

Čo keñ lu, written in 1366.¹ The Dictionary in Four Languages² writes this word *tsie-mu-lu* 祖母綠. This is a transcription of Persian *zumurrud*.

The word itself is of Semitic origin. In Assyrian it has been traced in the form *barraktu* in a Babylonian text dated in the thirty-fifth year of Artaxerxes I (464–424 B.C.).³ In Hebrew it is *bāreket* or *bārkat*, in Syriac *borko*, in Arabic *zummurud*, in Armenian *zemruxt*; in Russian *izumrud*. The Greek *maragdos* or *smaragdos* is borrowed from Semitic; and Sanskrit *marakata* is derived from Greek, Tibetan *mar-gad* from Sanskrit.⁴ The Arabic-Persian *zummurud* appears to be based directly on the Greek form with initial sibilant.

87. In regard to turquoise I shall be brief. The Persian turquoise, both that of Nīšāpūr and Kirmān, is first mentioned under the name *tien-tse* 甸子 in the *Čo keñ lu* of 1366. This does not mean that the Chinese were not acquainted with the Persian turquoise at a somewhat earlier date. It is even possible that the Kitan were already acquainted with turquoise.⁵ I do not believe that *pi-lu* 碧綠 represents a transcription of Persian *firūza* ("turquoise"), as proposed by WATTERS⁶ without indicating any source for the alleged Chinese word, which, if it exists, may be restricted to the modern colloquial language. I have not yet traced it in literature.⁷ As early as 1290 turquoises were mined in Hui-č'wan, Yün-nan.⁸ The Geography of the Ming dynasty indicates a turquoise-mine in Nan-nin čou 安寧州 in the prefecture of Yün-nan,

¹ Ch. 7, p. 5 b; *Wu li siao ši*, Ch. 7, p. 14. The author of this work cites the writing of the Yüan work as the correct one, adding *tsu-mu-lü*, which he says is at present in vogue, as an erroneous form. It is due to an adjustment suggested by popular etymology, the character *lū* ("green") referring to the green color of the stone, whose common designation is *lū pao ši* 綠寶石 ("green precious stone"); see GEERTS, *Produits*, p. 481.

² Ch. 22, p. 66.

³ C. FOSSEY, *Etudes assyriennes* (*Journal asiatique*, 1917, I, p. 473).

⁴ Cf. Notes on Turquoise, p. 55; *T'oung Pao*, 1916, p. 465. MUSS-ARNOLT (*Transactions Am. Phil. Assoc.*, Vol. XXIII, 1892, p. 139) states erroneously that both the Greek and the Semitic words are independently derived from Sanskrit. In the attempt to trace the history of loan-words it is first of all necessary to ascertain the history of the objects.

⁵ As intimated by me in *American Anthropologist*, 1916, p. 589. *Tien-tse* as the product of Pan-ta-li are mentioned in the *Tao i či lio*, written in 1349 by Wan Ta-yüan (ROCKHILL, *T'oung Pao*, 1915, p. 464).

⁶ *Essays on the Chinese Language*, p. 352.

⁷ In the *Pen ts'ao kan mu* (Ch. 8, p. 17 b) is mentioned a stone *p'iao pi lü* 縹碧綠, explained as a precious stone (*pao ši*) of *pi* 碧 color. This is possibly the foundation of Watters' statement.

⁸ *Yüan ši*, Ch. 16, p. 10 b. See, further, Notes on Turquoise, pp. 58–59.