

be of no avail to start from Chê-po (*T'šja-b'âk), and to imagine a generalized faulty reading in all the numerous quotations of T'ang and early Sung times, since Chê-po would still suppose *Čavag, not *Ĵavag. But since Chu-po can only refer to Java or Sumatra, it is of some importance to note that we have perhaps here the earliest Chinese location of a country where a *po-tieh* which was undoubtedly a cotton stuff of some sort, was manufactured.

The *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (820, 19a) cites an edict of the Emperor Wên-ti of the Wei dynasty which, from its position between two passages of the *Wei lio*, can only refer to the Emperor Wên-ti of the first Wei dynasty (=Ts'ao P'ei, who reigned from 220 to 226), and moreover is well in the trend of many other productions of that learned Emperor; I do not know why it has been omitted from Wên-ti's writings as collected in YÊN K'o-chün's *Ch'üan shang-ku san-tai...*, sect. *Ch'üan san-kuo wên*, chs. 4-8. The text says: «The places of origin of precious things are always China and the Western Countries; the products of other countries cannot be compared with them. The 'yellow cloth' (*huang-pu*) of 代郡 *Tai chün* (=the region of Ta-t'ung in northern Shan-hsi) is fine (細 *hsi*), the 練 *lien* (=white boiled gauze) of Lo-lang (in Corea) is refined (精 *ching*), and the T'ai-mo cloth' (太末布 *T'ai-mo pu*; T'ai-mo is an ancient name of Ch'ü-chou fu in Chê-chiang) of 江東 *Chiang-tung* (lit. 'East of the Chiang', *i. e.* the eastern part of the region south of the Chiang; = Chê-chiang) is white (白 *po*), but they are not so fresh and pure as the *po-tieh* cloth (白疊布 *po-tieh pu*).» Although it is difficult to reach a definite conclusion from such a fragmentary text, it looks as though the Emperor Wên-ti wished to contrast good Chinese textiles with the *po-tieh* of western countries which he considered superior. This would be the more interesting since the text, if I have dated it correctly, may be more ancient than even the source of both the *Hua-yang kuo-chih* and the *Hou-Han shu* and provide the earliest instance of the term *po-tieh* hitherto discovered. I find next that, in 331, Ta-yüan (Ferghâna) offered *po-tieh* to Shih Lo, who reigned in northern China (*T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 820, 20b). From that time, *po-tieh* often occurs in secular literature and in Buddhist translations down to the beginning of the Sung dynasty (cf. *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*, s. v. 疊, and YAMATA's Index to the various *I-ch'ieh ching yin-i*). It would be an error, however, to believe that *po-tieh* was uniformly written with the same second character. Prior to T'ang times, as if *tieh* had retained something of its foreign origin, the second element of *po-tieh* was often written by the translators or authors 繫 *chih* (*t'šiap), 縹 *hsieh* (*šjät; or 縹 which occurs also in the tale of *Yu-yang tsa-tsu*, 14, 5a; HUBER, *BEFEO*, VI, 37, has translated 細縹 *hsi-hsieh* [= *hsi-tieh*], «étouffe d'une finesse extraordinaire»), 褻 *hsieh* (*šjät), and even 繫 *chieh* (*kiet; on this last form, faulty, but frequent, cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 357; *TP*, 1912, 463; 1932, 152-153, 183; *BEFEO*, XXIV, 102). These forms are more than once denounced as vulgar or incorrect by the authors of the different *I-ch'ieh ching yin-i* (to the remarks to that effect which may be collected from the passages mentioned in YAMATA's Index, add that of K'o-hung, ch. 18, in 爲, III, 68a). As Hui-lin says (ch. 35, *ibid.* IX, 25a), there was no authorized character for *tieh*, so that we find sometimes «emergency» forms created by the translators. What is more important, the same authors often say that the ancient form of *tieh* was 𦉳 *t'a* (*t'âp; altered in 爲, VII, 45b; IX, 72b, 128a; but correctly given in IX, 133b); but 𦉳 *t'a* is to 𦉳 *t'a* what 疊 *tieh* is to 疊 *tieh*, that is to say, the authors of the *yin-i* established between the *tieh* of *po-tieh* and the *t'a* of «*t'a*