Köhalmi wants to spell borya or buruya, although Kawalewski clearly indicates the -o- of the first syllable; indeed boroya is the reading indicated in the Manju Mongol Kitad üüg yurban jüli-ün ayalyu neyilegsen toli biïti with a sort of lan-ch'ieh system for each syllable: po-o / lo-o / ka-a[43], Mrs. Köhalmi herself mentions a form borya in an undetermined dialect of East Turan, yet rejects this spelling for the Mongol form. There is no doubt that boroya is the only correct spelling.

After this digression we must come back to the Chinese name of this particular arrow: ho-pao shao-chien[43]. Mrs. Köhalmi translates this term: "umwundener pfeifender Pfeil." After the foregoing discussion of ho-po,
ho-pao: qab, it is evident that ho-pao is nothing but another spelling for ho-pao, and that it does not mean “to wrap around”. In fact, ho-pao here again is nothing but the transcription of a Turco-Mongol word.

The Wu-t'ii Ch'ing-wen chien also lists qabtaya boroya: ho-pao shao-chien.

Mrs. Köhalmi further briefly mentions another type of arrow called ya-tsui ho-pao shao-chien “duck-bill-pouch-whistling arrow” — in Mongol: qabčiju qataysan qabtaya boruya (in her spelling). Since the Manju tigen-ü toli bičig does not list this term, no definition is available. The Wu-t'ii Ch'ing-wen chien lists it immediately following qabtaya boroya. The Mongol expression qabčiju qataysan qabtaya boruya (read: boroya), Mrs. Köhalmi translated into German “zusammengedrückt ausgetrockneter [Säbel] taschen-jan” which is rather surprising and raises more problems than it solves. First there is no sabre (weapon) involved. Kowalewski (762a) renders qabči: “serrer, presser, prendre avec des tenailles”, the idea here probably being “held fast between two objects like in a duck’s bill”. Mrs. Köhalmi reads the second word qata- “to dry”, but a reading qada- is also possible and better suitable here: “to nail, to insert like a nail.” The Mongol name is not a precise equivalent or translation of the Chinese (or the Tibetan); and the Manchu term asumbuka tada jan “pushed-back pouch-whistling arrow” is no accurate equivalent either. In every one of these languages, the name evidently tries to describe vaguely the manner in which the arrow head was attached to the shaft, but essentially the arrow remained but a subvariety of the “pouch-whistling-arrow” described above.

These are, I believe, the main traits of the history of the word qab — qabtaya — ho-pao from the Yüan period to modern times. Yet there remains an intriguing question which has not been touched upon; as has already been mentioned, both in China and in Central Asia, the custom of wearing ornamental pouches is much older than Yüan times, when the word ho-po, ho-pao first entered China. Inevitably the question arises of a possible relationship between the Chinese ornamental pouches and the Central Asian custom.

41 Wu-t'ii Ch'ing-wen chien, p. 1055. Strangely enough on p. 3283, the Turkic equivalent for Mongol qabtaya is not the original qap, or xap, but keteči; the Turkic equivalent for qabtaya boroya is kete baši kez “arrow with a kete head”. For kez, see RADLOFF, Versuch II, 1170; kız “Pieil” in Çaydai. For kete and keteči, I owe the following information to Prof. Poppé (Jan. 28, 1968): in Kirgiz, keteč, keteči, ketečik is “a small embroidered purse” (K. K. YUDAKIN, Kirgizko-Russkii Slovar', Moskva, 1965, p. 382). Prof. Poppé confirms what I had suspected that this kete is related to Mongol kete “purse containing a flint and steel set”; see Dict. ordo, p. 263a: “briquet; la custode de cuir contenant un silex et de l’amadou munie à sa base d’une pièce d’acier servant de briquet.” Kirgiz keteči corresponds to Mongol ketečiči: (KowALEWZKI 2461ab) “la boîte à l’amadou”; Dict. ordo, p. 263a. The steel rim of this Mongol flint-and-steel set is curved very much like the bottom of the ho-pao pouch.

42 The Turkic equivalent in the Wu-t'ii Ch'ing-wen chien is ördek tumsuq baṣaq kez “duck-bill-head-arrow”. See RADLOFF, Versuch I, 1237; III, 1526; IV, 1551: baṣaq: eiserne Pfeilspitze; baṣaq-kez corresponds to qabtaya-boroya; again the word qap xap is not used.
before the advent of the Mongols; and the problem of a possible relationship of Chinese terms and Central Asian names. Admittedly, these are involved problems and the present writer feels qualified only to offer a suggestion with regard to one name, in the hope that it will arouse the curiosity of scholars better familiar with Chinese language and literature.

Of the terms listed at the beginning of this paper, one seems to present a promising line of investigation, namely tzu-ho\(^{46}\), literally "purple lotus-flower". There are three important texts from the Six Dynasties period bearing on this question. In the Chin-shu\(^{47}\) we read the following: "the Minister's ho-tzu\(^{48}\): with the sheng-tzu\(^{49}\) (silk?) they make a chia-nang\(^{50}\) 'double pouch' which is attached to the left shoulder on the outside of the dress. Some say that in Han times a report (to the Throne) was carried on the shoulders\(^{51}\) and so brought (to the Palace), but we do not know about that\(^{44}\)." In the Sung-shu\(^{52}\) we read regarding the same ornament: "On the shoulder of the Court dress is a chia-nang 'double pouch' made of tzu-sheng and fastened on the outside of the Court dress. (This pouch) is commonly called tzu-ho\(^{53}\).\(^{45}\) The third passage to be mentioned is from the Nan-Ch'i shu\(^{54}\): "the purple chia-nang 'double pouch' which the Minister wears on his shoulder is called 'seal-pouch'\(^{55}\) but is popularly known as tzu-ho\(^{46}\)."

