

cf. *infra*, p. 499), the *Nung-sang i-shih ts'o-yao* (1330; cf. *infra*, p. 504) and the *Tao-i chih-liao* (1350). Even after these dates, however, its adoption was far from being general: the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* always employs the old form, and so does the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*.

The now usual name of cotton, 棉花 *mien-hua*, does not often occur, either as such or with the earlier form of *mien*, before the second half of the 17th cent.; LI Shih-chên and even the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* ignore it. It is, however, fairly ancient. In his *Hsi-yü fan-kuo chih* (*Pei-p'ing T'u-shu-kuan shan-pên ts'ung-shu* ed., 19 b), Ch'ên Ch'êng, who, in 1414, was sent on a mission to various countries of Central Asia, says of Lükçün (east of Turfan) that «it produces 綿花 *mien-hua* with which one can make cloth (*pu*)». In his 圖書編 *T'u-shu pien* (89, 30 b), written from 1562 to 1577, CHANG Huang (1527-1608) says that the *so-lo pu* (cf. *infra*, p. 478) is made of 棉花 *mien-hua*; the same form also occurs in the *Min-pu shu*, written in 1585 (cf. *infra*, p. 480).

As to 草棉 *ts'ao-mien*, «plant cotton», it is a botanical name of fairly late origin. Up to now, I have not traced it earlier than 趙學敏 CHAO Hsüeh-min's 本草綱目拾遺 *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i* which was completed in 1765 (5, 10 a-b); CHAO employs *ts'ao-mien* in his own composition, and also in a quotation from a 藥性考 *Yao-hsing k'ao* which is unknown to me, which seems to have been then a recent work. I must add a few words to vindicate the date 1765 which I have assigned to the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i*. LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 229) says that the work was published in 1650, and only reprinted in 1765. This is in agreement with MO Yu-chih's Catalogue (Jap. ed., 8, 11 a), where we read that the *kêng-yin* of the preface of CHAO's collected medical works corresponds to 1650. On the other hand, YANG Shou-ching says, in a contradictory way (*Ts'ung-shu chü-yao*, 12, 31), first that the collective edition of CHAO's twelve medical works engraved under K'ang-hsi (1662-1722) is scarce, and secondly that only the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i* has been engraved. The date 1650 is impossible, since the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i* quotes abundantly from PIÑUELA's *Pên-ts'ao pu*, which appeared only in 1697 (cf. COURANT, *Catalogue*, 5332). CHAO Hsüeh-min's own preface to the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i* is dated 1765, and I have no doubt that there has never been an earlier edition, either in 1650, or under K'ang-hsi. After his first work had been engraved, CHAO thought of publishing his other medical works in a collective edition with the present one, and wrote for the collection a preface dated *kêng-yin*; this *kêng-yin* corresponds neither to 1650, nor to 1710, but to 1770. As no work of CHAO has survived except the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i*, it seems that the scheme of the collective edition was never carried out.

A term 花衣 *hua-i*, lit. «flower-garment», is known as a designation of «cotton cleansed of seeds». Curiously enough, it seems to go back to the beginning of the 5th cent.; *hua-i* occurs in ch. 25 of the *Shih-sung lü*, translated in A. D. 404 (NANJIÖ, No. 1115; 張, IV, 58 b), and is translated «cotton» by CHAVANNES, *500 Contes*, II, 260. Another term 子花 *tzü-hua*, «seed flower» is mentioned in the *Tung-hsi yang k'ao* (5, 6 a; cf. also 9 b, 10 b) among the products of Lü-sung (Luçon = the Philippines), with the gloss «it is *chi-pei* flowers (*chi-pei hua*)»; so it must have been a trade name of cotton, used, at least locally, at the beginning of the 17th cent. Such must have been the case also in the 6th cent. with 南布 *nan-pu*, «southern cloth» of *Ch'ên shu*, 27, 4 b, and, under the Yüan, of 南綿 *nan-mien*, «southern floss», of YS, 90, 8 a. In 1617-1618, 東京布 *Tung-ching pu*, «cloth of the Eastern Capital», was the designation of a cotton fabric in narrow strips