Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 74 (2020)

Heft: 3

Artikel: Marco Polo : from Hangzhou to Quanzhou

Autor: Haw, Stephen G.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-905709

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 21.10.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

DE GRUYTER ASIA 2020; 74(3): 485–512

Stephen G. Haw*

Marco Polo: From Hangzhou to Quanzhou

https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2020-0010

Abstract: When Marco Polo left China, he passed through Hangzhou (Quinsai) and then travelled approximately southwestwards into what is today Fujian province, to the cities of Fuzhou and Quanzhou (Zaiton). There are still a number of disagreements regarding his route, however, which are discussed here. Consideration is also given to Marco's use of "Facfur" to designate the last Emperor of the Song dynasty, and more generally to the issue of the use of Persian language in Yuan China. It is suggested that there is no clear evidence that Marco Polo learned Persian. An error regarding consumption of pepper in China during the thirteenth century is corrected. More evidence of the importation of very substantial quantities of pepper into China during the Song and Yuan periods is adduced. Identifications of all the places which Marco mentions in this section of his book are suggested, with the support of evidence.

Keywords: Marco Polo, Quinsai, Persian, Facfur, pepper

A number of uncertainties still exist regarding Marco Polo's account of his final journey from Quinsai[1] (Xingzai 行在; Hangzhou 杭州)[2] to the port of Zaiton[3] (Çaiton; Quanzhou 泉州).[4] There is disagreement about the identification of several of the places mentioned, and the full significance of some of Marco's information has not been realized. One of the places on the route, "Tanpigiu",[5] is one of the most problematic toponyms in all of Marco's text.[6] There are also difficulties with the route between Quzhou 衢州 and Jianning 建寧,[7] and with the identification of

1 BNF MS fr. 1116: 62 recto, 66 recto, 68 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 159, 168, 169, 174; MP/Kinoshita: 124, 133, 137, 142, 144, 147.

2 Moule 1957: 1, 3–10.

3 MP/Baldelli Boni: 156.

4 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 583–597; Haw 2017: 225; BNF MS fr. 1116: 70 verso, 72 verso, 74 recto, 75 recto; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 177, 178, 181, 183, 184, 185.

5 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 846–847; Haw 2006: 119–120; MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 343; MP/Kinoshita: 137–138.

6 Haw (forthcoming a).

7 Haw 2006: 120–121; Vogel 2013: 204; MP/Kinoshita: 138; Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 261, 569–570. Kinoshita has done exactly what Pelliot criticises Benedetto for doing.

***Corresponding author: Stephen G. Haw,** University of Oxford, Wadham College, Parks Rd, Oxford OX1 3PN, United Kingdom. E-mail: s.g.haw@wadh.oxon.org

"Tingiu" or "Tiungiu",[8] which was apparently somewhere near Quanzhou.[9] Other issues which require further comment and explanation include Marco's use of "Facfur" to designate the last Emperor of the Song dynasty,[10] and his report that very large quantities of pepper were consumed in Hangzhou every day.[11]

Facfur: The former Song capital of Quinsai is described at length in the *Description of the World*, particularly in Ramusio's edition.[12] Included in the account is a description of the palace of "King Fanfur"[13] or "Facfur".[14] According to Pelliot, "Polo's « facfur » is a very correct transcription of Pers[ian] [...] *fayfūr*, a common designation of the Chinese Emperor in Mussulman sources".[15] Pelliot also believed that the only Asian language which Marco ever mastered was Persian, which he used as the *lingua franca* of foreigners in the Yuan Empire.[16] There is a contradiction here, however, for it is clear that Marco did not understand the real meaning of *fayfūr*. Surely, if the word is Persian and Marco was fluent in that language, he should have understood it correctly. It is a calque of Chinese *Tianzi* 天子, "Son of Heaven".[17] This epithet was applied to Chinese emperors in general, yet Marco seems to have believed that it applied specifically to the last Emperor of the Song dynasty (he was also apparently confused as to who exactly this last emperor was).[18] He refers to "un signor detto Farfur" and to "Re Fanfur",[19] as if "Facfur" was the personal name of the Emperor. Indeed, Burgio defines "Facfur" as: "Il nome [...] usato per designare [...] un personaggio nel quale si sommano le *silhouettes* degli ultimi imperatori cinesi [...]".[20] Marco's usage of this term requires explanation.

In reality, the term *fayfūr* is not Persian, or rather, it is not Persian in origin and was never specifically Persian. Nor does it occur only in Muslim texts. As Pelliot in fact noted, the earliest known occurrences of *baypuhr* are in a document in the Parthian language, where it means "Son of God" and refers to Jesus

---

8 MP/Ramusio: 49B, 49C; BNF MS fr. 5631: 63 verso.
9 Haw 2006: 121; Vogel 2013: 204, 207 note i*; Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 853–856.
10 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 652–661.
11 MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 340; MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 2: 204, 210 note 7.
12 MP/Ramusio: 45C–48C; MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 326–342.
13 MP/Ramusio: 47E; MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 338–339 note 3.
14 MP/Barbieri: 214.
15 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 652.
16 Pelliot 1912: 592.
17 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 652–653. On *Tianzi*, see Ching 1997: 3–4, 14–16.
18 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 657–660.
19 MP/Ramusio: 41C, 41D. "El re Fatur"; MP/Gennari: 145. "Rex quidam nomine facfur": MP/Pipino: 132. Cf. MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 309.
20 MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 2: 313.

Christ.[21] The two occurrences in this document are not isolated examples, as Pelliot apparently believed. There are a number of other occurrences of this term in Parthian documents, referring in the singular to Jesus and in the plural to "angels and divinities".[22] The occurrences known to Pelliot are in a manuscript fragment from Dunhuang 敦煌 in China. It would indeed be odd if this term had travelled to China at an early date, only to travel back westwards to Iran and then reappear in China in Marco Polo's time.[23] This must surely be very unlikely. The term occurs in early Sogdian documents, as *βγpwr*. It was used in Sogdian to refer to the emperor of China at least as early as 313 CE.[24] It therefore cannot strictly be correct to say that this usage occurs "in Mussulman sources", for Islam did not exist when the term was first applied to the emperor of China in Sogdian documents. It may also be due to Sogdian influence that the initial consonant became *f*, as this was apparently a regular development from Sogdian *β*.[25] The term would then no doubt have entered Turkic as a loanword from Sogdian, for relations between the Sogdians and the Turks were close from an early period.[26] A number of loanwords from Sogdian have been recognised in Turkic languages.[27] The fact that this term passed into Turkic is well attested. Not only did *faghfur* or *fağfur* come to be used as a personal name in Turkic,[28] it is also used in modern Turkish with the meaning "porcelain"[29] (a usage comparable to the use of "china" in English).[30] It is therefore entirely possible that Marco's "Facfur" came from Turkic, not from Persian. Its use as a personal name in Turkic would explain why Marco misunderstood its true meaning.

---

21 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 652; Müller 1904: 34.

22 Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 107.

23 Manichaean texts, at least, were translated from Parthian and Sogdian directly into Chinese and probably also Turkic: see Lieu 1995.

24 Henning 1948: 604–607, 615. Note that this document, dated 313, the Sogdian Ancient Letter II, is the same as that referred to by Pelliot as "a text which seems to be from the end of the 2nd cent. A.D.": Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 652. The later date is now generally accepted: see de la Vaissière 2005: 43–46.

25 Gauthiot 1911: 58.

26 Haw 2014: 14–15; De la Vaissière 2005: 199–225.

27 For an example of a loanword from Sogdian in Uighur, see de la Vaissière 2005: 55. For other loanwords from Sogdian into Turkic languages, see Räsänen 1969: 80 (*borč*), 252 (*känt*), and perhaps also 220 (*kaŋda*).

28 The best known example is the "Faghfūr Dīwān" of the Bābur-nāma: Baber 1826: 423; Bābur 1922: 687; Baber 1871: 439. It must be noted, however, that Thackston gives "Maghfur" rather than "Faghfūr": Babur 1996: 445.

29 Redhouse 1880: 235; Kieffer/Bianchi 1837: 391.

30 See Laufer 1917: 126 note 2. As pointed out above, however, this word is not Persian in origin, as Laufer claims.

Whether Marco Polo was really fluent in Persian seems to me to be questionable. There is in fact very little evidence regarding exactly what languages he acquired. It is entirely possible that he learned Persian on his way across Asia to China, but there can be no certainty of that. His supposed knowledge of Persian is no more than an assumption, based very largely on the belief that Persian was a widely used *lingua franca* in Asia at the period. This questionable assumption has not always existed. In 1818, Marsden suggested that the languages which Marco learned after he had arrived at the court of Qubilai Qa'an were: "Perhaps the Moghul or Mungal, Ighur, Manchu, and Chinese".[31] "Manchu" here is clearly an anachronism, but its earlier precursor, Jurchen, is not entirely out of the question.[32] It is certainly quite likely that Marco learned Mongolian ("Moghul or Mungal") and Uighur Turkic ("Ighur"). He may well have had at least some knowledge of Chinese, although probably little or no knowledge of Chinese characters.[33] The idea that Marco used Persian more or less exclusively while he was in the Mongol Empire is undoubtedly false.[34] It appears to have been originated by Henry Yule, who had extensive experience of India but none whatsoever of China.[35] No doubt his own knowledge of Persian[36] and the position which the language held in India[37] influenced Yule's thinking. What is more surprising is that Paul Pelliot accepted this opinion, even though he was aware that some of Yule's alleged evidence for Marco's knowledge of Persian was spurious.[38] This particularly concerns Yule's treatment of the word "quesitam".[39] Yule admits that he "*deduced* a reading for the word" (his emphasis), this reading being "Quescican", which he interpreted as a Persian plural. He believed "that Persian was the colloquial language of foreigners at the Kaan's court, who would not scruple to make a Persian plural when wanted".[40] This is no more than speculation, however, and it is wrong. The word is purely Mongolian, the plural being *kešikten* or *kešigten*.[41] Other evidence which Yule cites in support of his opinion is Marco's use of "Pulisanghin" for the river

31 MP/Marsden: 25 note 44.
32 On the origin of the Manchus from the Jurchens, see Huang 1990: 253–255.
33 Haw 2006: 60–63; Haw (forthcoming a).
34 Haw 2014: 5–32.
35 MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 1: xxvii–lv.
36 MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 1: xxviii.
37 Fisher 2019: 225–229.
38 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 815.
39 BNF fr. 1116: 38 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 107; MP/Ramusio: 26B ("Casitan"); MP/Baldelli Boni: 76 ("questi Tan"); BNF fr. 5631: 35 recto ("questian, questiaus").
40 MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 1: 379–380 note 1.
41 De Rachewiltz, vol. 2: 672, 826, 829.

spanned by the now famous "Marco Polo" bridge.[42] Here again, however, Marco apparently failed to understand that this term really should have applied to the bridge and not to the river: "When one leaves the city of Khanbaliq and has gone ten miles, then he finds a large river called Pulisanghin".[43] Once again, this must call into question Marco's supposed knowledge of Persian.

