exhausted long ago. Thus Pliny and the ancient Chinese agree on the fact that amber was a product of India, while no amber-mines are known there at present. Amber was formerly found in the district of Yun-č'an in Yun-nan, and even on the sacred Hwa-šan in Šen-si.<sup>2</sup>

G. Jacob³ has called attention to the fact that the supposition of a derivation of the Chinese word from Pahlavi kahrupāī is confronted with unsurmountable difficulties of a chronological character. The phonetic difficulties are still more aggravating; for Chinese hu-p'o 琥珀 was anciently \*gu-bak, and any alleged resemblance between the two words vanishes. Still less can Greek harpax¹ come into question as the foundation of the Chinese word, which, in my opinion, comes from an ancient Šan or T'ai language of Yün-nan, whence the Chinese received a kind of amber as early at least as the first century A.D. Of the same origin, I am inclined to think, is the word tun-mou 頃年 for amber, first and exclusively used by the philosopher Wan Č'un.⁵

Uigur kubik is not the original of the Chinese word, as assumed by Klaproth; but the Uigur, on the contrary (like Korean xobag), is a transcription of the Chinese word. Mongol xuba and Manchu  $x\hat{o}ba$  are likewise so, except that these forms were borrowed at a later period, when the final consonant of Chinese bak or bek was silent.

90. Coral is a substance of animal origin; but, as it has always been conceived in the Orient as a precious stone, a brief notice of it, as far as Sino-Persian relations are concerned, may be added here. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. Ts'ien Han šu, Ch. 96 A, p. 5 (amber of Kashmir); Nan ši, Ch. 78, p. 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. Hwa yo či 華 嶽 志, Ch. 3, p. 1 (ed. of 1831).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> L. c., p. 355.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Proposed by Hirth, China and the Roman Orient, p. 245. This was merely a local Syriac name, derived from Greek  $\dot{a}\rho\pi\dot{a}\zeta\omega$  (In Syria quoque feminas verticillos inde facere et vocare harpaga, quia folia paleasque et vestium fimbrias rapiat.—Pliny, xxxvII, II, § 37).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Cf. A. Forke, Lun-heng, pt. II, p. 350. This is not the place for a discussion of this problem, which I have taken up in a study entitled "Ancient Remains from the Languages of the Nan Man."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> For further information on amber, the reader may be referred to my Historical Jottings on Amber in Asia (*Memoirs Am. Anthr. Assoc.*, Vol. I, pt. 3). I hope to come back to this subject in greater detail in the course of my Sino-Hellenistic studies, where it will be shown that the Chinese tradition regarding the origin and properties of amber is largely influenced by the theories of the ancients.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The proof of the animal character of coral is a recent achievement of our science. Peyssonel was the first to demonstrate in 1727 that the alleged coral-flowers are real animals; Pallas then described the coral as *Isis nobilis*; and Lamarck formed a special genus under the name Corallium rubrum (cf. Lacaze-Duthiers, Histoire naturelle du corail, Paris, 1864; Guibourt, Histoire naturelle des drogues, Vol. IV, p. 378). The common notion in Asia was that coral is a marine tree.