

The Anonymous Scribal Note Pertaining to The Bicig of Otemis

Francis Woodman Cleaves

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 16, No. 3/4. (Dec., 1953), pp. 478-486.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0548%28195312%2916%3A3%2F4%3C478%3ATASNPT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W

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 Sep 7 03:44:15 2007

THE ANONYMOUS SCRIBAL NOTE PERTAINING TO THE *BIČIG* OF ÖTEMIŠ

FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

In the description of Arabic manuscript number 1899 as cited by O. HOUDAS from the printed catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris on pages V-VI of the " Avertissement " to his translation entitled *Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-Din Mankobirti, Prince du Kharezm par Mohammed en-Nesawi,*[1] it is stated:

> . . . *On remarque à la page* 314 *cinq lignes d'écriture en langue et en caractères mongols, suivies des mots arabes:* هذا كتاب الامر سيف الدين نائب [VI] الكرك : « *Ceci est la lettre (ou l'écriture) de l'émir Saïf al-Dîn, lieutenant gouverneur d'Al-Karak.*» *Le feuillet qui porte ces lignes est un bout de rouleau qui paraît avoir contenu une dépêche officielle et n'a aucun rapport avec le texte d'Al-Nasawî. Ms. daté de l'an* 660 *de l'hégire* (1262 *de J.-C.*).

HOUDAS himself further stated (p. VI):

> La mention arabe, qui accompagne les cinq lignes de mongol, dont on trouvera le fac-similé en tête du présent volume, parle d'une localité dite Al-Karak, or d'après Yaqout cette orthographie avec l'article ne serait pas celle de la ville bien connue de Kérak, mais d'une petite bourgade située sur le territoire de Baalbek. J'aurais voulu pouvoir donner la traduction de ce fragment, mais les démarches que j'avais faites à ce sujet ne m'ont même pas valu l'honneur d'une réponse.

After page X of the " Avertissement " there is a plate entitled: " Fac-similé de la page 314 du manuscrit arabe n° 1899 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris."

HOUDAS dated his " Avertissement ": " *Paris, 25 février* 1895." It was, then, fifty-eight years ago that he wrote: " J'aurais voulu pouvoir donner la traduction de ce fragment, mais les démarches que j'avais faites à ce sujet ne m'ont même pas valu l'honneur d'une réponse."

[1] Paris: Ernest Leroux, éditeur, 1895 [= Publications de l'École des langues orientales vivantes, III[e] série.—Vol. X].

Although HOUDAS rendered a great service to Mongolianists by reproducing the document in his *Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-Din Mankobirti*, neither a transcription nor a translation of it has ever been published. That the document has not escaped their attention is evident from the fact that it has been mentioned by scholars several times:

On page 34 of his Сравнительная грамматика монгольского письменного языка и халхаского наречия [*Comparative Grammar of the Mongolian Written Language and the Khalkha Dialect*],[2] B. Ya. VLADIMIRCOV listed this document as number 3 among the chief monuments of the Mongolian written language:

3. Грамота Каракского Сайф ад-Дйна 1262 г.; факсимиле, в книге O. Houdas'a «*Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti par Mohammed en-Nesawi*», Paris 1895, Publications de l'Ecole des langues orientales vivantes, III s., v. 10.

[3. Letter of Saïf ad-Dīn of Karak of the y[ear] 1262; facsimile, in the book of O. HOUDAS *Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti par Mohammed en-Nesawi*, Paris 1895, Publications de l'Ecole des langues orientales vivantes, III s., v. 10.]

Louis HAMBIS, following, I presume, VLADIMIRCOV, also listed this document as number 3 among "Les principaux monuments de la langue mongole écrite" in "Appendice III" on page 91 of his *Grammaire de la langue mongole écrite* (Paris, 1945):

3° La lettre de Saifu-'d-Dīn, gouverneur de Karak; elle date de 1262.

On page 58 of his article "Stand und Aufgaben der Mongolistik" in *ZDMG* 100 (1950) .52-89, N. POPPE remarked:

Wenn man zu diesen unveröffentlichten, ältesten Denkmälern der schriftmongolischen Sprache noch diejenigen hinzuzählt, deren faksimilia uns vorliegen, die aber ebenfalls unbearbeitet blieben, so erhält man eine beträchtliche Zahl von alten Sprachdenkmälern. Wir wollen hier noch das Schreiben von Saif ad-Dīn von Karak vom Jahre 1262[5] . . . erwähnen.

[5] O. Houdas, Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-Din Mankobirti par Mohammed en-Nesawi, Paris, 1895, s. Facsimile.

