

The texts already quoted show that the *p'an-chih hua* grew in the south-eastern (cf. also *Tien hsi*, 4, 26 a) and south-western parts of Yün-nan; a last text shows it in the northernmost districts of the province. It occurs in the *Ming i-t'ung chih* (87, 23 a), where it is said that the *p'an-chih hua* grows in Pei-shêng chou, i. e. the modern Yung-pei, north of the Yang-tzū and east of Li-chiang. The text adds that it looks like cotton (*mien-hua*), that cushions can be made of it, and that «it can also be used to make cloth»; I think that the last words rest on a confusion with *Gossypium arboreum*.

The same confusion occurs in other works. In the *Chao-ch'ing fu chih*, completed in 1830-1833 (re-edition of 1876; COURANT, *Catalogue*, No. 1758; 3, 43 a), there is a notice on *mu-mien*, beginning as follows: «It is also called *p'an-chih hua*. *Chi-pei* sprouts are grafted on a 烏柏 *wu-po* root (*kên*; here = trunk), and they produce flowers which give cotton (棉 *mien*).» I do not know any such term as *wu-po*, and I think that it is a misprint for 烏柏 *wu-chiu*, the tallow-tree, *Stillingia sebifera*, which is given in the quotation of the present passage made at an earlier date in *Kuei-ssü lei-kao*, 14, 5 a. The author of the latter work mentions this as an example of a «cotton plant» which becomes a «cotton tree». I have found no other allusion to this grafting process, which to a layman seems rather extraordinary. But the main point is that the notice of the *mu-mien* or *p'an-chih hua* proceeds with quotations from an older redaction of the *Chao-ch'ing fu chih* and from the *Kuang-tung t'ung-chih* which indubitably refer in principle to the *Bombax* and yet mix it up with the true cotton plant. From the text, it is clear that one of the sources, perhaps ultimately going back to the *Ming i-t'ung chih*, had said that the floss of the *mu-mien* could be used not only to stuff cushions, but also to make cloth; this is why the text adds: «On inquiry from Cantonese people, there is nobody who weaves it.» A similar remark occurs in the 植物名實圖考 *Chih-wu ming-shih t'u-k'ao* (completed in 1848; 30, 3-4), the author of which, while reproaching Li Shih-chên with having confused *mien-hua* (*Gossypium*) with *mu-mien* (*Bombax*), gives under *mu-mien* quotations which can only refer to tree cotton.

YÜEH-NO. — Of the terms dealt with by HIRTH and ROCKHILL (*HR*, 220) as probable designations of «cotton», only one remains to be examined, 越諾 *yüeh-no* (*j_l^wat-nâk), which they thought was perhaps the name of a country in T'ang times, and later the name of «a light cotton gauze, or muslin». *Yüeh-no* was never the name of a country, but always the designation of a textile (cf. *BEFEO*, iv, 483). The term first occurs in the *Sui shu*, 83, 7 b (in the notice on Persia), and remained in use until the end of the Sung; LAUFER has discussed it in his *Sino-Iranica*, 493-496. But while stating quite correctly that the normal restitution of *yüeh-no* would be **varnak*, LAUFER sought in it a double designation, *yüeh-* representing Pers. *barnū*, or *vālā*, or *bālās*, all names of textiles, and *-no* being the Pers. *nah*, Polo's «nac» (*q. v.*), a sort of brocade. There is a fundamental error in this theory: *yüeh-no* clearly renders one word, not two. On the other hand, the fact that *yüeh-no* first occurs in a notice on Persia is a mere accident (I must admit, however, that most mentions occur in connection with Persia and Mussulman countries west of India), and we have to deal with a trade-name then current in Central Asia and the Indian Sea. In my opinion, the simplest solution would be to regard *yüeh-no* (*j_l^wat-nâk) as representing some Prâkrit form of Skr. *varṇakā*, a term derived from *varṇā* (usually «colour») and