

ality and the activities of Bodhidharma, it is open to grave suspicion. No plausible Sanskrit original of *ch'ü-shun* can be suggested. Apart from the texts connected with Bodhidharma's robe, the only examples of *ch'ü-shun* I have come across occur in the works of Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai (1189-1243), a scholar of Ch'i-tan Imperial descent, who was one of Chinghiz-khan's advisers and a minister of Ögädäi. He accompanied Chinghiz in his expedition to the West in 1218-1224, and in the short account of his journey, entitled *Hsi-yü lu*, we read that the people of the region of Samarkand all wore garments of *ch'ü-shun* (*Br*, I, 21). In the collection of his literary productions, entitled *Chan-jan chü-shih chi*, the term occurs twice (*Ssü-pu ts'ung-k'an* ed., 5, 5 a; 6, 19 b), the first time (but only in the *Chien-hsi-ts'un-shê* ed., 5, 3 b) with a note « *Ch'ü-shun* is a cloth (*pu*) of the Western countries (*hsi-yü*) ». BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 21) proposed to connect *ch'ü-shun* with Arabic *قاسم qaśm*, and remarked that cotton was now called « guza » in Russian Turkestan. But *qaśm* means « old cotton » (LECLERC, *Traité des simples*, in *Not. et Extr.*, XXVI, I, 93), and neither semantically nor phonetically agrees with *ch'ü-shun*. As to « guza », or better *gözä*, *γōzä* (> Turkī *yoza*), it is the Persian designation of the « capsule » of the poppy, flax, lily, and particularly cotton; it is out of the question here, and BRETSCHNEIDER would never have thought of it if he had known that Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's *ch'ü-shun* did not transcribe a local word heard in Turkestan, but was a term which had previously existed in Chinese. Modern Chinese commentators, unaware of the use of *ch'ü-shun* in Buddhist texts, have erroneously connected Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's term with 只孫 *Chih-sun* or 質孫 *chih-sun*, used in the Mongol period as the designation of a robe of honour (cf. *Hsi-yü lu liao-chu pu*, in *Chü-hsüeh-hsüan ts'ung-shu*, 4th *chi*, 38); but *chih-sun* transcribes Mong. *jisun*, « colour », and has nothing to do with *ch'ü-shun*. I do not think, however, that the occurrence of the term *ch'ü-shun* in Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's works would countenance the view that it was then current in any part of China. Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai was a scholar more or less prone to the use of pedantic terms. He may not have been very familiar with cotton and its more ancient names in Chinese; he knew the term *mu-mien*, however, and used it in one of his poems (cf. *infra*, p. 514).

ŚĀLMALI. — Of more importance is another word, 睽婆 *shan-p'o* (**śiām-b'uā*). It is given as a Sanskrit name of cotton in LI Shih-chên's *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* (36, 71 b), and from there it has passed into the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (*ts'ao-mu tien*, 303, 1 a, 10 b), and into STUART, *Materia Medica*, 198, as an equivalent of the cotton plant, *Gossypium herbaceum*. In his turn, LI Shih-chên had taken it from the *Fan-i ming-i chi* (*loc. cit.* 87 b). This time we have to deal with a true, though truncated Indian word, but one which is not a designation of the cotton plant. As already stated in 1889 by WATTERS (*Essays*, 435), the word meant is Skr. *śālmali*, which is *Bombax malabaricum*, the silk-cotton tree. But it escaped WATTERS that, as a matter of fact, a Chinese form *shan-p'o* never existed. The author of the *Fan-i ming-i chi*, Fa-yün, took it from Hsüan-ying's *I-ch'ieh ching yin-i*. In this *yin-i*, *shan-p'o* occurs twice as a catchword. Once (ch. 21), it is used merely to indicate the pronunciation of *shan* (*Tripit.*, 爲, VII, 81 a, copied into Hui-lin's ch. 43, *ibid.* IX, 64 b); the text in which the term appears ought to be in ch. 4 of NANJIO, No. 363, but the arrangement of the present No. 363, in 13 chs., is different from that of the collection in 10 chs. commented upon by Hsüan-ying and Hui-lin, and I have failed to trace