

far as to say that the transcription was 娑羅木 *so-lo-mu*, but *mu* (**muk*) of course means «tree» and is purely Chinese; moreover, it is not regularly attached to *so-lo*, even when the latter term is a designation of a «cotton tree». WATTERS's explanation long remained unchallenged, and, apart from the final *mu*, I formerly accepted it (*BEFEO*, IV, 173). LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 491-492) then proposed another derivation, from Lolo *sala*, «cotton» (P'u-p'a *sala*, Čöko *sölö*). In *TP*, 1921, 83, I gave my reasons for renouncing *sālmali*, and felt inclined to accept LAUFER's view. I still hold *sālmali* to be impossible, because, as we have seen above, all the Chinese transcriptions of this word suppose a *ś*-initial, not *s*- as in *so-lo* (< *sāla*, as well attested as *sāla*), and because too much of the original word would thus be omitted. But the derivation from Lolo *sala* is not evident, and I now think that this too may have to be abandoned.

LAUFER started from a quotation he found in the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* (36, 72 b) : «The various Nan-chao Man do not breed silkworms. They merely collect the white floss inside the seeds of the 娑羅 *so-lo* tree (*mu*), which they make into threads and weave into strips called 娑羅籠段 *so-lo lung tuan*, 'so-lo covering damask'» (段 *tuan* is the character which is now, though irregularly, written 緞 *tuan*, and means «satin», but also «cotton damask»). In the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, this was given as occurring in the *Nan-yüeh chih*, and LAUFER accepted it. We have already been confronted with an anachronistic quotation from the *Nan-yüeh chih*; the case is the same here, and LAUFER might have noticed that the *Nan-yüeh chih*, written in the 5th cent., could not have mentioned the name Nan-chao which did not exist until the 7th cent. But, in the present case, the quotation is genuine, and only the source is erroneously indicated. The same text, without indication of origin, occurs in the *Hsü po-wu chih* (*Tzū-shu po-chung* ed., 7, 2 b; WATTERS refers to this passage), a work of the middle of the 12th cent. (cf. *Ssü-k'u...*, 142, 47), but there it begins with «The various Man of the kingdom of P'iao» (= Pyū, the ancient name of Burma). It is also given, at greater length, in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (961, 3 a), but under a corrupt rubric 牧婆羅 *mu-p'o-lo*, due to the usual confusion of *so* and *p'o*, and to a graphic corruption of 收 *shou*, «to collect», into 牧 *mu*, «to tend cattle»; as it no longer made sense, *mu* was taken as part of the name of the tree. The text is as follows : «The 南夷志 *Nan-i chih* says : The Nan-chao abundantly collect (*mu*; read *shou*) the seeds of the *p'o-lo* (read *so-lo*) tree (*shu*), break their husk, the inside of which is white like willow catkins (*liu-hsü*), make this into threads and weave it into square strips, which they cut to make 'covering damask' (*lung tuan*). Men and women all wear it. The kingdom of P'iao, the Mi-ch'ên and the [Mi-]no (cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 171, 172) all throw on (披 *p'i*) 'p'o-lo (read *so-lo*) covering damask'.» Although the quotation in the *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* is not directly taken from the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, it seems probable that it is the title *Nan-i chih* which has been altered to *Nan-yüeh chih*. As to *Nan-i chih* itself, it is the name under which the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* cites the *Man shu*, written in 864 (cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 132, 172; *Man shu*, 49 a). Our text of the *Man shu*, recovered from the *Yung-lo ta-tien*, is often corrupt, but the work is of first-rate importance. We read in it (*Chien-hsi-ts'un-shê* ed., 31 a-b) : «West of the city (*ch'êng*) of Yin-shêng, the city of Chih-nan, Hsün-chuan and Chi-hsien (these are all places or regions in western Yün-nan), the Fan and Man tribes do not breed any silkworms. They merely collect the seeds of the *p'o-lo* (read *so-lo*) tree (*shu*), break their husk, the inside of which is white like willow catkins, and