

cloth' (毛布 *mao-pu*).» We find here a confirmation in an early text of the theory I have maintained above, to wit that, even when ancient dictionaries spoke of *po-tieh* as a «woollen cloth», it was a fabric of vegetal origin. Chiao-chih was the name of the *chün* («commandery») which corresponds to our Tongking, and its seat was practically identical with the present Hanoi. The location of the district of Ting-an of the 3rd cent. is not well ascertained, but it must have lain south of Hanoi in the southern part of the delta (cf. MASPERO in *BEFEO*, x, 582-583, 679; AUROUSSEAU, in *BEFEO*, XIV, IX, 13, 15). The *Shih chi so-yin*, i. e. the commentary of c. 730 on Ssü-ma Ch'ien (TAKIGAWA ed., 129, 35; the passage does not exist in the usual editions of the *Shih chi*, 129, 7 a) quotes one sentence which looks as if it belonged to the present passage, but, instead of the name of «Ting-an *hsien* of Chiao-chih», gives that of «the *chün* of 九真 Chiu-chên»; the *Tz'ü-t'ung* (p. 2777), probably using another independent edition of the same commentary of c. 730, gives «the *chün* of 九德 Chiu-tê». One of the two names must be corrupt, an intermediary form having perhaps been the 意 form of *tê*. Chiu-chên is modern Thanh-hoa; Chiu-tê corresponds to the present regions of Nghê-an and Ha-tinh (cf. MASPERO, in *BEFEO*, x, 679). But both are much more to the south than the ancient Ting-an, and it would be surprising if the author of the *Shih-chi so-yin*, even if he wished to use a name better known than that of Ting-an, should have chosen such an inaccurate equivalence, instead of retaining at least the well-known Chiao-chih; moreover, there were no *chün* c. 730. Since the *Wu lu* had a geographical section, I feel inclined to believe that more or less similar sentences occurred in the descriptions of various regions, and that the quotation in the commentary of c. 730 was not adapted from that of Ting-an in the *chün* of Chiao-chih, but taken from the description of the *chün* of Chiu-tê or from that of Chiu-chên.

Another quotation from the *Wu lu* is given in the *P'ei-wên yün-fu* (16 B, 100 a, s. v. *mu-mien*), the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (*shih-huo tien*, 312, *tsa-lu*, 2 a) and the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* (36, 72 a), but I do not know through what channel it has come down to us (it does not occur in the fragments of the *Shuo fu*, ch. 59): «In Chiao-chou and 永昌 Yung-ch'ang the *mu-mien* tree (*shu*) is higher than a house (*wu*); there are some which last more than ten years (有十餘年不換者). The fruit (*shih*) is as big as a wine-cup. The floss inside the flower is soft and white (the text in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* adds: 'by breaking one fruit, one obtains several pounds [of floss]', which is absurd), and it can be used to make cotton-wool (縑絮 *wên-hsü*) and 'woollen cloth' (*mao-pu*).» In the first centuries of our era, Chiao-chou included Kuang-tung, Kuang-hsi, Tongking and North Annam. Yung-ch'ang was during the first centuries of our era the name of a vast region in western Yün-nan, between Ta-li and Bhamo, and its name has survived down to our days. During the partition of China into the Three Kingdoms, the Shu Han dynasty of Ssü-ch'uan had created in Yün-nan a Chiao-chou of its own, the seat of which was not far from the present Ch'ü-ching in north-eastern Yün-nan (cf. *Chung-kuo ti-ming ta tz'ü-tien*, 281); but I do not think that this second Chiao-chou can be meant in the text of the *Wu lu*. The manufacture of cloth made from the *mu-mien* tree in the region of Yung-ch'ang in the 3rd cent. is of real interest if we remember that Yung-ch'ang was precisely the seat of the Ai-lao tribes who made the *po-tieh* mentioned in the *Hua-yang kuo chih* and the *Hou-Han shu*.

Almost of the same date as the *Wu lu* is a passage which occurs in the *San-kuo chih*, *Wei*