

devoted to a 娑羅綿樹 *so-lo mien-shu*, or « *so-lo* cotton tree », which existed west of the district city of T'ung-wang. It required the extended arms of three or four men to embrace it; it first gave flowers, and later gave leaves; the flowers opened only when there was a warm summer. The pistils (菜 *juì*) of the flowers had a floss (綿 *mien*) which was called 娑羅棉 *so-lo mien*, « *so-lo* cotton » (no stress can be laid upon the use of the two forms of *mien* in our very faulty editions of the *T'ai-p'ing kuang-chi*). It is to be remarked that this tree was brought into a miraculous connection with a famous deceased Buddhist monk, and that some of the particulars given about the tree (its size, and the flowers preceding the leaves) recur in descriptions of *so-lo* trees in texts which are supposed to refer to *śāla* trees. In fact, the tree of Li-chou may have been a *Bombax*.

The *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* (36, 72 b) cites an interesting text which it says occurs in 祝穆 Chu Mu's 方輿志 *Fang-yü chih* (« Geography ») : « 平緬 P'ing-mien produces 娑羅 *so-lo* trees (*shu*); the big ones are thirty or fifty feet high. They form seeds (*tzü*) which have floss (*mien*). This floss is made into threads and woven to make white felt (白氈 *po-chan*; perhaps a misreading of 白氈 *po-tieh*) [and] *tou-lo-mien*. » LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 491), when using this important text, said that Chu Mu was an author of the Sung dynasty. It is true that Chu Mu, of the Sung dynasty, published about 1239 a geographical work entitled 方輿勝覽 *Fang-yü shêng-lan* (cf. *Ssü-k'u* . . . , 68, 10 a), but the circuit (*lu*) of P'ing-mien (« Pacified Burma »), in the region of the present T'êng-yüeh, was established only in 1276 (YS, 61, 13 a). So there can be no doubt that the quotation really comes not from Chu Mu's *Fang-yü shêng-lan*, but from the [聖朝混一] *Shêng-ch'ao hun-i fang-yü shêng-lan* which was published under Qubilai's reign (1260-1294; cf. MIAO Ch'üan-sun's *I-fêng-t'ang tu-shu hsü-chi*, 3, 1 a) and incorporated (in 1307?; cf. *Kuan-ku-t'ang ts'ang-shu mu*, 3, 27 b, where « 31th » *ta-tê* year must be a slip for « 11th ») into the [事文類聚翰] 墨大全 [*Shih-wên lei-chü*] *Han-mo ta-ch'üan*; unfortunately I have at present no access to the latter collection. It is, at any rate, clear that the *so-lo* tree of this text is either a cotton tree or a silk-cotton tree. The size would suggest a silk-cotton tree, but it is only the floss of the cotton tree which could be used for weaving *tou-lo-mien*.

The same may be said of the passage from the *Ko-ku yao-lun* also adduced by LAUFER (*ibid.*). The *Ko-ku yao-lun* was published in 1387 and again in 1388, and added to in 1456-1459. Among the passages which belong to the original redaction, we read (*Hsi-yin-hsüan ts'ung-shu* ed., 8, 4 b) : « 兜羅錦 *Tou-lo-chin*. The *tou-lo-chin* is a product of the Southern Barbarians (Nan-Fan), of the Western Barbarians (Hsi-Fan) and of Yün-nan. It is woven with the 錦 *chin* inside the seeds of the 莎羅 *so-lo* tree (*shu*), and is similar to velvet (剪絨 *chien-jung*). It is five or six feet in breadth, and is much used for making blankets (*pei*) and also clothes can be made of it. » *Chin* means « brocade », but *tou-lo chin* must be a corrupt reading for *tou-lo*-[綿]*mien*, as already said by LAUFER. As we have seen above (cf. *supra*, p. 431), *tou-lo-mien* was under the Ming dynasty the designation of a cotton velvet; moreover, it is *mien*, « floss », not *chin*, « brocade », which is found « inside the seeds » of the *so-lo* tree, and this *so-lo* tree must be the cotton tree, *Gossypium arboreum*.

This conclusion is fully borne out by the fact that *so-lo*, as a designation of the cotton tree, has survived down to the present day, mainly in the modernized form already used in the *Ko-ku yao-lun*. According to the *Ming i-t'ung chih* (87, 17 b), completed in 1461, the « 梭羅 *so-lo* tree