It must be understood that Marco could very easily have crossed western and central Asia without any need to learn Persian. A knowledge of Turkic would undoubtedly have been sufficient. He himself refers to the Čagatai Qanate as "the great Turquie" and says that it extended from the Amu Darya all the way to the realm of the Great Qa'an in East Asia.[44] It may also be noted that William of Rubruck found very few Persian speakers in this region, so few as to be worthy of comment when he happened upon some: "After this we came across a fine town called Equius, inhabited by Saracens who spoke Persian, though they were a very long way from Persia".[45] Iran itself had been under Turkic rule for a considerable period before the second half of the thirteenth century, first under the Seljuqs and then under the Khwarazm-shahs.[46] Certainly during the early seventeenth century, when Pietro della Valle travelled in Iran, Turkish was widely spoken there.[47] Because of the common use of Turkic in Iran, European references to "Persian" language during the Renaissance period (and perhaps also earlier) sometimes really mean Turkic.[48]

The "Arabo-Persian" question: Recently, Philippe Ménard has attempted to reassert the importance of "Arabo-Persian" vocabulary in Marco Polo's text.[49] Like Yule and a number of other commentators, he has also denied that Marco could have had any knowledge of Chinese.[50] Also like Yule, however, Ménard is not in a position to judge, because he himself lacks such knowledge. This is

---

42 MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 2: 3, 5 note 2.

43 MP/Kinoshita: 93. Cf. MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 126; MP/Ramusio: 32D ("vn fiume nominato Pulisangan").

44 BNF fr. 1116: 96 recto–verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 231; MP/Kinoshita: 193; MP/Gennari: 242; MP/Simion: 332.

45 Jackson 1990: 147. Jackson claims that "*Equius* can only be Quyas", although he notes that the location of Quyas presents a problem. In reality, this place must surely be Iki-ögüz. This town is recorded as "Ēki-ōgūz" by Al-Kašγarī 1983–1985, vol. 1: 103. Assuming that William's "-qu-" represents the sound *k* and that the Turkic "-g-" was softened in William's time, then the pronunciation of "Equius" almost exactly matches "Ēki-ōgūz". See also Haw 2014: 14–15.

46 Bosworth 1968: 1–23, 42–66, 79, 135–144.

47 Gurney 1986: 105, 107, 110; Della Valle 1843, vol. 1: 431–432.

48 Orsatti 2003: 677–689.

49 I use "Arabo-Persian" as a translation of Ménard's term "arabo-persan": Ménard 2009: 126, 130.

50 Ménard 2009: 130–132.

evident from his inability to handle romanisation of Chinese adequately. Thus, he refers to "chinois *po-che* (aujourd'hui graphie *bochi*)". Presuming that the latter romanisation is intended to be Pinyin, it should read *boshi* 博士. It might be thought that this is merely a typographical error, but a few lines later he refers to "chinois *po-shih*", apparently without realising that this is simply a different romanisation (in the Wade-Giles system) of the same Chinese term.[51] Ménard is completely inconsistent as regards romanisation, indiscriminately mixing romanisations in various different systems: Pinyin, Wade-Giles, and others. An example is his use of "*hsien sheng*" (Wade-Giles) and "*xian*" (Pinyin) in the same paragraph, without comment.[52] He also suggests that Marco's *sensi* or *sensin*[53] might be derived from "le chinois *xian* qui veut dire 'immortel' car les ermites taoïstes recherchaient l'immortalité et peut-être ensuite *sheng* 'sages, saints'".[54] This would be very much more convincing if the term he suggests actually existed in Chinese, but it does not. Still in the same paragraph, he refers to the Daoist Zhengyi 正一 sect, and then to a second sect, "Quanschen". Presumably this should read "Quanzhen 全真", the sect of the adept Qiu Chuji 丘處機, known as Changchun zhenren 長春真人, famous for his journey across Central Asia to meet Činggis Qan.[55] What system of romanisation "Quanschen" may represent is entirely unclear.

A further problem with Ménard's analysis is that he does not systematically relate Marco Polo's vocabulary to its geographical context. It is entirely natural that Marco should use "Arabo-Persian" terms when he is describing western Asia. Ménard's arguments would be much more convincing if he could show that Marco uses multiple "Arabo-Persian" terms in his description of China. In fact, however, Marco does not.[56] It must also be pointed out that Ménard frequently assigns words to the wrong language, and errs in various other ways. One of the most egregious errors is his claim that the Mongols used a Persian word for the sable, a claim based on a spurious argument by Wehr.[57] The word in question, "rondes", does not exist other than as a scribal error. The real Mongolian word for the sable, *buluqan*, is well attested, with multiple occurrences in the thirteenth-century *Secret History of the Mongols*.[58] An

51 Ménard 2009: 111.
52 Ménard 2009: 115.
53 BNF fr. 1116: 33 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio vol. 1: 96; MP/Kinoshita: 66; BNF fr. 5631: 29 verso; MP/Ramusio: 17E ("sensim").
54 Ménard 2009: 115.
55 For the account of this journey, see CZXYJ. An English translation is Waley 1931.
56 Haw 2014: 6–13.
57 Ménard 2009: 103–104.
58 Haw (forthcoming b).

example of assigning a word to the wrong language is what he says about "cuiucci".[59] He has clearly completely misunderstood Pelliot's note on this word.[60] According to Ménard: "Il vient du chinois *kuai-shi* 'coureurs rapides', comme l'a identifié Pelliot". On the contrary, however, Pelliot states (correctly) that the word is originally Mongolian. The Chinese *guichi* 貴赤 (not "*kuai-shi*", which does not exist) or *guiyouchi* 貴由赤 are transcriptions of Mongolian, not the other way round. Ménard has also completely omitted at least two Mongolian terms from his discussion. The first is "samcin".[61] This is *Samǰing*, the Mongolian version of the Chinese title *Canzheng*, abbreviated from *Canzhi zhengshi* 参知政事, Second Privy Councillor.[62] The second omission is "sangon".[63] Here, unusually, Pelliot is wrong in trying to derive this term ultimately from Chinese *xianggong* 相公.[64] It is Mongolian and Turkic *sängün* or *sangun*, from Chinese *jiangjun* 將軍, "[military] general".[65] Since Ménard found only "une douzaine de mots turco-mongols" in Marco's text,[66] the addition of these two Mongolian words is significant.

In contrast, Ménard includes the word *papiones* in his analysis,[67] although this is probably not a "mot oriental". Nor is he able to explain it credibly: it certainly does not mean "singes".[68] Again, he claims that *borgal* comes "sans doute du persan *bulgari*, nom de la ville de Bolghar".[69] It should hardly be necessary to point out that the Bulǧars, from whom the town took its name, were a Turkic people.[70] The word is not Persian, but exists in that language only as a loanword from Turkic. It was also borrowed into Mongolian.[71] Marco may well have taken it directly from Turkic. Ménard also asserts that: "Le terme *musc* [...] vient du Persan *musk*".[72] This is at least questionable, for the word is attested in other languages earlier than in Persian: "The Pahlavi word *mušk* appears in

59 Ménard 2009: 114.
60 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 572–573.
61 BNF fr. 1116: 72 recto. I read "vonsamcin" here, although Eusebi and Burgio read "vonsanicin": MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 181. In this manuscript, "i" is not dotted, which frequently gives rise to ambiguity. Ramusio gives "Vonsancin": MP/Ramusio: 50B.
62 Farquhar 1990: 171; Doerfer 1963–1975, vol. 1: 342.
63 BNF fr. 1116: 60 recto; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 155; MP/Barbieri: 168.
64 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 825.
65 Haw 2014: 12; Thomsen 1924: 151 note 1, 173; Doerfer 1963–1975, vol. 3: 278–279.
66 Ménard 2009: 130.
67 Ménard 2009: 122.
68 Haw (forthcoming b).
69 Ménard 2009: 95.
70 Golden 1992: 103, 253–258; Brook 2006: 14.
71 Doerfer 1963–1975, vol. 2: 315–317.
72 Ménard 2009: 101.

several texts. Unfortunately, all of these are works that took their final form in Islamic times".[73] Greek *μόσχος* is certainly attested at an earlier date.[74] It occurs, for example, in the sixth-century *Christian Topography* attributed to Cosmas Indicopleustes, with a brief description of the musk-deer.[75] Whatever its origins, the word had entered European languages long before the thirteenth century. "Muscus" is mentioned by Albertus Magnus, with a reasonably good description of the musk-deer.[76] Ménard's claim that Marco "paraît un des premiers à avoir utilisé le mot"[77] must therefore be rejected.

