

the «silk-cotton tree», which is its accepted designation in English. By «cotton tree», I shall always mean *Gossypium arboreum*, and, by «cotton plant», *Gossypium herbaceum*, both being designations of true cotton.

TOU-LO-MIEN. — A first term which Chinese commentators have generally equated to cotton is 兜羅綿 *tou-lo-mien*, «*tou-lo* floss», in which *tou-lo* (**təu-lā*) undoubtedly transcribes Skr. *tūlā*. HIRTH was in error when he said (*HR*, 219) that *tou-lo-mien* did not occur before Chao Ju-kua, *i. e.* before c. 1225; I have found it in a Buddhist translation as early as the end of the 3rd cent. A. D. (cf. *TP*, 1933, 429-430; *Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, VIII, 84 b, 163 a; cf. also CHAVANNES, *500 Contes*, II, 179, 265). Translators of the early T'ang period adopted new forms, 妬羅綿 *tu-lo-mien* (*ibid.* VII, 98 a; IX, 192 a), 蠶羅綿 *tu-lo-mien* (*ibid.* VII, 87 a; VIII, 187 a), 堵羅綿 *tu-lo-mien* (*ibid.* VIII, 51 b, 69 b), and 覩羅綿 *tu-lo-mien* (in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā*; cf. 爲, I, 16 b), which never became of common use. Fa-yün, the Sung author of the *Fan-i ming-i chi*, gives 細香 *hsi-hsiang* as the meaning of *tou-lo* (*ibid.* 兩, XI, 87 b); but this is a corrupt reading for 細爽 *hsi-juan*, «thin and soft», given in an early T'ang gloss (cf. *ibid.* 爲, VIII, 51 b, 69 b). Fa-yün adds that, according to Hui-yüan, *tou-lo* means «ice», and 兜沙 *tou-sha* «hoar-frost». This comes from an absurd note of Hui-yüan, who maintained (*ibid.*, VIII, 151 b; x, 129 a, 147 b) that *tou-sha-lo*, a perfectly correct transcription of Skr. *tuṣāra*, «hoar-frost», ought to be written *tou-sha-tou-lo*, and was formed with *tou-sha*, «hoar-frost», and *tou-lo*, «ice» (he was perhaps led to this etymology by the white and flossy appearance of the hoar-frost); this *tou-lo*, which may have to be connected with the mysterious **tudyu*, «ice», of BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, 70, 292, is puzzling, but certainly has nothing to do with the *tou-lo*, *tūlā*, of *tou-lo-mien*. The latter *tou-lo* also occurs either alone (*Tripit.* 爲, IX, 167 b), or as *tou-lo*-[毳] *érh*, «*tou-lo* tuft» (*ibid.*, VIII, 166 a). Despite the glosses, I suspect that 毳 *érh* (**ńzi*) may have to be here pronounced *jung* (**ńziung*) like 茸 *jung* (**ńziung*), and may be in fact the prototype of the later 絨 *jung*, 絨 *jung*, 絨 *jung*, and 絨 *jung*, «floss», «a textile with a nap», and finally «velvet» (cf. the formation of 耳 *érh* [**ńzi*] and 茸 *jung* [**ńziung*]). In a polyglot list of the eighty «secondary signs» (*anuvyañjana*) of the Buddha published by DE HARLEZ (*TP*, 1896, 370), the forty-fourth sign is that, according to the Chinese text, the Buddha's «hands were like *tou-lo-mien*» (in DE HARLEZ's paper 錦 *chin* is a faulty reading instead of 綿 *mien*; on this frequent alteration, cf. *TP*, 1933, 429), and the corresponding Sanskrit term, very corrupt, is *kulapatriśasu*, which DE HARLEZ boldly rendered «the skin of his hands was like the *kulapatri*»; a note adds that the *kulapatri* is the «cotton tree». But *kalapatri* does not exist; the true form was either *tūlasadrśasu*[*pāṇi*], «having fine hands similar to *tūla* (cotton)», as partly suspected already by BURNOUF, *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, 587-588, or *tūlapuṭikāsu*[*pāṇi*], «having fine hands [like] cotton cloth», for which cf. *tūlapuṭikā* in *Mahāvīyūtpatti* No. 5874.

Most Chinese commentators have explained *tou-lo* as «cotton» (*mu-mien*) or «cotton down», but Tao-hsüan (7th cent.) maintained that it was a designation of willow and reed catkins as well (爲, VIII, 51 b, 69 b). There is in fact a decisive text to that effect in the *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādin (*Shih-sung lü*, ch. 18, in 張, IV, 15 b); and the opinion has been expressed that *tou-lo* could even be referred to the cocoons of wild silkworms (cf. ODA Tokuno, *Bukkyō dai-jiten*, 1278). The