

is specially named. *Po-tie*, further, appears in India;¹ and as early as A.D. 430 Indian *po-tie* was sent to China from Ho-lo-tan 呵羅單 on Java.² According to a passage of the *Kiu T'an šu*,³ the difference between *ku-pei* (Sanskrit *karpāsa*)⁴ and *po-tie* was this, that the former was a coarse,

¹ *Nan šu*, Ch. 78, p. 7 a.

² *Sun šu*, Ch. 97, p. 2 b.

³ Ch. 197, p. 1 b, indicated by PELLIOU (*Bull. de l'Ecole française*, Vol. III, p. 269).

⁴ It is evident that the transcription *ku-pei* is not based directly on Sanskrit *karpāsa*; but I do not believe with WATTERS (*Essays on the Chinese Language*, p. 440) and HIRTH (*Chau Ju-kua*, p. 218) that Malayan *kāpas* is at the root of the Chinese form, which, aside from the lack of the final *s*, shows a peculiar vocalism that cannot be explained from Malayan. Of living languages, it is Bahnar *kōpaih* ("cotton") which presents the nearest approach to Chinese *ku-pei* or *ku-pai*. It is therefore my opinion that the Chinese received the word from a language of Indo-China.

The history of cotton in China is much in need of a revision. The following case is apt to show what misunderstandings have occurred in treating this subject. *Ku-čun* (*ku-džun, *ku-duñ) 古終 is the designation of a cotton-like plant grown in the province of Kwei-čou 桂州; the yarn is dyed and made into *pan pu* 斑布. This is contained in the *Nan Yüe či* 南越志 by Šen Hwai-yüan 沈懷遠 of the fifth century (*Pen ts'ao kañ mu*, Ch. 36, p. 24). SCHOTT (*Altaische Studien*, III, *Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1867, pp. 137, 138; he merely refers to the source as "a description of southern China," without citing its title and date), although recognizing that the question is of a local term, proposed, if it were permitted to read *kutuñ* instead of *kučun*, to regard the word as an indubitable reproduction of Arabic *quṭun*, which resulted in the *coton*, *cotton*, *kattun*, etc., of Europe. MAYERS then gave a similar opinion; and HIRTH (*Chau Ju-kua*, p. 219), clinging to a Fu-čou pronunciation *ku-tün* (also WATTERS, *Essays*, p. 440, transcribes *ku-tun*), accepted the alleged derivation from the Arabic. This, of course, is erroneous, as in the fifth century there was no Arabic influence on China, nor did the Arabs themselves then know cotton. It would also be difficult to realize how a plant of Kwei-čou could have been baptized with an Arabic name at that or any later time. Moreover, *ku-čun* is not a general term for "cotton" in Chinese; the above work remains the only one in which it has thus far been indicated. *Ku-čun*, as Li Ši-čen points out, is a tree-cotton 木綿 (*Bombax malabaricum*), which originated among the Southern Barbarians (Nan Fan 南番), and which at the end of the Sung period was transplanted into Kiañ-nan. It is very likely that, as stated by STUART (*Chinese Materia Medica*, p. 197), the cotton-tree was known in China from very ancient times, and that its product was used in the manufacture of cloth before the introduction of the cotton-plant (*Gossypium herbaceum*). In fact, the same work *Nan yüe či* reports, "None of the Man tribes in the kingdom Nan-čao rear silkworms, but they merely obtain the seeds of the *so-lo* (*sa-la) 娑羅 tree, the interior of which is white and contains a floss that can be wrought like silk and spun into cloth; it bears the name *so-lo lun twan* 娑羅籠段." The *Fan yü či* 方輿志 of Ču Mu 祝穆 of the Sung period alludes to the same tree, which is said to be from thirty to fifty feet in height. The *Ko ku yao lun* (Ch. 8, p. 4 b; ed. of *Si yin huan ts'un šu*) speaks of cotton stuffs 兜羅錦 (= 綿; *tou-lo* = Sanskrit *tūla*) which come from the Southern Barbarians, Tibet (Si-fan), and Yün-nan, being woven from the cotton in the seeds of the *so-lo* tree, resembling velvet, five to six feet wide, good for making bedding and also clothes. The *Tien hi* writes the word 梭羅 (G. SOULIÉ, *Bull. de l'Ecole française*, Vol. VIII, p. 343). *Sa-la* is the indigenous name of the tree; *sa-la* is still the Lo-lo designation