

known as the most famous haven in the world; nor was I able to attach great weight to the arguments which he adduced. But his thesis, or a modification of it, has been taken up and maintained with more force, as already intimated, by the Rev. Dr. Douglas.

The latter makes a strong point in the magnificent character of Amoy Harbour, which really is one of the grandest havens in the world, and thus answers better to the emphatic language of Polo, and of Ibn Batuta, than the river of T'swan-chau. All the rivers of Fo-kien, as I learn from Dr. Douglas himself, are rapidly silting up; and it is probable that the river of Chinchew presented, in the 13th and 14th centuries, a far more impressive aspect as a commercial basin than it does now. But still it must have been far below Amoy Harbour in magnitude, depth, and accessibility. I have before recognised this, but saw no way to reconcile the proposed deduction with the positive historical facts already stated, which absolutely (to my mind) identify the Zayton of Polo and Rashiduddin with the Chinese city and port of T'swan-chau. Dr. Douglas, however, points out that the whole northern shore of Amoy Harbour, with the Islands of Amoy and Quemoy, are within the Fu or Department of T'swan-chau; and the latter name would, in Chinese parlance, apply equally to the city and to any part of the department. He cites among other analogous cases the Treaty Port Neuchwang (in Liao-tong). That city really lies 20 miles up the Liao River, but the name of Neuchwang is habitually applied by foreigners to Ying-tzŭ, which is the actual port. Even now much of the trade of T'swan-chau merchants is carried on through Amoy, either by junks touching, or by using the shorter sea-passage to 'An-hai, which was once a port of great trade, and is only 20 miles from T'swan-chau.\* With such a haven as Amoy Harbour close by, it is improbable that Kúblái's vast armaments would have made *rendezvous* in the comparatively inconvenient port of T'swan-chau. Probably then the two were spoken of as one. In all this I recognise strong likelihood, and nothing inconsistent with recorded facts, or with Polo's concise statements. It is even possible that (as Dr. Douglas thinks) Polo's words intimate a distinction between Zayton the City and Zayton the Ocean Port; but for me Zayton the city, in Polo's chapters, remains still T'swan-chau. Dr. Douglas, however, seems disposed to regard it as *Chang-chau*.

The chief arguments urged for this last identity are: (1.) Ibn Batuta's representation of his having embarked at Zayton "on the river," *i.e.* on the internal navigation system of China, first for Sin-kalán (Canton), and afterwards for Kinsay. This could not, it is urged, be T'swan-chau, the river of which has no communication with the internal navigation, whereas the river at Chang-chau has such communication, constantly made use of in both directions (interrupted only by brief portages); (2.) Martini's mention of the finding various Catholic remains, such as crosses and images of the Virgin, at Chang-chau, in the early part of the 17th century, indicating that city as the probable site of the Franciscan establishments.

[I remember that the argument brought forward by Mr. Phillips in favour of Changchow which most forcibly struck Sir H. Yule, was the finding of various Christian remains at this place, and Mr. Phillips wrote (*Jour. China Br. R. A. Soc.* 1888, 27-28): "We learn from the history of the Franciscan missions that two churches were built in Zaitun, one in the city and the other in a forest not far from the town. MARTINI makes mention of relics being found in the city of Changchow, and also of a missal which he tried in vain to purchase from its owner, who gave as a reason for not parting with it, that it had been in his family for several generations. According to the history of the Spanish Dominicans in China, ruins of churches were used in rebuilding the city walls, many of the stones having crosses cut on them. Another singular discovery relating to these missions, is one mentioned by Father VITTORIO RICCI, which would seem to point distinctly to the remains of the

---

\* Martini says of Ganhai ('An-Hai or Ngan-Hai), "Ingens hic mercium ac Sinensium navium copia est . . . ex his ('Anhai and Amoy) in totam Indiam merces avehuntur."