

xxi [1887], 230) to a passage in which the Fukienese author of the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao* (*Hsi-yin-hsüan ts'ung-shu* ed., 4, 7 b; cf. also 6, 18 a; 7, 12 b), who wrote in 1617-1618, speaks of the *tou-lo-mien* of the north-western part of Sumatra « which is now called 哆囉唵 *to-lo-lien* ». HIRTH read the last character *nien*, a pronunciation for which I can find no authority in Mandarin; yet he was certainly right when he identified this *to-lo-lien* with the later *to-lo-ni*. Let it be remarked by the way that this older form *to-lo-lien* does not support the connection made by the *Tz'ü yüan* between the *ni* of *to-lo-ni* and the *ni* used alone in Huang T'ing-chien's poem. As to 哆囉 *to-lo*, it has been customary, since WATTERS' day, to say that it was also written 多羅 *to-lo* and that the latter *to-lo* was sometimes used as a designation of the cotton tree (cf. WATTERS, *loc. cit.* 439; GILES, *Chin.-Engl. Dictionary*, No. 11302; TARANZANO, *Vocabulaire des Sciences*, II, 743). But in Chinese mediaeval texts 多羅 *to-lo* (**tâ-lâ*), as a botanical term (in other contexts it has been a designation of a cosmetic box; cf. *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 717, 5 b), always transcribes Skr. *tāla*, the palmyra, *Borassus flabelliformis* (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*, s. v. « talee » and « talipot »). In *Essays relating to Indo-China*, 2nd series, I, 193, GROENEVELDT, who adopts a dialectical pronunciation « to-lo » of *tou-lo*, refers the reader to D'HERVEY DE SAINT-DENYS, *Ethnogr. des peuples étrangers, Méridionaux*, 474, n. 33; but this is a palpable error since, in that note, D'HERVEY DE SAINT-DENYS speaks of *to-lo*, *tāla*, not of *tou-lo*. Moreover, although TARANZANO gives both forms, in all the Chinese examples of *to-lo-ni* I know, the characters 哆囉 *to-lo* are used (and these we find also in the earlier *to-lo-lien* of the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao*), not 多羅 *to-lo*, and I have met the latter form only in the *to-lo-jung* of the *Chêng tzü t'ung*, a woollen velvet. It looks as though WATTERS' assignment of the secondary meaning « cotton » to 多羅 *to-lo* were a mistaken inference drawn from the term *to-lo-ni*. That the *to-lo* of *to-lo-jung* and *to-lo-lien* or *to-lo-ni* is due to a confusion with *tou-lo* is probable enough (as was already suspected in 1868 by MAYERS, in *Notes and Queries*, II, 95; cf. also HIRTH, *China and the Roman Orient*, 249), but the confusion is of late popular origin (later than the phonetic evolution from **tâ-lâ* to *to-lo*), and it has nothing to do with the old term *to-lo* which, as a botanical name, only represents *tāla*, never *tūlā*. My provisional conclusion is that *to-lo-ni* is an adaptation in Mandarin of a local term used in Amoy and Chang-chou. In the Amoy and Chang-chou dialect, this name is *to-lô-nîⁿ* (cf. C. DOUGLAS, *Chin.-Engl. Dict. of . . . Amoy*, 335-336), and it is a matter of very frequent occurrence in that dialect that an initial *l*, so pronounced in literary usage, becomes *n*- in popular speech. Thus *to-lô-nîⁿ* exactly represents the *to-lo-lien* of the author of the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao*, himself a native of Chang-chou. The *to-lo-ni* of modern Mandarin, in its turn, may transcribe the popular Amoy pronunciation *to-lô-nîⁿ*, in which the final *-n* is practically mute. If so, *lien* would be the true earlier form of *nîⁿ* > *ni*, and its connection with the *ni* used by Huang T'ing-chien must probably be discarded. The only remaining difficulty would be to explain *lien*, since there are in the Amoy dialect interchanges between *l*- and *m*-, but not in the case of 綿 *mien*, which is there pronounced *biên* in literary usage, and *mîⁿ* in popular speech. On the other hand, the other solution would remain possible, if we should suppose that, as is often the case in the Amoy dialect, the final *-n* of *lien* and *nîⁿ* is itself of secondary appearance, and that the *l*- of *lien* instead of *n*- is a mistaken purism on the part of the author of the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao*; but I hold this to be less probable. *To-lo-jung* may, in its turn, have been created on the model of *to-lo-ni*. In my opinion, *to-lo-lien* and *to-lo-ni*, as well as the later terms formed