

speed to Ta-tu (*i.e.* to Cambalu). On receiving Poh-lo's report, the Emperor became convinced of the deceptions practised upon him by Achmed, and said: "It was a good thing that Wang Chu *did* kill him." In 1284 Achmed's successor is stated (chap. 209, p. 9½) to have recommended Poh-lo, amongst others, for minor Treasury posts. The same man (chap. 209, p. 12½) subsequently got Poh-lo appointed to a salt superintendency in the provinces; and as Yang-chou is the centre of the salt trade, it is just possible that Marco's 'governorship' of that place may resolve itself into this.

"There are many other Puh-lo and Poh-lo mentioned, both before Marco's arrival in, and subsequently to Marco's departure in 1292 from, China. In several cases (as, for instance, in that of P. Timur) both forms occur in different chapters for the same man; and a certain Tartar called 'Puh-lan Hi' is also called 'Puh-lo Hi.' One of Genghis Khan's younger brothers was called Puh-lo Kadei. There was, moreover, a Cathayan named Puh-lo, and a Naiman Prince Poh-lo. Whether 'Puh-lo the Premier' or 'one of the Ministers,' mentioned in 1282, is the same person as 'Poh-lo the *ts'an chêng*,' or 'Prime Minister's assistant' of 1284, I cannot say. Perhaps, when the whole *Yüan Shih* has been thoroughly searched throughout in all its editions, we may obtain more certain information. Meanwhile, one thing is plain: Pauthier is wrong, Yule is wrong in that particular connection; and M. Cordier gives us no positive view of his own. The other possibilities are given above, but I scarcely regard any of them as probabilities. On p. 99 of his Introduction, Colonel Yule manifestly identifies the Poh-lo of 1282 with Marco; but the identity of his title with that of Puh-lo in 1277 suggests that the two men are one, in which case neither can be Marco Polo. On p. 422 of Vol. I. Yule repeats this identification in his notes. I may mention that much of the information given in the present article was published in Vol. XXIV. of the *China Review* two or three years ago. I notice that M. Cordier quotes that volume in connection with other matters, but this particular point does not appear to have caught his eye.

"As matters now stand, there is a fairly strong presumption that Marco Polo is *once* named in the Annals; but there is no irrefragable evidence; and in any case it is only this once, and not as Pauthier has it."

Cf. also note by Prof. E. H. Parker, *China Review*, XXV. pp. 193-4, and, according to Prof. Pelliot (*Bul. Ecole franç. Ext.*