

Saqid=Zah(i)d

Francis Woodman Cleaves

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1/2. (Jun., 1955), pp. 234-238.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0548%28195506%2918%3A1%2F2%3C234%3AS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies is currently published by Harvard-Yenching Institute.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/hyi.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org
Fri Aug 24 05:16:55 2007

SAQID = ZĀH(I)D

FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

In his recent, brilliant article "A Mongol Decree of 720/1320 to the Family of Shaykh Zāhid" in *BSOAS* 16 (1954) .515-527, Professor V. MINORSKY has rendered a service of incalculable value to Mongolists as well as to Iranists by his identification of the names of the grantees in the *Bičig* of Busayid Baγatur Qan of 1320 as those of "members of the family of the well-known shaykh Tāj al-dīn Ibrāhīm Zāhid (615-700/1218-1301), the spiritual guide of the still more famous founder of the Ṣafavī order, Shaykh Ṣafī al-dīn Isḥāq (650-735/1252-1334)."

In note 3 on page 519 Professor MINORSKY remarked:

> It is strange that in the Mongol decree Zāhid is called *šaqid*, i. e. **shahīd* 'a martyr.' This term may stand here in the general meaning of 'the late.'

Professor W. B. HENNING, who did so much to help me when I was engaged in the study of the Teheran documents, discussing, for his part, in a letter dated 3 January 1955, some of the questions which Professor MINORSKY's article had raised in his mind relative to the name of the founder "Šaiχ Zāhid" and stating, among other things, that: "The founder, if = Šaiχ Zāhid, cannot possibly be called *šahīd*; he died of old age (83 years old)," concluded with the query:

> This leads me to the question I want to ask: is it possible that the word we read as *šaqid* can represent *Zāhid*? If so, this might prove a firmer basis for M.'s view; if not, how would the Mongols represent *Zāhid*?

This, I regret to say, is one of the instances in the transcription of the document as published in my article "The Mongolian Documents in the Musée de Téhéran"[1] in which, to use Professor MINORSKY's own words (page 515), "the decipherment still leaves certain points undecided."

[1] *HJAS* 16 (1953) .1-107.

In view of the great importance of Professor MINORSKY's contribution to the elucidation of the document and in an effort to keep apace with the progress which he has made in its study, I wish to rectify at this time the transcription of the word which I had assumed was the Persian-Arabic شهيد (*š(a)hīd*), i.e., "martyr."[2]

It is hardly necessary to remind those familiar with Mongolian palaeography that in the early texts there is frequently no graphic differentiation between the letter transcribed *s* and that transcribed *š*. When there is a differentiation between the two, it consists, of course, in the addition of two points to the right of the *s*, in which case the letter is read *š*.

In the case of a "native" Mongolian word, it is the usual practice to transcribe the letter *s* without the two points as *s*, even though the consonant *s* which it represents may have developed into *š* in the later language, as, for example, *sira* > *šira* > *šara* "yellow." It is primarily in the transcription of foreign words that difficulties arise, especially if such words resist identification or, as in the case at hand, are incorrectly identified. In an illuminating discussion of the problem in note 35 on pages 293-294 of his excellent article "A propos de l'écriture mandchoue,"[3] Professor Louis LIGETI formulated some sound principles to guide us in the transcription of the letter *s*, when it represents the consonant *š* in foreign words.[4] He did not however, treat of the transcription of *s*, when it represents the consonant *z* in foreign words. The only scholar, in fact, who seems to have taken cognizance of this problem was Paul PELLIOT. On page 219 of his posthumous *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or, Suivies de quelques noms turcs d'hommes et de peuples finissant en "ar"* (Paris, 1949) [= Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot II], he remarked, with reference to the ethnic "Qazaq (ou *Qasaq)": "Je dis « Qazaq (ou *Qasaq) » parce que le mongol médiéval,

[2] I shall attempt, in separate papers, to deal with other questions raised by Professor MINORSKY in his stimulating article.

[3] *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 2 (1952) .235-298.

