

scription of Hindustani añjir," as affirmed by Hirth, but of New Persian *anjir* or *enjir*, the Hindustānī (as well as Sanskrit *añjira*) being simply borrowed from the Persian; Bukhārā *injir*, Afghan *intsir*; Russian *indžaru*.

(3) Fu-lin 底欄 *ti-ni* or *ti-čen* 珍 or 璠 (**ti-tsen*, **ti-ten*); the latter variant is not necessarily to be rejected, as is done by Hirth. Cf. Assyrian *tittu* (from **tintu*); Phoenician *tīn*; Hebrew *tī'nu*, *te'ēnāh*;¹ Arabic *tīn*, *tine*, *tima*; Aramaic *ts'īntā*, *tēnta*, *tena*; Pahlavi *tin* (Semitic loan-word). The Semitic name is said to have taken its starting-point from south-eastern Arabia, where also, in the view of the botanists, the origin of fig-culture should be sought; but in view of the Assyrian word and the antiquity of the fig in Assyria,² this theory is not probable. There is no doubt that the Chinese transcription answers to a Semitic name; but that this is the Aramaic name, as insisted on by Hirth in favor of his theory that the language of Fu-lin should have been Aramaic, is not cogent. The transcription *ti-ni*, on the contrary, is much nearer to the Arabic, Phoenician, and Hebrew forms.³

(4) 優曇鉢 (or better 跋) *yu-t'an-po*, **u-dan-pat*(par), **u-dan-bar* = Sanskrit *udambara* (*Ficus glomerata*).⁴ According to Li Ši-čen, this name is current in Kwañ-tuñ.

(5) 無花果 *wu hwa kwo* ("flowerless fruit"),⁵ Japanese *ičijiku*. The erroneous notion that the fig-tree does not bloom is not peculiar to Albertus Magnus, as Hirth is inclined to think, but goes back to times of antiquity, and occurs in Aristotle and Pliny.⁶ This wrong observation arose from the fact that the flowers, unlike those of most fruit-trees, make no outward appearance, but are concealed within the

¹ In the so-called histories of the fig concocted by botanists for popular consumption, one can still read the absurdity that Latin *figus* is to be derived from Hebrew *feg*. Such a Hebrew word does not exist. What does exist in Hebrew, is the word *pag*, occurring only in Canticle (II, 13), which, however, is not a general term for the fig, but denotes only a green fig that did not mature and that remained on the tree during the winter. Phonetically it is impossible to connect this Hebrew word with the Latin one. In regard to the fig among the Semites, see, above all, the excellent article of E. LEVESQUE in the Dictionnaire de la Bible (Vol. II, col. 2237).

² E. BONAVALIA, Flora of the Assyrian Monuments, p. 14.

³ It is surprising to read Hirth's conclusion that "*ti-ni* is certainly much nearer the Aramean word than the Greek *συκῆ* [better *σῦκον*] for fig, or *ἐπίκεος* for caprificus." No one has ever asserted, or could assert, that these Greek words are derived from Semitic; their origin is still doubtful (see SCHRADER in Hehn, Kulturpflanzen, p. 100).

⁴ *Fan yi miñ yi tsi*, Ch. 8, p. 5.

⁵ Also other fruits are described under this name (see *Či wu miñ ši t'u k'ao*, Ch. 16, pp. 58-60). The terms under 4 and 5 are identified by Kao Ši-ki 高士奇 in his *T'ien lu ši yü* 天祿識餘 (Ch. A, p. 60, published in 1690, ed. of Šwo lin).

⁶ XVI, 39.