

independently MAYERS (in *Notes and Queries*, II, 95), followed by HIRTH and ROCKHILL (*HR*, 219), have thought of a Fukienese pronunciation «ku-tüng», and explained the term as a transcription of the Arabic *quṭn*, *quṭun*, «cotton» (cf. *supra*, p. 427). This is certainly the reason why *ku-chung* is underlined as being a transcription in TARANZANO, *Vocabulaire*, I, 344. LAUFER was right in denouncing such an etymology as impossible for many reasons; but one of his reasons will not stand, when, contrary to LI Shih-chên's plain statements, he says that LI Shih-chên held the *ku-chung* to be a «tree-cotton» (in the sense of *Bombax*). Moreover, had he not neglected the word *t'êng*, he would have noticed that a «creeper» was not a tree. But more serious difficulties have hitherto been left unnoticed. The *Nan-yüeh chih* was certainly written in the 5th cent. But Kuei-chou, which corresponds to the present Kuei-lin in Kuang-hsi, is an administrative name which was adopted for the first time in 507 (cf. *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, 355, 1 a). We shall see farther on that another quotation made from the *Nan-yüeh chih* by LI Shih-chên cannot be pre-T'ang. Perhaps the present one of unknown origin, if it be genuine, may come from the later continuation of the *Nan-yüeh chih*, the 續南越志 *Hsü Nan-yüeh chih*, on which cf. MASPERO, in *BEFEO*, XVIII, III, 7. Neither passage is among the fragments of the *Nan-yüeh chih* published in the *Shuo fu* in 120 chs., ch. 61. The extant fragments of the *Nan-yüeh chih* have been successively collected by CHANG Tsung-yüan and YEN K'o-chün, but unfortunately their work has never been published (cf. WANG Chung-min in *Fu-jên hsüeh-chih*, III [1932], No. 1, 17). In the present case, the authenticity of the passage may all the more be challenged on account of its disturbing similitude with the still more doubtful text quoted in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* as from the *Nan-chou i-wu chih* (cf. *supra*, p. 439). This latter text says: «The *mu-mien* (cotton) is produced by the *chi-pei*. When it is ripe, it is like goose down, and finer (*hsi*) than silk floss (*ssü-mien*). Inside there are kernels like *chu-hsün*. To use the [*mu-mien*], [the people] remove the kernels. Formerly they employed a rolling mill (輾軸 *chan-chou*); now they employ a seed cleansing stand (攪車 *chiao-ch'é*), which is more convenient. The cloth they make is called 'variegated cloth' (*pan-pu*). That which is gaily ornamented (繁縟 *fan-ju*) is called 城 *ch'êng* (? 'city [cloth]'); a coarser one is called 文縟 *wên-ju* ('ornamented'); a still coarser one is called 烏驎 *wu-lin* ('black piebald')». It seems clear that the passing from the «rolling mill» to the «seed cleansing stand» (this stand is depicted and described in *Nung shu*, 20, 16 b) and all the Chinese trade names for the different kinds of «variegated cloth» could only have been thought of at a time when the manufacture of cotton had reached a certain stage of development in China, that is to say, certainly not before the Sung dynasty. But, at the same time, if we leave out the name of the «*ku-chung* creeper» on the one hand, and the process of the manufacture of cotton stuff on the other, there is between the so-called text of the *Nan-yüeh chih* and that attributed to the *Nan-chou i-wu chih* too striking a coincidence in the trend and the terms of the description to be accidental. The «goose down» (the comparison with «goose down» and the name *pan-pu*, «variegated cloth», are used in the description of the cotton of Champa in *Nan shih*, 78, 1 b), the «silk floss» and, above all, the «*chu-hsün*» would not have spontaneously come twice in the same order to the mind of two different authors. There is even perhaps some ground to think that the so-called *Nan-yüeh chih* quotation may have been