

# Chinese Porcelain in Medieval Europe

By DAVID WHITEHOUSE

*Wainwright Fellow in Near Eastern Archaeology, University of Oxford*

*IN Faenza, LII (1966) I published the fragments of Chinese porcelain found at Lucera Castle and at the same time collected evidence for the occurrence of Chinese vessels elsewhere in Europe in the middle ages.<sup>1</sup> This paper contains a larger catalogue of finds and references, and attempts to assess the extent to which Chinese porcelain was available in Europe before the 16th century. It is divided into three parts: Introduction, Catalogue and short Discussion. An Appendix contains notes on Italian imitations of Chinese porcelain in the 15th and early 16th centuries.*

## INTRODUCTION

ORIENTAL and African objects, acquired by trade or as diplomatic gifts, were highly prized in medieval Europe, where they excited comment because of their rarity, fine craftsmanship or (as with ostrich eggs) their curiosity. In the later middle ages one such object was porcelain. Chinese porcelain, usually obtained from the Moslem countries of the east Mediterranean, was already known in Europe in the 13th century. However, even after 1400 porcelain was rare and Chinese wares did not become common until the 16th century, when the Portuguese established a network of trading stations in eastern waters. With the foundation of depots at Hormuz (1507), Goa (1509) and Malacca (1511) porcelain began to arrive regularly in Portugal, Spain and, later, the rest of western Europe. Shortly before the establishment of the entrepôts Portuguese explorers and merchants returned to Europe with samples of porcelain. In 1499 or 1503, for example, Vasco da Gama presented King Manoel and Queen Isabella with oriental objects, including *assi almiskwere e benjolm e porcelanas que se comprarão em calicut*.<sup>2</sup> From 1503 onwards inventories in Portugal and Spain refer to porcelain in ever-increasing quantities.<sup>3</sup>

Although no porcelain is recorded in Europe before the 13th century, it has long been known in the near and middle east.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, by this date many rulers in Egypt and western Asia possessed large collections and porcelain probably

<sup>1</sup> Whitehouse (1966). For a key to abbreviated references see p. 78. For Lucera, see also David Whitehouse, 'Ceramiche e vetri medioevali provenienti dal castello di Lucera', *Bolettino d'Arte*, 1966, pts. iii-iv, 171-8.

<sup>2</sup> Luís Keil, 'Porcelanas chinesas do século XVI com inscrições em português', *Boletim da Accademia Nacional de Belas Artes*, x (1942), 18-69, citing Caspar Correia, *Lendas da India* (Lisbon, 1858-66), I, 141. Keil mistakenly gives the date as 1498, although Vasco da Gama did not return from his first voyage until August or September 1499. *Calicut*, or Calicut, is modern Kozhikode, the capital of the Malabar district of Kerala in southern India.

<sup>3</sup> Davillier (1882), 18-20, and Appendix, p. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Tsugio Mikami, *Tōji No Michi* [Ceramic Road] (Tokyo, 1969), contains the most extensive published account of Chinese porcelain in the middle east.

could be purchased in the bazaar of every major town. The importation of porcelain was, however, only a minor element in the extensive pattern of trade which brought to the Moslem world the spices, silk and other luxury goods of India, China and SE. Asia. As a result of this trade porcelain was already available in the middle east by the beginning of the 9th century. Baihaqī, writing in 1059, records that °Alī Ibn-°Īsā, a governor of Khurāsān, sent a large consignment of porcelain to the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd (786–806) at Baghdad,<sup>5</sup> while a little later, according to Tanūkhī, Chinese vessels were used to contain a batch of perfumes made during the reign of the caliph al-Wāthiq (842–7).<sup>6</sup> The current excavations at Sīrāf show that Chinese export wares were reaching the Persian Gulf in large quantities before c.820.<sup>7</sup> Although at this date the principal market was almost certainly Baghdad, porcelain reached numerous towns in the near and middle east. Thus at Fustāt, the forerunner of Cairo, excavation and chance discovery have yielded a huge amount of Chinese material, beginning with Yüeh ware,<sup>8</sup> and perhaps also sherds with a mottled green and yellow finish,<sup>9</sup> of the 9th or 10th century. Elsewhere in the east Mediterranean fragments of a Yüeh-ware bowl, probably of the 10th century, are reported from Ashkelon,<sup>10</sup> while a long list of finds and references shows that porcelain was known throughout the eastern caliphate.<sup>11</sup> Al-Bīrūnī (973–1048), for example, describes the Chinese porcelain in a house at Rayy, 15 km. south of Tehran,<sup>12</sup> and Idrīsī, writing before 1154, notes that in his day porcelain was imported through the harbour of Aden.<sup>13</sup> Three thousand km. to the north, in Soviet Armenia, Yüeh and white wares, perhaps of the 9th or 10th century, have been found in excavations at Ani.<sup>14</sup>

The richest collections were very large indeed. Al-Maqrīzī, writing in the 15th century, reports that the Fātimid caliph al-Mustansir (1036–94) possessed whole rooms full of porcelain.<sup>15</sup> Three centuries later a wealthy Mameluk *qādī*, selling his personal effects in Cairo in 1337–8, realized 40,000 dirhems for various types of porcelain (*al-Awānī al-Sīnī*).<sup>16</sup> As Goitein explains, the name dirhem,

<sup>5</sup> Lane and Serjeant (1948), 110.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> David Whitehouse, 'Excavations at Sīrāf: fourth interim report', *Iran*, x (1970), 1–17, especially p. 2; *id.*, 'Some Chinese and Islamic pottery from Sīrāf', in Watson (1970), 30–4.

<sup>8</sup> Oscar Raphael, 'Fragments from Fustat', *Trans. Oriental Ceramic Soc.*, 1923–4, 17–25; R. L. Hobson, 'Chinese porcelain from Fostat', *Burlington Magazine*, LXI (1932), 109–13; Leigh Ashton, 'China and Egypt', *Trans. Oriental Ceramic Soc.*, 1933–4, 62–72; Kahle (1940–1), 30.

<sup>9</sup> Reported by Ashton, *op. cit.* in note 8, etc., but note the statement by George T. Scanlon, 'Egypt and China: trade and imitation', in D. S. Richards (ed.), *Islam and the Trade of Asia* (Oxford, 1970), 81–95, particularly p. 84: 'As yet no certifiable and/or published Tang three-coloured ware has turned up in Fustāt or in any other find-spot in Egypt.'

<sup>10</sup> J. D. Frierman, 'Chinese ceramics from Ashkelon and Caesarea', *Israel Exploration J.*, 19, no. 1 (1969), 44–5. The sherds from Caesarea belong to the 18th century and do not concern us here.