Indeed, Ménard's list of "premières attestations"[78] is generally suspect. "Noix d'Inde", for example, occurs as "nux indica" in the *De Vegetabilibus* of Albertus Magnus, dating from about 1256.[79] Albertus also mentions "mamonetus", undoubtedly the same as Marco's "maimon". According to Albertus: "Caput habet rotundum et faciem similiorem cum homine quam symia (It has a round head and a face more human than ape-like)".[80] Marco describes these monkeys as: "so different that there are some whose faces nearly resemble men's".[81] Nor is it likely that Marco Polo was "un des premiers" to use the word *turbit*.[82] This word occurs in a thirteenth-century manuscript of the *Livre des Simples Médecines* of Platearius.[83] "Turpeth" is reported to have been in demand in Sicily as early as the middle of the eleventh century.[84] The word is not originally Persian or Arabic: it is ultimately derived from the Sanskrit names *triputa*[85] or *trivrit*.[86] Similarly, *camphre* was not originally an Arabic word,[87] but ultimately derives from Austronesian (cf. Malay *kapūr*).[88] Indeed, it appears that

73 King 2017: 32. The use of the word "unfortunately" is telling: claims have often been made for Persian which seem to owe more to wishful thinking than to reality.
74 A recent etymological dictionary of Greek is able to cite only Modern Persian *mušk* as the supposed origin of Greek *μόσχος*, which is hardly satisfactory: Beekes 2010, vol. 2: 971.
75 Cosmas 1909: 319; Cosmas 1973, vol. 3: 325.
76 Albertus Magnus 1920: 1413; Albert the Great: 161–162. Albertus cites Platearius as his source: see Platearius 1913: 129.
77 Ménard 2009: 101.
78 Ménard 2009: 132.
79 Albertus Magnus 1867: 416.
80 Albertus Magnus 1920: 1413–1414; Albert the Great: 162.
81 MP/Kinoshita: 186. Cf. BNF fr. 1116: 94 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 227.
82 Ménard 2009: 97.
83 Platearius 1913: 191.
84 Lev/Amar 2008: 308.
85 Dymock/Warden/Hooper 1891: 527–528.
86 Amar/Lev 2017: 118; Genaust 1996: 665.
87 Ménard 2009: 88.
88 Marsden 1811: 149; Genaust 1996: 121.

the Arabs had little knowledge of camphor before their conquest of Iran.[89] Since camphor was known in Europe at least as early as the late eighth century, it can hardly be claimed that Marco was among the first to use the word.[90] The St Gall *Antidotarium* of the ninth century includes mention of "cafora" (and also of "musco").[91] It would be easy, but somewhat otiose, to give further examples of a similar kind. Ménard's analysis of the "mots orientaux" in Marco Polo's text is seriously flawed in multiple respects. His conclusions must certainly be rejected. It is surprising that Vogel should have accepted Ménard's analysis.[92] The Persian language was of very little importance in the Mongol Empire: Persian vocabulary appears to only a very limited extent in its administrative terminology. In the eastern part of the Mongol Empire, Mongolian and Chinese terms predominate, and in the western part, Turkic terms.[93]

Pepper: It is necessary to correct an error relating to pepper. It has been stated that: "The corrupt late Song minister, Jia Sidao (1213–75), is reported to have had 800 piculs of pepper among his stores".[94] The authority cited for this is Shiba Yoshinobu, but Shiba does not cite the source of his information.[95] The probable source has now been identified, and it does not support Shiba's claim. He apparently misunderstood the Chinese text. It must be explained that "800 piculs of pepper" (*hujiao babai shi* 胡椒八百石) became a byword in Chinese for luxury and extravagance. The original reference is not to Jia Sidao 賈似道, but to the Tang-period minister Yuan Zai 元載 (713–777). After Yuan's disgrace and death, it was found that he had as much as 800 piculs (*shi* 石) of pepper among his stores (1 *shi* was approximately 60 kg).[96] This indicates that pepper was already imported into China in large quantities during the eighth century, although it was clearly an expensive luxury then. Nonetheless, this calls into question Shiba's suggestion that "pepper only became widely consumed in and after the Sung dynasty".[97] The text which Shiba apparently misunderstood is in one of the collections of anecdotes assembled by Zhou Mi 周密. It records that when Jia Sidao's possessions were confiscated after his death they were found to include several hundred pots (*weng* 甕: the size is uncertain) of crystal sugar. Zhou records this as an example of hoarding, and ends the anecdote by quoting

89 Amar/Lev 2017: 145.
90 McCormick 2001: 714.
91 Sigerist 1923: 89.
92 Vogel 2013: 41.
93 Qiu 2012: 622; Farquhar 1990: 9.
94 Haw 2006: 141.
95 Shiba 1970: 202.
96 XTS, vol. 15, *juan* 145: 4714.
97 Shiba 1970: 206.

the saying about 800 piculs of pepper.[98] This is clearly not intended to apply specifically to Jia Sidao.

Nevertheless, there is good evidence for the import of substantial quantities of pepper into China during the thirteenth century. A mathematical treatise first published in 1247[99] includes an interesting problem concerning the cargo of a ship. Among the items listed as part of the cargo are "10,430 packages of pepper: each package weighs 40 *jin* 斤".[100] One *jin* was approximately half a kilogram, so that this is an enormous quantity of pepper. Although this is a theoretical problem for the study of mathematics, it is reasonable to think that it describes a situation that might plausibly have existed. Thus, what Marco says about very large quantities of pepper being carried into Hangzhou every day[101] is entirely credible. His assertion that: "for each shipload of pepper going to Alexandria or other places to be carried to Christian lands, a hundred come to this port of Zaytun"[102] may perhaps be an exaggeration, but not necessarily so. Very large quantities of pepper did indeed arrive in China. In January 943, the king of Fujian (Min 閩) sent tribute to the emperor of the Jin 晉 dynasty[103] to congratulate him on his recent accession to the throne. Among his presents were 600 *jin* of pepper.[104] On February 6, 1157, an embassy from the polity of Sanfoqi 三佛齊 in Sumatra[105] presented tribute to the Song Emperor which included no less than 10,750 *jin* of pepper.[106] When Ming forces took Fuzhou on January 18, 1368, they seized 639 horses, 105 seagoing ships, more than 199,500 piculs of grain (*liang* 糧), 1,450 ounces (*liang* 兩) of gold, and more than 6,300 *jin* of pepper.[107] As there was so much pepper in the port city of Fuzhou, Marco's claim that it was to Çaiton (Quanzhou) that "all the India ships come"[108] must be considered an overstatement. Other ports also had a share of the trade.

98 QDYY, *juan* 16: 297.
99 Libbrecht 1973: 2.
100 SSJZ, *juan* 17: 421; SXJZ, *juan* 9 *xia*: 15b.
101 MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 340; MP/Ramusio: 46B; MP/Barbieri: 216.
102 MP/Kinoshita: 141. Cf. BNF fr. 1116: 70 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 178.
103 Known as the Later Jin dynasty to distinguish it from an earlier dynasty of the same name, this was one of the five dynasties which controlled part of China between the fall of the Tang dynasty and the establishment of the Song dynasty: see Hung 2014: 7–36; and Ouyang 2004: lv–lxxvii.
104 CFYG, vol. 2, *juan* 169: 1883.
105 This polity is often identified with Śrīvijaya, but such an identification is doubtful: Haw 2019: 428–429.
106 SHY, vol. 8, *ce* 199: 7863.
107 MSL, vol. 1, *juan* 28 *xia*: 18.
108 MP/Kinoshita: 141. Cf. BNF fr. 1116: 70 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 178. This claim does not appear in Ramusio's edition: MP/Ramusio: 49B.

Further evidence for this is the list of trade commodities which arrived at Guangzhou during the Dade 大德 reign-period (1297–1307), which included pepper (unfortunately without any indication of quantity).[109]

The name Quinsai: Before leaving Hangzhou to consider Marco's route to Fujian, it is worth noting that Marco's claim that Quinsai means the "city of heaven"[110] is echoed by Odoric of Pordenone: "I came unto the city of Cansay, a name which signifieth '*the City of Heaven*'".[111] Since Odoric had personally visited Hangzhou, the suggestion that he was copying Marco Polo[112] does not seem very likely. There is certainly no evidence that this was the case. It is more likely that there was some kind of popular adage that somehow referred to Hangzhou by this appellation. Although Hangzhou does not in fact literally mean "city of heaven", what Marco and Odoric report cannot really be considered wrong. They were no doubt simply relating something which they had heard. Indeed, as Moule noted, when Kaifeng 開封 (Bian 汴) was capital of the Song Empire, it was apparently said there that Hangzhou was "the palaces of Heaven on Earth (*dishang tiangong* 地上天宮)".[113] This appears in at least two works of the Song period, so may have been in general usage.[114] Whether it was current in Marco Polo's time, however, is unclear.

The origin of the name "Quinsai" gave rise to lengthy discussions for a considerable period of time, until Moule eventually correctly related it to the Chinese "Xingzai 行在".[115] There is, however, still some difficulty regarding Marco's orthography of this toponym. Moule thought that: "the *hs* at the beginning of *hsing* [*xing*] was pronounced (according to the latest researches) like *ch* at the end of German 'Bach', and appears in Chinese words borrowed by the Japanese as a *k*."[116] This is somewhat misleading, certainly as far as the Japanese pronunciation is concerned. Many Japanese pronunciations of Chinese words date back to the Tang period, long before Marco's time. Reconstruction of the pronunciation of Chinese at various periods in the past has advanced greatly since Moule was writing. During the thirteenth century, "Xingzai" was probably usually pronounced not very differently from today.

