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PART II. CHÜAN-CHOW.

Having in my first paper 1) given a short account of Foreign intercourse with the Chang-chow Prefecture until its removal to Amoy, I will now give a like account of Foreign intercourse with the neighbouring Chüan-chow Prefecture during the same period. The city of Chüan-chow, as is well known among commentators of Marco Polo, has been considered the site of the mediæval port of Zaitun, so frequently mentioned by travellers of the Mongol period. I have for many years challenged that opinion, and at last, among some sinologues, I am beginning to get my view recognised. Mons. Cordier, in his valuable and learned work "Les Voyages en Asie au XIVe siècle du bienheureux frère Odoric de Pordenone, religieux de Saint-François", says:

"Il serait injuste de passer sous silence les travaux de M. Geo. Phillips publiés depuis lors. Dans "Chang-chow,, the capital of Fuh-kien in Mongol times" (Journal China Branch of the Royal Asiatic

Society XXIII n° 1, 1888, pp. 23 −30), il a incontestablement réussi à prouver que Tchang-tcheou a été une des capitales de Fou-kien à l'époque des Youen".

Dans un second mémoire: "The identity of Marco Polo's Zaitun with Changchow" (T'oung-pao n° 3, Oct. 1890, pp. 218−238) il ajoute encore de nouveaux faits à l'appui de sa thèse, qui, je l'avais déjà dit p. 285, était fort défendable et paraît aujourd'hui avoir gagné beaucoup de terrain pour ce qui est relatif à Tchang-tcheou, mais il manoeuvre sur un terrain beaucoup moins sûr lorsqu'il traite de Fou-tcheou".

Another Sinologue, Dr. F. Hirth, still adheres to the views of Klaproth, Pauthier and others, that Zaitun must be Chüan-chow, and he gives his reasons for so doing in an article in the T'oung-pao, December 1894, p. 388: "Über den Schiffsverkehr von Kinsay zu Marco Polo's Zeit", in which it is stated that persons wishing to sail to foreign lands must take ship at Chüan-chow; and he further, in support of his opinion, states, without however giving any authority, that Chüan-chow bore also the name of Suì-t'ung. I have an intimate acquaintance with most of the Chinese literature published relating to Fuh-kien, but I confess that I am up to the present unable to find in any book that Chüan-chow was ever called Suì-t'ung. I write this with much diffidence, for Dr. Hirth is an accurate Chinese scholar; but possibly he may have come across the fact in some rare Chinese book. Be that as it may, I do not think his statements are sufficient to upset the chronological and geographical facts I have brought forward in support of my theory, Dr. Hirth's derivation of the name Zaitun, from Suì-t'ung, appears to me, like that of Klaproth's Tseu-thung, very uncertain. The late Dr. Douglas in his notes on the identity of Zayton (Journal of the Royal Geographical Society 1874, p. 116), says: "The idea of the derivation of Zayton from Tseu-thung is a pure myth. T'swan