<sup>11</sup> Kahle (1940–1), 29–37.

<sup>12</sup> Kahle (1940–1), 30.

<sup>13</sup> Lane and Serjeant (1948), 113.

<sup>14</sup> B. A. Shelkovnikov, 'Kitayskaya keramika iz Raskopok Srednevekovikh Gorodov i Poseleniy Zakavkaziya', *Sovetskaya Archeologiya*, XXI (1954), 368–78. See also the criticism by Kamer Aga-Oglu, 'Russian excavations of Chinese ceramics in Transcaucasia', *Far Eastern Ceramics Bull.*, VIII, no. 3 (serial no. 35, September, 1956), 1–11.

<sup>15</sup> Paul Kahle, 'Die Schätze der Fatimiden', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXXIX (1935), 329–62.

<sup>16</sup> Lane and Serjeant (1948), 114, citing Makrizī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-Mar'rifat Duwal al-Mulūk* (ed. M. M. Ziyāda, Cairo, 1942), II, ii, 442.

traditionally a silver coin weighing 2·8 grammes, was applied to three separate denominations in Cairo: 1, a coin of pure silver, the *nugra*, equivalent to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of a dinar; 2, a coin of debased silver, 36–40 of which made a dinar; and 3, base coins of varying worth.<sup>17</sup> In the documents of the Cairo *geniza*, the word dirhem usually refers to the debased silver coin and, on this basis, the porcelain sold by the *qādī* realized at least 1,000 gold dinars—a very considerable sum. According to al-Khazradjī, in 1392 the sultan of Egypt brought out of storage ‘500 plates of porcelain never previously used, apart from that which had been previously used’.<sup>18</sup>

Porcelain was not valued for its high quality alone; superstition attributed to it remarkable therapeutic properties. In the mid 13th century Naṣīr ad-Dīn al-Tūṣī claimed that powdered porcelain was a cure for toothache and bleeding from the nose, while another superstition declared that celadon vessels revealed the presence of poison in the preparations they contained.<sup>19</sup>

Despite the impression of long-range commerce created by Marco Polo and other western travellers, the great bulk of the oriental merchandise which reached Europe before c.1500 was purchased from Moslem traders in Egypt and the Levant. Until the 13th century the main source of spices, silk and other goods was Egypt. Thus the records of the Genoese lawyer Scriba show that between 1156 and 1164 twice as many of his clients had interests in Alexandria as in all the ports of the Levant put together,<sup>20</sup> while in 1215–16 the city was said to contain some 3,000 Frankish merchants.<sup>21</sup> Shortly afterwards the focus changed. Already in 1184 the Moslem pilgrim Ibn Jubayr travelled with a merchant caravan from Damascus to the port of Acre and his account of the journey makes it clear that such caravans were frequent. The assize records of Jerusalem mention spices, silk and ivory, much of which had been carried overland from the Persian Gulf, if not beyond.<sup>22</sup>

With the expansion of the Mongols into western Asia after 1220 the proportion of the market supplied by Egypt diminished further. By establishing control over a huge area the Mongol Il-Khāns enabled caravans to travel from the middle east, central Asia and even China with reasonable security. The new overland route ended at Ayas (Lajazzo) in SE. Turkey and this rapidly became the leading entrepôt for trade between Europe and eastern Asia. Writing in 1298–9, Marco Polo reported that ‘all the spices and cloths from the interior are brought to this town, and all other goods of high value; and merchants of Venice and Genoa and everywhere else come here and buy them’.<sup>23</sup>

Chinese goods formed only a small part of this Asiatic trade and were, moreover, mostly textiles, which rarely survive in archaeological contexts; as a result Chinese objects are rare in western Europe. The only finds attributed to

<sup>17</sup> Goitein (1967), I, 360.

<sup>18</sup> Lane and Serjeant (1948), 115, citing al-Khazradjī, iv, 233.

<sup>19</sup> Kahle (1940–1), 37.

<sup>20</sup> Runciman (1954), III, 355.

<sup>21</sup> Adolf Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (Munich and Berlin, 1906), 181.

<sup>22</sup> Runciman (1954), III, 358.

<sup>23</sup> Marco Polo, *The Travels*, trans. R. E. Latham (Harmondsworth, 1958), 15.

pre-medieval trade or diplomacy are two bronze vessels of the type known as a *hu*, probably of the Han dynasty (206 B.C.—A.D. 220). One of the vessels was found in Rome<sup>24</sup> and the other in the Dane John at Canterbury.<sup>25</sup> Both were discovered before Chinese bronzes became collectors' items in Europe, and the Canterbury find was apparently from a Roman grave.

Porcelain apart, the only medieval items known to us are silks. The earliest surviving example is a fragment of taffeta from a 10th-century grave at Birka, the Viking entrepôt on Lake Mälär.<sup>26</sup> To the 11th century belongs a Byzantine ivory casket in Troyes Cathedral, the ends of which are decorated with birds, almost certainly copied from a Chinese textile.<sup>27</sup> From the 13th century we have the silk cover of the reliquary containing the jaw of King Erik IX of Sweden, who died in 1160. The relic probably reached its present home, Turku Cathedral in Finland, in 1273. The cover is a piece of vermilion damask, decorated with turtles and *fêng-huang* birds against a background of waves and clouds.<sup>28</sup> Several other churches, including Eskilstuna, Vena, and Uppsala Cathedral, all in Sweden, a church at Gerona in Spain and the Marienkirche, Danzig, possess or formerly possessed silks which have been identified as Chinese.<sup>29</sup> However, we must beware of confusing genuine Chinese products with contemporary Mongol textiles from the middle east (the *pannae tartaricae*, or Tartar cloths, of medieval inventories)<sup>30</sup> or even with Italian imitations. Thus, while one authority identifies as Chinese the brocade in the dalmatic of Pope Benedict XI (1303–4) in San Domenico, Perugia, another maintains that it was woven at Lucca.<sup>31</sup>

Although Luccan silk dominated the Italian market in the 13th and 14th centuries and was, indeed, exported to Egypt,<sup>32</sup> at least two specific references to Chinese silk occur in documents concerned with Genoa. In 1257 we have a record of *seta catuya* ('silk from Cathay') and in 1304 a document records the arrival in London of one bale of 'silk called Cathewy' from Genoa.<sup>33</sup> However, despite this varied evidence for the existence of oriental silk in medieval Europe, porcelain remains the only Chinese commodity of which several undisputed

<sup>24</sup> Birgit Vessberg, 'Un bronze du style Houai découvert à Rome', *Bull. Museum Far Eastern Antiquities* (Stockholm), ix (1937), 127–31.

