

and consequently would carry no weight in so far as the true form of the name, Nāgūdār or Tāgūdār, is concerned. The confusion was moreover too easy. Only a dot differentiates the two names; both princes had their name followed by the epithet «oyul» or «oylan»; even in their history there are some common points. Aḥmad-Tāgūdār also does not seem to have always been on good terms with his brother Abaya; and just as Čayatai's grandson sought refuge in Georgia, Aḥmad-Tāgūdār, on Abaya's death in 1281, came to the Imperial camp straight from Georgia (cf. Rašīdu-'d-Dīn's unpublished account of Aḥmad's reign). In some cases, I suspect that texts which have been taken as referring to Čayatai's grandson really concern Aḥmad-Tāgūdār. We should have a somewhat safer basis in this respect if it were true that as HAMMER has it (*Ha*¹, I, 322) Aḥmad-Tāgūdār had remained in Mongolia and was sent to Persia by Qubilai under Abaya's reign, that is to say after 1265; but although we know that Hülāgü had only taken with him, when he started for the West, his two elder sons Abaya and Yošmut (QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, 147), I cannot trace the origin of HAMMER's statement about Qubilai and Abaya.

Apart from occasional confusions between Aḥmad-Tāgūdār and the grandson of Čayatai in late Persian texts and among Western scholars, the form of the name of Čayatai's grandson requires further investigation. While Aḥmad-Tāgūdār's name is generally written Nāgūdār in Persian sources, the name of Čayatai's grandson occurs twice in Ĵuwainī, and the readings of the best mss. are once تگودار Tāgūdār (III, 91) and once نگودار Nāgūdār (III, 107); and it is also Tāgūdār which we find in a parallel passage of Abū'l-Faraġ, drawing in fact from Ĵuwainī (*Hist. Dynast.*, ed. POCOKE, text, 503; transl., 329). But there is something more, which has been overlooked by YULE and others. Čayatai's grandson, when he revolted against Abaya, went to Georgia, where he fought long enough to become well known to the Georgians; the Georgian chronicle has a long account of all these events, with many details not to be found elsewhere, and the name of the prince is always written «Thaguthar» or «Theguthar» (cf. BROSSET, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, I, I, 575-583; the note on p. 576 teems with confused statements). «Thakudar» is also the only reading in the Armenian account of Malakia, an author of the late 13th cent. (BROSSET, *ibid.* I, Add., 455, 465-466; PATKANOV, *Ist. Mongolov Magakii*, 31-32, 52-54). Now Armenian transcriptions have been accepted as decisive for «Tāgūdār» against «Nāgūdār» in the case of Aḥmad-Tāgūdār. Similarly, the conclusion seems inevitable that, for Čayatai's grandson, Georgian and Armenian transcriptions must prevail, and that his name was Tāgūdār, not Nāgūdār.

But what then about Polo's «Negodar»? Of the various individuals who could be considered, only one remains, and it is one whose case is still mysterious. In the course of his note, YULE (*Y*, I, 103) has quoted a general Nāgūdār who, according to D'OHSSON, was in command of some of the troops of the house of Ĵöči sent by Mongka with Hülāgü. When war broke out in 1262 between Hülāgü and Bärkä (then the head of the house of Ĵöči; see «Berca»), Nāgūdār and his colleague «Onguĵa» escaped to Ḥorāsān, pursued by the troops of Hülāgü, and thence eastward, where they seized upon Ghazni and other districts bordering on India (cf. *Oh*, III, 379). Unfortunately, D'OHSSON does not mention his source. This Nāgūdār cannot of course be the prince, grandson of Čayatai, who was still in Georgia in 1268-1269. But I have not succeeded in tracing him, no more than his colleague «Onguĵa», although «Onguĵa» (cf. Mong. *ongyoča*, «boat») is probably the same man whose name has been altered in Abū'l-Faraġ's text