

sometimes abbreviated as *chi-pu*, which gave the auspicious meaning «fortunate cloth». Chao Ju-kua's four categories leave out some of the terms he uses elsewhere, like *pu* alone (very frequent), 細布 *hsi-pu*, «fine cloth» (*HR*, 134; this was the designation of a particular fabric in Ming times and perhaps earlier), 雪布 *hsüeh-pu*, «snow cloth» (*HR*, 135), etc. In all such cases, HIRTH and ROCKHILL have rendered *pu* as «cotton cloth» or «cotton stuff», which may happen to be correct for the textiles of certain countries, but is not necessarily so; *pu* has been the ordinary name of «cotton stuff» only after cotton became a staple product in China, as it was not in Chao Ju-kua's time. In particular, it seems highly doubtful that, as would be implied by HIRTH and ROCKHILL's translation (*HR*, 168, 171), cotton cloth should have been generally used in Corea and Japan in the first quarter of the 13th cent. According to the *Nihon-koki* (ch. 8), cotton was introduced into Japan, independently of China, in 799, by a shipwrecked Hindu, or, according to the *Ruiju-kokushi* (ch. 199), in 800 by a shipwrecked man from K'un-lun (Indonesia and Malay Peninsula); cf. MOOKERJI, *A History of Indian shipping*, 1912, p. 174 (quoting TAKAKUSU's lecture published in *Journal of the Indo-Japanese Association*, Jan. 1910). But the adoption of the new textile seems to have been slow, and, moreover, would not affect the Corean aspect of the problem.

KU-CHUNG. — The question of the silk-cotton tree, the cotton tree, and the cotton plant has always been a *crux* for Chinese authors since Ming times. In recent Chinese works (cf. for instance *Chung-kuo* [藥] *yao-hsüeh ta tz'ü-tien*, 234), cotton from the silk-cotton tree is called 木棉 *mu-mien*, lit. «tree-cotton», and the true cotton, *Gossypium herbaceum*, is called 棉花 *mien-hua*, «cotton-flowers», or, still more recently, 草棉 *ts'ao-mien*, lit. «plant-cotton». Not a word is said of the cotton tree, *Gossypium arboreum*. But all this is modern nomenclature, and a mechanical application of it to the past is responsible for many errors. One of the more serious mistakes was made by LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 491) when he said that LI Shih-chên, the author of the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, considered the 古終 *ku-chung* as a «tree-cotton 木綿 (*Bombax malabaricum*)». It is true that LI Shih-chên (36, 71 b, 72 a) speaks of the *ku-chung* as a *mu-mien*, but it is because he always uses *mu-mien* as a designation of both the cotton plant and the silk-cotton tree; and, in the case of *ku-chung*, he most emphatically declares it twice to be «the *mu-mien* which is like a plant», not «the *mu-mien* which is like a tree».

Whether LI Shih-chên be right or not is another matter, and the problem must be approached from a different angle. In his notice on *mu-mien* (cotton), LI Shih-chên quotes a passage which is said to come from the lost 南越志 *Nan-yüeh chih*, or «Description of Nan-yüeh» (= Kuang-tung and Tongking), written by 沈懷遠 *Shên Huai-yüan* in the third quarter of the 5th cent. (cf. *Sung shu*, 82, 7 b-8 a; *Sui ching-chi-chih k'ao-chêng*, 3, 8). In LI Shih-chên, the passage is as follows: «桂州 Kuei-chou produces the 古終藤 *ku-chung t'êng* («*ku-chung* creeper»), the fruit of which is like goose down, and the kernel like 珠珣 *chu-hsün*. [The people] remove the kernel, spin [the down] as [one spins] silk floss (絲綿 *ssü-mien*) and dye it to make 'variegated cloth' (斑布 *pan-pu*)». This is the only text in which the name *ku-chung* occurs. Starting from it, SCHOTT in 1867 (*Altaische Studien*, III, 137, 138), and