

Mai (*I-chien chih*, end of ch. 45) describes what he himself shows to be seeds of *tsao-chia*, i. e. *Gleditschia chinensis*, which have certainly nothing to do with the true *so-lo* tree.

More definite is the use of 娑羅 *so-lo* as a designation of the 天師栗 *t'ien-shi-li*, « Celestial Master's chestnut » (by allusion to Chang *t'ien-shih* or Chang Tao-ling, the reputed founder of the Taoist church; BRETSCHNEIDER's explanation of *t'ien-shih* as « Buddha », *Botanicon Sinicum*, I, 65, is erroneous), i. e. the horse-chestnut, *Aesculus chinensis* (cf. *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, 29, 32-33; *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 222, 10 a [with a wrong reading *p'o-lo* instead of *so-lo*]; STUART, *Materia Medica*, 19; TARANZANO, *Vocabulaire*, II, 575). In the sense of horse-chestnut, *so-lo* is perhaps more regularly written 杪羅 *so-lo*, but this is not certain; 娑羅子 *so-lo-tzũ* is a common form of the same name, and all quotations mentioning a 娑羅 *so-lo* tree are referred to the *Aesculus* in the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i*, 7, 30-31. GILES in his *Chinese-English Dictionary* (No. 10.193) states that it is the name of the Indian *sāla* tree which has been transferred in China to the horse-chestnut. I think he is right. We have seen that Mei Yao-ch'ên used the last given form 杪羅 *so-lo* for what he intended to be the Indian *sāla* tree, *Shorea robusta*. As a matter of fact, I have little doubt that the passage of the name from the *Shorea robusta* to the *Aesculus chinensis* occurred very early, the confusion being due to the fact that the *Shorea robusta* was unknown in China, and at first the *Aesculus chinensis* was found only in a few districts of Ssũ-ch'uan (cf. also the verse on the *so-lo* flower in the *I-pu fang-wu lio-chi*, by Sung Ch'i [998-1061], *Chin-tai pi-shu* ed., 6 b; here the *so-lo* is different from the *t'ien-shih-li*, *ibid.* 3 a). Absurd as it is, the story in Shêng Hung-chih's *Ching chou chi* seems already to betray the confusion. This is established, anyhow, by another consideration. STUART (p. 19) remarks that another *Aesculus*, the *Aesculus turbinata*, is known to the Japanese as *tochi-no-ki* (Ch. 七葉樹 *ch'i-yeh shu*, « tree with seven leaves »), but that it is not mentioned in the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* and may not exist in China. This is only partly true. Though the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* does not speak of the *ch'i-yeh* tree, it is described in the *Lo-yang ming-yüan chi*, a work of the end of the 11th cent. (*Chin-tai pi-shu* ed., 6 a; cf. *Ssũ-k'u...*, 70, 13), and the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (*loc. cit.* 309, *chi-shih*, 2a) duly cites the passage in its chapter on the *so-lo* tree. A poem of Ou-yang Hsiu (1007-1072) is entitled « The 'tree with seven leaves' (*ch'i-yeh shu*) of the Ting-li-yüan » (at Lo-yang), but in the poem itself the tree is called *so-lo* (cf. *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 309, *i-wên*, 3 a). The old *Chiang-ning fu-chih* speaks also of *ch'i-yeh shu* in temples of the Nanking region and considers them as *so-lo* trees (*ibid.* 309, *tsa-lu*, 2); two more quotations are given in *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu shih-i*, 7, 71 b. It is also an *Aesculus* which is described as « flower of the *so-lo* tree » in the *Tsao-lin tsa-tsu chung chi*, 54 a, with the alternative name 鶴翎 *hao-ling*, « crane feathers ». In his *Ch'i-hsiu lei-kao* (40, 3 b-4 a), Lang Ying opposes the common belief that the *so-lo* tree was the 月中桂 *yüeh-chung kuei* (« moon cinnamon », *Litsea glauca*), since it was in fact the *ch'i-yeh* tree (*mu*). This identification of the *so-lo* tree with the *Aesculus chinensis* also occurs in a notice in which *so-lo* trees are mentioned on the T'ien-t'ai Mountain in Chê-chiang, and these trees had only « six or seven leaves » at the end of each branch (*T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ibid.* 309, *chi-shih*, 2 a).

We are now prepared to approach the problem of *so-lo* as a designation of a « cotton tree ». WATERS was first, I believe, to say that, in the latter sense, *so-lo* represented *sālmali*, the Indian name of the silk-cotton tree (*Essays on the Chinese language*, 435). He even went as