

Čayadai (in *YS*, 119, 8 a). In the *Secret History*, Čayatai is often respectfully addressed as « Ča'adai aqa », « Elder brother Čayatai »; the *YS* too, 124, 6 b, speaks of the grandsons of « Čayatai aqa ».

In Osmanli Turkish, partly perhaps because of the double value *ĵ* and *č* of *چ* of Persian sources, « Čayatai » has become « Ĵayatai », both as the name of Chinghiz-khan's son and as that of the language later spoken in the dominions of his branch. « Ĵayatai » is the only form given in RADLOV's great Turkish dictionary (iv, 15). It is « Čayatai », however, which is given with both meanings in Persian dictionaries (VULLERS, I, 580). I can vouch for the fact that « Čayatai » was the pronunciation used among the Turks of Chinese Turkestan. Although the word has practically died out there either as a personal name or as that of a tribe or of a language (cf. SHAW, *Vocabulary*, 94), I have heard at Kučā *čayatai ādam*, « čayatai man », used with the meaning of « a violent man », « a man with a bad temper » : a clear echo of the time when the Turks of Chinese Turkestan fought many a battle against their cousins of Russian Turkestan who had come to be known more particularly as Čayatai. The name, moreover, did not become obsolete so soon in Mongolia : a modern 察哈泰 Ch'a-ha-t'ai, Čayatai (or Čaqatai), has a biographical notice in ch. 270 of the *Kuo-ch'ao chi-hsien lei-chêng ch'u-pien*.

We are told by Rašidu-'d-Dīn that the name « Čayatai » was tabooed after Čayatai's death in 1242 : a Sünit who was called Čayatai and known as Čayatai Küčük, « Smaller Čayatai », had then to abandon his true name to be henceforth called by a mere tribal epithet, Sünitäi (*Oh*, II, 108; *Ber*, I, 47). It may be so, and the fact is that we hardly know of any « Čayatai » other than Chinghiz-khan's son. A second Čayatai named alongside of the prince Čayatai in *YS*, 2, 3 a (s. a. 1236), is probably due to a clerical corruption (cf. T'u Chi, 4, 11 b). The « prince Čayatai » mentioned in *YS* under 1228-1229 may be, as will be shown further on, an example of the survival and extension of the name of the true Čayatai, and not the personal name of a real homonym. Only one case remains to be considered : the *capitaneus*, Batu's *consanguineus*, to whom Rubrouck carried a letter in 1253 and whose name, to judge from the various readings of the mss., he seems to have written *Scacatay. The most natural restoration of such a name would be Čayatai, and this would show the name Čayatai in actual use thirteen years after prince Čayatai's death. But no safe conclusion can be based on such an isolated and doubtful instance (cf. *TP*, 1930, 203, 207).

Čayatai was the second of the four sons whom Börtä bore to Chinghiz-khan; he was younger than Jöči, but older than Ögödäi and Tolui. Qubilai, son of Tolui, was Čayatai's nephew, so that Polo is mistaken when he speaks of Čayatai as being Qubilai's own brother (Vol. I, 449). He is no less wrong when he represents Qaidu (see « Caidu »), a grandson of Ögödäi, as grandson of Čayatai (Vol. I, 447). We may of course suppose that Rustichello sometimes misunderstood Polo. For instance, Čayatai, whose name already occurred in the narrative, may have unduly taken Ögödäi's place in reference to Qaidu. On the other hand, Čayatai actually was the Great Khan's own brother (*i. e.* Ögödäi's), and the assertion becomes wrong only when it is added that this Great Khan was Qubilai. Polo himself may have known better, though this is by no means certain, for a confusion of the two persons runs throughout his whole text. It would in a way