As late as the Sui Dynasty, the expressions tzu-ho ~ ho-tzu, and chia-nang were still in use with this only difference that chia is now written with character\(^{56}\) with the same pronunciation and meaning\(^{47}\).

The Han pouches, called p'an-nang, etc. were always worn at the belt, whereas the tzu-ho ~ ho-tzu pouches of the post-Han period were worn on the left shoulder, but this may have been owing to changing fashion. The manner in which they were worn does not affect the name and is not of great importance to us here.

The question of the name centers around the expression chia-nang; taken at face value, the characters mean 'double pouch'. But is that the meaning? While the same chapters of the Six Dynasties histories regularly mention

---

\(^{43}\) I take this to be a kind of textile. The P'ei-wen yün-fu lists an expression sheng-tzu-shan "gown, or cape, made of sheng-tzu. Apparently it was the same as tzu-sheng of the following text.

\(^{44}\) Chin-shu (covers the years 265—419; compiled after 600) 25.13b.

\(^{45}\) Sung-shu (covers the years 420—479; compiled circa 500) 18.37a. Also quoted by CHAI Hao, T'ung-su-pien 25.17a, and translated by I. MARTIN, op. cit., p. 292. The Sung-shu also makes a reference to the Han custom; in fact the authors of the Chin-shu must have borrowed it from the Sung-shu which was compiled first.

\(^{46}\) Non-Ch'i-shu (covers the years 479—502; compiled after 500) 17.13b.

\(^{47}\) Sui-shu (covers the years 581—617; completed around 650) 11.6a, 20b21a.
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Tan-i as well as chia-i, lined and unlined garments, there is never mention of a tan-nang “unlined pouch”, which is easy enough to understand since a lining or the lack of it mattered very little for its purposes. Therefore even if the ornamental pouches of that period were usually made with a double layer of material, this would hardly be important enough to call them “double pouches”. According to the dictionaries, chia could also mean a collar, or lapel, but that was long before the Six Dynasties, so that there is little reason to consider the meaning “collar-pouch” or “pouch attached to the collar”. There remains another solution that chia in the expression chia-nang stands for a sound only: chia in Ancient Chinese is kap, which to the common people meant nothing at all and the people preferred to call those pouches by another name: tzu-ho, the first part of which indicated the material (tzu-sheng) of which they were made, and the second part, ho (Ancient Chinese: yâ) may well have been suggested by the lotus flowers embroidered on them while at the same time vaguely recalling the original sound. In other words what we have here is partially a case of popular etymology.

The very fact that the people at large were more or less reluctant to use the word kap seems to indicate something strange and unfamiliar about it: kap was a word of foreign origin. If the time lag between the third of fifth centuries for Chinese kap and the tenth or eleventh centuries of Turkic qap constitutes a serious objection to the borrowing theory, let us remember that a characteristic of the Turco-Mongol languages is their slow phonetic development: qap may well have existed in this form long before it was first noted down. Moreover, as is well known, the Six Dynasties period was marked by the arrival of many foreigners who settled in North China and even founded a number of shortlived dynasties. The official dynastic histories of those foreign ruling houses contain quite a few words of Turkic ancestry, some closely resembling the corresponding modern forms. To mention only one example, we may cite the well-known word hsien-chen for yamči, modern Tu. yamči, Mongol Jamči “officer of a postal station”.

If this view is correct, then CHAI Hao’s insistence that ho (first tone) in tzu-ho should be read in the fourth tone: “to carry on one’s back” becomes entirely irrelevant. Indeed tzu-ho is a noun, while ho in the fourth tone is a verb. Chai of course, was thinking to the Han custom of carrying a report on one’s shoulders or back, and according to him this was the origin of the word tzu-ho. Even the compilers of the Sung-shu admitted they were not sure what connection there was between the Han custom and the name tzu-ho.

50 Kang-hsi tzu-tien also reads ho in ho-tzu of the Chin-shu in the fourth tone like in ju-ho, so that ho-tzu is supposed to mean "to carry the purple".
Moreover, Chai also states that ho-pao was derived from zu-ho. As we have seen, ho-pao is an independent development from ho-po: qab of the Yüan period. It seems entirely due to accident that the same character ho “lotus” was chosen for the earlier name of the ornamental pouch as well, but as has been indicated above, the ornamentation of the pouches may have suggested such a choice of character.

I do not known when and why the expression chia-nang, kap-pouch, disappeared, and if my explanation of this term is correct, it is indeed interesting that a Turkic word should have entered China as a loan word twice in recorded history: as long as the final clusile of the ju-sheng was audible in North China, one syllable in Chinese was enough to render the Turkic word; later as the ju-sheng had disappeared by the time of the Yüan Dynasty, two characters were needed to render the same word.