

PROTH, and down to PAUTHIER, BLOCHET (*Bl.* II, App. 48) and FERRAND, the term *tz'ü-t'ung* has always been transcribed, although wrongly, as if it were *tzü-t'ung*. Now *tz'ü-t'ung* is *ts'ie-d'ung*; if we had to do with a transcription prior to the 10th century we should expect **sidun*. As the form must have passed abroad after the 10th century, the normal transcription would have been **situn*, not **zītūn* or **zāitūn* (in the same way as *ts'an* [$<ts'am$] then gave *sam-* in Persian transcription [see «Vonsamcin»], while *tso-*, unaspirated, gave *zo-*, and *Man-tzū* gave *Manzi* [see «Mangi»]; *ts-* and *tz-* render the same phonem in our romanization of Chinese). So here again we are confronted with a difficulty, though a minor one, which we can waive if we satisfy ourselves, on historical grounds, that «Zaiton» is Ch'üan-chou.

The two main opponents of the identification of «Zaiton» with Ch'üan-chou have been C. DOUGLAS and PHILLIPS, both of whom have decided in favour of 漳州 Chang-chou, south-west of Amoy. Their chief arguments were that Chang-chou's harbour had a better title than that of Ch'üan-chou to the high praise lavished upon it by Polo and Ibn Baṭṭūṭah; that Chang-chou had been at various times during the Mongol period the capital of the province, alternating in this regard with Ch'üan-chou; that later the Spaniards and Portuguese often spoke of the great port of «Chincheo» which YULE took at first to be Ch'üan-chou, but which is in fact Chang-chou; that «Zaiton» had been an important Christian centre in the Mongol period and Christian remains of mediaeval times have been found at Chang-chou, not at Ch'üan-chou; and finally that Ibn Baṭṭūṭah spoke of the textiles of Zāitūn in terms which could only refer to those of Chang-chou. Although YULE always maintained his opinion in favour of Ch'üan-chou, he was much impressed in his latter years by these arguments. As for CORDIER, he was unhesitatingly for Ch'üan-chou in 1891 in his *Odoric de Pordenone* (p. 281), pronounced in favour of Chang-chou in 1895 (*L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 33), and wavered between the two in 1903 when re-editing YULE (*Y*, II, 241). ARNAIZ's paper in *TP*, 1911, 678-704, is partly a refutation of PHILLIPS. But that paper, written in Spanish, has not received due attention; CORDIER does not even allude to it in *Y*, III, 100. So I shall examine the question again, sometimes with fresh material, and in greater detail than in KUWABARA's discussion of *Mem. of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* in 1928 (II, 30-33).

I agree that the Chang-chou estuary, including the bay of Amoy as an advanced port, constitutes a magnificent harbour, with the proportions of which Ch'üan-chou cannot compete. But we cannot to-day judge of the conditions which obtained several centuries ago, when the process of silting was less advanced at Ch'üan-chou than it is now. The fact remains that Chinese mediaeval sources give a much greater importance to Ch'üan-chou than to Chang-chou. Inspectorates of maritime trade (市舶司 *shih-po-ssū*) existed at the main ports of call of foreign vessels. One was established at Ch'üan-chou in 1087, soon suppressed, but re-established in 1103. Transferred to the more northern port of Fu-chou, it came back to Ch'üan-chou in 1132 (*Yü-ti chih-shêng*, 130, 5a; cf. also *HR*, 20-21), and retained there the official name of «Inspectorate of maritime trade of the *lu* of Fu-chien». This is the title which Chao Ju-kua had in 1225 when he compiled his *Chu-fan chih* from the foreign merchants trading at Ch'üan-chou (*TP*, 1912, 449). The conditions remained unchanged when the Mongols conquered southern China. Four Inspectorates of foreign trade were created in 1277, one being at Ch'üan-chou, and in 1293 these