

etymology of the name Bakūr, and although, as will soon be seen, Fayfūr has been used as a man's name at a late date, I am afraid that, in the present state of our knowledge, the equation of all the Πάκορος, Pacorus, etc., to Baγpūr is hardly defensible. The case may be different, however, with one of the names adduced by JUSTI. Procopius (1, 5 [DINDORF ed., p. 26]), in a passage copied from Faustus of Byzantium (second half of the 4th cent.), calls Sapor II « Πακούριος ». Both LAUFER (*Beginnings of porcelain*, 126) and FERRAND (*JA*, 1924, I, 243) have declared that this Πακούριος was the earliest example known of baγpūr. On account of the earlier Parthian Pahlavī and, above all, Sogdian examples, this is of course erroneous. But, if we remember that Faustus of Byzantium, although of Greek origin, wrote a *History of Armenia*, and that Armenian bakur has found a counterpart in the bagūr of the Syriac catena, it will appear quite plausible that Πακούριος, used as a designation of the Sassanian king Sapor II (4th cent. A. D.), should really be an example of the use of the title of « Son of Heaven » for one of the four (or five) Sons of Heaven of the Chinese texts, and one who is not the Chinese Emperor.

As is well known, tribal names and foreign titles have often been employed as men's names in Central Asia. YULE has already said (*Y*, II, 148) that Fayfūr seemed to be used as a man's name in the *Memoirs of Bābur*, and I have no doubt that he was right (cf. A. S. BEVERIDGE's translation, 551, 687, 750); the form Mayfūr given by the Ḥaydarabād Ms. must be an erroneous reading of the same type as maγbūr in Sulaymān (cf. *supra*, p. 653).

But the history of the term fayfūr is not limited to its use as a title or a man's name. The derivative forms Pers. fayfurī > Turk. farfuru, farfuri have acquired the meaning of « porcelain », and as such have passed into modern Greek φάρφουρι and into all Slavic languages, beginning with Russian farfor (cf. the various Slavic forms in BERNEKER, *Slav. Etymol. Wörterbuch*, I, 279; LOKOTSCH, No. 569; LAUFER, *Beginnings of porcelain*, 126). BERNEKER says that in « Osmanli » fayfur means not only the Chinese Emperor, but « a region in China, famous for its porcelain »; in fact, « Osmanli » must be a slip for « Persian », and the definition is borrowed from VULLERS, who quotes his native source. But it is sheer nonsense. There never was any region really called Fayfūr in China (although a strangely worded passage of I-Ching in CHAVANNES, *Les religieux éminents*, 56 [but not in the corresponding text of TAKAKUSU, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion*, 136], would seem to refer the corresponding name devaputra to the Chinese capital). The error of VULLERS' source recurs, however, in Sīdī 'Alī Čelebī (1554 A. D.; cf. *Fe*, 501) : « The best kind of porcelain, called pāytaḥtī čīnī, is found at Šahr-i-naw and at Fayfūr. The most costly goods are called pāytaḥtī and fayfūrī ». Šahr-i-naw was a designation of Ayuthia in Siam (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 795), and Fayfūr is used here as a place-name. But pāytaḥtī čīnī means « porcelain (čīnī) of the capital ». As to pāytaḥtī and fayfūrī, mentioned by Sīdī 'Alī Čelebī as designations of costly goods (not particularly of porcelain), they would seem to mean, in his text, « [goods] of the capital » and « [goods] of Fayfūr », respectively, Fayfūr being a place-name. But I have little doubt that this is the result of some misunderstanding. In *TP*, 1931, 458, I have already expressed the view that, if fayfūrī > farfuri came to mean porcelain, it was because it was the « [porcelain] of the fayfūr », i. e. of the Chinese Emperor. When properly understood, the two terms used by Sīdī 'Alī Čelebī are equivalent : they were pāytaḥtī, because they came from the capital, and they were fayfūrī, because the capital was the residence of the Emperor. But fayfūrī certainly goes