[4] I incline to concur with his recommendation that *bii tas, Bis Baliγ, Toγan Qus,* and *Derbis* in the Mongolian text of the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362, too, be transcribed *bii taš, Biš Baliγ, Toγan Quš,* and *Derbiš.*

n'ayant pas de *-z-*, le remplaçait par *-s-*, ou parfois par *-ǰ-*, dans les emprunts."

It is now clear from Professor MINORSKY's identification of the names of the grantees that the word in line 1 of the fragment of the *Bičig* of 1320, provisionally designated as "Document III (Fig. 30/Page 41) (A)," [5] and that in line 1 of the "Summary of Contents" on the verso of the same document, also provisionally designated as "Document III (Fig. 29/Verso) (2)," [6] which I transcribed *šaqid* and *šaqid-un* respectively and identified with the Persian-Arabic word *š(a)hīd*, "martyr," must be stricken and replaced by the transcriptions *Saqid* and *Saqid-un* respectively, because it is the name of the *Zāh(i)d* family.

Although this appears to be the only attested instance in Mongolian in which an initial Persian *z* is transcribed by *s*, in the name *Fasan* in the first line of the *Bičig* of Γasan of 1302 [7] we have an example of a medial Persian *z* transcribed by *s*.[8]

In the third line of the "Summary of Contents" of the same *Bičig* of Busayid Baγatur Qan we have in the name of the scribe, *Birus* (< *Pīrūz*),[9] an example in which a final Persian *z* is transcribed by a Mongolian *s*.

[5] CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[6] CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[7] Cf. Antoine MOSTAERT et Francis Woodman CLEAVES "Trois documents mongols des Archives secrètes vaticanes," *HJAS* 15 (1952).419-506 + 8 plates (p. 470).

[8] There may also be cited as being of pertinent interest the following examples in B. VLADIMIRCOV's article "Арабские слова в монгольском" ("Mots arabes en mongol") in Записки Коллегии Востоковедов (*Mémoires du Comité des Orientalistes*) 5 (1930).73-82: "New. Writ. Oirat *murza* 'murza; [79] hospitable host (in tales) < Kir. *murza* < Pers. *mirzā* < *amir-zāda*, 'prince of the blood' < Arab. *amir* 'commander, prince,'" (pp. 78-79) and "Writ. Mong. *χarminǰin*, . . . 'red cloth, cremosin' << Arab. *qirmizi* 'purple-red' < Skt. *krṃiǰā* 'kermes, cochineal'" (p. 81). To these we may add still other examples which are found in his earlier article "Mongolica I" in the same Записки Коллегии Востоковедов (*Mémoires du Comité des Orientalistes*) 1 (1925).305-341: "Writ. Mong. *baǰar*, *basar*, Writ. Oirat. *bazar*, . . . < Pers. *bāzār*" (p. 331); "Writ. Mong. *ürüs sara* 'spring moon, moon of the renewal of nature,' . . . < Pers. *rūz*, . . . 'day'" (p. 337); "Writ. Mong *šinǰir* . . . < Pers. *zinǰīr*, *zanǰīr* 'catena, chain, little chain'" (p. 338); and "Writ. Mong. *tarbus* . . . < Pers. *χarbuz* (Mid. Pers. *χarbūzak*) (LAUFER, 443-444, the transcription is not exact)."

[9] Professor MINORSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 527, refers to him as "the scribe called Birus (*Firūz?)." Although it is conceivable that *Birus* is a transcription of *Fīrūz*, not *Pīrūz*, I should expect, in such a case, to see it written **Wirus*, not *Birus*. Cf., e. g., *Iridiwarans* "Roi de France" in line 2 of the *Bičig* of Öljeitü of 1305 to Philippe le Bel.

These examples are adequate to establish the fact that the Mongolian *s* served to transcribe the Persian *z* in all positions—initial, medial, and final.