---

109 DNZ, *juan* 7: 55.

110 BNF fr. 1116: 66 recto; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 169; MP/Kinoshita: 133; MP/Ramusio: 45C; MP/Barbieri: 206.

111 Yule 1913–1916, vol. 2: 192. Cf. Odoric 2010: 40.

112 Andreose and Ménard in Odoric 2010: 160.

113 Moule 1957: 10.

114 Moule drew attention to the text in *Fengchuang xiaodu*: FCXD, *juan shang*: 219. There is another occurrence, not noted by Moule, in the *Qing yi lu* of about 950: QYL, *juan shang*: 17.

115 Moule 1957: 1–10.

116 Moule 1957: 9.

Pulleyblank gives "xiŋ-tsaj",[117] while Coblin reconstructs "ɣjiŋ-dzaj".[118] Marco's "Quinsai"[119] does not obviously reflect these Chinese pronunciations. Marco undoubtedly used "Qu-" with the value of *k*.[120] He may perhaps also have used it ambiguously, as he used "ch-", with the value either of *k*- or of *h*- (*χ* or *ɣ*). Marco commonly uses *n* for *ŋ*.[121] Thus, "Quin-" might represent Chinese "xiŋ" or "ɣjiŋ". There is some difficulty with "-sai", however, which does not obviously represent Chinese "tsaj" or "dzaj". Nevertheless, this is not impossible, as early Venetian usually wrote *s* for *z*.[122] Marco may have used *s* where *z* (for *ts*/*dz*) would have been more accurate.

There is another possibility. "Quinsai" might represent a Mongolian pronunciation. In Mongolian, Chinese "xing" was pronounced "qing"(*king*); it is attested in, for example, *Xing zhongshu sheng* 行中書省, Mongolian *Qing jungshu sing* (*King ǰungšu sing*), Branch Central Secretariat.[123] "Zai" was pronounced "sai"; the homophone "zai" occurs in *Zaixiang* 宰相, Mongolian *Saisang*, Minister.[124] Thus, the original of Marco's "Quinsai" could have been a Mongolian pronunciation, "Qingsai (Kingsai)", of Chinese "Xingzai". This cannot be considered certain, however. Marco's "Quinsai" might have been derived either from Chinese or from Mongolian. The claim that it is a Persian transcription[125] is entirely without foundation. It has been noted that Marco's Chinese toponyms often closely resemble those of Rashīd al-Dīn,[126] but this cannot be taken to mean that Marco took them from a Persian source. It is simply that both Rashīd al-Dīn and Marco took their forms of toponyms from similar sources.[127] Indeed, the Arabic-Persian version of Xingzai was at least sometimes "Ḥansa",[128] significantly further from the Chinese original than Marco's "Quinsai". It may also be useful to emphasize that one of the proposed originals of "Quinsai", *Jingshi* 京師 (capital city),[129] is certainly out of the

117 Pulleyblank 1991: 344, 391.
118 Coblin 2007: 115, 134.
119 BNF fr. 116: 62 recto, 66 recto ("quisai, quinsai") 66 verso, 68 verso ("quisai"); MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 159, 168, 169, 173, 174; MP/Ramusio: 41D, 45C, 46A,B,C,E,F, 47D,E, 48A,B,C,D (always "Quinsai"); MP/Barbieri: 206 ("Quisay, Qinsay"), 216, 220 ("Quinsay), 222 ("Qinsay").
120 Haw (forthcoming a; forthcoming c).
121 Haw (forthcoming a).
122 Ferguson 2007: 75–76.
123 Farquhar 1990: 367.
124 Farquhar 1990: 171. Strictly, these are not quite homophones, as the tones are different.
125 See, for example, the note by Andreose and Ménard in Odoric 2010: 160.
126 See, for example, Olschki 1960: 234 note 4.
127 Cf. the case of "Mangi": Haw 2014: 8–9.
128 Jackson 1998: 95.
129 This is the identification of Pauthier and Yule, among others: MP/Pauthier: 491 note 1; MP/Yule-Cordier: 149 note 3.

question. As Moule noted, the Song court never accepted the loss of northern China, with the old capital of Kaifeng.[130] This is, in fact, why Hangzhou was commonly called "Xingzai" (or "Xingzaisuo 行在所"), which means a place where the emperor is temporarily resident while travelling.[131] Hangzhou was never considered the "real" capital, which was always Kaifeng.[132] The term "Xingzaisuo" is old. It can be traced back at least to the reign of Wudi 武帝 of the Han dynasty (141–87 BCE).[133]

From Hangzhou to Fuzhou: Before discussing the places which Marco mentions on the route from Hangzhou southwards, some preliminary comments are necessary. During Marco's final journey on his way out of China towards the Ilkhanate, he was not travelling alone nor with a small group of companions. He was accompanying the Princess Kökečin and the three ambassadors who had come from the Ilkhanate to request a new bride for their master the Ilkhan.[134] They would probably have travelled with a considerable suite of attendants, and they would have expected to travel in some degree of comfort. It was therefore no doubt necessary to follow a route which passed through major settlements as frequently as possible. Small towns and villages would almost certainly have lacked the resources to meet their needs. It is therefore not necessarily the case that the route chosen would have been the shortest one possible. From the point of view of comfort, travel by water would have been preferable. When overland travel could not be avoided, it may well be that the routes used would have needed to be suitable for wheeled carts for baggage and carriages for the Princess and her ladies-in-waiting. It seems that many of those who have tried to identify the places on the route have usually overlooked these points. It is also the case that Marco had already made at least one return journey to India,[135] so that some of the information that he gives may have been acquired in the course of different journeys.

"And at the end of the day's journey [from Hangzhou] one finds the city [...] which is called Tanpigiu".[136] This place has caused considerable confusion. It is clear that the name has been corrupted by copyists in every extant version of the text.[137] Proposed identifications have varied from Shaoxing 紹興,[138] "without

130 Moule 1957: 7.
131 See, for example, FYSL, vol. 1, *juan* 1: 1–2; YDJS, vol. 1, *juan* 1: 1–2.
132 Ridgway 2014: 228.
133 HS, vol. 1, *juan* 6: 180; vol. 9, *juan* 69: 2971.
134 Cleaves 1976: 181–188.
135 BNF fr. 1116: 8 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 44; MP/Kinoshita: 12; MP/Ramusio: 3 F.
136 MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 343. Cf. MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 174; MP/Ramusio: 48C. MS VB reads "ii giornate": MP/Gennari: 115.
137 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 846–847.
138 MP/Pauthier, vol. 2: 519 note 1.

any attempt at a phonetic equivalence"[139]; to "Tai-ping-fu" (太平府), of which "the situation [...] presents a formidable difficulty"[140]; to Fuyang 富陽,[141] which "does not in any way resemble Polo's Ta Pin Zu"[142]; to Yen-chou (Yanzhou 嚴州; Jiande 建德)[143]; and very possibly to other places which I have overlooked. The only one of those mentioned above which makes any sense at all to me is Fuyang, which is at least very close to being in the right place. It is on the Fuchun 富春 River (which becomes the Qiantang 錢塘 a short distance downstream), southwest of Hangzhou and possibly about one day's journey from the city.[144] If anything, however, it is too close to Hangzhou. According to Odoric of Pordenone, "there be also great suburbs, which contain a greater population than even the city itself. For the city hath twelve chief gates, and from each of them cities extend to a distance of some eight miles, each one greater than Venice is or Padua".[145] These suburbs would probably have extended particularly along the river, so that Fuyang might have been more or less a suburb of Hangzhou (as it in fact is today). The best suggestion yet made for the identification of Tanpigiu is the next place on the river after Fuyang, which is Tonglu 桐廬.[146] Phillips tried to identify this town with Marco's Vugiu,[147] which follows Tanpigiu on the route,[148] but this seems unlikely. Vugiu was three days' journey beyond Tanpigiu, and therefore four days from Hangzhou. Tonglu is not sufficiently far from Hangzhou. Nor do phonetics favour such an identification with Vugiu.

There is at least some phonetic resemblance between "Tanpigiu" and "Tonglu".[149] It is possible to imagine that "Tan-" might have been corrupted from "Ton-" or "Tun-", and the "-n-" could easily have become "-m-". If the original orthography was "Tunglu", then "-glu" might well have been miscopied as the common toponym ending "-giu". The insertion of "-p[i]-" after "-m-" would not be surprising.[150] This involves multiple scribal errors, but nevertheless is plausible. It certainly cannot be considered entirely satisfactory, but there

139 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 846.
140 MP/Marsden: 547 note 1081.
141 MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 2: 220 note 1.
142 Phillips 1890: 222.
143 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 846–847.
144 See the sketch map herewith, and also Tan Qixiang (ed.) 1996: 27.
145 Yule 1913–1916, vol. 2: 194–195. Cf. Odoric 2010: 40.
146 Haw 2006: 119–120; Haw (forthcoming a).
147 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 874.
148 Phillips 1890: 222.
149 'Phags-pa Chinese pronunciation "duŋ-lu": Coblin 2007: 108, 130.
150 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 847.

is no better explanation. Pelliot's suggestion that "Tanpigiu" is a corruption of "Gamgiu" involves just as much miscopying, and is unconvincing as Pelliot's claim that the "G-" represents initial "ŋ-" is certainly wrong.[151] Moreover, this "Gamgiu" (Yanzhou; Jiande) is too far from Hangzhou, certainly much more than one day's journey. According to the Song-period *Yuanfeng jiu yu zhi*, from Muzhou 睦州 (Yanzhou)[152] northwards to the border of the prefecture was 120 *li* 里, and then from the border to Hangzhou was a further 155 *li*. This would make a total of approximately 90 miles (140 km).[153] One day's journey was a very variable distance, but 30 miles a day was comparatively fast, at least in medieval France. Half that distance was common. It is probably relevant that large parties and people of high rank usually tended to travel more slowly, that carts tended to slow journeys, and that longer journeys were usually made at a slower rate of travel than short ones.[154] Marco's total of four days from Hangzhou to Vugiu, well beyond Jiande (see below and map), was good going. This part of the journey was probably made in boats on the river, so carts would not have been used. It was upstream, however, and therefore slower than a downstream journey.

