

*ku-lü t'êng* or *lü-t'êng*; the terms *ku t'êng* and *lü t'êng* occur fairly often in literature, but merely in the sense of *t'êng* that are old or of *t'êng* that are green. Whatever the case may be, the main point is that the 古綠藤 *ku lü-t'êng*, from which cloth was made, is hardly different from the cloth giving 古終藤 *ku-chung t'êng* in the pseudo-*Nan-yüeh chih* text; one of the two forms must be a graphic corruption of the other, but I am not in a position to tell which. One result, however, has been reached, I think, by this provisional inquiry: the «*ku-chung* creeper», which has played too important a part in European research on the history of cotton in China, should disappear altogether from Chinese botanical nomenclature. It is almost needless to add that LAUFER's attempt at connecting *ku-chung* with Lepča *ka-čuk ki-kun*, «cotton tree», Sin-p'o *ga-duñ*, *id.* and Meo *čoa*, «cotton», is valueless.

MU-MIEN. — In discussing the question of *ku-chung*, I have referred several times to cotton as *mu-mien*, and we have seen that LAUFER rendered it «tree-cotton», which is indeed a word-for-word translation (*mu*, «tree»; *mien*, «cotton»), as if the term had been created in contradistinction to *ts'ao-mien*, lit. «plant-cotton», the *Gossypium herbaceum*. But this is a mistake. The word 綿 *mien*, formerly and more regularly written 絲 *mien*, is very ancient in Chinese as the designation of «floss silk». When cotton became known in China, cotton fabrics were designated as *tieh* or *po-tieh*, but unwoven cotton, and by extension the tree or plant which produced cotton was called *mu-mien*, where *mu* does not really mean «tree» in contradistinction to «plant», but vegetal in contradistinction to *mien* alone or to *ssü-mien*, which was «floss silk». The most that can be said is that, if the Chinese then created the term *mu-mien* (tree + floss), and not *ts'ao-mien* (plant + floss), it may be due to the nature of the cotton-yielding vegetable with which they first became acquainted; it may have been first the silk-cotton tree, and the name would have soon been extended by analogy to the cotton tree and the cotton plant. But this is not binding, and the Chinese may have done what the Germans did when they called cotton «Baumwolle», *i. e.* «tree-wool», although they certainly did not have in view a true tree like the *Bombax*. As late as the end of the 16th cent., LI Shih-chên did not know how to distinguish between the tree (or trees) and the plant except by speaking of «the *mu-mien* which is like a tree» and «the *mu-mien* which is like a plant».

The earliest mention of *mu-mien* I have found occurs in a fragment of the geographical section of the 吳錄 *Wu-lu* of 張勃 Chang Po (last quarter of the 3rd cent.; cf. *Sui ching-chih k'ao-chêng*, I, 12 b, and MASPERO, in *BEFEO*, XVIII, III, 25), which has been preserved in a 5th cent. work, the 齊民要術 *Ch'i-min yao-shu* (*Chin-tai pi-shu* ed., 10, 44 b; it is also given in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 960, 17 a, but is not included among the fragments of the *Wu lu* collected in the *Shuo fu* in 120 chs., ch. 59): «In the district (*hsien*) of 定安 Ting-an of [the *chün*] of 交趾 (交趾 in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* and *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-ma tien*, 303, 2 a) Chiao-chih, there is the *mu-mien* tree (*shu*), which is ten feet high. Its fruit (*shih*) is like a wine cup; at its orifice (口 *k'ou*, retained in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*; but the *T'ai-ping yü-lan* gives 中 *chung*, 'inside [the fruit]', which seems preferable; the next quotation, parallel to this one, gives *chung*), there is floss (*mien*) like the floss of the silkworm. It can also be used for making cloth, which is called 白縠 *po-hsieh* (on this form, cf. *supra*, p. 449), and by some, 'woollen