

speaks of *po-tieh* as being made in Burma, or (87, 38 a; *T'u-shu pien*, 89, 51 a) at 干崖 Kan-yai (also called 干額 Kan-ê, at the confluence of the Nam-ti and the Ta-ping in Upper Burma; cf. BEFEO, ix, 666; the Sino-Pa-i Vocabulary, 10 b, renders Kan-yai as 猛那 Mêng-na, which then ought to be different from the 猛乃 Mêng-nai of BEFEO, ix, 669), or when it says (87, 29 b; *T'u-shu pien*, 89, 30 b) that Chin-ch'ih (= Yung-ch'ang) produces 縹纈 *piao-tieh* (? «purple tieh»), which is «*po-tieh* cloth» (*po-tieh pu*).

In this paragraph on *chi-pei*, Chao Ju-kua enumerates four qualities of cotton cloth, which, in decreasing order of value, are *tou-lo-mien* (cf. *supra*, p. 431), 番布 *fan-pu* («foreign cloth»), *mu-mien* properly so called, and 吉布 *chi-pu*. In Chao Ju-kua's accounts of the various kingdoms, *tou-lo-mien* is mentioned in the kingdoms of India and of the Arabs (HR, 88, 97, 116). *Fan-pu* often occurs, sometimes as of various colours (HR, 61, 84, 87, 88, 92, 126); we also find this term in YS, 16, 9 a, in the account of an embassy of 1291 from Quilon (see «Coilum»). *Mu-mien* is mentioned by Chao Ju-kua in the section on Chiao-chih (Tongking), where *mu-mien* and *chi-pei* follow each other in the list of the native products (HR, 46). Moreover, in the section on Hai-nan (HR, 183), we hear of the *mu-mien* which the Li aborigines mix up in their textiles with threads unravelled from Chinese silken fabrics to make new cloth, but this is taken over from the *Kuei-hai yü-hêng chih*, 14 a, which speaks only of *mu-mien* (*chi-pei* never occurs in the work), and *chi-pei* is Chao's own and perhaps arbitrary addition. The same may be said of the next sentence, when he adds that the Li women also weave cloth made only of «*mu-mien* or *chi-pei*». It looks as though the distinction apparently drawn by Chao Ju-kua between *mu-mien*, which he uses only for Tongking and Hai-nan, and *chi-pei*, which occurs for these and other countries, were artificial and due primarily to his use of different sources. One might think at first that he understood *chi-pei* as *Gossypium herbaceum*, and *mu-mien* as *Gossypium arboreum*, so that there should be no serious objection to the respective translations «cotton» and «tree cotton», which have been adopted by HIRTH and ROCKHILL. We must remember, however, that, in 1178, Chou Ch'ü-fei knew only the cotton tree (*shu*), not the cotton plant (*ts'ao*), and it was precisely this difference which made him hesitate to accept the otherwise obvious identification of the «*ku-pei* plant» of pre-T'ang and T'ang texts with the «*chi-pei* tree» of his own time (cf. *infra*, p. 437). Unless a great change had taken place between 1178 and 1225, Chao Ju-kua's *chi-pei* ought also to be *Gossypium arboreum*, and, as such, synonymous with *mu-mien*. But the fact is that we lack information as to the place, time, and condition in which the cotton plant progressively took the place of the cotton tree; it is only the cotton plant which we find from the outset in Chiang-su, as results from the details given in Hu San-hsing's text (cf. *infra*, p. 501). As to Chao's *chi-pu*, it does not occur anywhere else in his book, and may be a misreading for *chi-pei* or *chi-pei pu* (the 吉費 *chi-pei* of HR, 155, is another misreading; as to *pei*, used alone twice, HR, 177, 181, it is either also a misreading of *chi-pei*, or a «literary» abbreviation based on its use in the parallel definition of *po-tieh* and *ku-pei* in the *Hsin T'ang shu*; cf. p. 442); *chi-pei*, and its equivalent *chi-pei pu*, «*chi-pei* cloth», are repeatedly mentioned in Chao's descriptions of the various kingdoms. I must add, however, that *chi-pu* occurs in Wang Chêng's *Nung shu* (21, 16 a; 吉衣 *chi-i* is a misquotation in Wang Chêng's text as cited by Hsü Kuang-ch'i; cf. *Chin. Repository*, xix, 469), and it may be, after all, that *chi-pei pu* was