

rice », and the name must have been given owing to the granular appearance of the product (« small grained camphor », as GROENEVELDT translates). There is no reason to suppose, with MAYERS (*China Review*, III, 224), supported by GERINI (*Researches*, 441), that *mi* is here the first element of a foreign term. The « bluish camphor » is strangely reminiscent of the « blue camphor » (*azraq*) of the Arabs, and probably is the same stuff; it has remained in use in later Chinese *materia medica* (cf. *Pên-ts'ao kang-mu*, 34, 60 a).

In his notice on Borneo (*HR*, 156), Chao Ju-kua enumerates four kinds of camphor : « plum-flower camphor » (梅花腦 *mei-hua nao*), « quick camphor » (速腦 *su-nao*; *su* is also used in the terminology concerning gharu-wood; cf. *HR*, 206-207), « gold-foot camphor » (金脚腦 *chin-chiao nao*), and « rice camphor » (米腦 *mi nao*); but the special notice on camphor (*HR*, 194) omits « quick camphor », adding « bluish camphor » at the end of the list; and it may be, as is surmised in *HR*, 194, that « quick camphor » and « bluish camphor » refer to the same sort, which would probably be the lowest, in agreement with the notice on camphor and with the notice translated above from the *Sung shih*. On the other hand, *azraq* or blue camphor is the last in Ibn Baytār's list, so that the identity of the two is the more probable; and perhaps the other terms of the two lists are also in some sort of correspondence. « Plum-flower camphor » is also mentioned by Chao Ju-kua in the notice on Lambri as being used in the preparation of betel (*HR*, 73, but mispunctuated as if « plum-flower » and « camphor » were two distinct items). It occurs also in the notice of the *Tao-i chih-liao* on « Ambergris Island » (Pulo Bras?), but has been omitted from ROCKHILL's translation (*TP*, 1915, 158; the paragraph is mistranslated throughout). In the notice of the same *Tao-i chih-liao* on Borneo, Wang Ta-yüan mentions, among the products of the country, 梅花片腦 *mei-hua p'ien nao*, which ROCKHILL (*TP*, 1915, 265) translated « 'plum-blossom' and 'flake' camphor ». But the passage must be read in connection with the notice in Chao Ju-kua, which says: « [The camphor] which forms 'flakes' (*p'ien*; the translation « crystals » in *HR*, 193, is not adequate) is called 'plum-flower camphor' because it resembles plum-flowers » (cf. also *Ming i t'ung chih*, 90, 17 a, based on Chao Ju-kua). So it is clear that, in the *Tao-i chih-liao*, there is only one product, and that we must translate « plum-flower flake camphor ». In the preface to the *Hsi-yang ch'ao-kung tien-lu*, the author speaks of 梅腦 *mei-nao*; it is the same as *mei-hua nao*, « plum-flower camphor », abbreviated for reasons of rhythm, and has nothing to do with *mi-nao*, « rice camphor », contrary to what was supposed by MAYERS (*China Review*, III, 224) and accepted by GERINI (*Researches*, 441). In the same work, in the section on Borneo (*Yüeh-ya-t'ang ts'ung-shu* ed., 1, 18 b, the author, 黃省曾 Huang Hsing-ts'êng, speaks of 龍腦牛腦梅花腦 *lung-nao niu-nao mei-hua-nao*; *niu-nao* is certainly corrupt for *mi-nao*, but the very enumeration « camphor, rice camphor and plum-flower camphor », as well as its order, shows that Huang Hsing-ts'êng was not familiar with his subject.

*Lung-nao*, « dragon brain », is of course a purely Chinese designation given to true camphor on account of its scent; it is of the same type as *hu-p'o*, « tiger soul », for « amber », also on account of the scent, or as *ma-nao*, « horse brain », for agate, on account of its appearance. I cannot trace an example of *lung-nao* before the 7th cent., although it probably existed already in the 6th, alongside of « P'o-lü perfume ». In spite of its legendary character, a paragraph of the lost *Liang ssü kung-tzū chi* (on which see « Femeles », pp. 677), preserved in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 803, 6-7 (and,