<sup>25</sup> Leigh Ashton and Basil Gray, *Chinese Art* (London, 1935), 64.

<sup>26</sup> Geijer (1951), 34 and 97, cat. no. 1. See also *id.*, *Birka III. Die Textilfunde aus den Gräbern* (Uppsala, 1938), 59, fig. 17, pl. 13, no. 4.

<sup>27</sup> David Talbot Rice, 'Iranian elements in Byzantine art', *Mémoires du III<sup>e</sup> congrès international d'art et d'archéologie iraniens* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1939), 203–7 and especially, pl. lxxxvii. See also E. Sabbe, 'L'importation des tissus orientaux en Europe occidentale en haut moyen âge (ix<sup>e</sup> et x<sup>e</sup> siècles)', *Revue belge de philol. et d'hist.*, xiv (1935), 811–48.

<sup>28</sup> Geijer (1951), 35 and 97, cat. no. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Geijer (1951), 97–8; Dubosc (1954), 205–6. The fragment from Gerona, now in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C., was found in a 13th-century casket; the Danzig textile is now in the Lutherkirche, Lübeck. For a catalogue of the remarkable collection of medieval Chinese, Islamic and Italian textiles assembled in the Marienkirche, Danzig, see Walter Mannowsky, *Kirchliche Gewänder und Stickereien aus dem Schatz der Marienkirche* (Danzig, Stadtmuseum, 1929).

<sup>30</sup> See, e.g., the references to Tartar fabrics in the Vatican in 1295, cited by E. Molinier, *Inventaire du trésor du Saint-Siège sous Boniface VIII (1295)*, (Paris, 1888), nos. 804–994, 1143–72 and 1263–81.

<sup>31</sup> Geijer (1951), 35; Antonio Santangelo, *The Development of Italian Textile Design* (London, 1964), 20, and (for an illustration of the dalmatic) pl. 20.

<sup>32</sup> Goitein (1967), I, 102.

<sup>33</sup> R. S. Lopez, 'China silk in Europe in the Yüan period', *J. American Oriental Soc.*, LXXXI (1952), 72–3. 'Cathay', derived from *Khitai*, was the name by which Europeans knew China or, more specifically, China north of the Yangtze, in the Mongol period.

examples survive, together with references to other examples in more than a dozen documents. The sections which follow contain a catalogue of the evidence.

## CATALOGUE

We may divide the evidence into three categories:

- I. Fragments of porcelain found in archaeological excavations,
- II. Porcelain vessels which can be shown to have arrived in Europe during the middle ages, and
- III. References to porcelain in medieval documents.

In each category doubt attaches to at least one item and in sections I and II I have divided the material further into (i) reliable and (ii) doubtful (and sometimes discredited) examples. The first two sections are intended as a corpus of all the extant vessels which are known, or believed, to have reached Europe before c.1500. The third section, which is based almost entirely on secondary sources, makes no claim to be complete and I have no doubt that further research would reveal additional references.

### I. FRAGMENTS FOUND IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS

#### i. RELIABLE FINDS

##### 1. *Lucera (Puglie), Italy*<sup>34</sup>

In 1964 and 1965 Professor G. D. B. Jones and I directed two short excavations inside the medieval castle at Lucera in collaboration with the Soprintendenza ai Monumenti, Bari. The visible remains belong to a castle begun by Frederick II in 1223 and considerably enlarged after 1269 by Charles I (1265–85) and Charles II (1285–1309) of Anjou. On several occasions the castle served as a royal residence. During the excavations we recovered numerous exotic objects, including gilded and enamelled glass, ostrich-egg shell, Syrian lustre ware, and fragments of three Chinese vessels. The Chinese fragments, which are now in the magazzino of the Museo Civico, Lucera, came from two deposits, both of which belong to the 13th century, probably after the Angevin conquest in 1269.

*a.* Rim fragment of a Yüeh-ware bowl (PL. IX, A). Light grey stoneware with a suggestion of brown, containing small white inclusions. Greyish brown glaze streaked with brown and thicker inside the vessel than on the outside, through which the white inclusions appear cream. The decoration consists of lotus petals radiating from the foot, carved on the outside in low relief. Mr. B. Gray kindly informs me that the fragment, which cannot be paralleled among the sherds from Shao-hsing in the British Museum, but probably can be matched in the latest period at Yüeh-yao, belongs to the 11th century.

*b.* Two fragments from a celadon vessel with a broad flange-rim (PL. IX, A). Fine light grey stoneware with a few tiny air spaces and darker grey inclusions.

<sup>34</sup> Whitehouse (1966).

Thick, rather cold grey-green crackled glaze. Mr. Gray kindly identified the sherds as Chekiang celadon, probably of the 12th century.

*c.* Part of a small *Ch'ing pai* bowl (PL. IX, B). White porcelain with a pale grey-blue glaze covering the interior and the outside of the vessel above the foot. The decoration is restricted to the inside and consists of a narrow fretted zone above a broader zone of plant motifs. It is carried out in white slip trailed under the glaze. Mr. Y. Mino of the Royal Ontario Museum suggests that the vessel was made in Fukien in the 12th or 13th century.

## 2. Winchester (Hants), England

The Director of the Winchester Research Unit, Mr. M. Biddle, kindly tells me that two fragments of Chinese porcelain have been found during his recent excavations at Winchester.

*a.* Small fragment of blue and white porcelain (inv. no. BS. RF. 135) from the side of a small cup or bowl. It has a white body, colourless glaze and decoration in greyish blue. The sherd was found in a late 14th- or early 15th-century level in Lower Brook Street.

*b.* Scrap of celadon with a fine light grey body and a greenish glaze (inv. no. BS. RF. 30). It also comes from Lower Brook Street, but was not stratified and is too small to permit identification.

## 3. Budapest, Hungary

Professor David Wilson has kindly drawn my attention to statements by L. Gerevich about finds of Chinese material in Budapest. Gerevich<sup>34a</sup> mentions 'a porcelain jar from Buda Castle', reminiscent of the Gagnières-Fonthill Vase, described below (p. 70 f.), and fragments of 'olive green plates and jugs' from 15th-century rubbish-pits. Gerevich emphasizes the Chinese origin of the sherds; presumably they are celadon. None of the finds is illustrated.

## ii. FINDS OF UNCERTAIN DATE OR ORIGIN

### 4. Corinth, Greece<sup>35</sup>

A fragment of blue and white porcelain was recovered from a late Byzantine deposit and a 'scatter of other similar pieces' occurred elsewhere on the site. Unfortunately, the dates of the fragments are uncertain and we do not know whether any belongs to the medieval period. It is more likely, perhaps, that they were imported during the Ottoman occupation, as was a fragment of blue and white porcelain found at Nicosia in Cyprus.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34a</sup> L. Gerevich, *The Art of Buda and Pest in the Middle Ages* (Budapest, 1971), 79.

