

form, while the Mongols pronounce *Ḥamil*. In a Sogdian document of the first centuries of our era (end of 2nd cent.?), *Km'yδ*, which can be read as **Kamēl*, seems to furnish the first mention of the native name (cf. *TP*, 1931, 460). There is a huge gap between that first occurrence and the second example, found in 1050-1052 in the Persian account of *Gardēzī*; this time the name is written *قامل* *Qāmūl* (cf. BARTHOLD, *Otčēt o komandirovké*, 92, 117; *Mi*, 229). The same spelling occurs in 1340 in the *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* (transl. LE STRANGE, 249). In 1420, *Šāh-Rūḥ*'s envoys passed through *قامل* *Qāmūl* (or *Qāmīl*?; cf. QUATREMÈRE, in *Not. et Extr.*, XIV, I, 310, 389; *Y*¹, I, 273); they found there side by side a mosque and a Buddhist temple. Marignolli made a number of converts at «*Kamul*» (*Wy*, 550). The Catalan Map writes «*Camull*»; Fra Mauro, «*Chamul*» (HALLBERG, 108). RAMUSIO's informant «*Chajji Memet*» mentioned *Camul* (RAMUSIO, II, *Dichiaratione*, 16^o; *Y*¹, I, 293). Benedict Goës stayed one month at *Camul* in 1606 (*Y*¹, IV, 239). «*Hamil*» appears on RENAT's Map I (cf. BADDELEY, *Russia, Mongolia, China* [1919], I, ccii). The existence of a Nestorian bishopric of *Qomul* («*Camula*»), whose occupant was present at the inauguration of the *Catholicos Denha* in 1266, is mentioned as probable by YULE (I, 211), and given as established in SAEKI, *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China*, 1937, chart facing p. 348, but omitted from HERRMANN, *Atlas of China*, map 45; and would require substantiating. The source is a list in ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II, 455-456, and the name may be corrupt or refer to another place.

Qomul occurs on the Chinese map of c. 1330, in the form 合木里 *Ha-mu-li* (*Br*, II, 20), but as it is not included in the dominions of the house of *Čayatai*, it is not listed at the end of *YS*, 63, nor is it mentioned by T'u Chi, 160.

The name is repeatedly mentioned in the *YS*, though written in different ways. BRETSCHNEIDER said (*Br*, II, 20, 21) that the modern form *Ha-mi* occurred in ch. 122, in the biography of the *īdīqut* *Barčuq-art-tegin*, and CORDIER repeated it in *Y*, I, 211. But this is a mistake. The form in *YS*, 122, 2 a, is 哈密力 *Ha-mi-li*, *Qamīl* (with the wrong information that *Ha-mi-li* lay south of *Qarā-ḥōjō*). I have not so far been able to find the form *Ha-mi* before the Ming dynasty; but it is the only one used in the account of the mission of *Ch'ên Ch'êng* in 1414 (*Hsi-yü hsing-ch'êng chi*, ed. of the Peiping National Library, 4 a) and in the companion work, equally the work of *Ch'ên Ch'êng*, entitled *Hsi-yü fan-kuo chih* (same edition, 20 a-b).

The most usual transcription of the name in *YS* in 合迷里 *Ha-mi-li*, *Qamīl* (合 *ho* always stands for 哈 *ha* in the proper names of the Mongol period), occurring first in 1286 (*YS*, 14, 4 a and b, perhaps also 8 b), then in 1294 (*YS*, 18, 2 a : «*Tegin-tāngrim of Ha-mi-li*»), in 1303 (*YS*, 21, 1 b) and in 1304 (*YS*, 21, 6 a). Other transcriptions are 合迷裏 *Ha-mi-li* in 1288 (*YS*, 15, 5 b), 渴密里 *K'o-mi-li* (*YS*, 133, 3 a), and 罕勉力 *Han-mien-li* which I had noted, but cannot now trace. All these are based on *Qamīl*. But 合木里 *Ha-mu-li* in 1289 (*YS*, 15, 7 a), 合木裏 *Ha-mu-li* also in 1289 (*YS*, 50, 11 a), 甘木里 *Kan-mu-li* in 1290 (*YS*, 16, 1 a) and 感木魯 *Kan-mu-lu*, the motherland of a Uighur monk (*YS*, 202, 2 a), are transcriptions of *Qamul*. A 合馬里 *Ha-ma-li* of *YS*, 8, 4 b, may represent a different name. The 含伊羅 *Han-i-lo* (**Ham-i-lo*) mentioned in a preface of 1270 and a colophon of 1277 (*Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 寒 VI, 114 b, 124 a) renders *Qamīl*, our «*Camul*», but with a curious syllabic division. It is also *Qamīl* which is miswritten 阿模里 *A-mu-li* (for *K'o*[柯]-*mu-li*?) in the Chinese map of c. 1330 (cf. *Br*, II,