

become easier to understand if the custom already obtained in Polo's time to use Čayatai's name as the designation of his branch.

Moreover, we must not be too much surprised at Polo's errors when we see those made by other mediaeval travellers and historians. Plan Carpine (*Wy*, 65) knew that Chinghiz-khan had four sons, but he gives them in the following order: Ögödäi, Jöči, Čayatai and a last one (= Tolui) whose name he was not told. Kirakos gives to Chinghiz-khan three sons in the following order: Čayatai, a second son unnamed (Jöči or Tolui) and Ögödäi (BROSSET, *Deux historiens arméniens*, I, 115; PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, II, 13). In Hethum, Čayatai becomes the third son of Ögödäi (*Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, 157, 163, 296). Even the Mongol chronicler « Sanang Setsen » is mistaken and gives Čayatai as Chinghiz-khan's eldest son (SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 111). European scholars are not always more accurate: Čayatai becomes Chinghiz-khan's third son, instead of second, in RADLOV's dictionary (IV, 15), in SREZNEVSKIĪ (*Clavijo*, 425) and in LE STRANGE (*Clavijo*, 350). In 1819, 'JIGS-MED NAM-MKHA (HUTH, *Gesch. des Buddhismus*, II, 29) gives the four names in the correct order, but attributes to Čayatai five fanciful sons who became kings of western Asia and India, one of them being « Kodkhar » (read « Koñkhar »), king of « Rom », and residing in « Stambhola », which in a note to the text is supposed to be part of the mythical land of Śambhala!

On Čayatai, cf. Juwainī, I, 226-232; Rašidu-'d-Dīn in *Bl*, II, 153-197 (Rašid left this section incomplete); T'u Chi, 148, 32, 1 a-2 b; 148, 39 a; *Oh*, II, 99-108; *EI*, s. v. « Čaghatāi-khān », by BARTHOLD.

We do not know in which year Čayatai was born, but he was older than Ögödäi, who was born in 1186. It is not likely that there should have been a great difference of age between them, and we may assume that Čayatai was born c. A. D. 1185. He took part in the campaigns of his father against the Jučen and against the Mussulmans. After Chinghiz-khan's death (1227), Čayatai remained most of the time in his own appanage which extended from Bokhara and Samarkand to the region of Beš-baliq (north-east of Urumchi). In the summer, he used to reside at قیاس Quayās (? \*Quyāš) near Almalīq, and in the winter at a place the name of which has been read مراوزیک ایلا \*Mārāūzīk-Īlā, but which may as well be \*Māzāūrāng-Īlā, \*Mārāūrāng-Īlā, \*Mārūwāzīk-Īlā, etc. None of the names has as yet been identified, but both places were certainly in the Ili region (cf. Juwainī, I, 31, 227; Kāšyarī, in *Brockelmann*, 247 [« Qayas »] and 248 [« Quayas »]; *Oh*, II, 107; BARTHOLD, *12 Vorlesungen*, 76, 181; *Mi*, 298, 301); T'u Chi's identification (32, 1 a) of the winter residence with « Maryinan » (the « Margelan » of our maps; cf. *Br*, II, 54) is not acceptable. Rubrouck mentions a city of « Equius » which has been equated with Kāšyarī's « Ikī-ögüz » by BARTHOLD (*12 Vorlesungen*, 95; cf. *TP*, 1936, 363); although this is a possible solution, I am not convinced that an identification of « Equius » with « Quayas » is not just as likely. Apart from his dominions in the West, we know that Čayatai had been given as appanage 47,330 families of T'ai-yüan-fu in Shàn-hsi in 1236 at the time of the repartition of lands in North China among Mongol princes and grandees (*YS*, 2, 3 a; 95, 2 b; *Oh*, II, 70); in 1238, he received an additional grant of 10,000 families of Chên-ting (see « Achbaluch ») and 深州 Shên-chou (now Shên-hsien; cf. *YS*, 95, 2 b).

In the *Secret History*, written when Čayatai was still alive, he is represented by Chinghiz-