

have here the name of the people of Mosul; perhaps they owed it to their commercial activities abroad that they were widely known in the West, and that may be the reason why they are given a special mention in the Papal documents.

290. MULECTE

<i>melete</i> LT	<i>mulecte</i> F, L	<i>mulette</i> FA, FB
<i>milect</i> F	<i>mulehet</i> R	<i>muleze</i> V
<i>milicie</i> TA ¹ , TA ³	<i>mulete</i> P; G	<i>mulhee</i> Z
<i>mollete</i> VA	<i>muleto, nulleto</i> VB	<i>nilicie</i> (?) TA ³

Although, with the exception of « Horiat », I find no case in Polo's nomenclature when *h* is used alone, and not in the combinations *ch*, *gh*, or *th*, the form « Mulehet » of R is so good that I might well have adopted it. It is already in Y, I, 139, and is accepted in RR, 49 (the name has been dropped accidentally from the Index). Prof. BENEDETTO (B¹, 445) writes « Muleete » and adds « not identified; the conjectures proposed until now have no sufficient foundation ». « Muleete » is not bad in itself, but I cannot understand the remark that follows. There is not the slightest doubt that Polo's « Mulehet », as before him Rubrouck's « Mulihet » (so we must read in Wy, I, 210, 287, despite QUATREMÈRE and ROCKHILL) and King Hethum's « Mulhed » (Br, I, 171), and even probably after him, Odoric's distorted « Millistorte » (Wy, I, 488), represent the name constantly given to the Ismailians by Mussulman writers of the time, *mulhid*, pl. *mulāhidah*, « heretic »; Benjamin of Tudela writes « Mōlahāt » (*Mém. Ac. des Inscr.*, IV [1818], 23); the Georgians write « Mulid » (BROSSET, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, I, I, 511, 530); Kirakos gives in Armenian « Mela-hid » (PATKANOV, *Ist. Mongolov*, II, 8, 113); the equivalence has already been proposed by QUATREMÈRE (*Hist. des Mong.*, 122), PAUTHIER (*Pa*, 97), YULE (Y, I, 141-142).

This name is the only one under which the Chinese texts know the Ismailians, although it is written in different ways (they do not know « Asciscin », *q. v.*; see also « Viel de la montagne »); and, like Polo, they make it the name of the country. The main texts are :

1° (*Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, ed. WANG Kouo-wei, 62) : In *jên-wu* (1222), « the Emperor (= Chinghiz-khan) sent an envoy to instruct the fourth prince (= Tolui) to come back quickly; as he had to pass through the kingdom of 木刺奚 *Mu-la-hsi* (*Mulāhidah*), he devastated it greatly » (cf. Br, I, 292, where « Mu-la-di » is a misprint for « Mu-la-hi »).

2° (YS, I, 9 a) : In *jên-wu* (1222), the Imperial Prince Tolui, « on coming back passed through the kingdom of 木刺夷 *Mu-la-yi* (*Mulāhidah*) and devastated it greatly ».

3° (YS, 2, 1 a) : In the first year [of T'ai-tsung, Ögödäi] (1231), « the chief of the kingdom of Yin-tu (India) and the chief of the kingdom of 木羅夷 *Mu-lo-yi* (*Mulūhidah*) came and rendered homage to the Court ».