

five years; at first I did not believe it. Passing Ch'üan-chou (in Fu-chien), I arrived between T'ung-an and Lung-ch'i (both S.W. of Ch'üan-chou). Swaying by the side of the road, [there was something] having the appearance of a hazel tree or Judas tree; when I came near and looked at it, it was cotton (*mien-hua*). The time was just *ch'ing-ho* (= the fourth moon); the old boughs already showed miserable yellow flowers. But this cannot be called *mu-mien*. The *mu-mien hua* ('*mu-mien* flower') is a lofty tree, with red (*tan*) flowers like [those of] the camelia (*ch'a*; often = *shan-ch'a*, 'camelia'); the fruit (*shih*) it bears is abundant; it is what in Wu (= Chiang-su) is called *p'an-chih hua*. YANG Yung-hsiu (= YANG Shên) has spoken of it at length in the *Tan-ch'ien* (= *Tan-ch'ien hsü-lu*), and has marvelled at it, saying that it occurred in Chan-i chou in Yün-nan (Chan-i chou, now Chan-i hsien, is somewhat north-east of Ch'ü-ching in Yün-nan; but YANG Shên really refers to A-mi chou, much more to the south [cf. *supra*], and it is A-mi chou which is correctly given here by the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*), and that he had heard that in the Ling (= Wu-ling mountains) and in Kuang[-tung] (but in fact YANG's text gives 'Ling-nan', not 'Ling Kuang') it was extremely abundant. [This shows that] he did not know that the *Hui-an chih* ('Description of Hui-an'; Hui-an is a *hsien* east of Ch'üan-chou in Fu-chien) had already mentioned that tree and called it 攀桂花 *p'an-kuei hua* ('flower of grasped cinnamon' ?); Yang says *pan-chih hua*; with the *p'an-chih hua* used in Wu (= Chiang-su), it makes three names for one and the same product. The quality (*p'in*) of the flower (of the *p'an-chih hua*) is inferior to that of the *mien-hua* (true cotton), and it is only good for stuffing mattresses » (this last sentence is omitted in the *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*). On the question of names, I rather think that *p'an-kuei hua* is a graphic corruption of *p'an-chih hua* and that we have only two forms. What is more important is the astonishment of the Chiang-su man, who in his own province knew only *Gossypium herbaceum*, when he saw in Fu-chien the *Gossypium arboreum* for the first time. Moreover, his text leaves no doubt that, in his time and his province of Chiang-su, *mu-mien* and *p'an-chih hua* were synonymous and had become designations no longer of the cotton tree, *Gossypium arboreum*, but of the silk-cotton tree, *Bombax malabaricum*.

The *Wu-Hsün tsa-p'ei* (cf. *supra*, p. 438) also speaks of the *p'an-chih hua* (cf. *T'u-shu chi-ch'êng*, *ts'ao-mu tien*, 303, *tsa-lu*, 2a) : « Our 松 Sung (= Sung-chiang; the author was a native of the region of Shanghai) covers the world with its garments of cotton cloth (*mien-pu*), but the beginnings of the introduction of cotton (*mien-hua*) [into China] are not known. The tradition is that the plant came from the Hsi-Fan (a term loosely used in late Ming times for the 'Western Countries' of earlier and later texts) and for the first time entered China under the Yüan... » The author goes on with quoting in full a long text on cotton cultivation which he attributes to Shih Chao, who lived c. 1100, and concludes : « What Shih Chao speaks of is, without any doubt, cotton (*mien-hua*); the only thing is that now the bow to card cotton is made of wood and more than six feet long (the text attributed to Shih Chao spoke of a bamboo bow one foot and four or five inches long), which merely makes a small difference with the ancient [practice]; so it is wrong to say that [cotton cultivation] began under the Mongols (as will be shown in the last part of the present memoir, the text attributed to Shih Chao has nothing to do with him, and dates from the end of the 13th cent.). But Shih Chao speaks of the plant as *mu-mien*, which is not correct. The *mu-mien* was produced in Chiao[-chou] and Kuang[-chou]; this tree was an armful in girth;