<sup>35</sup> Charles H. Morgan II, *Corinth XI. The Byzantine Pottery* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), 171.

<sup>36</sup> A. H. S. Megaw, 'Three medieval pit-groups from Nicosia', *Report Dep. Antiquities of Cyprus 1937-39*, 145-68, with addendum, 224-6. The porcelain, cat. no. B1, was found in a 16th-century pit.

5. *Almería, Spain*<sup>37</sup>

Among the medieval pottery from the Alcazaba of Almería are the following four fragments published by Zozaya, who suggests that they are probably Chinese. The fragments are now preserved in the local museum.

*a.* Part of the rim of a bowl, diam. 10·7 cm., with a hard, slightly translucent white fabric and a colourless glaze. The exterior is decorated with lotus petals in low relief, recalling the Yüeh sherd from Lucera Castle. The interior bears an Arabic inscription in green, painted over the glaze just below the lip. It contains the Qur'ānic phrase *al-mulk lillāhi* ('the power is of God'), and Zozaya notes that the letter *kāf* in the word *mulk* is incorrectly formed. He concludes that the inscription was made by a Chinese potter, unfamiliar with the Arabic script.

*b.* Fragment from the base of a bowl with a broad shallow foot-ring, diam. 8 cm. Like item *a* the fragment is of hard, white fabric with a colourless glaze. The interior bears decoration incised under the glaze, consisting of a concentric zone of indeterminate ornament, surrounded by a broader zone of intersecting arcs and circles, each apparently with a smaller motif in the centre.

*c.* Scrap from the rim of a bowl, too small to permit measurement of the diameter. The sherd is of fine, white fabric with a colourless glaze.

*d.* Fragment from the rim of a bowl, diam. about 8·5 cm. The sherd is of relatively poor quality, of an opaque fabric and with a colourless glaze.

The fragments are difficult to place and none falls readily into a recognized class of Chinese porcelain. Zozaya states that the fabrics of sherds *a-c* contain kaolin and are slightly translucent, and accordingly he regards them as probably Chinese. However, at least one possible alternative exists in the Islamic world, and the inscription on *a* and the ornament on *b* suggest that it is here, rather than in China, that we should seek analogies. The 'white wares' of Saljūq Persia, for example, have a hard, white fabric which may be slightly translucent. Furthermore they frequently imitate Chinese prototypes and the broad foot of *b*, which certainly occurs widely in 10th- and 11th-century China, is also a common Saljūq form. The inscription on *a*, at present without parallel in Chinese ceramics, would be perfectly acceptable in an Islamic context. Much of the epigraphic ornament on Islamic pottery is incorrectly expressed, probably because it was made by illiterate or barely literate workmen copying, but failing to understand, intelligible archetypes. The ornament of *b* again suggests an Islamic origin; indeed, the inner zone may contain debased kūfic letters. In view of these Islamic parallels it would be wise to reinforce Zozaya's caution about identifying the fragments as Chinese and to look for an origin in the near or middle east. Here

<sup>37</sup> Juan Zozaya, 'El comercio de al-Andalus con el oriente: nuevos datos', *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Orientalistas*, v (1969), 191-200; *id.*, 'Chinese porcelain in caliphal Spain', in Watson (1970), 54-7.

the most likely source is Saljūq Persia, whence, as we know, vessels were exported occasionally to the Mediterranean.<sup>38</sup>

#### 6. *Writtle (Essex), England*<sup>39</sup>

Among the finds from a late 15th- or early 16th-century deposit on the site of the hunting-lodge built for King John (1199-1216) is a fragment of sandy, buff earthenware covered with a greenish glaze resembling celadon. The fragment comes from the side of a small hemispherical bowl. Although at first thought to be celadon, the sherd is now recognized as an imitation either from SE. Asia or, more probably, from the Islamic near east.

#### 7. *Genoa (Liguria), Italy*

The imported pottery found by T. Mannoni during excavations in the centre of Genoa includes a fragment of imitation celadon: a scrap of soft, cream earthenware with a rich, green glaze. The sherd comes from a bowl, fluted on the inside, which is evidently an Islamic copy of a Chinese original. For a reference to *porcelletta* at Genoa in 1384, see p. 74.

## II. VESSELS IN MUSEUMS AND OTHER COLLECTIONS

### i. PIECES WHICH CERTAINLY REACHED EUROPE BEFORE c.1500

#### 1. *The Gagnières-Fonthill Vase*<sup>40</sup>

The National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, possesses a porcelain bottle, 28.3 cm. high, with a hard white body and a bluish *Ch'ing pai* glaze (inv. no. 3941.1882: PL. x, A). The vessel bears incised and applied ornament divided into three horizontal zones. The highest zone, at the base of the neck, contains simple triangular leaves; the central zone, on the body, consists of four sunken quatrefoils each containing applied chrysanthemums and tree peonies; the lowest zone, just above the base, contains gouged and incised lotus petals.

The ornament is highly distinctive and this enabled Lane to identify the vessel as a piece recorded in 1713 by Gagnières, whose drawing was reproduced by Mazerolle in 1897.<sup>40a</sup> After 1713 the history of the vessel is unknown until it reappeared in the collection of William Beckford at Fonthill Abbey and was illustrated in a catalogue of the Fonthill sale in 1822-3. Subsequently the bottle again disappeared until it was acquired by the National Museum of Ireland in 1882.

<sup>38</sup> The Musei Civici, Pavia (Lombardy), Italy, possess a fragmentary Saljūq bowl with carved ornament under a turquoise glaze, which was removed for safety from the façade of S. Michele at Pavia. A broken example of Saljūq white ware survives *in situ* in the S. side of S. Sisto at Pisa. For information on these vessels I am indebted to Drs. Francesco Aguzzi and Liana Tongiorgi. For a piece of 12th-century Lakabi ware from Istanbul see R. Martin Harrison and Nezi̇h Firatli, 'Excavations at Saraçhane in Istanbul: fifth preliminary report', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, xxii (1968), 195-216, fig. 14.

<sup>39</sup> P. A. Rahtz, *Excavations at King John's Hunting Lodge, Writtle, Essex, 1955-57* (Soc. Med. Archaeol., monograph series, no. 3, London, 1969), 110, fig. 59, no. 998.

<sup>40</sup> Lane (1961).

<sup>40a</sup> F. Mazerolle, 'Un vase oriental en porcelaine orné d'une monture d'orfèvrerie du xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Gazette des beaux arts*, xvii (1897), 53-8.