In view of the historical and linguistic importance of each of the relatively few extant Mongolian documents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the time has come, in my opinion, when

[2] Leningrad, 1927.

the steps taken by HOUDAS for the purpose of presenting a translation of the document should be given the consideration to which they were entitled.

As for the author and the date of the text, VLADIMIRCOV, as we have seen (page 479 above), listed the document as "Грамота Каракского Сайф ад-Дйна 1262 г." ["Letter of Saĭf ad-Dīn of Karak of the y(ear) 1262"], HAMBIS (page 479 above) as "La lettre de Saifu-'d-Dīn, gouverneur de Karak; elle date de 1262," and POPPE (page 479 above) as "das Schreiben von Saif ad-Dīn von Karak vom Jahre 1262." On page 117 of his posthumous *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or* [3] the late Paul PELLIOT called it "un document fragmentaire en mongol daté de 1262, qui émane du gouverneur de Kérak à l'Est de la Mer Morte."

In attributing the document to Saīf al-Dīn of Karak, VLADIMIRCOV, HAMBIS, and POPPE obviously did so, because it is stated in the two lines of Arabic text which HOUDAS translated (see page 478 above) that the *kitāb* is that "of the *amīr* Saīf al-Dīn, *nā'ib* of al-Karak." In the Mongolian text, however, it is stated that the *bičig* is that "of the *nayiba* of Karag, Ötemis."

The question of the authorship of the five lines in Mongolian is closely related to that of their nature. When we recall the statement in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, as cited by HOUDAS (see p. 478 above), that: "*Le feuillet qui porte ces lignes est un bout de rouleau qui paraît avoir contenu une dépêche officielle et n'a aucun rapport avec le texte d'al-Nasawî*" and when we compare these five lines with those which constitute the "Summary of Contents" on the reverse of the *Bičig* of Busayid Baγatur Qan of 1320, it is quite clear that they are simply an anonymous scribal note. The two lines in Arabic script are of the same nature. That both notes refer to a single document called *bičig* in the Mongolian text and *kitāb* in the Arabic is not to be doubted, for the "*nayiba* of Karag, Ötemis" and the "*amīr*, Saīf al-Dīn, *nā'ib* of al-Karak" are unquestionably one and the same person with two names, one Turkish (Ötemis ~ Ötemiš) and one Arabic (Saīf al-Dīn).

[3] Paris, 1949 [= *Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot* II].

My colleague and friend Professor Richard N. FRYE has very graciously made an effort to identify Ötemiš / Saīf al-Dīn. He found in line 2 on page 166 of K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamlūkensultane* (Leiden, 1919), under the date "16th of Rabi' al awwal of the year 717," i. e., 30 May 1317, the name أيتمش المحمدىو بهادر الكركى Aīt (a) m (u) š al-M (u) ḥ (a) m-m (a) dī wa B (a) hād (u) r al-K (a) r (a) kī.[4] *Aīt (a) m (u) š* is, of course, *Ötemiš*.[5] He also found on page 382 of E. BLOCHET's "Moufazzal ibn Abil-Fazail, Histoire des sultans mamlouks" in *Patrologia Orientalis*, tome XIV, fascicule 3 (Paris, 1920), the name of an *amīr* of Baibars: سيف الدين ايتمش السعدى S (a) īf al-Dīn Aīt (a) m (u) š al-S (a) 'dī. It is tempting to think that the former, if not the latter, is our Ötemiš / Saīf al-Dīn.[6] From these examples, in any case, it is perfectly clear that both the Arabic *Saīf al-Dīn* and the Turkish *Ötemiš* occurred as components in the name of a single person.

Although these five lines are comparable to those constituting the "Summary of Contents" on the reverse of the *Bičig* of Busayid Baγatur Qan of 1320, they do not, however, summarize the contents of the *Bičig* of Ötemiš, but merely allude to them in the words: *möna qoyin-a ene bičig-i ken ungšibasu iraqmad kitügei* ("If anyone read this *bičig* in the future, let him show mercy"). It is regrettable that we do not have the *Bičig* of Ötemiš, for, without it, it is virtually impossible to comprehend the true significance of these words. That the *Bičig* itself was an official "Writ" or "Letter" seems entirely probable.

The date of the Arabic manuscript of the text of Al-Nasawī is, as we have seen (p. 478), 1262. As for that of the Mongolian text, inasmuch as it is expressly stated in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, as cited by HOUDAS (see p. 478 above), that: "*Le feuillet qui porte ces lignes est un bout de*

[4] On 1 November 1953 Professor FRYE suggested that: "Although no variant readings are given, perhaps, the *wa* between the two names is a later addition, and one should read *Aīt (a) m (u) š al-M (u) ḥ (a) mm (a) dī, the Hero, al-K (a) r (a) kī*."

