

## 315. PINGIU

*pangiu* Ft*pigni* TA<sup>1</sup>*pigui* Vr, TA<sup>1r</sup>*piguy* FA*pinçu* Z*pingiu* F*pingui* Fr, LT, TA<sup>1</sup>, V, VB*pinguy* FA, FB*piugiu* L*pogui* TA<sup>3</sup>

Although some secondary Mss. lead to « Pigiū », the best, in particular F and Z, have *pin-*, and I accept that Polo possibly used « Pingiu »; « Pigiū » would be \*Pigiū > Pigiū; Fra Mauro writes « Pinzu » (cf. *Zu*, 36; HALLBERG, 409). Nevertheless, I do not doubt that Polo ought to have called it « Pigiū », and that the Chinese original, as has long been agreed, is 邠州 P'ei-chou (one might think of an original \*Puigiū, but it would be an unattested dialectical pronunciation, as there does not seem to have been a labial semi-vowel in the mediaeval pronunciation of that particular character). But most commentators are mistaken when they identify it with the modern P'ei-chou, much too far to the north-east, and not on the road which followed what was the course of the Huang-ho from 1324 to 1853. CHARIGNON (*Ch*, III, 23-25) says very justly that Polo's P'ei-chou is the old P'ei-chou, on the northern bank of the old river, at about three-fifths of the distance between Hsü-chou and Su-ch'ien. The seat of P'ei-chou was only moved north-east in 1689. It is the new P'ei-chou which is wrongly called « Old P'ei-chou » (« Kieou Pi-tcheou », Chiu-P'ei-chou) on D'ANVILLE's map; but Chinese maps place « Old P'ei-chou » correctly.

P'ei-chou was a *chou* in the beginning of the T'ang; suppressed later, it was re-established by the Chin and remained a *chou* throughout the whole of the Yüan dynasty (YS, 59, 7a).

## 316. PONTE OF VENESE

*ponte de ueniexia* V

The name occurs only in V, a 15th cent. Ms. in Venetian, very corrupt, but going back to a lost original of great value; moreover, the present passage seems to have left traces in RAMUSIO (cf. *B*, 4). Although Ponte of Venice has been introduced by BENEDETTO into his text, no information is given about him either in *RR*, 430, nor in *B*<sup>1</sup>, 446. It would be of great importance, however, to know something of the man, since V says that he was the official representative of Venice (*podestà*) at Constantinople when the two elder Polos started for the Crimea; and some details as to his years of office would help to settle the long-debated problem of the date of departure of the elder Polos. Unfortunately, I do not know of any list of the Venetian official representatives at Constantinople in the 13th-14th cents., such as the one which was compiled for those of Genoa.

At any rate, owing to Sir Percival David who kindly provided me with photographs of the pages