

China. How this would have been possible, is not explained by him. The Sanskrit term for the pomegranate (and this is evidently what Hirth hinted at) is *dāḍima* or *dālima*, also *dāḍimva*, which has passed into Malayan as *delīma*.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that the Chinese transcription bears some relation to this word; but it is equally obvious that the Chinese form cannot be fully explained from it, as it leads only to \**du-lim*, not, however, to *dalim*. There are two possibilities: the Chinese transcription might be based either on an Indian vernacular or Apabhraṃṣa form of a type like \**dulim*, \**duḍim*,<sup>2</sup> or on a word of the same form belonging to some Iranian dialect. The difficulty of the problem is enhanced by the fact that no ancient Iranian word for the fruit is known to us.<sup>3</sup> It appears certain, however, that no Sanskrit word is intended in the Chinese transcription, otherwise we should meet the latter in the Sanskrit-Chinese glossaries. The fact remains that these, above all the *Fan yi miñ yi tsi*, do not contain the word *t'u-lin*; and, as far as I know, Chinese Buddhist literature offers no allusion to the pomegranate. Nor do the Chinese say, as is usually stated by them in such cases, that the word is of Sanskrit origin; the only positive information given is that it came along with General Čaṅ K'ien, which is to say that the Chinese were under the impression that it hailed from some of the Iranian regions visited by him. \**Dulim*, *dulima*, or \**durim*, *durima*, accordingly, must have been a designation of the pomegranate in some Iranian language.

(2) 丹若 *tan-žo*, \**dan-zak*, *dan-yak*, *dan-n'iak*. This word appears in the *Ku kin ču*<sup>4</sup> and in the *Yu yan tsa tsu*.<sup>5</sup> Apparently it represents a transcription, but it is not stated from which language it is derived. In my estimation, the foundation is an Iranian word still unknown to us, but congeners of which we glean from Persian *dānak* ("small grain"),

<sup>1</sup> J. CRAWFURD (History of the Indian Archipelago, Vol. I, p. 433) derives this word from the Malayan numeral five, with reference to the five cells into which the fruit is divided. This, of course, is a mere popular etymology. There is no doubt that the fruit was introduced into the Archipelago from India; it occurs there only cultivated, and is of inferior quality. On the Philippines it was only introduced by the Spaniards (A. DE MORGA, Philippine Islands, p. 275, ed. of Hakluyt Society).

<sup>2</sup> The vernacular forms known to me have the vowel *a*; for instance, Hindustānī *darim*, Bengālī *ḍālim*, *dālim* or *dārim*; Newāri, *dhāḍe*. The modern Indo-Aryan languages have also adopted the Persian word *anār*.

<sup>3</sup> In my opinion, the Sanskrit word is an Iranian loan-word, as is also Sanskrit *karaka*, given as a synonyme for the pomegranate in the Amarakoṣa. The earliest mention of *dāḍima* occurs in the Bower Manuscript; the word is absent in Vedic literature.

<sup>4</sup> At least it is thus stated in cyclopædias; but the editions of the work, as reprinted in the *Han Wei ts'un šu* and *Ki fu ts'un šu*, do not contain this term.

<sup>5</sup> Ch. 18, p. 3 b (ed. of *Pai hai*).