When Gagnières drew the piece, it bore silver-gilt and enamel mounts, which were missing by the time it reached Dublin. However, the drawing is sufficiently clear to show the mounts in detail and these indicate that the vessel was given by Louis the Great of Hungary (1342–82) to Charles I of Durazzo in 1381. We have no information on how the vessel arrived in Europe, but Mazerolle suggested that it may have been brought by an embassy of Nestorian Christians from China, who visited Pope Benedict XII in 1338. The embassy, Mazerolle believed, would have passed through Hungary on its way to the papal court at Avignon.

## 2. *The Katzenelnbogen Bowl*<sup>41</sup>

Among the treasures of the Hessisches Landesmuseum, Kassel (West Germany) is the famous celadon bowl with silver-gilt mounts embellished with the arms of Count Philip of Katzenelnbogen, as borne until 1453 (inv. no. B. II. 240: PL. X, B). The bowl has a curving side and is covered with a bright green glaze. It is identified as a product of the Lung-Chüan region in the Yüan or early Ming period.<sup>42</sup> The vessel is mounted as the cup of a chalice with a broad hollow stem and a six-lobed foot. The total height is 20.6 cm. and the diameter 16 cm. The style of the mounts suggests that they were made in a Rhenish workshop in the mid 15th century. The vessel is mentioned several times in the inventories of property belonging to the landgraves of Hesse, beginning in the 16th century. In 1594, a note refers to a *purtslan trinkeshir* 'which a count von Katzenelnbogen brought back from the orient'. We know that Count Philip, whose arms appear on the piece, travelled in the east in 1433–4 and it is possible that he acquired the bowl during this journey. In any case, it was undoubtedly in his possession in Germany by 1453.

## ii. DOUBTFUL OR DISCREDITED VESSELS

### 3. *The Marco Polo Jar*<sup>43</sup>

The Treasury of St. Mark, Venice, contains a small porcelain jar which traditionally is supposed to have been brought to Europe by Marco Polo himself (PL. IX, C). The jar is 12 cm. high and has a maximum diameter of 8.1 cm. The vessel is a *mei-p'ing* with a five-lobed body. It has a foot-ring and a short tapering neck, thickened at the base, with four small loops intended for the cord which originally attached the lid. The vessel is made of white, translucent porcelain with a cream glaze over the whole of the outside except the foot. The glaze has a greenish tint and is accidentally crackled near the base. The jar bears four zones of decoration in low relief. The ornament consists of bands of petal-like motifs, each with a central rib, at the top and bottom of the pot, between which are two bands of conventional floral scrolls.

The piece belongs to a group of small vessels, usually jars, commonly found

<sup>41</sup> Max Sauerlandt, *Keramik- und Glasstudien II. Edelmetalfassungen in der Keramik* (Berlin, 1924), 36.

<sup>42</sup> Dubosc (1954), 126, cat. no. 438; Hackenbroch (1955), 24.

<sup>43</sup> Raphael (1931–2); Dubosc (1954), 156, cat. no. 565.

in SE. Asia. In recent years excavations and chance discovery have yielded examples in Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines, several parallels, for instance, being reported from Satingphra in Malaysia.<sup>44</sup> Discussing these finds, Lamb points out that the vessels are mass-produced items, probably used as containers for perishable goods, such as sauce. He suggests that they were made in south China or Vietnam; Raphael has suggested Fukien.

Several scholars accept the tradition that the jar reached Europe in the 13th century, usually on the grounds that a piece of this type lacks the qualities which might have persuaded 16th-century or later merchants to import it as an antique. Unfortunately, the argument is open to doubt, for among the vessels certainly imported from the far east in the 16th and early 17th centuries is at least one piece which failed to satisfy the normal canons of taste. This is the 'Tradescant Vase' in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, a large jar decorated in relief with floral motifs and covered with vivid green and yellow glazes. The vase came into the possession of John Tradescant, Sr., of London in 1620.<sup>45</sup> We should be cautious, therefore, about accepting the jar in St. Mark's simply because it would not have appealed to the taste of a later period; in the absence of precise information, we cannot know when it was exported from eastern Asia.

#### 4. *A Ch'ing pai bottle*<sup>46</sup>

While discussing the Fonthill Vase, Lane drew attention to a similar *Ch'ing pai* vessel in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (acc. no. c68-1957). This is a bottle with a bluish glaze and applied floral motifs. According to Lane, it belongs to the 14th century. The neck has been broken and the damage is concealed by ormolu mounts made in Germany shortly after 1700. Lane applies to this vessel the argument which Harrisson and others apply to the Marco Polo Jar: that a piece of such quality is unlikely to have been imported to Europe by the Portuguese or the Dutch. He suggests, therefore, that, like the Fonthill Vase, it may have been imported in the middle ages—a possibility which cannot be proved.

#### 5. *A second vessel from St. Mark's, Venice*<sup>47</sup>

The Grandidier collection in the Louvre includes an octagonal incense-burner complete with cover and stand, made in Fukien. The vessel was purchased from Davillier, who stated that it had been presented to him by a priest in charge of the Treasury of St. Mark. Like the Marco Polo Jar, the vessel was reputed to have reached Venice in the medieval period. However, the burner appears to belong to the Ch'ing dynasty (1644-1912) and it is clear that Davillier was deceived.

<sup>44</sup> Alastair Lamb, 'Notes on Satingphra', *J. Malaysian Branch of Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, xxxvii, pt. i (1964), 74-87, particularly pls. 12-14.

<sup>45</sup> Tom Harrisson, '“Export wares” found in west Borneo', *Oriental Art*, v, no. 2 (1959), 42-51. A proof-reading error causes the date 1420 to appear instead of 1620.

<sup>46</sup> Lane (1961), 131, fig. 11. The vessel is illustrated also by R. Schmidt, *Chinesische Keramik* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1924), pl. 81b.

<sup>47</sup> Raphael (1931-2), 15.

## III. REFERENCES IN MEDIEVAL DOCUMENTS

The following documents refer, or may refer, to porcelain vessels, although sometimes it is not certain whether the object in question was porcelain, Islamic pottery, glass or mother-of-pearl, because the word porcelain was often used to describe an object made of almost any translucent or shiny substance. Thus, as Davillier noted, an unnamed Spanish document mentions *una porcelana de vidrio* (i.e. glass), while in 1505 an inventory of property belonging to Queen Isabella the Catholic refers to *una copa de vidrio que se llama porcelana* and the writer of a 15th-century document cited by Davillier thought it necessary to specify *una porcelana de porcelana*<sup>48</sup>. Davillier argues that the vessel in Queen Isabella's inventory really was of porcelain and was called 'glass' simply because it was translucent. However, we cannot know whether the writer meant a glass vessel or a porcelain vessel with glass-like translucence. A final difficulty is created by the widespread use of *porcelana* to mean mother-of-pearl, a complication which does not, however, arise in Spain and Portugal, where *nacar* was used to indicate shell. The references which follow include several doubtful examples, although I have omitted all those in which *porcelana* clearly means something other than Chinese ceramics.

