

different rubrics; he has been followed by BRETSCHNEIDER (*Botanicon Sinicum*, II, 348, 350) and STUART (*Materia Medica*, 312, 423); both agree to see in the *t'ung* the *Paulownia imperialis* and in the *wu-t'ung* the *Sterculia platanifolia*, and to state that the tree from the bark of which cloth was woven was the *Sterculia*. I am convinced that the latter opinion is a double mistake. First, I cannot discover any ancient text which speaks of cloth made from the bark of the *wu-t'ung* tree. Kuo I-kung's *Kuang chih*, as cited in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* (966, 9 b) says: « There is white *wu-t'ung*. The kingdom of P'iao (= Burma) has the white *t'ung* tree (*po-t'ung-mu*); its leaves (葉 *yeh*) have a white down (毳 *ts'ui*); the people take this down, soak it, and make it into threads with which they weave cloth. » Apart from the first sentence, the quotation also occurs earlier in the T'ang encyclopaedia *I-wên lei-chü* (85, 28 b). The *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (*ts'ao-mu tien*, 239, *chi-shih*, 2 a) gives it in the same form as the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*. Ch'ên Chu's *T'ung p'u*, « Monograph of *t'ung* », dated 1049, cites it in identical terms (*T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 237, 11 a). I have no doubt, however, that 葉 *yeh*, « leaves », is an old graphic corruption of 華 *hua* or 花 *hua*, « flower ». As a matter of fact, the passage of the *Kuang chih*, as cited in the commentary of the *Hou-Han shu* (116, 8 a; cf. BEFEO, IV, 173), does not give *yeh*, but *hua* (the compiler of the fragments of the *Kuang chih* in the *Yü-han-shan-fang chi i-shu*, 2, 1 b, seems to have used a bad edition of the *Hou-Han shu*). Although the main compiler of the *I-wên lei-chü*, Ou-yang Hsün, died A. D. 641, whereas the commentary of the *Hou-Han shu* was completed only in 676-678, we have no edition of the *I-wên lei-chü* earlier than the one revised under the Ming dynasty, and cannot be sure that Ou-yang Hsün's original text already gave the faulty reading.

However that may be, the fact that *hua*, and not *yeh*, is the only possible reading can be established by another series of arguments. As we have seen, the *Hou-Han shu* says that cloth was made from the « flowers » of the *wu-t'ung* tree, and so does the *Hua-yang kuo-chih* (4, 18 a-b), which says in like terms: « In Yung-ch'ang, there is the *wu-t'ung* tree (*mu*), the flowers of which are soft like silk threads (絲 *ssü*). The people spin them to make cloth, every strip of which is about five feet broad; it is clean and white and does not get soiled; its popular name is 桐華布 *t'ung-hua pu* ('*t'ung*-flower cloth'). They cover the dead with it, and afterwards wear it and sell it to others » (the quotation in *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 339, *chi-shih*, 2 b, copied from *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 957, 9 b, is most inaccurate). In the same way, Tso Ssü (3rd cent.), in his « Ode on Ch'êng-tu » (*Shu-tu fu*), too famous not to have been genuinely preserved, says (*Wen-hsüan*, ch. 4): « For cloth (*pu*), they have the flowers of *t'ung* (種華 *t'ung-hua*); for flour, they have the *kuang-lang* (cf. *supra*, p. 473) ». The rare character used by Tso Ssü, *t'ung*, not discussed in botanical works, is historically homophonous of the *t'ung* of *wu-t'ung*, and is certainly to be regarded as its equivalent. The commentary adds: « The tree is called *t'ung*; its flowers have a soft down which can be spun to make cloth. It grows in Yung-ch'ang ». In speaking of cloth made from the « bark » of the *wu-t'ung*, BRETSCHNEIDER expressly refers to Lu Chi's « Memoir on natural history in the Book of Odes » (*Mao-Shih ts'ao-mu niao-shou ch'ung-yü shu*). This is a well-known work by 陸璣 Lu Chi, *tzü* 元恪 Yüan-k'o, a man of the Wu kingdom who lived in the middle of the 3rd cent. (LEGGE, *Chin. Classics*, IV, Proleg., 178, and BRETSCHNEIDER, *Botanicon Sinicum*, I, 33, still confuse this Lu Chi of the Three Kingdoms with the celebrated author