

strongest evidence for the fact that the *su-ho* of the Chinese designates the storax of the ancients.¹

The *Fan yi miñ yi tsi* (*l.c.*) identifies Sanskrit 咄魯瑟劍 *tu-lu-se-kien*, **tu-lu-söt-kiam*, answering to Sanskrit *turuṣkam*, with *su-ho*. In some works this identification is even ascribed to the *Kwan či* of the sixth century (or probably earlier). In the *Pien tse lei pien*,² where the latter work is credited with this Sanskrit word, we find the character 竭 *kie*, **g'iaδ*, in lieu of the second character *lu*. The term *turuṣka* refers to real incense (olibanum).³ It is very unlikely that this aromatic was ever understood by the word *su-ho*, and it rather seems that some ill-advised adjustment has taken place here.

T'ao Huñ-kiñ (A.D. 451-536) relates a popular tradition that *su-ho* should be lion's ordure, adding that this is merely talk coming from abroad, and untrue.⁴ Č'en Ts'añ-k'i of the eighth century states,⁵ "Lion-ordure is red or black in color; when burnt, it will dissipate the breath of devils; when administered, it will break stagnant blood and kill worms. The perfume *su-ho*, however, is yellow or white in color: thus, while the two substances are similar, they are not identical. People say that lion-ordure is the sap from the bark of a plant in the western countries brought over by the Hu. In order to make people prize this article, this name has been invented." This tradition as yet unexplained is capable of explanation. In Sanskrit, *rasamala* means "excrement," and this word has been adopted by the Javanese and Malaysians for the designation of storax.⁶ Thus this significance of the word may have given the incentive for the formation of that trade-trick,— examples of which are not lacking in our own times.

Under the T'ang, *su-ho* was imported into China also from Malayan regions, especially from K'un-lun (in the Malayan area), described as

¹ The most important pharmacological and historical investigation of the subject still remains the study of D. HANBURY (Science Papers, pp. 127-150), which no one interested in this matter should fail to read.

² Ch. 195, p. 8 b.

³ Cf. Language of the Yüe-chi, p. 7.

⁴ He certainly does not say, as BRETSCHNEIDER (Bot. Sin., pt. III, p. 463) wrongly translates, "but the foreigners assert that this is not true." Only the foreigners could have brought this fiction to China, as is amply confirmed by Č'en Ts'añ-k'i. Moreover, the *T'añ pen ču* 唐本注 says straight, "This is a falsehood of the Hu."

⁵ Č'en lei pen ts'ao, Ch. 12, p. 52 (ed. of 1587).

⁶ BRETSCHNEIDER (*l. c.*) erroneously attributes to Garcia da Orta the statement that Rocamalha should be the Chinese name for the storax, and STUART (Chinese Materia Medica, p. 243) naturally searched in vain for a confirmation of this name in Chinese books. GARCIA says in fact that liquid storax is here (that is, in India) called Rocamalha (MARKHAM, Colloquies, p. 63), and does not even mention China in this connection.