

(*Fe*, 524). Somewhat older is the mention of « Mutapalay » on the so-called « Cantino » map of 1502 (cf. KAMMERER, *La Mer Rouge*, II, 391).

It may possibly also be the 沒特不 *Mo-t'ê-pu* or *Mu-t'ê-pu* (= *Mutepul ?) of an « ancient Chinese map », as supposed by FUJITA in his commentary on the *Tao-i chih-lio* (8 b).

YULE is certainly right when he says that Polo called the kingdom of Telingana by the name of the port he touched at. As to the story of the widow who reigned some forty years after the death of her husband, I have to point out that, according to *JRAS*, 1927, 598, this queen was not the widow, but the daughter of the deceased king.

293. NAIAN

naan Ft

naiam F, FA, TA¹, TA³, VA; R

naian F, Fr, FA, FB, L, V, VB

naias FAt

nain Fr, V

nania VL

nayam LT, P, TA³

nayan Fr, t, FA

noiam VA

Nayan (Ch. 乃顏 *Nai-yen*, Pers. نایان *Nayan*; means « eighty » in Mongolian) is given by YULE (*Y*, I, 334; II, 505) as « the great-great-grandson of Chinghiz's brother Uchegin, called in the Chinese annals Bilgutai », and BENEDETTO (*B*¹, 445) makes him a descendant of another of Chinghiz-khan's brothers, Jöçi-qasar. BENEDETTO's opinion is simply a mistake. As to YULE's information, it is an arbitrary combination of two apparently conflicting statements, that of *YS*, 107, 4 b, which names the « great prince » 乃顏 *Nai-yen* as the son of the prince of 廣寧 *Kuang-ning* 瓜都 *Kua-tu* (read 瓜都 *Chao-tu*, *Jautu*) and the great-grandson (not great-great-grandson) of Chinghiz-khan's half-brother Bälğütäi (cf. also *YS*, 59, 1 b), and that of the Persian historians, who see in him a descendant of Chinghiz-khan's youngest brother, Tämügä-otčigin (not « uchegin » [= *üčügän*], as is still said too often). *Kuang-ning* is to the WSW. of Mukden, N. of 錦州 *Chin-chou*, and there is no doubt that this appanage belonged to Bälğütäi's family, but the « great prince » Nayan of the genealogical tables (*YS*, 107, 4 b) must be the prince 納牙 *Na-ya* (*Naya*) who was almost induced to join in Nayan's revolt; Rašidu-'d-Din also employs sometimes نایا *Naya* for Nayan, and the two forms seem to be equivalent; there are thus two princes Nayan living at the same time and almost in the same regions. The Nayan who revolted against Qubilai is not named in the genealogical tables perhaps because his name had been suppressed from the Imperial family records after he had been put to death, and it is by mistake that subsequent writers (for instance the *Yüan shih hsün-pien*, 19, 1 a) have thought he was the Nayan of the lineage of Bälğütäi. HUNG Chün and particularly T'U Chi (75, 8 a) have shown that the Chinese texts themselves give strong arguments for placing Nayan among Tämügä-otčigin's descendants, and there is no doubt that the Persian historians are correct on that point. The genealogy of Nayan can almost certainly be fixed as follows : Tämügä-otčigin, Jibügän, Tačar (> Tāčar), Ajuł, Nayan; Nayan was thus a great-great-grandson of Tämügä-otčigin (cf. *Bl*, II, 94, corrected with T'U Chi, 75, 7 b-8 b); instead of being Qubilai's « uncle », as Polo has it, he was a cousin younger by three generations.