

("yellow plum").¹ Both fruits are referred to in Pahlavi literature (above, pp. 192, 193).

As to the transplantation of the Chinese peach into India, we have an interesting bit of information in the memoirs of the Chinese pilgrim Hūan Tsañ.² At the time of the great Indo-Scythian king Kaniška, whose fame spread all over the neighboring countries, the tribes west of the Yellow River (Ho-si in Kan-su) dreaded his power, and sent hostages to him. Kaniška treated them with marked attention, and assigned to them special mansions and guards of honor. The country where the hostages resided in the winter received the name Cīnabhukti ("China allotment," in the eastern Panjāb). In this kingdom and throughout India there existed neither pear nor peach. These were planted by the hostages. The peach therefore was called *cīnanī* ("Chinese fruit"); and the pear, *cīnarājaputra* ("crown-prince of China"). These names are still prevalent.³ Although Hūan Tsañ recorded in A.D. 630 an oral tradition overheard by him in India, and relative to a time lying back over half a millennium, his well-tested trustworthiness cannot be doubted in this case: the story thus existed in India, and may indeed be traceable to an event that took place under the reign of Kaniška, the exact date of which is still controversial.⁴ There are mainly two reasons which prompt me to accept Hūan Tsañ's account. From a botanical point of view, the peach is not a native of India. It occurs there only

¹ In the Pamir languages we meet a common name for the apricot, Minjan *čerī*, Waxī *čiwān* or *čōān* (but Sariqolī *nōš*, Šigni *naž*). The same type occurs in the Dardu languages (*jui* or *ji* for the tree, *jarote* or *jorote* for the fruit, and *juru* for the ripe fruit) and in Kāčmīrī (*tser*, *tser-kul*); further, in West-Tibetan *ču-li* or *čo-li*, Balti *su-ri*, Kanaurī *čul* (other Tibetan words for "apricot" are *k'am-bu*, *a-šu*, and *ša-rag*, the last-named being dried apricots with little pulp and almost as hard as a stone). KLAPROTH (*Journal asiatique*, Vol. II, 1823, p. 159) has recorded in Bukhāra a word for the apricot in the form *tserduli*. It is not easy to determine how this type has migrated. TOMASCHEK (*Pamir-Dialekte*, p. 791) is inclined to think that originally it might have been Tibetan, as Baltistan furnishes the best apricots. For my part, I have derived the Tibetan from the Pamir languages (*T'oung Pao*, 1916, p. 82). The word is decidedly not Tibetan; and as to its origin, I should hesitate only between the Pamir and Dardu languages.

² *Ta T'añ Si yū ki*, Ch. 4, p. 5.

³ There are a few other Indian names of products formed with "China": *cīnapišta* ("minium"), *cīnaka* ("Panicum miliaceum, fennel, a kind of camphor"), *cīnakarpūra* ("a kind of camphor"), *cīnavaṅga* ("lead").

⁴ Cf. V. A. SMITH, *Early History of India*, 3d ed., p. 263 (I do not believe with Smith that "the territory of the ruler to whose family the hostages belonged seems to have been not very distant from Kashgar"; the Chinese term Ho-si, at the time of the Han, comprised the present province of Kan-su from Lan-čou to An-si); T. WATTERS, *On Yüan Chwang's Travels*, Vol. I, pp. 292-293 (his comments on the story of the peach miss the mark, and his notes on the name Cīna are erroneous; see also PELLLOT, *Bull. de l'Ecole française*, Vol. V, p. 457).