

abbreviation as in « sperm whale », such terms as « sperm oil » and « sperm candle » have been created as late as the middle of the last century to designate the oil found with the *spermaceti* or candles prepared with *spermaceti*. The word *spermaceti* itself has been traced in English to 1471 (MURRAY).

Spermaceti and oil are found mainly in the head of the cachalot, but also, to a lesser degree, in other parts of its body. Moreover, some other whales and dolphins yield the same products, although to a much lesser extent. But « ambergris » is almost exclusively a secretion of the cachalot, so that Polo's « whalefish and capdoille » are more or less pleonastic (see « Ambergris »).

QAZWĪNĪ († 1283) speaks of the oil which was obtained from the head of what certainly is the cachalot (cf. *Y*, II, 408). We find the same information in Chinese texts. One of the authorities formerly adduced must, however, be left out. The *Yu-yang tsa-tsu* of the 9th cent., which describes a cetacean six to nine yards long under the unexplained names of 奔鯨 *pên-fu* (perhaps for *p'ên* [噴]-*fu*, « spouting *fu* ») and 鬚 *chi*, says that one of these « fish » yielded thirty to forty bushels of oil (膏 *kao*) which could be used to feed lamps; but it was only by punctuating the text erroneously that ROCKHILL made it mean that the oil was obtained from the head of the *pên-fu* (*TP*, 1915, 158). On the other hand, Chao Ju-kua, writing in 1225, is unambiguous. According to his notice of Chung-li (= Somali coast), huge dead fish thirty odd yards long were stranded there every year. The natives did not eat their flesh, but « cut out their brains, marrow and eyes to get oil (油 *yu*), sometimes as much as three hundred odd 罈 *têng* (from one fish)» (cf. *HR*, 131). Perhaps the eyes were taken out for another reason than to get oil; at any rate, « whale eyes » were more than once offered as tribute (cf. LAUFER in *TP*, 1913, 342; add the text of the *Yüan-ho chün-hsien t'u-chih* of the early 9th cent. in which « big fish eyes » [大魚睛 *ta-yü-ching*] are mentioned as a tribute sent to the Court from the modern Hui-chou-fu in Kuang-tung [34, 6 b]). The value of *têng* is uncertain. HIRTH and ROCKHILL (*HR*, 69, 132, 283) say that, in Buddhist works, it is generally the Skr. *tolā*, a small weight equal to four *māṣa* (but cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², s.v. « tola » and « mace », where the « tola » is equal to twelve *māṣa*), but must here represent « some other foreign word, Persian probably ». I do not know HIRTH and ROCKHILL's authorities, but cannot trace *têng* as a measure in any Chinese text, Buddhist or otherwise, except that of Chao Ju-kua; moreover the *tolā* is a weight of late date, not likely to appear in Indian Buddhist texts. My own impression is that we have here to deal with a purely Chinese, though dialectical, term for which there was no regular character. Chao Ju-kua wrote it 罈 *têng*, but I think it probable that it is the same word which occurs many times a little more than a century later in the *Tao-i chih-liao*, where it is written with the unauthorized character 罈 (? *têng*). In his partial translation of the *Tao-i chih-liao* (*TP*, 136, 251, 266), ROCKHILL rendered the latter form as « jar » without any remark. He was certainly right, and the unauthorized character of the *Tao-i chih-liao* is still used now to write *dìng*, « jar », of the Fu-chou dialect (cf. MACLAY and BALDWIN, *An alphab. dictionary of... the Fouchow dialect*² [1898], 195). In such a case, Chao Ju-kua would mention a limit somewhat above three hundred jars of oil for a whale; it is much nearer the true figures than the thirty to forty bushels of the *Yu-yang tsa-tsu*.

One difficulty remains, for which I can offer no satisfactory solution. The « tunny » is of