

chih section, in the description of the Wo kingdom, or Japan (30, 11 a); it is very embarrassing. We are told that, in the Wo kingdom, «men leave the top of the head bare and tie *mu-mien* round (?) their heads» (男子皆露紛以木絲招頭). Now, scholars are agreed that the Wo people did not know cotton for centuries after the date of this text. *Mu-mien* has, however, been interpreted as meaning cotton in this passage, possibly with the idea that this was cotton stuff imported from abroad. But it seems hardly possible that, at a date when cotton was still unknown in China proper, enough cotton material should have come from the south seas to provide one of the elements of the national costume of the Wo population. I have consulted my colleague Haguenaer on this point. Unfortunately, the history of the Japanese names of cotton, *momen* and *wata*, is hard to trace; in particular, one cannot tell how and when Ch. *mu-mien*, which ought to have given **moku-men* in Japanese, became *momen*. HAGUENAUER remarks that, in the *Kiki* and the *Manyōshū*, 木綿 is used to represent Jap. *yufu* (**jup-*) > *yū*, and that this may reflect the change of technique from a tow headband to a cotton one. But 木綿 as representing Jap. *yufu* > *yū*, has also been interpreted as a designation of the ancient coarse cloth made from the «liber» of the paper-mulberry, *Broussonetia papyrifera* (cf. also the cloth and the paper made from the «bark» of the *fu-sang* tree in the half-legendary accounts of Fu-sang [*Liang shu*, 54, 11-12, and SCHLEGEL, in *TP*, 1892, 121, 129-134]). The cloth which, according to the *Sui shu*, 81, 5 a, was worn by the natives of Liu-ch'iu (probably then = Formosa), seems to have been made from the «bark» of a different tree. I have no authority to decide on the purely Japanese side of the problems, but I feel certain that, in the text of the *San-kuo chih*, *mu-mien* does not mean cotton. The term had been created in southern China and Tongking where there were both *Bombax* and *Gossypium*; but the Wei, in northern China, had neither. On the other hand, when speaking of the *mu-mien* of Wo men, the Chinese Wei account cannot have copied a Sino-Japanese term, since Chinese writing was still unknown in Japan at that period. The Wei must have used the new southern term *mu-mien*, «tree-floss», which conveyed no precise meaning to them, as a designation of the mulberry bast cloth of the Japanese. And, at first, the Japanese in their turn copied the Wei when they adopted 木綿 as an ideographic notation of their own native word *yufu*. It was only at a later stage that they read it *momen* and used it in the sense of «cotton».

We might have expected to find something about *mu-mien* in the *Nan-fang ts'ao-mu chuang*, «Description of plants and trees of the southern regions», due to 嵇含 Hsi Han (264-307). In fact, the term does not even occur in it. But we must not forget that the transmission of the work attributed to Hsi Han is far from satisfactory; the text, as we have it, contains interpolations, and there are also omissions (cf. *BEFEO*, XIV, ix, 10).

The 羅浮山記 *Lo-fou-shan chi*, or «Description of the Lo-fou Mountain» (in Kuang-tung), by 袁宏 Yüan Hung (328-376; cf. *Sui ching-chi-chih k'ao-chêng*, 6, 19 a; Wu Shih-chien's *Pu Chin shu ching-chi-chih*, 2, 20 a) is lost, but the following passage has been preserved in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (960, 17 a; cf. also *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 303, 1 b, and, for a very incomplete version, *shih-huo tien*, 312, *tsa-lu*, 2 a): «The *mu-mien* gives in the first month flowers which are as great as [those of] the *fu-jung* ('nelumbium', or, if taken in the sense of 木芙蓉 *mu fu-jung*, 'hibiscus'). When the flowers fall, it forms carpels (子方 *tzü-*