

genealogical tables]). HAMMER (*Ha*¹, I, 284), speaking of events of 1278-1279, in which « Nigudarian bands » took part, adds that these were formed of the former troops of the Čayatai prince « Niguder » after that prince's death, and that they were a rabble of Šul, Mongol, Türkmän, and Kurd bandits. YULE has already noted that HAMMER gives no authority for the origin of the « Nigudarian bands » (*Y*, I, 103), but accepts (*Y*, I, 102) HAMMER's data as to their motley ethnical constituents. The statement that the « Nigudarian bands » were formed of the subordinates of Čayatai's grandson Nägüdär (or Tägüdär) who, after his disgrace, had retired to Seistan, appears also in D'OHSSON (*Oh*, III, 516), whose authority is here Waśśāf (in a section not yet translated); but in D'OHSSON, more reliable than HAMMER, the Šul, Mongol, Türkmän and Kurd people, instead of forming the « Nigudarian bands », are the troops of the province of Fars who try to oppose their inroad. There is nevertheless some contradiction in D'OHSSON's text when he says first, quoting Rašid, that « Nägüdär »'s troops were incorporated in 1269 into Abaya's army and that « Nägüdär » himself, according to Waśśāf, was put under the custody of the *noyan* « Couroumisch » (*Oh*, III, 435; read « Qurumši », and cf. *TP*, 1938, 150-152), and later, referring to Waśśāf again, represents « Nägüdär » as being no longer in bondage and, having settled in Seistan with his « vassals », as being strong enough to constitute the « Nigudarian bands » (*Oh*, III, 516). It is not easy to find one's way through the untranslated portions of Waśśāf, and I am not able to say anything more on this point for the present, except that according to Rašid (*Bl*, II, 159; and in the history of Abaya, *BN*, Pers. 209, f. 301 a), Čayatai's grandson used to be present in the Imperial camp (*ordu*) of Abaya until he died; the death of Nägüdär or Tägüdär must then have taken place before 1281.

All modern scholars have taken for granted that the name of Čayatai's grandson was Nägüdär, not Täküdär; Rašid (*Bl*, II, 158) adds to his name an epithet *بنده* of doubtful reading (? Yäbä = Jäbä; cf. also *Bl*, II, 167); the epithet « Aghul » or « Oghlan » in *Y*, I, 103, is of course Turk. « *oyul* » or « *oylan* », « son », with the meaning of « prince » (cf. *Pe*, 168). But here again we are not on safe ground. In 1595, Abū'l-Fazl speaks of the Hazāra of Afghanistan as the descendants of the Čayatai troops sent by Mongka with Hülägü under the command of Nägüdär-oylan, and YULE has said (*Y*, I, 103) that Čayatai's grandson is evidently the man to whom Abū'l-Fazl alludes. But YULE has omitted two words (« his son »); Abū'l-Fazl expressly states that this Nägüdär-oylan is Hülägü's son (GLADWIN, *Ayeen Akbery*, II, 163; JARRETT, *The Āin i Akbari*, II, 401-402), that is to say he mistakes him for the *ilkhan* Aḥmad, originally named Tägüdär, but misread as Nägüdär in most Persian histories (see « *Acmat*² »). When Thomas HERBERT, in 1628, saw at Kāšān a tomb which was said to be that of « Nycador-Oglan the Usurper » (ed. W. FOSTER, 219, and cf. *TP*, 1930, 439), the epithet implies that he believed it to be that of Aḥmad-Tägüdär, for whose name he thus uses the same form as Abū'l-Fazl. The form of the name of Čayatai's grandson would seem to be settled by RAMSTEDT's sentence about Mongols of the present day still inquiring about the fate of the army of this grandson « Nukodar »; but with all due respect for RAMSTEDT's Mongol scholarship, I am afraid that there is some misunderstanding here. The Mongols of Mongolia, as far as I am aware, have no direct tradition about the Čayatai troops which were sent with Hülägü to Persia; if some of them know even of their former existence (and one would wish more precise information on the point), the knowledge must have come to them through Mussulman authors,