

a designation explains the error Ibn Baṭṭūṭah makes when he says (iv, 256) that porcelain is made in China only at Zāitūn (= Ch'üan-chou) and at Sinkälān (= Canton); he mistook the ports of export for the places where the wares were manufactured.

Fortunately, another Chinese work, the *Tao-i chih-liao* of 1349-1350, gives a more precise indication: in five cases, it speaks of « porcelain of Ch'u-chou », or of « porcelain of Ch'u[-chou] », or of « green porcelain of Ch'u[-chou] » (cf. ROCKHILL, in *TP*, 1915, 112, 132, 136, 147, 271). The place-name is well known; it is 處州府 Ch'u-chou-fu in Chê-chiang, the prefecture to which the *hsien* of Lung-ch'üan belonged. It has been commonly believed, on the authority of the *Ching-tê-chên t'ao lu* (6, 6 a, which in fact repeats the words of the *T'ao-shuo*, 1914 ed., 2, 9 a), that the Lung-ch'üan factories were moved to Ch'u-chou-fu at the beginning of the Ming dynasty (cf. JULIEN, *Hist. et fabrication*, 30; HIRTH, *Ancient Porcelain*, 36), and ROCKHILL, because of the texts of the *Tao-i chih-liao*, remarked that the factories must have been moved at an earlier date (*TP*, 1915, 112). This is certainly a grievous error. JULIEN's and HIRTH's opinion merely follows a tradition which may be valueless, and the work may have gone on at Lung-ch'üan well into the middle of the Ming dynasty. There is in Sir Percival DAVID's collection a celadon libation cup bearing on one side the inscription 龍泉縣學儒祭器, « Libation vessel of the Confucian College of the district of Lung-ch'üan », and on the other, 弘治四年三月立 « Established (*li*) in the third month of the fourth year of Hung-chih (1491) ». It may have been made at Ch'u-chou-fu, though it may just as well have been made at Lung-ch'üan. As a matter of fact, the *Lung-ch'üan hsien chih*, 3, 18 b, speaks of porcelain manufactured at Lung-ch'üan in 1436-1449, and even as late as 1465-1505. Moreover, even when the celadon wares were still manufactured at Lung-ch'üan, they could very well have been, and were in fact, commonly known under the name of the prefectural city. This was positively stated in the revised *Ko-ku yao-lun* of 1459 (end of ch. 7): « The old Lung-ch'üan ware... is now called Ch'u-ch'i [Ware of Ch'u-chou-fu] or Ch'ing-ch'i [Green ware] » (HIRTH, *Ancient Porcelain*, 34). In any case, what is of interest for us is to find the name « Ch'u-chou porcelain » used as an adequate designation of celadon half a century after Polo. We have seen that Polo's porcelain must be celadon. Now, the most frequent clerical errors in mediaeval manuscripts are the confusion of *t* and *c* and that of *n* and *u*. Ch'u-chou ought to be *Ciugiu in Polo's system of transcribing Chinese names. I have no doubt that « Tingiu » has been altered from *Ciugiu = Ch'u-chou[-fu]; but the corruption, at least that of *c-* to *t-*, must have occurred in the archetype of all our manuscripts.

The word « porcellaine » is employed by Polo in its two meanings of « shell » (cowry) and of « china » (a third meaning, « purslane », < Fr. « pourcelaine » < It. « porcellana », occurs in Pegolotti [EVANS, 427], and may partly account for some of the corruptions of the Mss. in Polo's chapter on « Lochac »; cf. Vol. I, 369). It is borrowed from the Italian *porcellana* (and *porcelletta*), a derivative form of the word *porcella*, « sow ». The sense of « shell » is of course the more ancient. Polo's text is up to the present the earliest where the word occurs with an unambiguous meaning of « china » (cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 725; HEYD, *Hist. du commerce*, II, 678-680). With Polo's French text in front of us, we cannot but feel some amazement when we read in BLOCH, *Dict. étymol. de la langue française*, II, 171, that the meaning of « white pottery imported from the East » was evolved only in the 16th cent.