

it is eagerly collected, women sit at their looms, and *chi-pei* is woven for the new white clothes of the husbands. *Chi-pei* has never been the name of *Bombax malabaricum*, and the latter was never and could never have been used for making cloth, but only as stuffing for mattresses, etc. So Wang Kuang-yang's *pan-chih hua* ought to be *Gossypium arboreum*; but Wang may have misapplied the term, and I must admit that the colour of the flowers and the time of their opening would rather suggest the *Bombax*.

In speaking of errors in the names of plants, Lu Jung, a doctor of 1466, has the following passage in his *Shu-yüan tsa-chi* (*Shou-shan-ko ts'ung-shu* ed., 12, 10 a): «The tree-cotton-flower (*mu-mien-hua*) grows in Nan-yüeh (= Kuang-tung and Kuang-hsi); it is a tree four or five *chang* high (= 40 to 50 feet); the flower is red like the camelia (山茶 *shan-ch'a*, *Camelia japonica*); the seeds (*tzü*) are like the fruit (*shih*) of the *ch'u* (*Broussonetia papyrifera*); floss (*mien*) is produced in the seeds, and can be used to stuff cushions; it is what the people of Su-chou (in Chiang-su) call *p'an-chih-hua*. What is spun and woven to make cloth should be called 'cotton-flower' (*mien-hua*) only; the 雲間通志 *Yün-chien t'ung-chih* (a monograph on Sung-chiang in Chiang-su) calls it *mu-mien-hua*; it must be that it follows the error of Master 蔡 Ts'ai (= Ts'ai Ch'ên, the commentator of the *Shu ching*, on whom cf. *infra*, p. 487).»

In his *Tan-ch'ien hsü lu* (*Pao-yen-t'ang pi-chi* lith. ed., 8, 2 b), YANG Shên (1488-1559) has a brief note on *mu-mien*, more or less similar to that of Lu Jung. He first quotes two poems of the 9th cent. in which the expression «*mu-mien* flowers» occurs, then describes the *mu-mien* tree of the south, an armful in girth, with red flowers like the camelia and yellow pistils, states that it was not planted in Chiang-nan, and maintains that it is the «*mu-mien* tree» of the *Wu lu* (cf. *supra*, p. 460). He goes on to say: «This is the *pan-chih hua* of our days. It grows in A-mi-chou in Yün-nan (N. N. W. of Mêng-tzü), and is extremely abundant in Ling-nan (= Kuang-tung and Kuang-hsi).» We have seen that the «*mu-mien* tree» of the *Wu-lu* was *Gossypium arboreum*. But Lu Jung and YANG Shên's description is that of *mu-mien* in the sense in which *mu-mien* was used in Kuang-tung, where it was the name of *Bombax malabaricum*. Consequently YANG Shên's identification of the «*mu-mien* tree» of the *Wu lu* is erroneous. At the same time, Lu Jung and YANG Shên must have known what was meant by *pan-chih hua* in their own days, at least in some parts of China, and they clearly understood *Bombax malabaricum*. In spite of the fact that a lofty tree like the *Bombax* can hardly have been from the first known under the misleading name of «flower», and also that the *pan-chih hua* in Wang Kuang-yang's song ought to be *Gossypium arboreum*, we must admit that the same change of meaning which obtained in Kuang-tung for *mu-mien* also took place in the case of *pan-chih hua*, and that what may originally have been a name of *Gossypium arboreum* was, at a slightly later date, used for the *Bombax malabaricum*.

The 閩部疏 *Min-pu shu* is a short miscellany devoted to Fu-chien, and mainly to its products; it was published in 1585 by 王世懋 WANG Shih-mou, a native of T'ai-ts'ang in Chiang-su, and contains a curious passage on the cultivation of cotton (*Chieh-yüeh-shan-fang* ed., 7 b; cf. also *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 303, *tsa-lu*, 1-2): «I had formerly heard from old men that the people of Kuang[-tung] planted cotton (棉花 *mien-hua*) which reached six or seven feet in height and that there were some [bushes] which were not changed (易 *i*) for four or