

But there may be a third reason, to wit that Persia produced a drug which was not camphor proper, but reminded of it. In Ibn Baytār's important notice on camphor (LECLERC, *Traité des simples*, in *Not. et Extr.*, XXVI, 1, 127-131), there is a passage mentioning, among the places of production of camphor, Sofāla, which, without the addition « of India », may be the one on the eastern coast of Africa (cf. *Fe*, 95, 112, 288; HEYD, II, 591, is in favour of Sofāla = Supāra in India). This camphor of Sofāla may have been extracted from a tree which was not the *Dryobalanops*. The same thing may have occurred in Persia. The *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu* (34, 62) has preserved a notice on a tree called 元慈勒 *yüan-tz'ü-lo* which was given in the lost *Pên-ts'ao shih-i* of 陳藏器 Ch'ên Tsang-ch'i, a Ning-po man who lived in the first half of the 8th cent. The notice begins with saying that the *yüan-tz'ü-lo* « is produced in the kingdom of Po-ssü; it looks like the 'dragon-brain perfume'; it is the 'grease' (脂 *chih*) inside a tree »; it is used in much the same way as camphor, in particular against cataract. One may be surprised that LAUFER should not have adduced this camphor-like product of Po-ssü in favour of his « Malayan Po-ssü »; perhaps the name of the product stopped him. *Yüan-tz'ü-lo* clearly is a transcription, and no less clearly is corrupt: *yüan*, followed by *tz'ü*, gives a combination which is phonetically impossible. The most natural correction is to read 兀 *wu* instead of 元 *yüan*, and *wu-tz'ü-lo* is *\*nguät-dz'i-lək*; this would suppose an original like *\*uzrak*. Now, one of the kinds of camphor mentioned by Ibn Baytār is أزرق *azraq* (LECLERC, 127; *Fe*, 288). In Arabic, زرق *zurqah* means « blue color », *azraq*, pl. زرق *zurq*, means « blue »; this is the reason why FERRAND, with a question mark, rendered *azraq* as « blue camphor »; it will be seen further on that this finds a curious counterpart in later Chinese sources. I cannot be certain that *yüan-tz'ü-lo* < *\*wu-tz'ü-lo* is *azraq*, but there is a fair chance that it is so, and here again we must think either of a camphor-like drug produced in Persia, or of camphor brought on Persian ships, which so came to be known to the Chinese under an Arabic name, probably used also by the Persians.

Sumatra was the great camphor producing country in the early Middle Ages; so it is surprising that I-ching, who was in Sumatra towards the end of the 7th cent., should say that « in the Southern Seas, a little camphor (*lung-nao*) is produced » (cf. TAKAKUSU, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion*, 129). Camphor (*lung-nao*) is also mentioned on TAKAKUSU's p. 48. Moreover, on p. 45, it is not certain that we must correct 片子香油 *p'ien tzü hsiang yu* into 附子香油 *fu-tzü hsiang-yu* as TAKAKUSU did; *p'ien-tzü hsiang yu* may be « oil of the flake perfume », i. e. « camphor oil ».

It is only under the Sung dynasty that we get more precise data on the Chinese terminology concerning camphor. In 977, the king of Po-ni (Borneo) sent an embassy which offered to the Chinese Emperor « one *katī* (家底 *chia-ti*) of camphor in great flakes (大片龍腦 *ta-p'ien lung-nao*), eight *katī* of the second class (*ti-êrh-têng*) [of camphor], eleven *katī* of the third class (*ti-san-têng*), twenty *katī* of « rice camphor » (米龍腦 *mi lung-nao*), and twenty *katī* of « bluish camphor » (蒼龍腦 *ts'ang lung-nao*); every *katī* was equivalent to twenty ounces (*liang*). » This example of the Indonesian *katī*, our « catty », ought to be added to *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 175, where the earliest example is almost six centuries later. In the rest of the tribute, there were « five boards (*pan*) of camphor [wood] » (cf. *Sung shih*, 489, 8 a; GROENEVELDT, *Notes on the Malay Archipelago*, 230). It will be noticed that, judging from this text, there were three classes of « flake camphor », followed by « rice camphor » and « bluish camphor ». *Mi* means « husked