

had grown to seven (*Yüan tien-chang*, ch. 22; *YS*, 17, 7*b*; 94, 10*b*-11*b*). But there was none at Chang-chou (the text of *YS*, 94, 10*b*, referred to by PHILLIPS in *JNCB*, 21, 42, and in *TP*, 1895, 453, is irrelevant). Moreover, the one at Ch'üan-chou enjoyed until 1293 a privileged position : while the duties levied at the six other ports on imported heavy goods were one-fifteenth of their value, they were only one-thirtieth at Ch'üan-chou (for the general rules, cf. *HR*, 21-22). It looks indeed as though it had been the policy of the Southern Sung to concentrate foreign trade as far as possible at Ch'üan-chou. In 1178, for instance, when an embassy came from San-fo-ch'i (Palembang-Jambi) which the Emperor did not wish to permit to proceed to the Court, orders were issued to receive and treat the envoys at Ch'üan-chou (*Sung shih*, 489, 6*b*). On September 8, 1278, a high-sounding title was bestowed by Qubilai upon the goddess of sailors at Ch'üan-chou (*YS*, 10, 4*a*); more epithets were added in 1288, 1299, 1329, 1354 (cf. WANG Hui-tsu², 2, 5*b*).

These facts would suffice, in my opinion, to establish that the great centre for foreign trade in the Middle Ages was not at Chang-chou, but at Ch'üan-chou, and consequently that Ch'üan-chou is Zāitūn. But PHILLIPS's other arguments must also be dealt with.

Rašidu-'d-Dīn (*Bl*, II, 490) has the following paragraph on Fu-chou and Zāitūn in his list of the Chinese provinces (YULE's translation in *Y*, II, 239, and *Y*¹, III, 126, based on KLAPROTH's, is inaccurate; that of *Oh*, II, 638, is unsatisfactory) : « The seventh *šing* (see 'Scieng') [is that of] the city of Fu-ju, [one] of the cities of Manzī (see 'Mangi'). Formerly the [seat of the] *šing* was there. [Then] it was transferred to Zāitūn; but now it has returned there (*i. e.* to Fu-ju). » Even from an incomplete translation, YULE had concluded that there was a striking parallelism between what Rašid said of Fu-ju and Zāitūn and what PAUTHIER (*Pa*, 525) had translated from Chinese sources about Fu-chou and Ch'üan-chou. PHILLIPS objected (*JNCB*, XXIII [1889], 24-27, and *TP*, 1890, 234) on the ground that Chang-chou had also been, from time to time, the provincial capital of Fu-chien during the Mongol period, so that it may have been Rašid's Zāitūn. ARNAIZ's reply to PHILLIPS (*TP*, 1911, 686) that the compilation from which PHILLIPS quoted must have mixed up the place-name is not pertinent. Of course — and this ARNAIZ did not notice — PHILLIPS is wrong when he makes a work which is supposed to have been written in 1328 quote from the *Yüan shih* of 1369, while its real source is a Ming compilation. But the source of that Ming compilation has been correctly reproduced; it is *YS*, 12, 7*a*, which says : « In the 20th *chih-yüan* year, ... the third moon,] ... on [the day] *jên-wu* (April 26, 1283), the *hsüan-wei-ssü* of the circuit (*tao*) of Fu-chien was suppressed; the 'moving Grand Secretariat' (*hsing chung-shu-shêng*) was re-established (復立 *fu li*) at Chang-chou. » It must not be forgotten that the «moving Grand Secretariats», *hsing chung-shu-shêng*, or in an abbreviated form *hsing-shêng*, of the Yüan period have given their name to the *shêng*, or «provinces», of later times, and can almost be equated to the «provinces» themselves (see «Scieng»). Surprising as the text of the *YS* may appear, it seems at first sight difficult to think here of a corrupt reading. Not only does the same text occur in the *Yüan shih lei-pien*, which may merely copy the *YS*, but PHILLIPS cites another text, the real origin of which I have unfortunately not been able to determine, according to which the «moving *shêng* of Chang-chou» must have been in existence already in 1280; that would explain how, after a temporary suppression, it came to be «re-established» in 1283. Still on this point I have certain doubts which will be expressed hereafter. At any rate, such a