[5] Professor FRYE also informed me, on the same date, that: "On page 175 his full name is given as سيف الدين ايتمش المحمدى *S (a) īf al-Dīn Aīt (a) m (u) š al-M (u) ḥ (a) mm (a) dī*."

[6] "Or his son," as further suggested by Professor FRYE on the same date.

rouleau qui paraît avoir contenu une dépêche officielle et n'a aucun rapport avec le texte d'al-Nasawî," it is, at least, questionable whether one is justified in assigning the date of 1262 to this undated Mongolian document.

Although I am reluctant to accept the date 1262 for the reason which has just been stated, I believe that the document was written in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Its linguistic and orthographic features are those characteristic of other documents of the period: (1) the occurrence of archaic vocabulary (*möna* [= *mona*] *qoyin-a* "in the future") and (2) the fronting of back vowels (*büi* [= *bui*] and *möna* [= *mona*]). The high incidence of Arabic vocabulary (*iraqmad* "mercy," *Karag* "Karak," [*n*]*ayibayin* [genitive of *nayiba* < *nā'ib*], and *nayib* [< *nā'ib*]) is also a characteristic feature of other documents of the same period from the same part of the Mongolian world.

It is interesting to observe, however, that the document contains linguistic features which, in the light of our present knowledge, might be considered anomalous: (1) *ene bičig Ötemis Karag-un* [*n*]*ayibayin büi* ("This *bičig* is [that] of the *nayiba* of Karag, Ötemis") instead of *ene Ötemis Karag-un nayibun bičig büi* ("This is the *bičig* of the *nayib* of Karag, Ötemis") and (2) *Ötemiš nayib Karag-un irgen medelün bükü-dür bičibei* ("The *nayib* Ötemiš wrote [this], at the moment when he was governing the people of Karag") instead of *Ötemiš nayib Karag-un irgen-i meden bükü-dür bičibei* ("The *nayib* Ötemiš wrote [this], at the moment when he was governing the people of Karag"). The inconsistencies in orthography (i. e., *nayiba-* ~ *nayib* and *Ötemis* ~ *Ötemiš*) and the total absence of any punctuation are of no special significance. It is also interesting to observe that the point for marking the *-n* is used with regularity: l. 1: *ene*; l. 2: [*n*]*ayibayin* and *möna*; l. 3: *ene*, *ken*, and *ungšibasu*.

Mongolian and Arabic Texts

[Transcription]

[1] ene bičig Ötemis Karag-un
[2] [n]ayibayin büi möna qoyin-a
[3] ene bičig-i ken ungšibasu iraqmad

[4] kitügei Ötemiš nayib Karag-un irgen
[5] medelün büküi-dür bičibei. H(a)δā k(i)tāb al-amīr S(a)īf al-Dīn
[6] nā'(i)b al-K(a)r(a)k

Index Verborum Mongolicorum

[N. B. Proper names are capitalized. Words of Arabic origin are identified by their inclusion in Arabic script. All numbers refer to lines of the text.]

bičibičibei 5
bičig 1, 3
bübüküi 5
büi [= bui] 2
-dür (dat.-loc.) 5
ene 1, 3
-i (acc.) 3
iraqmad [< Arab. رحمت (*r(a)ḥm(a)t*)] 3
irgen 4
Karag [< Arab. كرك (*K(a)r(a)k*)] v. Karag-un irgen, Karag-un nayibayin
Karag-un irgen 4
Karag-un [2] nayibayin 1-2
ken 3
kikitügei 4
medelmedelün 5
möna [= mona] 2
nayib [< Arab. نائب (*nā(i)b*)] 4
[n]ayibayin (gen. of *nayiba*) 2
Ötemis 1
Ötemiš 4
qoyin-a 2
-un (gen.) 1, 4
ungšiungšibasu 3
-yin (gen.) 2 (nayibayin)

Mongolian and Arabic Texts

[Translation]

This *bičig*[1] is[2] [that] of[3] the [*n*]*ayiba*[4] (*nā'ib*) of Karag[5] (Karak), Ötemis.[6] If anyone read this *bičig* in the future,[7] let him show[8] mercy.[9] The *nayib*[10] (*nā'ib*) Ötemiš wrote [this], at the moment when he was governing[11] the people of Karag (Karak). This[12] [is] the *kitāb*[13] of the *amīr*,[14] Saīf al-Dīn,[15] *nā'ib*[16] of al-Karak.[17]

Notes

[1] The word *bičig* means "writing," hence, "writ," "letter," "book," etc. In this anonymous scribal note it unquestionably refers to a "writ" or "letter" of Ötemiš / the *amīr*, Saif al-Dīn, *nā'ib* of al-Karak. For further remarks see page 481 above.

