

hsien north-east of Ch'üan-chou and a well-known centre for the manufacture of white porcelain. The same solution is adopted by ARNAIZ (*TP*, 1911, 688), in reply to PHILLIPS who had once more thought of the region around Chang-chou (see « Çaiton »). CHARIGNON (*Ch*, III, 118-119), bent on a *de facto* identification with Ching-tê-chên, corrected « Tiungui » to « Ciungui », and saw in « Ciungui » a transcription of 洪州 Hung-chou, another name of Nan-ch'ang, the capital of the province in which Ching-tê-chên is located. But Hung-chou is an obsolete name of T'ang times; in the Yüan period, Nan-ch'ang was called Lung-hsing, which was the name known to foreigners like Rašidu-'d-Din and Waśśāf (see « Çaiton »); Hung-chou is therefore out of the question.

The identification with Tê-hua was rejected by HIRTH (*Ancient Porcelain*, Leipzig and Munich, 1888, 44) because, according to the *Ching-tê-chên t'ao lu* (1891 ed., 7, 13 b), quoted in JULIEN's *Histoire et fabrication de la porcelaine chinoise*, p. 29, the manufacture of porcelain at Tê-hua began only in the Ming dynasty. The same objection is repeated by CHARIGNON (*Ch*, III, 118). I do not think it carries great weight, as recent information as to the Ming date of the manufacture of porcelain at Tê-hua seems to be contradicted by Sung and Yüan fragments of Tê-hua ware found in Fu-chien as well as in the Near East.

But while so many others were allured by Ching-tê-chên's comparatively late fame, HIRTH was the first to bring into the case the name of the great centre where was manufactured the ware most extensively exported in the Middle Ages, *i. e.* 龍泉 Lung-ch'üan in the southern corner of Chê-chiang, the motherland of the famous « celadon ». As some clue was to be found for « Tingui » (RAMUSIO's form), HIRTH attempted to derive it from 劍川 Chien-ch'uan, one of the names by which Lung-ch'üan was called in Sung times.

I do not think that Chien-ch'uan was a happy suggestion as an etymology of « Tingui »; in such a case we should expect something like *Camcian or *Camcion. Moreover Lung-ch'üan was only called Chien-ch'uan from 1120 to 1131 (*Sung shih*, 88, 2 b; or 1122-1131 according to *Lung-ch'üan hsien chih*, 1878 ed., I, 2 a), and there is very little chance that the latter short-lived name should have survived in current speech in the Mongol period. Its use in the inscription on a vase of 1327 in the collection of Sir Percival DAVID (HOBSON, *A Catalogue of Chinese Pottery and Porcelain*, 1934, p. 52) is of an archaistic and bookish character, as is shown by the use in the same inscription of an obsolete name for Ch'u-chou-fu. Nevertheless, HIRTH had hit the mark as to the place, if not as to the name. I have no doubt that the ware described by Polo is Lung-ch'üan celadon.

It might be objected that Polo seems to locate his « Tingiu », or whatever the true form of the name may be, in the same province as Fu-chou, whereas Lung-ch'üan belonged in his time to the « moving *shêng* » of Chiang-chê and still forms part of Chê-chiang. But such an objection would apply to an even greater degree to faraway Ching-tê-chên, while Lung-ch'üan at least borders on Fu-chien. Polo had not been to « Tingiu », and might well have assigned it to the Fu-chien province if from « Tingiu » the ware came direct to Ch'üan-chou; and this we know to be the case.

Apart from an instinctive feeling that celadon must be meant, HIRTH was guided in his identification by a sentence peculiar to RAMUSIO, which has been incorporated in BENEDETTO's text (cf. *RR*, 264; *B*¹, 274), and is given in a note of the present translation. The text is certainly puzzling, to such a point that BENEDETTO, having now two mentions of « Tingiu », wonders whether they