

it came into common use has not been ascertained. Nevertheless, it goes pretty far back, and its use under the Sung is proved by *Yü-ti chi-shêng*, 124, and in 1225 by Chao Ju-kua (*HR*, 175-190).

In the Mongol period, from about 1278, Hai-nan was officially associated with 海北 Hai-pei, «North of the Sea», in the title of a commissioner (*hsüan-wei-ssü*) named «Commissioner of North of the Sea and South of the Sea», who was stationed on the mainland, at Lei-chou (*YS*, 63, 7 b-8 a). And already in the beginning of 1279, we find an edict mentioning «the districts (*chün*) of Ch'ung, Yai and Wan of South of the Sea»; these districts were all in the island of Hai-nan. The popular name thus fell in with the official designation. Hai-nan by itself is referred to in 1329 (*YS*, 33, 5 b), and a work of 1349-1350 speaks of «cottons of Champa and Hai-nan» (*TP*, 1915, 123). So Polo was amply justified in applying the name to the whole Gulf of Tonking which, with the island of Hai-nan, was the «South of the Sea» section of the Lei-chou Commissariat.

The Catalan Map of 1375 shows the island of «Caynam», with the correct form of the distorted name as it appears in Z and R; BUCHON took it to be the Andaman Islands, but the true identification with Hainan has already been adopted in *Y*¹, I, 301, and CORDIER, *L'Extrême-Orient dans l'Atlas Catalan*, 10, 23-24, 45. Opposite the island and on the mainland, the Catalan Map has an important town, with the legend: *Cjutat de caynã açj finis catayo*. The second part of this corroborates the identification, as Hai-nan is the southernmost portion of China. But the city of Caynã = Caynam raises a difficult problem. CORDIER disposed of it by saying that the city was a fancy of the cartographer. The question is not so simple.

Rašidu-'d-Din mentions in *Kafjäh-guh*, i. e. Chiao-chih-kuo, Tonking (see «Caugigu»), two towns neither of which has been satisfactorily identified. BLOCHET (*Bl*, II, 499), following QUATREMÈRE (*Hist. des Mongols*, xcv; cf. also *Y*¹, III, 30), reads one of the names as حِينَام Hāinam; but while QUATREMÈRE took this name to be that of the island of Hai-nan, BLOCHET identifies his Hāinam with «Qainam», marked in MARTINI's *Atlas Sinensis* as a town of «Kiaochi, sive Couchinchina». The reading of the name in Rašid is doubtful. D'OHSSON (*Oh*, II, 640) adopted hypothetically «Djessam»; BLOCHET's mss. write حِصَام, صِيَام and صِنَام; *h* is of rare occurrence in Rašid's transcriptions of Mongolian and Chinese names, and one might think of readings like *Činam, etc. Nevertheless, Hāinam is probably correct. YULE (*Y*¹, III, 131) has already quoted from the first edition of the first volume of ELLIOT's *History of India* a passage where Rašid describes a sea-route from India to China by way of Champa, «Haitam» subject to the Great Khan, and Mahačin (= Canton). «Haitam» YULE took hypothetically for Hai-nan, and this was confirmed in ELLIOT's revised edition of the first volume (p. 71), where we find Hāinam, not Hāitam.

Of course, MARTINI is no authority for Indo-China; his second-hand information of the 17th cent. carries no weight for the 13th or 14th; and there was no city of «Qainam» south of Tourane in his time. But MARTINI never meant to locate a «Qainam» in Annam. In his system of spelling, *q* is always followed by *u*, and in spite of a blurred engraving, the form he meant is in fact «Quinam», that is to say, the name then given in European documents to Annam in general, or to the port of Faifo; cf. *Bull. des amis du Vieux Huê*, I, 337-340, 347-351; *BEFEO*, xxxvi, 114.

But the curious case of the «city» of the Catalan Map remains unexplained. The tradition of such a city lingered for two centuries. In 1554, Sidi 'Alī Čälābī mentions a port of اِينَم Aīnam