

between Šanbā (Champa) and the Gate of China, and this is likely to be Hai-nan (cf. *Fe*, 501, 684; *Instr. naut.* III, 165-166); at that period, the initial *h-* (*h-*) of Chinese names was sometimes dropped in transcriptions, as in the Portuguese *aytāo* instead of **haytāo*, 海道 *hai-tao*, « sea-commissioner » (cf. DALGADO, *Glossário Luso-Asiático*, I, 18²).

It seems difficult to separate the names given by Rašīd, in the Catalan Map, and last by Sīdī 'Alī, although their use of these names may be somewhat different. It is possible that a port on the island of Hai-nan is meant by Sīdī 'Alī, if that port was then a regular port of call for the Mussulmans. If the « city » of the Catalan Map has not been placed on the mainland by mistake, it ought to be Lei-chou, and we must then suppose that the seat of the Commissariat, although on the mainland and consequently « North of the Sea », had come to be popularly named « South of the Sea », because the « South of the Sea » districts of the Commissariat were the most active in foreign trade. Either of the two values would do for Rašīd's sea itinerary from India to China. But the Persian historian must be mistaken when, elsewhere, he makes Hāinam a city of Annam-Tonking and not of China, unless in this last case our reading of Hāinam be itself an error.

141. CHISCI

achisi, quinsi LT

altriso, quisai S

chis, chysci Z

chisci Z, V, L

chisi F, FA, TA¹, LT, P, V, VA, VL, S; R

chisin, quixi VA

chisti R

chisy FA

chysi FB

cisy, cysi, quiz FB

ochoisi VB

risi VL

qisci F, L, Z

quis FA, L

quysi G

The island of Kīš. The mss. authorize only « Chisci », but I think « *Chisce » has a fair chance of being the original spelling, of the same type as « Abasce », « Chescemir ». In any case, I prefer « Chisci » to the « Kisi » of *RR*, 425, and the « Chisi » of *B*¹, 441.

The Persian form is كيش Kīš, in Arabic قيس Qīs and more often Qāis; cf. BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *Dict. hist.* 468, 499; it seems that the Arabic pronunciation Qāis is now the usual one. « Guase » and « Kena » of *Y*¹, I, 144, « Ghes » and « Kenn » of *Y*, I, 64, and of *Y*¹, I, 145, « Geise » or « Kena » of *Br*, II, 130, « Ghez » or « Kem » of *RR*, 425, do not exist as names of the island (cf. DAMES, *Barbosa*, I, 80-81). Polo speaks of Kīš from hearsay, and not very accurately (cf. *Y*, I, 65; II, 452-453); for mediaeval mentions of Kīš, cf. also *Fe*, 68, 389; *LS*, 257; and the notice « Qais » of *EI*, by STRECK.

The island of 記施 Chi-shih, Kīš, was described by Chao Ju-kua in 1225 (*HR*, 117, 133-134). The Chinese map of c. 1330 and the corresponding list of *YS*, 63, 16 *b*, name 怯失 Ch'ieh-shih, Keš (= Kīš); cf. *Br*, II, 129-130.

Guillaume Adam, in 1316-1318, mentions « Chyx » (= Kīš), wrongly identified with Kīšm in the Introduction (*Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, CXCI, 553).