

until it was challenged by G. PHILLIPS and Carstairs DOUGLAS, and more recently by CHARIGNON. I think that KLAPROTH was probably right, in spite of some weak points in his argument.

In the first place, KLAPROTH was mistaken when he quoted as an independent source on «Zaiton» a late Turkish geography which in the paragraph in question is quite evidently an almost *verbatim* retranslation from Polo himself (PAUTHIER in *Pa*, 528, and PHILLIPS in *TP*, 1895, 455, still follow KLAPROTH here, but YULE knew better; cf. *Y*, II, 230). KLAPROTH moreover misunderstood *tz'ü-t'ung* as meaning two different plants, «thorns and *Bignonia tomentosa*». This last error has unfortunately been repeated by PAUTHIER (*Pa*, 528), CORDIER (*L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 32) and BLOCHET (*Bl*, II, 490). But *tz'ü-t'ung* is the name of a thorn-bearing tree, probably here the *Acanthopanax ricinifolium* (but it is also used as a name of the *Erythrina Indica*, which was adopted in the present case by KUWABARA in *Mem. of the Research Department of the Toyobunko*, II [1928], 30). According to KLAPROTH, *Tz'ü-t'ung* was an ancient name given to Ch'üan-chou because its city walls were all planted round with *tz'ü-t'ung*.

YULE, who was always in favour of the identification of «Zaiton» with Ch'üan-chou, thought that *Tz'ü-t'ung* had been, according to KLAPROTH, the real official name of Ch'üan-chou; and as the name Ch'üan-chou already existed «in the 7th or 8th century», the use of *Tz'ü-t'ung* and its passage into foreign languages as *Zäitün* was bound to be of a very early date (*Y*, II, 237). Of course, KLAPROTH made the best of his case by being vague on the nature and use of *Tz'ü-t'ung* as a name. DOUGLAS rightly objected that the name was not *Tz'ü-t'ung*, but *Tz'ü-t'ung-ch'êng* [城], the «City of the *tz'ü-t'ung*», and that it was an epithet rather than the true name (*Y*, II, 236). CHARIGNON (*Ch*, III, 115), going further, said that even *Tz'ü-t'ung-ch'êng* never existed, but only *T'ung-ch'êng*, which cannot give the etymology of «*Zäitün*». According to CHARIGNON, the true etymology of the name is 瑞桐 *Jui-t'ung*, which was found by HIRTH as a name of Ch'üan-chou in a work of 1274, and which CHARIGNON himself met with in a modern Chinese work. But CHARIGNON blundered here. In the work of 1274, there was no mention of Ch'üan-chou under the name of *Jui-t'ung*; HIRTH, in a note of his own (*TP*, 1894, 388; cf. also *JRAS*, 1896, 73), mentions Ch'üan-chou with the alternative name *Jui-t'ung* between brackets, without, however, giving any reference. Two years later (*TP*, 1896, 224), PHILLIPS replied to HIRTH's note by saying that, familiar as he was with the main works on Fu-chien, he had never seen the name of *Jui-t'ung* in any of them. I think there is here a misunderstanding first of HIRTH, and later of CHARIGNON. In the *Ta-Ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, the very book where KLAPROTH found his *Tz'ü-t'ung*, the quotation in which *Tz'ü-t'ung* appears goes on by saying that when the *tz'ü-t'ung* give forth first leaves and afterwards flowers, the five cereals grow in plenty; «for that reason these (*tz'ü-t'ung*) are called *jui-t'ung* ('auspicious *t'ung*')». There seems to be no name here, and the case is probably the same in the modern compilation used by CHARIGNON. Even in the late parallel passage of the local monograph *Chin-chiang-chih* cited by ARNAIZ in *TP*, 1911, 679, I think that *jui-t'ung* is merely another name of the *tz'ü-t'ung*, and not of the city as in ARNAIZ's translation.

As to CHARIGNON's argument that *Tz'ü-t'ung-ch'êng* did not exist, but only *T'ung-ch'êng*,