There is little difficulty with the identification of Vugiu. It is generally accepted that it is Wuzhou 婺州, modern Jinhua 金華.[155] The only caveat is Pelliot's comment that: "Polo must have left Chin-hua [Jinhua] to the east, and the exact place he refers to seems to be 蘭溪 Lan-ch'i [Lanxi]".[156] This remark is entirely comprehensible, as Wuzhou was not on the main river which Marco and his travelling companions were following. However, it ignores the facts which have been outlined above. Marco was travelling with a considerable number of people who would have required the resources which the principal town of a route (*lu* 路)[157] would no doubt have been more able to supply than a town of county level, like Lanxi.[158] There is no good reason to think that a short detour to Wuzhou would not have been justified. Marco's account should take precedence over Pelliot's opinion. Continuing from Wuzhou, Marco next mentions Ghiugiu.[159] Again, there is little problem with this toponym. This is Quzhou 衢

151 Haw (forthcoming a).
152 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 846; FYSL, vol. 1, *juan* 5: 94.
153 YJYZ, vol. 1, *juan* 5: 219.
154 Boyer 1951: 597, 598–601, 604–606.
155 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 874; MP/Kinoshita: 138; MP/Cliff: 214, 386 note 55; MP/Barbieri: 222; Vogel 2013: 204; MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 2: 222.
156 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 874.
157 Wuzhou became the seat of government of a route in 1276: YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1497.
158 Lanxi became a prefecture in 1295, however: YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1497.
159 MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 343.

州, still so called today.[160] As far as this town, the journey was probably entirely by boat on the river. After Quzhou, there is disagreement about the next stages of the journey.

From Quzhou, after four days' travel, Marco's itinerary arrives at Cianscian or Zengian.[161] In another three days, Cugiu is reached.[162] The second of these toponyms is less problematic than the first. There is very little possibility that Pelliot's reconstruction of Cugiu as "Singiu" (Xinzhou 信州) is correct. He himself admits that this supposed "original form [...] is not the one which has the best support in the manuscripts".[163] It seems to me that the correct identification of this toponym is with Chuzhou 處州,[164] which is phonetically much more convincing. It is only necessary to assume that an "i" has been dropped from an original "Ciugiu". Pelliot's point regarding his "Singiu" being in "the province the seat of which was at Hangzhou"[165] is irrelevant, because the same is true of Chuzhou also. It is true, however, that Chuzhou was probably not on the shortest route from Quzhou to Fuzhou. Nonetheless, it is entirely possible that this was the easiest route for a large group of travellers. On the other hand, identifying Cugiu with Chuzhou creates a serious problem with the identification of Cianscian/Zengian. Kinoshita, perhaps following Benedetto,[166] and in spite of Pelliot's criticism that Benedetto "contradicts himself",[167] identifies Cianscian as Changshan. She then takes Cugiu to be Chuzhou.[168] Pelliot is right that this does not make sense, for Changshan 常山 was not on the way from Quzhou to Chuzhou. The fundamental problem here is that "Cianscian" undoubtedly looks as though it should be a transcription of "Changshan". Everything else militates against such an identification, however. "When one leaves the city of Quzhou, one went [...] southeast [...] four days' journey, then one finds the city of Changshan [Cianscian], which is very large and beautiful; it is on a mountain at the divide of a river, half of it going upstream and half of it down".[169] The

160 Haw 2006: 120; Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 735; MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 2: 222; MP/Kinoshita: 138. On Marco's orthography of this toponym, see Haw (forthcoming a).
161 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 261; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 175 ("cianscian, ciansan"); MP/Ramusio: 48D ("Zengian"); MP/Simion: 287 ("Zansian, Zansui").
162 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 569–570; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 175; MP/Ramusio: 48D,E ("Gieza"); MP/Simion ("Guguin").
163 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 570.
164 Haw 2006: 120.
165 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 569.
166 MP/Benedetto: 441, 442.
167 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 570.
168 MP/Kinoshita: 138.
169 MP/Kinoshita: 138.

original text (of MS F) says: "a chief de quatre jornee, adonc treuve l'en la cité de Cianscian, qe mout est grant et biel et est sus un mont que parte le flum, que le une moitié ala en sus, et l'autre moitié en jus".[170] The important details here are (1) "Cianscian" is southeast of Quzhou; (2) it is four days' journey from Quzhou; and (3) it is on a mountain which divides "a river", which flows in two different directions from the mountain ("upstream [...] and [...] down" is not exactly a correct translation: rivers cannot normally flow upstream). None of these is right for Changshan.

"Chang-shan is a city of the third class, and is said to be 140 le [*li*] from Chu-chu-fu [Quzhou]. [...] It is built at the base of a hill about a mile from the river, but its suburbs extend down to the water's edge".[171] 140 *li* is less than 50 miles (80 km), which is certainly not four days' journey. Changshan is in a river valley, more or less on the banks of the river; it is not on a mountain. When Robert Fortune travelled from Quzhou to the Wuyi 武夷 Mountains in the 1840s, he found that for about 30 *li* from Changshan the road was in the valley. Only after this distance did it climb up towards a pass in the hills.[172] Moreover, there is no trace of any division of a river or rivers at or near Changshan. Finally, Changshan is almost due west from Quzhou, not southeast. While Marco's directions are often inaccurate, they are rarely as far wrong as this. The only thing which suggests the identity of Cianscian with Changshan is the phonetic resemblance. Everything else is wrong. It must be noted, however, that the reading of Ramusio's edition is "Zengian", which does not much resemble "Changshan". In fact, it could well be a slightly corrupt version of a different toponym, Suichang 遂昌. "Zengian" might plausibly be a copyist's error for "Zuegian". Phonetically, this would be very close to the pronunciation of Suichang during the thirteenth century: the 'Phags-pa Chinese pronunciation is "zuɛ̆-tʂ'aŋ".[173] Whereas everything about the description of the location of "Cianscian" is wrong for Changshan, it is right for Suichang. This town is almost exactly southeast of Quzhou. It is on a mountain and close to a watershed, from which rivers run either to the north and northeast, eventually to the Qiantang near Hangzhou, or approximately southeast towards Wenzhou 溫州. It is further from Quzhou than is Changshan. As it would be an uphill journey from Quzhou to Suichang, four days might well have been needed to complete it. Suichang is also directly on the way from Quzhou to Chuzhou. It is perhaps possible that Marco simply made a mistake about the toponyms here. He had travelled in this

170 BNF fr. 1116: 69 verso; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 175.
171 Fortune 1852: 182.
172 Fortune 1852: 184–186.
173 Coblin 2007: 116, 127.

area more than once, possibly by different routes. He may accidentally have confused Changshan with Suichang, or perhaps the confusion was due to misunderstanding on the part of Rustichello. The reading of Ramusio's edition suggests a later correction.[174]

There is general agreement about the identification of the next toponym after Cugiu: "qenlifu", "qenlinfu", or "quelinfu".[175] This is Jianningfu 建寧府 (modern Jian'ou 建甌).[176] As has been pointed out already, "lin[g]" is a dialect pronunciation of *ning*.[177] The suggestion that it is a local dialect pronunciation of the Jianning area[178] seems to be wrong, however. In the modern Jian'ou dialect, *n-* and *l-* are reported to be differentiated.[179] Nonetheless, as Pelliot remarked, confusion of *n-* and *l-* is common in many parts of China.[180] Pelliot mentions Hunan province, and it is certainly very common in Sichuan.[181] Again, it has already been stated that Marco would often have heard dialect pronunciations outside the area where they were usually spoken, if only because officials were normally appointed to posts outside their native areas.[182] The use of *-fu* at the end of this toponym reflects the status of Jianning under the Song dynasty. It was raised to the status of a superior prefecture (*fu* 府) in 1162.[183] Under Mongol rule, it became the seat of government of a route in 1289.[184] As this had happened so recently, it is not surprising that Marco still referred to Jianning as a *fu*.

Between Jianning and "Fugiu", which is undoubtedly Fuzhou 福州,[185] Marco mentions only one place, "Uuqen" or "Vuguen".[186] This has been discussed at length elsewhere. It is certainly Houguan 侯官.[187] Since Pelliot's lengthy discussion,[188] "Çaiton" has generally been recognised to be Quanzhou 泉州.[189] There is, however, still some difficulty with the identification of

174 On the possibility that toponyms in Ramusio's edition, and in the Zelada manuscript, may reflect revisions made after the text had originally been written, see Haw (forthcoming a).
175 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 814; BNF fr. 1116: 70 recto; MP/Barbieri: 228; MP/Ramusio: 48 F.
176 Haw (forthcoming c).
177 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 815; Haw (forthcoming c).
178 MP/Benedetto: 440.
179 Li Rong et al. (eds.) 1998: 6, 8–14.
180 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 815.
181 Personal experience. See also Qin 2014: 17.
182 Haw (forthcoming a).
183 YDJS, vol. 4, *juan* 129: 3691.
184 YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1504.
185 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 725–726; MP/Kinoshita: 139; MP/Cliff: 217.
186 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 875.
187 Haw (forthcoming c).
188 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 1: 583–597.
189 MP/Kinoshita: 141 note 26; MP/Cliff: 387 note 64; Vogel 2013: 204.

