

of important plants than any other people of Asia (and I should even venture to add, of Europe), the exact and critical history of a plant-cultivation can be written only by heeding all data and consulting all sources that can be gathered from every quarter. The evidence accruing from the Semites, from Egypt, Greece, and Rome, from the Arabs, India, Camboja, Annam, Malaysians, Japan, etc., must be equally requisitioned. Only by such co-ordination may an authentic result be hoped for.

The reader desirous of information on the scientific literature of the Chinese utilized in this publication may be referred to Bretschneider's "Botanicon Sinicum" (part I).¹ It is regrettable that no *Pen ts'ao* (Herbal) of the T'ang period has as yet come to light, and that for these works we have to depend on the extracts given in later books. The loss of the *Hu pen ts'ao* ("Materia Medica of the Hu") and the *Č'u hu kwo fañ* ("Prescriptions from the Hu Countries") is especially deplorable. I have directly consulted the *Čeñ lei pen ts'ao*, written by T'añ Šen-wei in 1108 (editions printed in 1521 and 1587), the *Pen ts'ao yen i* by K'ou Tsuñ-ši of 1116 in the edition of Lu Sin-yüan, and the well-known and inexhaustible *Pen ts'ao kañ mu* by Li Ši-čen, completed in 1578. With all its errors and inexact quotations, this remains a monumental work of great erudition and much solid information. Of Japanese *Pen ts'ao* (*Honzō*) I have used the *Yamato honzō*, written by Kaibara Ekken in 1709, and the *Honzō kōmoku keimō* by Ono Ranzan. Wherever possible, I have resorted to the original source-books. Of botanical works, the *Kwañ k'ün fañ p'u*, the *Hwa p'u*, the *Či wu miñ ši t'u k'ao*, and several Japanese works, have been utilized. The *Yu yañ tsa tsu* has yielded a good many contributions to the plants of Po-se and Fu-lin; several Fu-lin botanical names hitherto unexplained I have been able to identify with their Aramaic equivalents. Although these do not fall within the subject of Sino-Iranica, but Sino-Semitaica, it is justifiable to treat them in this connection, as the Fu-lin names are given side by side with the Po-se names. Needless to say, I have carefully read all accounts of Persia and the Iranian nations of Central Asia contained in the Chinese Annals, and the material to be found there constitutes the basis and backbone of this investigation.²

There is a class of literature which has not yet been enlisted for the

¹ We are in need, however, of a far more complete and critical history of the scientific literature of the Chinese.

² The non-sinological reader may consult to advantage E. H. PARKER, Chinese Knowledge of Early Persia (*Imp. and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XV, 1903, pp. 144-169) for the general contents of the documents relating to Persia. Most names of plants and other products have been omitted in Parker's article.