As to the medial *q* in *Saqid*, it is a transcription of the Persian *h*. I can recall no other attested example in the early texts in which *q* transcribes a Persian *h*. It is, however, regularly used to transcribe the Persian *ḥ*, as in *Aqmad* < *Aḥm (a) d*,[10] *Maqmad* < *M (a) ḥm (a) d*,[11] *Maqmud* < *M (a) ḥmūd*,[12] and *Muqamad* < *M (u) - h (a) mm (a) d*.[13] It is also used to transcribe *χ*, as in *qarab* < *χ (a) rāb* [14] and *Qoǰa* < *Xwāǰ (a) h* in *Dimiš Qoǰa* (< *D (a) m (a) šq Xwāǰ (a) h*) .[15] Finally, it is used to transcribe *q* as in *qanun* < *qānūn*.[16]

The only other attested example of a Persian *h* in early Mongolian transcription is that in the name *Ibrāh (i) m* written *Ibrayim*, where it was transcribed by the Mongolian *y*.[17] Intervocalic *h*, however, was not foreign to Mongolian itself, as we know from such Middle-Mongolian sources as the *Secret History of the Mongols*, where we find *ihe'el* (*~ibegel~ibegeli*) [18] " protection " and *ǰahing* " inner lappel." [19] In one instance we also have *iheyel* [20] " protection."

Thus, in the light of Professor MINORSKY's identification, there can be no doubt that the word in question is *Saqid*, not *šaqid*, and that it is a transcription of the Persian name *Zāh (i) d*.

(If we adopt the principle of transcription formulated by Professor LIGETI on pages 259-260 of his article " A propos de l'écriture mandchoue," we must write **Firus* and *Iridifarans*.) We must not forget, on the other hand, that we have *Ired Barans-a* and *Berenggüd-ün* in lines 4 and 26 respectively of the *Bičig* of Arγun of 1289 to Philippe le Bel, where *b* represents *f*.

[10] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 34b.

[11] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 37a.

[12] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 37a.

[13] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 37b.

[14] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 38a.

[15] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 35b.

[16] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 38a.

[17] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 36a, where, however, " Ibarim " is an error for " Ibrayim."

[18] Cf. Erich HAENISCH, *Wörterbuch zu Mangḫol un Niuca Tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao Pi-shi), Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, Leipzig, 1939, p. 81.

[19] Cf. HAENISCH, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[20] Cf. HAENISCH, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

The revised transcriptions *Saqid* and *Saqid-un* also necessitate slight revisions in the translation of the passages in which the name is found:

1) In "Document III (Fig. 30/Page 41) (A)"[21] we must now read:

[1] ǰrlγ-iyar ečige-yügen šiγ Čamaladin-u or-a šiγ Saqid

[2] Ibrayim-un suǰada-dur [saγ]uǰu . . . .

and translate:

"Although by Edict, in the place of my father, the *šiγ* Čamaladin, I sat on the *suǰada* of the *šiγ* Saqid Ibrayim. . . ."

2) In "Document III (Fig. 29/Verso) (2)"[22] we must now read

[1] šiγ Saqid-un qaγas-a waγb-i

[2] köbegün inu medetügei.

and translate:

"Let his son administer the *qaγas-a waγb* of the *šiγ* Saqid."

In reply to a query from me, dated 31 January 1955, as to whether the fact that the "shaykh" is called "Tāj al-dīn Ibrāhīm Zāhid" in Persian, but "Saqid Ibrayim" in Mongolian, i. e., with the transposition of the two names, is of any significance, Professor MINORSKY very kindly stated in a letter dated 4 February 1955:

As I find in the India Office Persian Catalogue (col. 1011) a Qāḍī Zāhid Muhammad, I presume that Shaykh Zāhid Ibrāhīm would be possible in ordinary parlance. Even Shakyh Zāhid, or Shaykh Ibrāhīm alone, would suffice. Surely the Mongol edict omits a lot of honorifics in rhymed prose like: al-shaykh al-*Zāhid* al-imām al-*'ābid*, after which the name of Ibrāhīm would come, with the blessings: "may God illuminate his grave" etc. As the document gives *Badr al-dīn Mahmūd and Šams al-dīn Muhammad, one would expect some such title, with *al-dīn*, before Ibrāhīm [one can *hardly* say *Zāhid* al-dīn], but as Shaykh Zāhid was *dead*, a simplified title would not be unexpected in unceremonious Mongolian.

---

[21] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[22] Cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 33.