"tinugiu", "Tingui" or "tinçu", a place where porcelain was manufactured.[190] Vogel has accepted a hypothesis which identifies "Tiunguy" with a town called Fengzhou 豐州. Today, this is a township within the municipality of Nan'an 南安, bordering on Quanzhou.[191] It must be objected that Nan'an was Fengzhou only for a few years during the Tang dynasty, from 622 until 635.[192] It is hardly likely that such a short-lived name would have persisted until Marco Polo's time, six and a half centuries later. It has been claimed that the name of Fengzhou did continue to be used for the present township of Fengzhou long after it had ceased officially to be so designated, but no evidence whatsoever has been provided to support such a claim.[193] There is perhaps some confusion here, as the name Fengzhou was applied at various periods to several different towns.[194] The township in Nan'an now called Fengzhou does not seem to have been known by that name until the Republican period.[195] The argument that there was a Fengzhou in what is today Fujian province from 567 until 589[196] is irrelevant, because this Fengzhou was Fuzhou.[197] In any case, there is little phonetic resemblance between Fengzhou and Tingui or Tiunguy. Confusion between "f" and "t" is not common in the various recensions of Marco Polo's text. Nor does the local pronunciation of *feng* as *hɔŋ*[198] make much difference to the phonetic problem. Marco's transcription of *hɔŋ* would have been "con[g]" or something similar, which is still far removed from "Tin[g]-". Pelliot cites variants from a dozen manuscripts of the text, all of which have initial "t", except for one with initial "l".[199] Initial "t" is therefore likely to be correct. Phonetically, the identification of this place with Fengzhou is highly improbable, and the simple fact is that no Fengzhou existed near Quanzhou during the late thirteenth century or at any time within the previous six centuries.

---

190 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 853–856; BNF fr. 1116: 71 recto; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 178; MP/Ramusio: 49B,C; MP/Barbieri: 246.

191 Vogel 2013: 207 note i*; Zheng Yi 2004: 38–45.

192 THJ, vol. 5, *juan* 102: 2031; MNAXZ, *juan* 1: 7.

193 Zheng Yi 2004: 41.

194 For example, during Marco Polo's time, there was a Fengzhou in north China, in the route of Datong 大同: YS, vol. 5, *juan* 58: 1376.

195 There is no mention of Fengzhou township in *The Cities and Towns of China* of 1910, although it notes that Nan'an was called Fengzhou during the Tang dynasty: Playfair 1910: 339. Until 1936, what is now Fengzhou township was the county town of Nan'an: Ding Li et al. (eds.) 1990: 99.

196 Zheng Yi 2004: 40.

197 THJ, vol. 5, *juan* 100: 1990.

198 Zheng Yi 2004: 41; Lin Liantong (ed.) 1993: 88–89.

199 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 853.

The orthography "Tiunguy" was no doubt adopted from Pauthier's edition.[200] It occurs only in the FA group of manuscripts[201] and cannot take precedence over the majority of recensions of the text. Pipino has "tingui",[202] Ramusio has "Tingui",[203] and the Zelada manuscript has "tinçu".[204] It seems clear that "Tingiu" was most probably Marco's original intention. This obviously resembles Tingzhou 汀州, modern Changting 長汀.[205] There is no good reason to question this identification, which is supported by Marco's statement, in MS F, that "those of this city have a language of their own"[206] ("cele de ceste cité ont lengajes por eles").[207] MS V^1 mentions "tungui" and the porcelain made there, and immediately afterwards says: "Et questi de questa citade àno parlar per sí (And those of this city have their own language)".[208] "This city" clearly refers to "tungui". This is significant, because Changting is populated by Hakkas, who speak a language different from the Min dialects of Fujian.[209] Yule claims that this comment applies to Quanzhou,[210] but it clearly does not. Pauthier's text in fact reads: "Ilz ont en ceste cité de Tyunguy un autre langaige par eulx". The reading of MS FA^1 justifies this.[211] The porcelain bowls which Marco says were made in Tingzhou are of doubtful value for the identification of this place, as porcelain was produced in many local kilns.[212] The old idea that production was concentrated in only a few major centres is incorrect, at least for the period before the Ming dynasty. Pelliot's lengthy argument that Tingiu must be a corruption of Chuzhou, the prefecture in which the Longquan 龍泉 kilns were located,[213] is not at all convincing. Again, as has been suggested previously, even if porcelain was not manufactured there, Tingzhou might have been associated with porcelain because it was on the route by which products from Jingdezhen 景德鎮 were carried to Quanzhou.[214]

---

200 MP/Pauthier, vol. 2: 532.
201 BNF fr. 5631: 63 verso.
202 MP/Pipino: 150.
203 MP/Ramusio: 49B,C.
204 MP/Barbieri: 246.
205 Haw 2006: 121, 123.
206 MP/Kinoshita: 142. Cf. MP/Moule-Pelliot, vol. 1: 353.
207 BNF fr. 1116: 71 recto; MP/Eusebi-Burgio, vol. 1: 178.
208 MP/Simion: 290.
209 Hashimoto 1973: 7; Chen 2004: 800; Xiong Zhenghui et al. (eds.) 2012: 117, map B1–17.
210 MP/Yule-Cordier, vol. 2: 236.
211 MP/Pauthier, vol. 2: 533; BNF fr. 5631: 63 verso.
212 Zhu Tiequan et al. 2012: 476; Zhao Bing 2001: 63–64; Barnes 2010: 342, 350.
213 Pelliot 1959–1973, vol. 2: 853–856.
214 Haw 2006: 123.

Conclusion: Marco's route from Hangzhou to Quanzhou begins by following rivers which flow into the Qiantang, travelling upstream towards the southwest (see map). The first town on the itinerary is Tonglu (Tanpigiu), followed by Wuzhou (Vugiu) and then Quzhou (Ghiugiu). At Quzhou, the river is left behind and the route climbs to the watershed near which Suichang (Zengian) is situated. From here, again following a river, there is a descent to Chuzhou (Cugiu). Then, turning westwards, the itinerary crosses the mountains into Fujian province, descending to Jianning (Quenlin). From here, following the Min River, the route passes Houguan (Uuguen) and arrives at Fuzhou (Fugiu). It continues to Quanzhou (Çaiton). Tingzhou (Tingiu) was not on the route, but is inland from Quanzhou. The administrative status of these various towns is of some interest. Wuzhou, Quzhou, Chuzhou, Jianning, Fuzhou, Quanzhou and Tingzhou were all the seats of administration of routes.[215] With the exception of Jianning (see above), all of these routes had been established during the late 1270s, immediately after the Mongol conquest of the Song Empire. Only three towns are mentioned which were of lower administrative status, all of them county towns (*xian* 縣). Tonglu was a county within Jiande route.[216] It is interesting that Marco mentions this place but not Jiande, which he must also have passed through. This suggests that he did not mention places solely because of their importance, but also noted towns for other reasons. Tonglu was no doubt mentioned as the first stop after leaving Hangzhou. Suichang was a county within Chuzhou route,[217] and Houguan a county within Fuzhou route.[218] Suichang was notable because of its position on the watershed between Quzhou and Chuzhou, and Houguan because of its production of sugar.[219]

As has also been shown above, there is reason to question whether Marco really had a knowledge of Persian. It is certainly unlikely that he used the Persian language much, if at all, while he was in China. On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt what he says about large quantities of pepper being carried into Hangzhou every day. He is not always right: Quanzhou was not the only port which received ships from India, and Tingzhou was certainly not the only place where porcelain was manufactured. As has been remarked previously, he is usually correct when his information was obtained personally, but often inaccurate when he relied on what others told him.[220] Considering the

215 YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1496–1497, 1499, 1503–1505, 1506.
216 YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1495.
217 YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1499.
218 YS, vol. 5, *juan* 62: 1504.
219 Haw (forthcoming c).
220 Haw 2006: 174–175.

problems created by scribes and translators, who have undoubtedly generated obscurities in a significant part of Marco's text, the *Description of the World* is a remarkably accurate account of the Empire of Qubilai Qa'an.

Bibliography

Manuscripts and Editions of Marco Polo's book

BNF MS fr. (1116): Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département de Manuscrits, français 1116, *Livre qui est appelé le Divisiment dou monde*, de Marc Pol (Manuscript F).

BNF MS fr. (5631): Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département de Manuscrits, français 5631, *Les voyages de* Marco Polo (Manuscript FA[1]).

MP/Baldelli Boni: *Il Milione di Marco Polo, testo di lingua del secolo decimoterzo, ora per la prima volta pubblicato ed illustrato dal Conte Gio. Batt. Baldelli Boni*, vol. 1 (1827). Firenze: Giuseppe Pagani (edn of Manuscript TA[1]).

MP/Barbieri: Marco Polo (2008): *Milione, Redazione Latina del manoscritto Z, Versione Italiana a fronte*. Edited by A. Barbieri, 2nd edn. Parma: Fondazione Pietro Bembo/Ugo Guanda Editore.

MP/Benedetto: Marco Polo (1932): *Il libro di messer Marco Polo, cittadino di Venezia, detto Milione, dove si raccontano le meraviglie del mondo*, ricostruito criticamente e per la prima volta integralmente tradotto in lingua italiana da Luigi Foscolo Benedetto. Milano/Roma: Trèves, Treccani, Tumminelli.

