

to be the non-Mussulmans, among whom there were many Christians. It is in fact quite possible that the Nestorians of Kāšyar were to a great extent Uighurs, who may have still used the Uighur writing instead of the Arabic script of the Mohammedans. In any case, « Among the Turks in this land... » is a correction, not a translation.

Syriac documents testify to the importance of the Nestorian community at Kāšyar. A list of the Nestorian metropolitan sees dating from the middle of the 13th cent. gives as the nineteenth see « Kāšgar » and as the twenty-fifth « Kāsemgar and Nuāketh »; another list of c. 1349 gives as the nineteenth see « Tark » (read « Turk ») instead of « Kāšgar » and as the twenty-fifth see « Kašimghar » and « Navaketh » (cf. *Y*¹, III, 22-24; *Br*, II, 47; Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, 71-72; *Mo*, 21). There can be no doubt that a wrong duplication has taken place, and probably Kāšyar occurs only as the twenty-fifth see, or rather as one of the two seats of that see (such double seats of bishoprics or archbishoprics often occur in the Nestorian church). « Nuāketh » or « Navaketh » is of course a place the Iranian name of which means « New City ». The *Hudūd al-Ālam* mentions a city Navākat in the neighbourhood of Tūnkat, in the valley of the Chu River. MINORSKY (*Mi*, 289) correctly identified Tūnkat with the 頓建 Tun-chien (Tūnkānt) of Chinese texts, but could not locate Navākat. It is however evident that it is the 新城 Hsin-ch'êng of Chinese texts, 60 li east of Tūnkat, the name of which means « New City » (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 10). But this « New City » is in Russian Turkestan, and the joint see of Kāšyar might be expected to be entirely in Chinese Turkestan. In the *Hudūd al-Ālam*, a city « Navījkath » is mentioned « on the bank of the river », after other places in the region of the Lop-Nōr. MINORSKY (*Mi*, 234-235) has felt some hesitation as to its location, but rightly recognized that it was a Sogdian form, Nōč-kāθ, « New City », and thought of the old Sogdian colony south of the Lop-Nōr to which I have devoted a short paper in *JA*, 1916, I, 111-123. But it escaped him that in my paper (p. 119, 121-122), there were two mentions in the Lop region of a city 新城 Hsin-ch'êng, « New City », also called 弩支城 Nu-chih-ch'êng, « Nu-chih City ». *Nu-chih* must be a rendering of *nōč*, and the whole Sogdian name must have been Nōč-kāθ. One of the Chinese texts is of c. 750, the other of the end of the 8th cent., while the *Hudūd al-Ālam* was completed in 982-983. The « New City » had been founded by Sogdian immigrants south of the Lop-Nōr in the first half of the 7th cent. Although we cannot follow its history after the 10th cent., it is quite possible that, owing to its Sogdian origin, it remained a partly Christian centre for several centuries longer, and was with Kāšyar the joint seat of the Nestorian metropolitan see in the Tarim basin. « Nuāketh » or « Navaketh » would represent the Persian form of the Sogdian Nōč-kāθ. The only difficulty is that, with the exception of the Syriac list (if the identification be correct), we have no other mention of the city in the Mongol period, at least under that name.

As to « Kašimghar » or « Kāsemgar », something must have gone wrong with the text. The form Kāšyar, which I have quoted above from early Mohammedan authors, is also the only one used in the Mongol period by Ĵuwainī, Rašīdu-'d-Dīn, Waśśāf, the author of *Nuzhat-al-Qulūb*, etc. What is more, the Syriac writers were aware of it. Not only have we « Kāšgar », correctly written, though wrongly inserted in the Syriac list of the middle of the 13th cent., but the name occurs for instance in the history of Mār Yahbalaha III (cf. BUDGE, *The Monks of Kublāi Khān*, 139 : « Kashkār »). It seems impossible that the Nestorian patriarchate should not have had a