

## 195. ÇAITON

<i>airon, çaitem, çaiton</i> F	<i>caytum, çaintum, çaitum,</i>	<i>sarcam, sarcan</i> FB
<i>cacar, çarcairon, çarton, çayton,</i>	<i>çaytum, çaytun, zaytun</i> Z	<i>sartam</i> FBr
<i>zayton</i> LT	<i>chaiton, zaitoni (?) zaython</i> VL	<i>sartan</i> FAt, FB
<i>caiten, cancaron, caron, zerito (?)</i>	<i>charia, zanto, zaton</i> TA <sup>3</sup>	<i>zaito</i> TA <sup>1</sup> , VA
VB	<i>chatan, zartom</i> TA <sup>1</sup>	<i>zaitom, zaizen</i> VA
<i>caiton</i> F, L, VB	<i>çaairon, zairon</i> L	<i>zaiton</i> TA <sup>1</sup> , V
<i>carcon, kayten, sarcon, tarcon</i>	<i>çairon</i> F, L	<i>zaitum</i> R
FA	<i>çartan</i> Fr, t	<i>zarton</i> TA <sup>1</sup> , TA <sup>3</sup>
<i>carton</i> FA, FB	<i>marchon, zaitore, zandon,</i>	<i>zaycem</i> G
<i>caycan</i> P, P <sup>5</sup>	<i>ziargati</i> V	<i>zaytem</i> P
<i>cayton</i> FB, Z		

Without the slightest doubt, the various readings represent a pronunciation «Zaiton». In the jumble of the mss. readings of the name, I fail to discover any clue for a difference between the name of the city and that of the port. Former efforts in that direction have proved futile (cf. *Pa*, 527; PHILLIPS, *JNCB*, XXI [1887], 41-42; *Y*, II, 234, 240). Yet the text speaks of the «port» and of the «city of this port»; cf. Vol. I, 351. Andrea da Perugia, who arrived in the city in 1318 and became the local bishop in 1322, speaks in 1326 of that «great city», *que vocatur lingua persica Zaiton* (*Wy*, 374). Peregrino da Castello's much-discussed letter is said to have been written at «Zayton» on December 10, 1318 (*Wy*, 368). The same spelling is used by Odoric (*Wy*, 460) and Marignolli (*Wy*, 536). John of Cora's «Racon» is of course a clerical error (*JA*, VI [July 1830], 68; *Y*<sup>1</sup>, III, 100). «Zayton» appears on the Catalan Map (cf. CORDIER, *L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 32-33). Fra Mauro's map gives «Çaiton», «Zaiton» and «Zaidon» (cf. *Zu*, 38; HALLBERG, 95; and the map itself). Persian and Arabic sources uniformly write زیتون Zāitūn; for instance, Ibn Sa'īd († 1274 or 1286; *Fe*, 349), Rašīdu-'d-Dīn (*Bl*, II, 490), Ibn Baṭṭūṭah (transl. DEFRÉMERY and SANGUINETTI, IV, 269, 272, etc.; *Fe*, 427-429, 454-455), Abū-'l-Fidā (in REINAUD, *Géogr. d'Aboulféda*, II, II, 122-124), down to the *Āin-i Akbarī* of 1595 (*Fe*, 554). Waśśāf's ms., as edited by HAMMER (Persian text, 43), writes لکنین فرورزیون وجین کلان, which HAMMER (*Ha*<sup>2</sup>, transl., 43) has rendered «Lonkin Ferwesetion», but which evidently represents «Lonkin-fu (Chin. Lung-hsing-fu [フ]; *vide infra*), and Zāitūn (زیتون), and Čin-kālān (= Canton; omitted by HAMMER)». I quote this example to show that the vocalic signs in HAMMER's ms. are arbitrary, and in particular that they cannot be cited to support any reading different from Zāitūn.

Already in 1655, the Jesuit MARTINI, in his *Novus Atlas Sinensis* (§ on «Civencheu»), proposed to identify «Zaiton» with 泉州 Ch'üan-chou on the coast of Fu-chien. DE GUIGNES concurred with him (*Hist. gén. des Huns*, III, 169). Finally, KLAPROTH published in 1824 (*JA*, v [July 1824], 41-44; also XI [1833], 342) a note in which he explained «Zaiton» as a transcription of 刺桐 Tz'ü-t'ung, saying that he had found Tz'ü-t'ung given as an ancient name of Ch'üan-chou in the *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*. This equivalence was accepted for half a century,