MP/Cliff: Marco Polo (2015): *The Travels*, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Nigel Cliff. London: Penguin Books.

MP/Eusebi-Burgio: Marco Polo (2018): *Le devisement dou monde*, testo, secondo la lezione del codice fr. 1116 della Bibliothèque Nationale de France, a cura di Mario Eusebi, glossario, a cura di Eugenio Burgio, 2 vols. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.

MP/Gennari: Marco Polo (2009): «*Milione*», Redazione *VB*. Edizione Critica Commentata. Tesi di dottorato di Pamela Gennari. Università Ca' Foscari Venezia.

MP/Kinoshita: Marco Polo (2016): *The Description of the World*, translated by Sharon Kinoshita. Indianapolis: Hackett.

MP/Marsden: Marco Polo (1818): *The Travels of Marco Polo, a Venetian, in the Thirteenth Century*, [...] translated from the Italian, with notes, by W. Marsden, FRS, & c. London.

MP/Moule-Pelliot: A. C. Moule/Paul Pelliot (1938): *Marco Polo: The Description of the World*, 2 vols. London: Routledge.

MP/Pauthier: G. Pauthier (1865): *Le Livre de Marco Polo, citoyen de Venise, conseiller privé et commissaire impérial de Khoubilaï-Khaân; redigé en français sous sa dictée en 1298 par Rusticien de Pise [...]*, 2 vols. Paris: Firmin Didot.

MP/Pipino: Marka Pavlova z Benátek (1902): *Milion*, translated by J.V. Prášek. : Prague: Emperor Franz Joseph Czech Academy for Sciences, Literature and Arts.

MP/Ramusio: Marco Polo (1559): L'Historia delle cose de Tartari, & diversi fatti de'loro Imperatori. In: *Navigationi et Viaggi*. Edited by G.-B. Ramusio, vol. 2. Venice: Giunti, 1–60.

MP/Simion: Marco Polo (2019): *Il Devisement dou monde* nella redazione veneziana V (cod. Hamilton 424 della Staatsbibliothek di Berlino), Samuela Simion. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.

MP/Yule-Cordier: *The Book of Ser Marco Polo Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, translated and edited, with notes, by Colonel Sir Henry Yule, 3rd edn, revised by H. Cordier, 2 vols (1903). London: John Murray.

Pre-modern Chinese sources

CFYG: Wang Qinruo, et al. 王欽若 (1013): *Ce fu yuan gui, jiao ding ben* 册府元龜, 校訂本. Edited by Zhou Xunchu 周勛初, 12 vols. Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2006.

CZXYZ: Li Zhichang 李志常 (c. 1228): *Changchun zhenren xi you ji* 長春真人西遊記. In: *Qiu Chuji ji* 丘處機集. Edited by Zhao Weidong 趙衛東. Ji'nan: Qilu shushe, 2005: 200–325.

DNZ: Chen Dazhen 陳大震 (comp.) (c. 1305): *Dade Nanhai Zhi* 大德南海志. Edited by Li Yongxian 李勇先 (*Song-Yuan zhenxi difangzhi congkan, jia bian*, 宋元珍稀地方志叢刊, 甲編, vol. 8). Chengdu: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 2007.

FCXD: Yuan Jiong 袁褧 (c. 1105): *Fengchuang xiaodu* 楓窗小牘. In: *Quan Song biji* 全宋筆記, Collection 4, vol. 5 第四編, 五. Edited by Zhu Yian 朱易安 et al. Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2008: 209–247.

FYSL: Zhu Mu 祝穆 (c. 1267): *Fangyu shenglan* 方輿勝覽. Edited by Zhu Zhu 祝洙, 3 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003.

HS: Ban Gu 班固 et al. (111): *Han shu* 漢書, 12 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.

MNAXZ: Su Jingtan 蘇鏡潭 (c. 1912): *Minguo Nan'an xian zhi* 民國南安縣志 (Zhongguo difang zhi jicheng 中國地方志集成, Fujian fuxian zhi ji 福建府縣志輯 28). Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 2000.

MSL (1962): *Ming Taizu shilu* 明太祖實錄, 4 vols. Taibei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.

QDYY: Zhou Mi 周密 (c. 1290): *Qi dong yeyu* 齊東野語. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

QYL: Tao Gu 陶穀: *Qing yi lu* 清異錄 (c. 950). In: *Quan Song biji* 全宋筆記, Collection 1, vol. 2 第一編, 二. Edited by Zhu Yian 朱易安 et al. Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2003: 1–114.

SHY: Xu Song 徐松 et al. (comp.) (1936): *Song huiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿, 8 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1957.

SSJZ: Qin Jiushao 秦九韶 (1247): *Shu shu jiu zhang* 數書九章. In: *Congshu jicheng chubian* 叢書集成初編. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1935–1937.

SXJZ: Qin Jiushao 秦九韶 (1247): *Shu xue jiu zhang* 數學九章. In: *Qinding Siku quanshu* 欽定四庫全書. Beijing, 1792.

THJ: Yue Shi 樂史 (c. 990): *Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇記, 9 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007.

XTS: Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修/Song Qi 宋祁: *Xin Tang shu* 新唐書, 20 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

YDJS: Wang Xiangzhi 王象之 (c. 1230): *Yu di ji sheng* 輿地紀勝, 8 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992.

YJYZ: Wang Cun 王存 (1080): *Yuanfeng jiu yu zhi* 元豐九域志. Edited by Wang Wenchu 王文楚/Wei Songshan 魏嵩山, 2 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984.

YS: Song Lian 宋濂 et al. (eds.) (c. 1370): *Yuan shi* 元史, 15 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.

Other sources

Albert the Great (1987): *Man and the Beasts: De Animalibus (Books 22–26)*, translated by James J. Scanlan. Binghampton: State University of New York.

Albertus Magnus (1867): *De Vegetabilibus Libri VII, Historiae Naturalis Pars XVIII*, critical edition begun by Ernst Meyer and completed by Karl Jessen. Berlin: Georgius Reimerus.

Albertus Magnus (1920): *De Animalibus Libri XXVI*, nach der Cölner Urschrift, herausgegeben von Hermann Stadler, vol. 2. Münster: Aschendorff.

Al-Kašγarī, Maḥmūd (1982–1985): *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk)*, edited and translated by Robert Dankoff in collaboration with James Kelly, 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Printing Office.

Amar, Zohar, Lev, Efraim (2017): *Arabian Drugs in Early Medieval Mediterranean Medicine*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Baber, Zahir-ed-din-Mohammed (1871): *Mémoires*, traduits pour la première fois sur le texte djagatai par A. Pavet de Courteille, vol. 2. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Baber, Zehir-ed-din Muhammed (1826): *Memoirs*, written by himself, in the Djagatai Turki, and translated, partly by the late John Leyden, partly by William Erskine. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, & Green.

Babur (1996): *The Baburnama: Memoirs of Babur, Prince and Emperor*, translated by Wheeler M. Thackston. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bābur, Zahiru'd-dīn Muhammad (1922): *The Bābur-nāma in English (Memoirs of Bābur)*, Translated from the original Turki text by Annette Susannah Beveridge, vol. 2. London: Luzac.

Barnes, Laurie E. (2010): "Yuan Dynasty Ceramics". In: *Chinese Ceramics: From the Palaeolithic Period through the Qing Dynasty*. Edited by Zhiyan Li, Virginia L. Bower, Li He. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 330–385.

Beekes, Robert (2010): *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Bing, Zhao (2001): Les imitations de porcelaines de Ding du Xe au XIVe siècle: le cas des officines de potiers de Jizhou au Jiangxi. *Arts Asiatiques* 56: 61–80.

Bosworth, C. E. (1968): "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (A.D. 1000–1217)". In: *The Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. 5, the Saljuq and Mongol Periods*. Edited by J.A. Boyle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–202.

Boyer, Marjorie Nice (1951): "A Day's Journey in Mediaeval France". *Speculum* 26.4: 597–608.

Brook, Kevin Alan (2006): *The Jews of Khazaria*, 2nd edn. Lanham/Boulder/New York/Toronto/Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Chen, Matthew Y. (2004): "Changting Hakka Tone Sandhi: Analytical Challenges". *Language and Linguistics* 5.4: 799–820.

Ching, Julia (1997): "Son of Heaven: Sacral Kingship in Ancient China". *T'oung Pao* 83: 3–41.

Cleaves, Francis Woodman (1976): "A Chinese Source Bearing on Marco Polo's Departure from China and a Persian Source on his Arrival in Persia". *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 36: 181–203.

Coblin, W. South (2007), *A Handbook of 'Phags-pa Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Cosmas Indicopleustes (1909): *The Christian Topography*, edited, with geographical notes, by E.O. Winstedt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cosmas Indicopleustes (1973): *Topographie Chrétienne*, introduction, texte critique, illustration, traduction et notes par Wanda Wolska-Conus, vol. 3 (Livres VI–XII. Index). Paris: Editions du Cerf.

De la Vaissière, Étienne (2005): *Sogdian Traders: A History*, translated by James Ward. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

De Rachewiltz, Igor (2006): *The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Della Valle, Pietro (1843): *Viaggi, descritti da lui medesimo in lettere familiari all'erudito suo amico Mario Schipano*. 2 vols. Brighton: G. Gancia.

Ding Li 丁莉 et al. (eds.) (1990): *Zhongguo Diming Cidian* 中國地名詞典. Shanghai: Cishu chubanshe.

Doerfer, Gerhard (1963–1975): *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*. 4 vols. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond (2004): *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (*Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. 3, part 1). Turnhout: Brepols.

