

women of the Nan Man (the aboriginal tribes of southern China), being fastened in their hair;<sup>1</sup> and were known in the kingdom of Nan-čao.<sup>2</sup> Likewise the women of Wei-čou 維州 in Se-č'wan wore strung *se-se* in their hair.<sup>3</sup> Further, we hear at the same time of *se-se* utilized by the Chinese and even mined in Chinese soil. In some cases it seems that a building-stone is involved; in others it appears as a transparent precious stone, strung and used for curtains and screens, highly valued, and on a par with genuine pearls and precious metals.<sup>4</sup> Under the year 786, the T'ang Annals state, "The Kwan-č'a-ši 韃察使<sup>5</sup> of Šan-čou 陝州 (in Ho-nan), Li Pi 李泌 by name, reported to the throne that the foundries of Mount Lu-ši 盧氏 produce *se-se*, and requested that it should be prohibited to accept these stones in the place of taxes; whereupon the Emperor (Te Tsuñ) replied, that, if there are *se-se* not produced by the soil, they should be turned over to the people, who are permitted to gather them for themselves." The question seems to be in this text of a by-product of metallic origin; and this agrees with what Kao Se-sun remarks in his *Wei lio*, that the *se-se* of his time (Sung period) were made of molten stone.

I have given two examples of the employment of *se-se* in objects of art from the *K'ao ku t'u* and *Ku yü t'u p'u* (p. 31). Meanwhile I have found two instances of the use of the word *se-se* in the *Po ku t'u lu*, published by Wan Fu in 1107-11. In one passage of this work,<sup>6</sup> the patina of a *tin* 鼎, attributed to the Čou period, is compared with the color of *se-se*: since patinas occur in green, blue, and many other hues, this does not afford conclusive evidence as to the color of *se-se*. In another case<sup>7</sup> a small *tin* dated in the Han period is described as being decorated with inlaid gold and silver, and decorated with the seven jewels (*saptaratna*) and *se-se* of very brilliant appearance. This is striking, as *se-se* are not known to be on record under the Han, but first appear in the accounts of Sasanian Persia: either the bronze vessel in question was not of the Han, but of the T'ang; or, if it was of the Han, the stone thus diagnosed by the Sung author cannot have been identical with what was known by this name under the T'ang. I already had occasion to state (p. 33) that the Sung writers knew no longer what the

<sup>1</sup> *T'añ šu*, Ch. 222 A, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Man šu*, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> *T'ai p'in hwan yü ki*, Ch. 78, p. 9 b.

<sup>4</sup> *Min hwan tsa lu*, Ch. B, p. 4; *Wei lio*, Ch. 5, p. 3; *Tu yan tsa pien*, Ch. A, pp. 3, 8; Ch. C, pp. 5, 9 b, 14 b.

<sup>5</sup> Official designation of a Tao-t'ai.

<sup>6</sup> Ch. 3, p. 15 b.

<sup>7</sup> Ch. 5, p. 46 b.