1. 1323. From the will of Queen Maria of Naples and Sicily.  
*Item Paulo Gerardi . . . Bocalettum unum cum coperculo qui poritur in extimatione de sporcellano, et est de vitro, extimatum uncias duas pro uncia una.*  
*Item Baldo de Baldis scutellas duas de porchellana pro tarenis quindecim.*<sup>49</sup>
2. 1363. From an inventory of property belonging to the duke of Normandy.  
*Deux plats, iiii écuelles et iiii saussières de porcelaine.*<sup>50</sup>
3. 1372. From an inventory of property belonging to Jeanne d'Evreux.  
*Ung pot à eau de pierre de pourcelaine à ung couvercle d'argent; un pot à vin de pierre de pourcelaine plus blanche.*<sup>51</sup>

Both Hackenbroch (1955, p. 25), and Lane (1961, p. 129), regard these items as Chinese and Lane suggests that, while the first piece might have been celadon, the second probably was porcelain, since it was noted as being white.

<sup>48</sup> Davillier (1882), 18-19.

<sup>49</sup> Béla Krisztinkovics and Maurizio Korach, 'Un antico documento sulla porcellana cinese in Europa', *Faenza*, LIII (1967), 27-30, citing Gustav Wenzel, *Monumenta Hungariae Historica: Diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-Korból* (Budapest, 1874), I, 239-40 and 244.

<sup>50</sup> Davillier (1882), 9.

<sup>51</sup> H. Havard, *Dictionnaire de l'ameublement* (Paris, 1890), s.v. 'porcelaine'.

4. 1379–80. From an inventory of property belonging to Louis I, duke of Anjou (1360–84).

*Une escuelle de porcelaine à servir de fruit, garnie d'argent doré: et par le pié est à plusieurs savages; et dessus a vi esmaus, en chascun desquels a une teste d'apostre, et les bors sont esmailliés d'asur, et y a gens qui chacent et aucuns qui jouent à divers jeux. Et sur lesdis bors a trois escuçons de nos armes pendants à avelez; et y aussi a trois fretelez dorez à perles et a petis grenas, et sur chascun fretez a une langue de serpent. Et poise en tout v mars vi onces.<sup>52</sup>*

Louis I was named heir to the kingdom of Naples by Joanna I in 1378. However, Charles III, duke of Durazzo, occupied Naples in 1381 and prevented Louis from making himself more than the nominal king. The vessel mentioned above must have been acquired by Louis before he travelled to Italy and so presumably reached France as a trade item or a diplomatic gift.

5. 1384. A notarial document in the Archivio di Stato, Genoa, mentions *porcelletta* in a list of merchandise which also includes *pignatte dorate* (presumably lustre ware) and glass.<sup>53</sup>

6. 1416. From an inventory of property belonging to Jean, duke of Berry (1406–16).

*Une aiguière de porcelaine ouvrée, les pié, couvercle et biberon de laquelle sont d'argent doré et l'envoya nostre Sant Père le Pape Jehan XXII<sup>e</sup> (sic), en don à Monsieur . . . Un plat fait de porcelaine, sanz aucune garnison, estant dedans un estuy de cuir, non prisé pour ce qu'il a esté rompu en amenant de Bourges à Paris. Un pot de porcelaine à une ance d'argent et le demoirant, avec le couvercle, garny d'argent doré . . . . Un autre pot de porcelaine avec l'ance de mesme . . . . Deux petites escuelles de porcelaine, prisées i sol iij den.<sup>54</sup>*

The first John XXIII was the schismatic pope, Baldassare Cossa, elected in 1410 and deposed in May 1415. He spent most of his pontificate in Italy, leaving the country only in the autumn of 1414, when he attended the Council of Constance. He spent his last months in office as a fugitive and it is highly probable that the porcelain vessel was sent as a gift from Rome or Florence, between 1410 and 1414.

7. 1447. Gifts sent to Charles VII of France (1422–61) by an oriental ruler. . . . *Si, te mande par ledit ambassadeur un présent: c'est à sçavoir du baume fin de nostre sainte vigne; un bel liépart, trois escuelles de porcelaine de Sinant (China), deux grandz platz ouvertz de porcelaine, deux touques verdes de porcelaine, deux bouquetz de porcelaine, ung lavoir ès mains et un garde-manger de porcelaine ouvré.<sup>55</sup>*

<sup>52</sup> H. Moranvillé, *Inventaire de l'orfèvrerie et des bijoux de Louis I, duc d'Anjou* (Paris, 1905), III, 518, item 3354.

<sup>53</sup> Gian Giacomo Musso, 'Le fonti liguri d'archivio sui rapporti commerciali medievali nel Mediterraneo', *Atti del IV<sup>o</sup> Convegno Internazionale della Ceramica* (Albisola), in the press.

<sup>54</sup> Davillier (1882), 9.

<sup>55</sup> Whitehouse (1966), 92, citing Davillier (1882), 9–11.

Davillier (*loc. cit.* in note) states that the quotation comes from a letter written by the 'Sultan of Egypt or Babylon' to Charles VII about overtures made to him by French merchants trying to improve their trading concessions in the Levant. Babylon was an early name for Fuṣṭāṭ, the forerunner of Cairo, and the ruler in question is presumably the Mamelūk Sulṭān of Egypt, Malik al-Jāhir (1438-53). It is interesting to note that the letter specifies 'porcelain from China'. Presumably the 'green porcelain' is either true celadon or an imitation, like the fragments from Writtle and Genoa. The word *touque*, meaning a bowl, is now obsolete.

8. 1456. From an inventory of property belonging to René I, duke of Anjou and king of Naples and Sicily (1431-80).

*En la petite chambre dessus la Saulcerie, a plusieurs auriolles de verre, gardemangers de terre, plaz de pourcelaine et autres choses de verre, dont y plusieurs rompuz et cassez.*<sup>56</sup>

9. 1456. From an inventory of property belonging to Piero de' Medici, ruler of Florence (1464-9).

