

perhaps it is an adjectival form in *-tu, -du*, of a Mong. dialectical *bai* for *bayan*, «rich» (the Turk. form is *baī*); or it may be another form of the more common Baiju (itself unexplained). Hethum (*Hist. des Crois., Arm., II, 189-190, 315*) writes «Baydo».

Baidu, grandson of Hülägü and son of Taraqai («the Bald»), offended by Gāihatu (see «Quiacatu»), rebelled against him, and the *il Khan* was put to death on April 21, 1295. On May 6 (?) Baidu ascended the throne but, after five months, was overcome and on October 5, 1295 killed by Aryun's son Ghazan (see «Cačan»).

In *YS, 107, 7 b*, a king 亦憐眞八的 I-lien-chên-pa-ti is mentioned as the great-great-grandson of Hülägü, great-grandson of I-lien-chên-to-êrh-chih, Mong. Iränjin-dorji (< Tib. Rin-chen rdo-rje), grandson of T'o-t'o-mu-êrh (\*Toq-tömür = \*Toq-temür?), the name of I-lien-chên-pa-ti's father remaining unknown. There is of course something wrong in this filiation. Iränjin-dorji is another name of Gāihatu (see «Quiacatu»), who was Abaya's son and Aryun's younger brother; so he was a grandson, not a son, of Hülägü, and such is the case also of Baidu. Accordingly there is very little possibility of identifying I-lien-chên-pa-ti, the would-be great-grandson of Iränjin-dorji, with Baidu, as has been attempted by T'u Chi, 71, 5 a, and 148, 57 b, 59 b, since both are cousins of the same generation. Moreover, T'u Chi has laboured under the misconception that *pa-ti* of I-lien-chên-pa-ti could be a transcription of Baidu; wrong Western sources make him write «Kärlägä» for Baidu's father instead of Taraqai, and he believes that *i-lien-chên* is another transcription of *öljāi*. Although I do not believe in BLOCHET's «Ratnapati» (*Introduction, 226*), it is clear that the name is to be taken as a whole, perhaps a Mongol-Tibetanized form of Ratnapāla (cf. a Ratnapāla in *YS, 106, 1 b*) or Ratnabhadra. I do not know who he is.

Baidu is said by Bar Hebraeus and in the «Life» of Mār Yahbalaha III (cf. CHABOT, *Hist. de Mar Jabalaha III, 106*) to have been very well disposed towards the Christians, but we have no reason to believe that he was a Christian himself, as Polo says. Nevertheless his fall seems to have been due in great measure to the hatred of the Mussulmans, who resented his sympathy towards the adverse creed.

For Gāihātū's death (Baidu's accession to the throne took place a few days later), I have adopted the date of April 21, 1295, although D'OHSSON (*Oh, IV, 113*) and BROWNE (*Hist. of Pers. Lit., III, 39*) who both, on the authority of Mussulman sources, say that it was a Thursday, give April 23, 1295; but April 23 was a Saturday. On the other hand, HAMMER (*Ha<sup>1</sup>, I, 408*), followed by *Y, I, 38*, and *B<sup>1</sup>, 440*, gives March 24, 1295, which is a Thursday, but HAMMER has confounded Jumāda I with Jumāda II. The correct equivalents are given by BARTHOLD, *EI, s. v. «Baīdū»*. The «Life» of Mār Yahbalaha (CHABOT, 104, 105) says that Baidu remained on the throne from April 24 to September 25, 1295; we would have lent more weight to this text if it did not include the qualifying words «more or less». But even with a possible error of a few days in the dates I have adopted, it is clear that Maqrīzī (QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks, II, II, 26*) and Abū-'l-Ghāzī (*Ha<sup>1</sup>, II, 30*) are wrong when they attribute roughly eight months to Baidu's reign instead of five. Moreover, the term «seven months and ten days» given by HAMMER is a mistake even with his own dates.