

«cotton», perhaps from the cotton plant in the case of the Burmese countries of P'iao, Mi-ch'ên and Mi-no, but probably from the cotton tree in its original application to the tribes of western Yün-nan, particularly in the region of Yung-ch'ang. But, in such a case, «so-lo tree» was not the earliest designation of that «cotton tree» in Chinese literature. When the Chinese reached Indo-China and Yün-nan, they were particularly struck by two remarkable species: a tree which yielded flour, and another from the flowers of which cloth was woven. The tree which yielded flour was at first designated under the purely Chinese name 桃榔 *kuang-lang* (perhaps an enlargement of a popular name 光郎 *kuang-lang*, «bright boy»), but fairly soon a kindred species became known as 莎木 *so-mu*, «so [**suâ*]-tree», so written in the *Ch'i-min yao-shu* (10, 46 a), the *T'ang yün* (cf. *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, 31, 24 b, and *K'ang-hsi tzü-tien*, *pu-i*, rad. 140 and the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (960, 16 b), although LI Shih-chên always retains in his text and his quotations an unauthorized form 紗 *so* (**suâ*). According to LI Shih-chên, the *so* of *so-mu* would be a phonetic alteration of 囊 *hsiang-mu*, «*hsiang* (**sïang*)-tree», which designated the same tree in the geographical section of the *Wu lu* (third quarter of the 3rd cent.; cf. *supra*, p. 460). I am of a different opinion. *So-mu* too appears at an early date, since it occurs in the 蜀志記 *Shu chih chi* (cf. *Ch'i-min yao-shu*, 10, 46 a), or 蜀記 *Shu chi* (cf. *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, 31, 24 b), or *Shu chih* (cf. *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 960, 16 b); the *Shu chi* would probably be that of 李膺 Li Ying (cf. *Sui ching-chi-chih k'ao-chêng*, 6, 16 a; *Ch'i-min yao-shu*, 10, 24 b; but this cannot be the Li Ying who died A. D. 169), and date from the 5th cent. at the latest. If the title be *Shu chih*, it would carry us back to the 3rd cent. (cf. *ibid.* 6, 23 b). In any case, we have to deal with a sago-yielding tree (cf. STUART, *Materia Medica*, 389-390), and I believe that the *so* (**suâ*) of *so-mu*, «so tree», is nothing but a transcription of «sago» itself, Jav., Mal., Sund., Battak, Mak., and Bug. *sagu*, Dayak and Tagal *sago* (cf. FAVRE, *Dict. malais-français*, II, 599). If *hsiang* (**sïang*), which, apart from the *Wu lu*, occurs in the famous *Wu-tu fu*, «Ode on the capital of Wu», written by Tso Ssü (3rd cent.), is phonetically connected with *so*, I would regard it as a more literary and less accurate representation of the same foreign word. On other later Chinese transcriptions of Mal. *sagu*, cf. TP, 1933, 391, and, for European transcriptions YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 780-781; Polo describes *sago*, and even brought some of it back to Venice (cf. Vol. I, 377), but, like Odoric (*Wy*, 448), does not give its name.

The other remarkable tree found in the south by the Chinese was the one with the flowers of which cloth was made by the native tribes of western Yün-nan. I have translated above (p. 444) the passage from the *Hou-Han shu* (116, 8 a), according to which the people of Ai-lao, i.e. of Yung-ch'ang in western Yün-nan, «have the 梧桐 *wu-t'ung* tree (*mu*), the flowers (*hua*) of which they spin to make cloth (*pu*)». Yet BRETSCHNEIDER (*Botanicon Sinicum*, II, 349, 351) says that cloth was made from the bark of the tree, and the same information is given by STUART, *Materia Medica*, 423. It is true that Polo speaks of cloth made of the «bark» of trees at «Cuigiu» (*q. v.*; = Hsü-chou-fu in Ssü-ch'uan, «Sui-fu» of our maps; cf. Vol. I, 298-299, and Y, II, 124, 127); but this cannot refer to the fabric under discussion here. A great deal of confusion has long prevailed among Chinese scholars on the subject of the various sorts of *t'ung*, which, in principle, is the designation of the *Paulownia* (cf. the numerous texts in *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 237-239). LI Shih-chên was the first to give *t'ung* and *wu-t'ung* under two