

fabric, *ku-pei* was the coarse, in contradistinction to the fine variety called *po-tieh*. Moreover, *po-tieh*, either from the outset or soon after it had been adopted, meant «white *tieh*»; but, in the absence of any other specification, it was used as a generic name for «fine cotton stuff». *Tieh* alone, however, was always felt to be a word which had this same meaning, and could be used in other combinations. The *tieh* was «fine», and yet we are told of «coarse *tieh*» (麤疊 *ts'u tieh*; cf. Hui-lin, ch. 65, in 爲, IX, 72b). Side by side with *po-tieh*, «white *tieh*», there are examples of 黑疊 *hei-tieh*, «black *tieh*» (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 133, where the translation «black garments forming folds» for *hei-tieh* is erroneous); one could not have said «black *po-tieh*» without indulging in a contradiction in terms. A distinction is hardly to be traced in Sung times between *ku-pei* (which had become *chi-pei*) and *po-tieh*, because *po-tieh* seems to have already become an obsolete term by that time, occurring only in quotations made from earlier works or in allusions to them. Neither *ku-pei* (*chi-pei*) nor *po-tieh* occurs in Fan Ch'êng-ta's *Kuei-hai yü-hêng chih*, the preface of which is dated 1175; it employs only *mu-mien* (*Chih-pu-tsu-chai ts'ung-shu* ed., 14a). In the *Ling-wai tai-ta*, *mu-mien* is used only once (10, 9a), in a passage which seems to be derived from a more ancient source, and it is not mentioned in the special paragraph entitled *chi-pei* (6, 12-13) which is devoted to cotton. In this *chi-pei* paragraph, *po-tieh* occurs only in connection with the Nan-chao (not «Laos» as in *HR*, 219, but the Ta-li kingdom in Yün-nan), but the very name «Nan-chao» betrays the antiquarian nature of the passage, since the former Nan-chao kingdom of T'ang times was known under the Sung as the kingdom of Ta-li; and, moreover, «Nan-chao», in Chou Ch'ü-fei's text, is a misquotation from the *Hsin T'ang shu*, where the passage refers not to Nan-chao, but to Champa. Chao Ju-kua's two mentions of *po-tieh*, in the paragraphs on Champa and India (*HR*, 48 [where the rendering «white muslins» is inaccurate], 111), are also derived from T'ang sources, but nothing is said of *po-tieh* in the special paragraph on «cotton», entitled *chi-pei* (*HR*, 217-218). In the Supplement to the *P'ei-wên yün-fu* (*Yün-fu shih-i*, 105, 9a, s. v. «*po-tieh*»), a passage is given as drawn from the notice of the kingdom of Ta-li in the *Sung shih*; the Ta-li people are said there to have had almost the same customs and the same dress as the Arabs (Ta-shih), and to have worn around the breast a piece of *po-tieh* which reached to their feet. But it must be a misquotation, since there is not a word of all this in the Ta-li paragraph of the *Sung shih* (488, 8a-b), and the whole passage is in *Sung shih*, 489, 1a-b, and refers to Champa. It is the only one which would suggest that *po-tieh* was still a living term in southern China under the Sung, and it may go back to a source dating from the beginning of the dynasty. The only indication that *po-tieh* had more or less survived either in northern China, or in Chinese Turkestan until the Mongol period is provided by the account of Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un's travels across Central Asia in 1221-1224. In speaking of the dress of the inhabitants of what is now Russian Turkestan, Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un says that it was made of *po-tieh* (WANG Kuo-wei's ed., 2, 1b), and repeats it in a poem (2, 2b). In the first case, BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 89) has inaccurately rendered *po-tieh* as «woollen stuff» and WALEY (*Travels of an Alchemist*, 107) correctly as «cotton»; both have omitted the poem. The «*po-tieh* cloth» mentioned by Hsü Kuang-ch'i in speaking of the garb of the Buddhist patriarchs (cf. *infra*, p. 489) is a scholarly recollection. We have, I think, instances of misleading archaizing, among hundreds of others, when the *Ming i-t'ung chih* (87, 35a; followed by *T'u-shu pien*, 89, 31b)