Dymock, William, Warden, C. J. H., Hooper, David. (1891): *Pharmacographia Indica: A History of the Principal Drugs of Vegetable Origin, Met with in British India*, vol. 2. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner.

Farquhar, David M. (1990): *The Government of China under Mongolian Rule: A Reference Guide*. Stuttgart.

Ferguson, R. 2007: *A Linguistic History of Venice*. Firenze.

Fisher, Michael H. (2019): "Conflicted Meanings of Persianate Culture: An Intimate Example from Colonial India and Britain". In: *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of an Asian Lingua Franca*. Edited by Nile Green. Oakland: 225–241.

Fortune, R. (1852): *A Journey to the Tea Countries of China; Including Sung-lo and the Bohea Hills; with A Short Notice of the East India Company's Tea Plantations in the Himalaya Mountains* London.

Gauthiot, Robert (1911): Quelques Termes Techniques Bouddhiques et Manichéens. *Journal Asiatique* 10e série, 18: 49–67.

Genaust, Helmut (1996): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der botanischen Pflanzennamen*, 3rd edn. Basel/Boston/Berlin.

Golden, Peter B. (1992): *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples: Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East*. Wiesbaden.

Gurney, J.D. (1986): "Pietro Della Valle: The Limits of Perception". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 49.1: 103–116.

Hashimoto, Mantaro J. (1973): *The Hakka Dialect: A Study of Its Phonology, Syntax and Lexicon*. Cambridge.

Haw, Stephen G. (2006): *Marco Polo's China: A Venetian in the Realm of Khubilai Khan*. London.

Haw, Stephen G. (2014): "The Persian Language in Yuan Dynasty China: A Reappraisal". *East Asian History* 39: 5–32.

Haw, Stephen G. (2017): Tung Oil and *Tong* 桐 Trees. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 167.1: 215–236.

Haw, Stephen G. (2019): "Śrīvijaya, Java, and the Sunda Strait during the Fifth to Tenth Centuries". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 169.2: 409–435.

Haw, Stephen G. (forthcoming a): "The Orthography of Marco Polo's Toponyms". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

Haw, Stephen G. (forthcoming b): "Some Problematic Animals in Marco Polo's *Description of the World*". *Imago Temporis: Medium Aevum*.

Haw, Stephen G. (forthcoming c): "Marco Polo in 'Mangi': Kuizhou, Fuling, Houguan, and the Pontoon Bridge at Fuzhou". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

Henning, W.B. (1948): "The Date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 12.3/4: 601–615.

Huang, Pei (1990): New Light on the Origins of the Manchus. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 50.1: 239–282.

Hung, Hing Ming (2014): *Ten States, Five Dynasties, One Great Emperor: How Emperor Taizu Unified China in the Song Dynasty*. New York.

Jackson, Peter (1990): *The Mission of Friar William of Rubruck: His Journey to the Court of the Great Khan Möngke 1253–1255*, translated by Peter Jackson, introduction, notes and appendices by Peter Jackson with David Morgan. London.

Jackson, Peter (1998): "Marco Polo and His 'Travels'". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 61.1: 82–101.

Kieffer, J.D., Bianchi, T. X. (1837): *Dictionnaire Turc-Français, à l'usage des agents diplomatiques et consulaires, des Commerçants, des Navigateurs et Autres Voyageurs dans le Levant*, vol. 2. Paris.

King, Anya H. (2017): *Scent from the Garden of Paradise: Musk and the Medieval Islamic World*. Leiden/Boston.

Laufer, Berthold (1917): *The Beginnings of Porcelain in China* (Field Museum of Natural History, Publication 192). Chicago.

Lev, Efraim, Amar, Zohar (2008): *Practical* Materia Medica *of the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean according to the Cairo Genizah*. Leiden/Boston.

Li Rong 李榮/Li Rulong 李如龍/Pan Weishui 潘渭水 (eds.) (1998): *Jian'ou Fangyan Cidian* 建甌方言詞典. Nanjing.

Libbrecht, Ulrich (1973): *Chinese Mathematics in the Thirteenth Century: The Shu-shu Chiu-chang of Ch'in Chiu-shao*. Cambridge, MA/London.

Lieu, Samuel N. C. (1995): "From Parthian into Chinese: The Transmission of Manichaean Texts in Central Asia". *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 90.4: 357–370.

Lin Liantong 林連通 (ed.) (1993): *Quanzhoushi Fangyan Zhi* 泉州市方言志. Beijing.

Marsden, William (1811): *The History of Sumatra, Containing an Account of the Government, Laws, Customs, and Manners of the Native Inhabitants, with a Description of the Natural Productions, and a Relation of the Ancient Political State of that Island*, 3rd edn. London.

McCormick, Michael (2001): *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, A.D. 300–900*. Cambridge.

Ménard, Philippe (2009): Les Mots Orientaux dans le Texte de Marco Polo. *Romance Philology* 63: 87–135.

Moule, A. C. (1957): *Quinsai, with Other Notes on Marco Polo*. Cambridge.

Müller, F. W. K. (1904): Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinesisch-Turkistan. II Teil". *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*: 1–117.

Odoric (2010): *Le voyage en Asie d'Odoric de Pordenone*, traduit par Jean Le Long OSB, *Itineraire de la Peregrinacion et du voyaige* (1351); Edition critique par Alvise Andreose et Philippe Ménard. Genève.

Olschki, Leonardo (1960): *Marco Polo's Asia: An Introduction to His "Description of the World" Called "Il Milione"*, translated by John A Scott and revised by the author. Berkeley/Los Angeles.

Orsatti, Paola (2003): "«Turco» e «Persiano» nell'Europa del Rinascimento e la Questione della Lingua Franca in Asia". In *Turcica et Islamica: Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta*. Edited by U. Marazzi, vol. 2. Napoli: 677–705.

Ouyang Xiu (2004): *Historical Records of the Five Dynasties*, translated, with an introduction, by Richard L. Davis. New York.

Pelliot, Paul (1912): Kao-Tch'ang, Qoco, Houo-Tcheou Et Qarâ-Khodja. *Journal Asiatique* 10.19: 579–603.

Pelliot, Paul (1959–1973): *Notes on Marco Polo: Ouvrage Posthume*, 3 vols Paris.

Phillips, George (1890): "The Identity of Marco Polo's Zaitun with Changchau". *T'oung Pao* 1: 218–238.

Platearius (1913): *Le Livre des Simples Medecines*, traduction française du *Liber de simplici medicina dictus Circa instans*, tirée d'un manuscrit du XIIIe siècle (Ms 3113 de la Bibliothèque Ste. Geneviève de Paris) et publiée pour la première fois par le Docteur Paul Dorveaux. Paris.

Playfair, G. M. H. (1910): *The Cities and Towns of China: A Geographical Dictionary*, 2nd edn. Shanghai.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1991), *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.

Qin Qixiu (2014): "A Probe into the Negative Impact of Sichuan Dialect on English Phonetics Learning and Countermeasures". *Studies in Literature and Language* 9.2: 16–19.

Qiu Yihao, (2012): "Mongolian or Turkish? Note on a Political Term Used in Mongol Court". In: *Uluslararasi Türk-Iran Dil Ve Edebiyat Ilişkileri Sempozyumu*, Istanbul Üniversitesi ve Allame Tabatabai Üniversitesi. Istanbul.

Räsänen, Martti (1969): *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*. Helsinki.

Redhouse, J. W. (1880): *Redhouse's Turkish Dictionary, in Two Parts, English and Turkish, and Turkish and English*, 2nd edn, revised and enlarged by Charles Wells, vol. 1. London.

Ridgway, Benjamin B. (2014): "Two Halls of Hangzhou: Local Gazetteeers and the Grading of Geography for a Song Dynasty City". *Frontiers of Literary Studies in China* 8.2: 225–252.

Sigerist, Henry E. (1923): *Studien und Texte zur frühmittelalterlichen Rezeptliteratur*. Leipzig.

Tan Qixiang 譚其驤 (ed.) (1996): *Zhongguo lishi ditu ji* 中國歷史地圖集, vol. 7, *Yuan, Ming shiqi* 元, 明時期. Beijing.

Thomsen, Vilhelm (1924): Altürkische Inschriften aus der Mongolei in Übersetzung und mit Einleitung. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 78: 121–175.

Vogel, Hans Ulrich (2013): *Marco Polo* Was *in China: New Evidence from Currencies, Salts and Revenues*. Leiden/Boston.

Waley, Arthur (1931): *The Travels of an Alchemist: The Journey of the Taoist Ch'ang-ch'un from China to the Hindukush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan*. London.

Xiong Zhenghui 熊正輝 et al. (eds.) (2012): *Zhongguo yuyan ditu ji* 中國語言地圖集: *Language Atlas of China* (2nd edn), *Hanyu fangyan juan* 漢語方言卷. Beijing.

Yoshinobu, Shiba (1970): *Commerce and Society in Sung China*, translated by Mark Elvin. Ann Arbor.

Yule, Henry (1913–1916): *Cathay and the Way Thither: Being a Collection of Medieval Notices of China*, translated and Edited by Colonel Sir Henry Yule, new edn, revised by Henri Cordier, 4 vols. London.

Zheng Yi 鄭弋 (2004): "*tiunguy* Ji 'Fengzhou' — Dui « Make • Boluo Xing Ji » Zhong Yi Dimingde Kaozheng; *Tiunguy* 即 '豐州' — 對 « 馬可 • 波羅行記 » 中一地名的考證". *Lishi Jiaoxue* 歷史教學 483: 38–45.

Zhu Tiequan et al. (2012): "Study on the Provenance of Xicun Qingbai Wares from the Northern Song Dynasty of China". *Archaeometry* 54.3: 475–488.