

into انكوحنا «Otguhanā (read انكوجا Onguča?; *Hist. Dynast.*, text, 508; transl., 332). We may suppose that this one was really a Nāgüdār, not a Tāgüdār, and he at least is said to have invaded the borders of India; nevertheless the possibility of a confusion remains, since the Čayatai prince Tāküdār was also involved in the intrigues of the princes in 1262, and is said to have then saved his life by submitting to Hülāgü (BROSSET, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, I, Add., 455; PATKANOV, *Ist. Mongol. Magakii*, 31-32). Nāgüdār or Tāgüdār, we should want more precise information about him to enable us to determine whether he can still be the same as the *emir* Nāgüdār (or Tāgüdār?) who, according to the chronicle of Herat, had settled in Herat with 300 adventurers from 'Iraq and created trouble in 1298 (*Y*, I, 103), or the Nāgüdār-bahadur (or Tāgüdār-bahadur?) who, in the next year, is named among the *emirs* of the predatory Qutluyšāh (*Ha*¹, II, 104).

If the *emir* of 1262 is really a Nāgüdār, he is likely to be the eponym of the Nāgüdārī bands; these freebooters did much harm in Eastern Persia at the end of the 13th cent. and in the beginning of the 14th. To the references already given by QUATREMÈRE (*Not. et Extr.* XIV, 284) and by YULE (*Y*, I, 102-104), we may add a curious text of Mufazzal on one of their campaigns against the kingdom of Delhi (BLOCHET, *Moufazzal*, 556-557). Waśśāf says that the Nāgüdārī are a people of the Seistan; Rašīd speaks of their army (*laškar*). According to a text of Mirhōnd, Nāgüdārī had been transferred to 'Iraq by Ghazan, with summer and winter encampments, which sounds very much like a repetition of what Arjun had done with the Qaraunas some fifteen years earlier; these Nāgüdārī, in Mirhōnd's account, form one of several chiliarchies (*hazāra*). The texts generally agree to call these freebooters «Nāgüdārī», although they occasionally give «Tāgüdārī». HAMMER (*Ha*¹, I, 284, 309) has blamed d'OHSSON for confounding the Qaraunas of Ḥorāsān with the Nāgüdārī of Seistan; but as we have seen, an *emir* Nāgüdār and his men had settled at Herat in Ḥorāsān, in the very region where we hear most of the Qaraunas. The Mongol Amaĵi-Nāgüdārī of the chronicle of Herat (*JA*, 1861, I, 456; *Oh*, IV, 184) may be the same as the «Aladu» of *Ha*¹, I, 13, «Alaĵu» of *Oh*, IV, 46, who had at one time Qaraunas under his command, and anyhow that Nigudarian was in the region of Herat, not in Seistan. Probably no strict distinction was made between them, and it may be that Qaraunas was the name used regularly by the Mongols, while Nāgüdārī was practically its later (?) Persian equivalent. Polo's only mistake was then, owing to the phonetic resemblance, to associate unduly the Nāgüdārī, *alias* the Qaraunas, with the Čayatai prince Tāküdār, as the Persians did themselves later, on account of graphic analogy. The Qaraunas, *alias* Nāgüdārī, of Ḥorāsān and Seistan seem at the same time to have been the ancestors of the Nāgüdārī > Nāgdārī whom we find in Bābur's time in the region of Kabul; some of them, and also some of the Hazāra (cf. *Hobson-Jobson*², s. v. «Huzāra»), spoke Mongolian according to Bābur (transl. A. BEVERIDGE, 207); the Hazāra, *i. e.* Chiliarchies, owe evidently their name to the former organization of the Mongol army (it is surprising that no such use of this Persian word should be mentioned by VULLERS), and they still speak an archaic Mongolian dialect, although they are becoming more and more iranized (cf. RAMSTEDT, *Mogholica*). Although A. BEVERIDGE, in the translation of the *Memoirs of Bābur*, transcribes the name of the Nāgüdārī by «Nikdārī» as well as by «Nikdirī» (pp. 196, 200, 207), there is no -ī- in any ms. after the *d*; all the mss. give نكدري Ngdri, *i. e.*