

remodelled on that of the pseudo-*Nan-chou i-wu chih* at a late date. Both the *Nan-yüeh chih* in LI Shih-chên's quotation and the *Nan-chou i-wu chih* as reproduced in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* speak of 斑布 *pan-pu*, «variegated cloth», but in the quotation of the latter text made in 1313 by the author of the *Nung shu*, this term is written twice in the form 班布 *pan-pu*, of identical meaning, which is often used in pre-Sung texts (cf. the quotations in the *P'ei-wên yün-fu*); of course, both quotations may have used the more modern form, but it may also be that the so-called *Nan-yüeh chih* quotation was copied from the pseudo-*Nan-chou i-wu chih* after one form of *pan-pu* had, in the latter text, been changed into the other. More striking is the case of 珠珣 *chu-hsün*, which I have left untranslated. It occurs on the one hand in the quotation from the pseudo-*Nan-chou i-wu chih* as given in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, and on the other in the quotation from the *Nan-yüeh chih* in the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*; and it is carefully retained by the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (*ibid.* 303, 11 a) and by the *Chung-kuo yao-hsüeh ta tz'ü-tien* (p. 235) in copying LI Shih-chên's notice (but the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ibid.*, *chi-shih*, 1 a, leaves out *hsün*, retaining only *chu*, when reproducing the *Nan-yüeh chih* passage alone). Yet it does not make much sense. *Chu* means «pearl», and *hsün* is a half-precious stone more or less similar to jade (I do not know on what authority TARANZANO, II, 581, says it is a «branch of coral»). Now, instead of *chu-hsün*, the quotation in the *Nung shu* gives 珠珣 *chu-kou*, with a phonetic note expressly stating that the second character is to be read *kou*. *Kou* is also the designation of a kind of jade, and *chu-kou* is not much more satisfactory than *chu-hsün*. But I feel inclined to think that we have here an unauthorized form of some popular term designating perhaps seed pearls, with which cotton seeds could be compared and which was still understood in 1313. At any rate, the *Nung shu*, with its phonetic gloss, must have preserved the original reading, and since the quotation from the *Nan-yüeh chih* gives the same corrupt form *chu-hsün* which we find in the pseudo-*Nan-chou i-wu chih* as quoted in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, there is a fair chance that the so-called *Nan-yüeh chih* passage is a piecemeal forgery later than 1313. Some clue may perhaps be found to the origin of part at least of the so-called quotation from the *Nan-yüeh chih*. The *I-wên lei-chü*, a T'ang encyclopaedia completed c. 640, quotes a passage from P'ei Yüan's *Kuang-chou chi*, a work prior to 527 (cf. *infra*, p. 462), on the use of *mu-mien* («cotton») by the southern Barbarians to make cloth. The first sentence of the quotation will be translated farther on in the discussion of *mu-mien*. Then come four characters which I hardly dare translate (皮圓當竹, «the skin is round like that of the bamboo?»), and a last sentence: «They peel (剝 *po*) old «green creepers» (古綠藤 *ku-lü t'êng*) and spin (績 *chi*) [the skin] to make cloth (*pu*)». This text is certainly not clear; moreover it looks as if two different quotations, perhaps from two different works, had erroneously become amalgamated into one. The «peeling» of creepers occurs elsewhere: the *Nan-fang ts'ao-mu chuang* (quoted in *Ch'i-min yao-shu*, 10, 36 a) describes a creeper, called 聶藤 *êrh-t'êng*, «tuft creeper», which the people of the south «peel» (*po*) to make tufts (*êrh*). But the interpretation of *ku lü t'êng* is doubtful. It may be taken as the name of a creeper, the «*ku-lü* creeper»; or as meaning «old 'green creepers'», «green creeper» being then the name of a *lü-t'êng* creeper; or as meaning old creepers which are still green; or even, though less probably, as meaning «old [and] green creepers». I have found no trace of a creeper called