

in the Chinese text (上毛縑 *shang mao-t'an*, «superior woollen blanket [?]») would not refer to cotton either. On the other hand, Hui-lin, in all his glosses on *tieh* and *po-tieh*, maintained that both terms applied to a cotton, not a woollen, stuff. The natural conclusion is that he must have made a mistake in the present case, and that the *kaucava* was not a «*po-tieh* cloth», *i. e.* cotton stuff; we cannot deduce from his gloss that the *koj'ava* or *košava* of the Kharoṣṭhī documents bears evidence to the cultivation of cotton in Chinese Turkestan at the beginning of our era.

But there is another difficulty. In *TP*, 1923, 129, I have already alluded to another passage of Hui-lin, who, commenting on the name Pa-lu-chia, Bharuka (= Aqsu) of Hsüan-tsang, says (爲, x, 46 b): «This country produces fine good *po-tieh* [and?] extremely fine woollen blankets (*mao-chi*), which are appreciated in the neighbouring kingdoms and in China; at the [present] time, people (lit. the people of the time) call them 'Mo-lu *tieh*'; in fact, they are woollen cloth. See what is said in the *K'uo-ti chih*» (此國出細好白氈上細毛屬爲隣國中華所重。時人號爲末祿疊。其實毛布也。見括地志說). When I briefly referred to this text in 1923, I accepted it at its face value, and supposed that 末祿 Mo-lu (*Muât-luk) was another transcription of Bharuka; at the same time, I noted that Hsüan-tsang and the *Hsin T'ang shu* spoke of the excellent textiles of Bharuka, and that the *Hsin T'ang shu* mentioned a «small kingdom» of Mo-lu east of the Arabs (who had conquered Persia). But the question is not so simple, and we must go into it in greater detail.

The *K'uo-ti chih*, a comprehensive geographical work in 550 chs. and 5 chs. of prefaces and tables, was prepared by order, and published in 642 under supervision of a member of the Imperial House, 李泰 Li T'ai, prince of 魏 Wei (cf. *Hsin T'ang shu*, 80, 3 a-b; 58, 14 a). It has long been lost. The extant fragments were collected and published in 1797 by SUN Hsing-yen in the *Tai-nan-ko ts'ung-shu* (cf. CHAVANNES, *Mém. historiques*, I, CCXVI; *JA*, 1902, II, 144; *BEFEO*, IV, 131); there is no mention in them of Pa-lu-chia or Mo-lu (SUN Hsing-yen did not know Hui-lin's work, which was recovered from Corea only in the 19th cent.), so that we cannot say positively what elements in Hui-lin's gloss are traceable to the *K'uo-ti chih*. But we have some indirect means of reaching a solution.

In the *Hsin T'ang shu* (221 A, 9 a), we are told, among other things, that Pa-lu-chia (Bharuka), a «small kingdom», produced 細氈 褐 *hsi chan ho*, «fine felt and serge». The whole notice is taken in fact from Hsüan-tsang, who says (Kyōto University ed., I, 17) that Bharuka has «fine felt and fine serge, which are appreciated in the neighbouring kingdoms» (細氈細褐鄰國所重; instead of «felt», JULIEN, *Mém.*, I, 10, translates «cotton», and WATTERS, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, I, 64, «cloth»; this is due to a misreading 氈 *tieh* in a late Ming edition, but all the ancient editions and mss. give 氈 *chan*, which is confirmed by the *Hsin T'ang shu*). Evidently we have here the source of part of Hui-lin's gloss, which is precisely a comment on Hsüan-tsang's text. On the other hand, it could not have occurred in the *K'uo-ti chih*, since the form Pa-lu-chia of the name of Aqsu is Hsüan-tsang's own transcription, and the pilgrim had not returned from India when the *K'uo-ti chih* was published. The mention of the woollen textiles of Pa-lu-chia having been taken by Hui-lin from Hsüan-tsang, his indebtedness to the *K'uo-ti chih* must be limited to the «fine good *po-tieh*», which were called «Mo-lu *tieh*».