

similar to those of the time of the conquest may have been taken. At any rate, this «moving Grand Secretariat» of Chang-chou could only have been something created *ad hoc* and of temporary nature, not to be placed on a par with the one which was at times at Fu-chou, at others at Ch'üan-chou, and which is certainly the *šing* of the Fūjū and Zāitūn spoken of by Rašidu-'d-Dīn.

PHILLIPS's next argument in favour of Chang-chou was the frequent mention of «Chincheo» in early Spanish and Portuguese accounts; at first YULE had taken «Chincheo» to be Ch'üan-chou, while it is in fact Chang-chou. But this has no great bearing on the Zāitūn question, since the conditions prevailing at the time of the Spanish and Portuguese travellers of the 16th and 17th centuries were probably quite different from those which obtained in the 13th and 14th. Moreover, while I readily admit what YULE has himself acknowledged, that he has confused the two places in regard to «Chincheo», I am far from being sure that all Spanish and Portuguese authors gave the same meaning to «Chincheo». Some at least of the references to «Chincheo» point in fact to Ch'üan-chou (cf. also YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 200), but a discussion of the passages would require much space, without throwing any light on Zāitūn.

Another of PHILLIPS's arguments, that Christian remains had been found at Chang-chou, not at Ch'üan-chou, becomes a boomerang against his own hypothesis. MARTINI's «Chang-chou» Bible has a good chance of being the same Bible as was later obtained at Ch'ang-chou in Chiang-su by COUPLET (cf. *Mo*, 85-86). The «Chang-chou» stone crosses of faulty Dominican reports of the 17th cent. have turned out to be Ch'üan-chou stone crosses for which we possess details of place and date in Jesuit engravings of the time (cf. ARNAIZ, in *TP*, 1911, 687-688; *Mo*, 78-83). These crosses have disappeared, but a new one was discovered in 1906, and it was again at Ch'üan-chou; there is also at Ch'üan-chou the tomb of the Persian Christian Ḥudādār or Ḥudādād (cf. *TP*, 1911, 727; 1914, 644; *Mo*, 80-81; ECKE and DEMIÉVILLE, *The Twin Pagodas*, 22, and Pl. 70 b). Moreover, the Christians were only a minority among the foreigners of Zāitūn; the Mussulman community was of far greater importance. Now, Ch'üan-chou possesses the most ancient and the best-built mosque of China, with important inscriptions and with a cemetery (cf. ARNAIZ and VAN BERCHEM in *TP*, 1911, 677-727). When in 1217 a Buddhist priest brought back to his monastery in Japan a specimen of Arabic writing, he had had it written by a Mussulman merchant at Ch'üan-chou (*JA*, 1913, II, 181-185). Sculptural remains of approximately the same date testify to the presence also of a South-Indian colony (cf. *Ostasiat-Zeitschr.* 1933, 5-11; NILAKANTA SASTRI, *The Cōlas*, II, I, 440; ECKE and DEMIÉVILLE, *The Twin Pagodas*, p. 22 et Pl. 69).

The mass of arguments in favour of Ch'üan-chou and against Chang-chou is so overwhelming that a discussion of Polo's statement concerning the porcelain produced at «Tingiu», a city of the same «province» as «Zaiton», or of Ibn Baṭṭūṭah's notices on the textiles of Zāitūn cannot change our conclusions. The question of «Tingiu» will be discussed in another note (see «Tingiu»). I shall only say here a few words on the textiles, not to establish the identification of Zāitūn, but because the subject is of some interest in itself.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭah speaks of the velvet damasks (*kimḥā*; see under «Camut») and of the satin (*aṭlas*) made at Zāitūn and known as *zāitūniyyah*, «Zaitunese» (transl. DEFRÉMERY and SANGUINETTI, IV, 269; the translation of *kimḥā* as «velvet» is doubtful; cf. *Y*¹, IV, 118). Elsewhere he