*Una choppa de porciellana leghata in oro . . . .*

*Uno vaso di porciellana choi chopercio . . . .*

*Uno infreschatio di porciellana . . . .*

*Uno piatello di porciellana bigio (grey) . . . .*

*Uno orciuolo di porciellana . . . .*

*Uno vaso di porciellana leghato in horo col chopercio.*<sup>57</sup>

These are six out of a total of eleven pieces. None of the references indicates the precise nature of the vessel, although the first and last items, which were mounted in gold, presumably were highly prized. It is difficult to understand what the grey porcelain plate could have been, unless it was a type of celadon.

10. 1461. The doge of Venice, Pasquale Malipiero, received a gift of twenty porcelain vessels from Abulfet Hamet, the Mamelūk Sulṭān of Egypt.<sup>58</sup>

11. 1464. From an inventory of property belonging to Piero de' Medici.

*Una coppa di porcellana legata in oro pie et coperchio punzonato, fl. 200.*<sup>59</sup>

12. 1487. Lorenzo de' Medici, ruler of Florence (1482-92), received a gift of porcelain from Kait Bey, one of the last Mamelūk Sulṭāns of Egypt.<sup>60</sup>

13. Late 15th century. Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vite di uomini illustri del secolo XV*, ed. L. Frate (1893), III, 92, records that the Florentine scholar Nicolao Nicoli ate

<sup>56</sup> Whitehouse (1966), 93, citing Davillier (1882), 10.

<sup>57</sup> Whitehouse (1966), 93, citing Muntz (1888), 16-33.

<sup>58</sup> Lane (1954), I, citing Marino Sanuto, 'Le Vite dei dogi' in *Rerum Italicorum Scriptorum* (1785), XXII, 1169.

<sup>59</sup> Whitehouse (1966), 93, citing Muntz (1888), 39. The *fiorino*, or florin, first issued in Florence in 1252, was a gold coin of about 54 grains (= 3.5 grammes).

<sup>60</sup> Davillier (1882), 14, and Lane (1954), 30, citing a letter from Pietro Bibbiena to Clarice de' Medici, published first by A. Fabroni, *Laurentii Medicis Magnifici Vita* (Pisa, 1784), 337.

from 'the most beautiful antique vessels and in the like manner the whole of his table was covered with vessels of porcelain'.<sup>61</sup>

Da Bisticci compiled his *Lives* between 1482 and 1498.

14. 1493. Davillier (1882, p. 14), mentions a reference to porcelain in an inventory of property belonging to Ercole d'Este (1471-1505).

## DISCUSSION

If we omit the doubtful finds from Almería, we have no record of Chinese porcelain in Europe before the late 13th century and only two instances—the sherds from Lucera and the reference of 1323—which are earlier than c.1350.

When we examine the definite examples, two points emerge. First, whenever we are told the source of the porcelain, it was sent to its latest owner as a gift: the schismatic Pope John XXIII sent the duke of Berry a porcelain vessel in 1410-14; an oriental ruler sent several vessels to the king of France in 1447; another sent twenty vessels to the doge of Venice in 1461, and yet another sent porcelain to Lorenzo de' Medici in 1487. Clearly, therefore, although porcelain vessels were almost certainly imported in merchants' consignments, and a few pieces (such as the Marco Polo Jar and the Katzenelnbogen Bowl) may have been brought to Europe by travellers from the orient, much of the porcelain found in medieval Europe arrived as diplomatic gifts. Second, it appears that Egypt played a significant role in the transmission of such gifts in the 15th century. Thus, the king of France probably received porcelain from Egypt in 1447 and the doge of Venice and Lorenzo de' Medici undoubtedly received presents of porcelain from Egyptian rulers in 1461 and 1487.

Although the porcelain known to us from documentary sources belonged exclusively to royal or aristocratic households, the discovery of fragments at Winchester and Corinth shows that it was not necessarily restricted to the highest class of society. Wealthy merchants, too, might possess porcelain vessels, just as they possessed Islamic pottery<sup>62</sup> and glass.<sup>63</sup> Nevertheless, none of these items reached the public at large; they were all expensive luxury goods.

Indeed, slight as the evidence is, we know enough to surmise that porcelain was rare, perhaps very rare indeed, before the Portuguese expansion of the early 16th century. While scraps of Islamic pottery and glass are distributed thinly, but widely, over much of the Mediterranean and western Europe, porcelain occurs on only a handful of sites; while Islamic vessels occur as *bacini* in north and central Italy, there is no recorded example of Chinese porcelain; and finally, I do not know of a single porcelain vessel depicted in any late medieval French or Italian painting or manuscript, although a wide range of pottery and glass appears.

<sup>61</sup> Lane (1954), 1.

<sup>62</sup> John G. Hurst, 'Near eastern and Mediterranean medieval pottery found in north west Europe', *Archaeologia Lundensia*, III (1968), 195-204.

<sup>63</sup> For references to some of the Islamic glass found in western Europe, see D. B. Harden, 'Medieval glass in the west', *Proc. VIIIth International Congress on Glass, 1968* (Soc. Glass Technology, Sheffield, 1969), 102 f.; *id.*, 'Ancient glass, III: post-Roman', *Archaeol. J.*, CXXXVIII (1972), 106 f.

We may conclude, therefore, that Chinese porcelain was rare in Europe before the 16th century. Although leading families might acquire, through purchase or gift, porcelain vessels, such vessels were never readily available and always commanded a high price. Indeed, the great value attached to porcelain is indicated by the precious mounts in which the vessels were often encased.

## APPENDIX

## PORCELLANA CONTRAFACTA

The earliest true porcelain made in Europe was almost certainly 'Medici porcelain', produced in Florence under the patronage of Francesco Maria de' Medici. The first pieces were made c.1575 and production probably ceased on the death of Francesco Maria in 1587. Medici porcelain has a translucent, soft-paste fabric with underglaze ornament, mostly in blue.<sup>64</sup>

Nevertheless, documentary evidence shows that *porcellana ficta* or *contrafacta* was made in Italy long before Medici porcelain, and by 1518, if not earlier, Venetian craftsmen were marketing pseudo-porcelain. The earliest apparent reference to it occurs in a letter published by Davillier.<sup>65</sup> The letter cannot be traced and subsequent writers have questioned its authenticity,<sup>66</sup> probably with justice. Allegedly written in Venice by a priest, Uielmo da Bologna, to a colleague in Padua, the letter bears the date April 1470 and reports that *maestro Antuonio*, who owned a kiln in the San Simeone quarter of Venice, had produced *porcelane trasparenti* resembling the porcelain imported from Barbary; indeed, it was perhaps superior. The vessels were decorated with *uernixi et colori conuenienti*. The full text is as follows:

*Magnifico signor mio. Hauerete con questa nostra una piadena [basin] et uno uasello de porcelana che uole mandarui m. Antuonio archemista che haue finito di dar fuoco alla noua fornaxa de S. Simion. Questi duoi pezzi son facti dal m. con grandissima perfetione perche lui a ridoto le porcelane trasparenti e uaghissime [very light] con certa bona terra che uoi come sapete gli auete fato auere, le quali con uernixi et colori conuenienti uengono a cusi bellissimo lauoro, che pareno uenuti di barbaria et forse migliori. Il suo secreto ha messo in lauoro tucti li bocalari [potters] et archimisti nostri, ma lui che archimista non uuol dar loro il secreto di tale bellissima inuentione. Hieri fo da lui un senatore di grandissimo ualore che li a promesso di parlare con persone di proprie (?) della lui inuentione e del suo gran ualore. Questo ui facio conoscere perche so che a uoi sara grandissimo piacere di saperlo. Et dio ui conserui et salutate tuti in padua et a uoi mi ricomando.*

If we exclude this letter, the three earliest references to pseudo-porcelain are the following, all belonging to the 16th century:

1. September 1504. From a document in the archive at Modena.  
*Schudelle* (bowls) *sette di porcellano contrafacta*.<sup>67</sup>
2. 4 June 1518. Leonardo Peringer, *spechiarius in Marzaria* (the Merceria, a street leading from the Piazza San Marco, Venice), claimed that he had invented *un nouo artificio over deficio non piu facto ne usitato in questa inclyta cita de Venetia per fabbricare ogni sorte de pozelane chome sono quele de Levante trasparenti*.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Lane (1954), 3-7.

<sup>65</sup> Davillier (1882), 27-8, quoting G.M. Urbani de Gheltof, *Una fabbrica di porcellana in Venezia nel 1470* (Venice, 1878).

<sup>66</sup> Lane (1954), 2.

<sup>67</sup> Davillier (1882), 30.

<sup>68</sup> M. Urbani, *Studi intorno alla ceramica veneziana* (Venice, 1876), 38.

3. 17 May 1519. A letter from Iacopo Tebaldo, the agent of Alfonso d'Este at Venice, informs his master that he had acquired from a Venetian craftsman *un piatello e una scutella di porcellana ficta*.<sup>69</sup>

It is highly probable that the 'porcelain' mentioned in document 2, and perhaps also in the other documents, was glass. Leonardo Peringer was a *spechiarius*, or mirror-maker, and the most likely identity of the material is white *lattimo* glass, a Venetian speciality developed in the early 16th century. In this context, it is interesting to note that Leonardo claims that his 'porcelain' was a *nuovo artificio . . . non piu facto ne usitato* in 1518. If his claim is true, it offers a possible starting date for the manufacture of white glass in Venice.

## ABBREVIATIONS

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Davillier (1882)         | Baron Davillier, <i>Les Origines de la porcelaine en Europe</i> (Paris and London, 1882).   |
| Dubosc (1954)            | Jean-Pierre Dubosc, <i>Arte cinese</i> (Venice, 1954).  |
| Geijer (1951)            | Agnes Geijer, <i>Oriental Textiles in Sweden</i> (Copenhagen, 1951).  |
| Goitein (1967)           | S. D. Goitein, <i>A Mediterranean Society</i> (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967).   |
| Hackenbroch (1955)       | Yvonne Hackenbroch, 'Chinese porcelain in European silver mounts', <i>Connoisseur</i> , June 1955, 22-7.  |
| Kahle (1940-1)           | Paul Kahle, 'Chinese porcelain in the lands of Islam', <i>Trans. Oriental Ceramic Soc.</i> , 1940-1, 27-46, an English version of <i>id.</i> , 'Islamische Quellen zum chinesischen Porzellan', <i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> , LXXXVIII (1934), 1-43. |
| Lane (1954)              | Arthur Lane, <i>Italian Porcelain</i> (London, 1954).   |
| Lane (1961)              | ———, 'The Gagnières-Fonhill Vase: a Chinese porcelain of about 1300', <i>Burlington Magazine</i> , ciii (1961), 124-31.   |
| Lane and Serjeant (1948) | Arthur Lane and R. B. Serjeant, 'Medieval pottery and glass from the Aden littoral', <i>J. Roy. Asiatic Soc.</i> , October 1948, 108-33.  |
| Muntz (1888)             | Eugène Muntz, <i>Les Collections des Médicis au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le musée, la bibliothèque, le mobilier</i> (Paris, 1888).  |
| Raphael (1931-2)         | Oscar Raphael, 'Chinese porcelain jar in the Treasury of San Marco, Venice', <i>Trans. Oriental Ceramic Soc.</i> , 1931-2, 13-15.   |
| Runciman (1954)          | Steven Runciman, <i>A History of the Crusades</i> (Cambridge, 1954).  |
| Watson (1970)            | William Watson (ed.), <i>Pottery and Metalwork in T'ang China</i> (London, Percival David Foundation of Chinese Art, 1970).   |
| Whitehouse (1966)        | D. B. Whitehouse, 'Chinese porcelain from Lucera Castle', <i>Faenza</i> , LII (1966), 90-3.   |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While compiling this paper, I received much valuable assistance and advice, which I acknowledge with gratitude. Mr. Basil Gray, formerly Keeper of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, commented on the finds from Lucera Castle. Mr. Nicholas Lowick, Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, discussed with me the value of the Mamelük dirhem noted on p. 64 f. Mr. James Allan, Department of Eastern Art, Ashmolean Museum, and Dr. Géza Féhervári, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, advised me on the Islamic documents noted in the Introduction. Mr. Mark Sholl translated for me the paper by Shelkovnikov cited on p. 64 and commented on the French inventories on pp. 73 ff. Dr. Juan Zozaya, Director of the Museo Provincial, Soria, discussed with me his discoveries in Almería. Mr. Martin Biddle, Director of the Winchester Research Unit, has generously permitted me to mention the finds from Winchester in advance of his own publication. Dr. Tiziano Mannoni of the Istituto di Mineralogia, University of Genoa, kindly showed me his material from Genoa, and Dr. Gian Giacomo Musso of the Istituto di Scienze Storiche, University of Genoa, discussed with me the document mentioned on p. 74. The following institutions have kindly allowed me to reproduce photographs of material in their collections: the National Museum of Ireland, Dublin; the Hessisches Landesmuseum, Kassel; the Treasury of St Mark, Venice. The photograph of the Marco Polo Jar appears by courtesy of Messrs. Osvaldo Böhm and the photographs of the finds from Lucera Castle by courtesy of the British School at Rome. Finally, my thanks are due to Miss Sarah Jennings for typing a draft of the manuscript.

## NOTE

*The Society is much indebted to the British Academy for a grant towards the cost of publishing this paper.*

<sup>69</sup> Davillier (1882), 26.