

from Tongking and Annam (*Tung-hsi yang k'ao*, I, 11 b). In my opinion, the 花蕊布 *hua-jui pu*, « flower-bud cloth » (or « flower-stamen cloth »), from Samarkand, mentioned in the *Kuang-yü chi*, 24, 15 a (and earlier in *Ming i-t'ung chih*, 89, 23 a; also in Khotan, *ibid.* 89, 25 a), was not an « ornamented cloth », as translated by LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*, 251, but a « cotton cloth ».

Employed alone, the combination 花綿 *hua-mien*, « flower floss », in the Chinese translation of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Nos. 5870 [where 花線 *hua-hsien* is a misreading or a misprint] and 5871) is a late, and unusual form. Moreover, it shows once more that the translators of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* from Tibetan into Chinese often adopted arbitrary interpretations: *hua-mien*, « cotton », is given as a translation of Skr. *vakkali*, Tib. *bag-le-ba*. But the would-be Skr. *vakkali* can be nothing else than a Prākṛit form of Skr. *valkala*, « bark garment » (cf. Pali *vakkala* and *vakkali*), and Tib. *bag-le-ba* seems to be an adjectival form of *bag-le*, itself based on a Prākṛit form similar to Beng. *bāklā*, « bark » (on which cf. J. BLOCH, *La formation de la langue marathe*, 404; but *bag-le-ba* may have been contaminated by *Bag-le-pa* or *Bag-le-ba*, « of Balkh »).

I may add that the change of 綿 *mien* to 棉 *mien*, in order to show that the product was vegetal and not « silk » (*i. e.* animal) floss, had been anticipated by the creation of another character. The 杜仲 *tu-chung*, *Eucommia ulmoides*, is sometimes called *mu-mien*, on account of the silky fibres which can be drawn out when breaking its bark (cf. STUART, *Materia Medica*, 166; *mu-mien* is already given as an alternative name of *tu-chung* in ch. 12 of the *Hsin-hsiu pên-ts'ao*, written in the 7th cent. [*Chuan-hsi-lu ts'ung-shu* ed.]). In the early Middle Ages, this tree was merely called *mien* in what corresponds to the modern provinces Chê-chiang and Chiang-su. For writing that *mien*, a character 棉 *mien* was created, which is obtained through the addition of the « tree » radical to the character *mien* meaning « silk floss »; this character already occurs in the *Yü p'ien*, the author of which died in A. D. 581, and the tree, with its name written in this way, was described under the Sung dynasty by Su Sung (cf. *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*). The more modern 棉 *mien* of *mu-mien*, « cotton », was coined in the same spirit, and in a way it may be said to be but a simplified form of 綿 *mien*, *Eucommia ulmoides*.

CH'Ü-SHUN. — Other ancient names of cotton, given in our dictionaries, remain to be examined. One is 屈眊 *ch'ü-shun* (**k'juət-šjuěn*). It is said to be a Sanskrit word meaning « great fine cloth » (*ta hsi pu*), and is the name of the material of the robe which Bodhidharma had inherited from the patriarch Simha and which he transmitted to his successors. It was blue-black, and had been made from cotton plucked at « the heart of the flowers ». Hsü Kuang-ch'i had actually seen it, or its substitute (*Nung-chêng ch'üan-shu*, 35, 2). The earliest mention I know of it occurs in the *Fan-i ming-i chi*, dated 1143 (not 1151 as in NANJIO, *Catalogue*, No. 1640; 兩, XI, 87 b; cf. also FUJII's, *Bongo jiten*, 145; ODA Tokuno, 301). The *Ko-chih ching-yüan* (27, 22 b) quotes the 南華志 *Nan-hua chih*, a work which I do not know, as stating that « the ritual garment (信衣 *hsin-i*) of the sixth patriarch was made of seven strips (*t'iao*) of [cloth of] gold thread (*chin lü*); it is the *ch'ü-shun* cloth; in the Western Countries (Hsi-yü), they consider the *ch'ü-shun* as 'fine cloth' (*hsi-pu*) ». One can never vouchsafe for the accuracy of the quotations in the *Ko-chih ching-yüan*; but the « gold threads » are impossible, since they could not be « cotton », or even be confused with « cotton ». *Ch'ü-shun* seems to be a term of the Dhyāna or Zen sect, and like everything regarding the person-