[2] The orthography *büi* for *bui* is interesting. The fronting of back vowels in the initial syllable is an orthographic feature not only of this document (see page 482

above), but also of many others of the period. Cf., e. g., Francis Woodman CLEAVES, "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1362 in Memory of Prince Hindu," *HJAS* 12 (1949).1-133 (p. 127, n. 225); "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1335 in Memory of Chang Ying-jui," *HJAS* 13(1950).1-131 (p. 126, n. 250); "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in Memory of Jïgüntei," *HJAS* 14(1951).1-104 (pp. 100-101, n. 155; p. 103, n. 163); "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1346," *HJAS* 15(1952).1-123 (p. 119, n. 261); Antoine MOSTAERT and Francis Woodman CLEAVES, "Trois documents mongols des Archives secrètes vaticanes," *HJAS* 15(1952).419-506 (p. 426); and Francis Woodman CLEAVES, "The Mongolian Documents in the Musée de Téhéran," *HJAS* 16(1953).1-107 (p .21). Cf. also *möna* for *mona* in line 2 below.

[3] For this use of the genitive immediately followed by the copula, see my remark on page 482 above. The only other example which I have encountered is that in the *Secret History of the Mongols* § 214 (*YCPS* 9.16a1): . . . *juldu* (? *jüldü*) *Altani-yin bolba* ". . . the chief merit was [that] of Altani."

[4] The form *nayiba* instead of *nayib* < Arabic نائب (*nā'ib*) (which appears in line 4 below) is extraordinary. That we should expect *nayibun* instead of *nayibayin*—the final *-a* of *nayiba* cannot be explained either on Arabic or Mongolian grounds—is perfectly clear from the fact that we find *nayibud* (a Mongolian plural in *-ud* of *nayib*) in line 2 of "Document III" (Fig. 30 / Page 41) (B) of the Teheran documents. For a discussion of the word cf. CLEAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 60, n. 11.

[5] This name has already been discussed by B. VLADIMIRCOV on page 77 of his article "Арабские слова в монгольском" ["Arabic Words in Mongolian"] in Записки Коллегии Востоковедов (*Mémoires du Comité des Orientalistes*) 5(1930). 73-82 (cf. the review by P. PELLIOT in *TP* 28[1932].510-511). VLADIMIRCOV wrote:

"12. Монг.-письм. *Karag* (~*Karak*) < араб. *Karak* 'название одного города' *karχā* 'город, укрепленное место': см. грамоту каракского Сайф ад-Дина 1262.[9]

---

[9] Факсимиле в книге O. Houdas'a. Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti par Mohammed en-Nessawi. Paris, 1895.

["12. Mong.-Writ. *Karag* (~*Karak*) < Arab. *Karak* 'name of one city' < Aramaic *karχā* 'city, fortified place': v. the letter of the Karak Saïf ad-Dīn of the year 1262.[9]

"[9] Facsimile in the book of O. Houdas. Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti par Mohammed en-Nesawi. Paris, 1895."]

In transcribing the name *Karag*, I have followed VLADIMIRCOV. Inasmuch as the *k* in the Arabic original ك ر *K(a)r(a)k* is not a velar (i. e., *q*), the Mongols, notwithstanding the presence of the posterior *a* vowel, wrote the name *Karag*. Cf. also such words as *garudi*, *gandarwis*, etc. of Sanskrit origin in which the Mongols write *g*, not *γ*, because in the Sanskrit original the initial guttural is *g*, not the velar *γ*.

As for the location of *Karag* (< *Karak*), HOUDAS, as we have already seen (p. 478 above), stated: "La mention arabe, qui accompagne les cinq lignes de mongol, . . . parle d'une localité dite Al-Karak, or d'après Yaqout cette orthographe avec l'article ne serait pas celle de la ville bien connue de Kérak, mais d'une petite bourgade située sur le territoire de Baalbek."

On page 117 of his posthumous *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, however, Paul PELLIOT, commenting on the remark by Bertold SPULER on page 297 of *Die Goldene Horde, Die Mongolen in Russland* 1223-1582 (Leipzig, 1943): "Krk (gemeint ist offenbar, trotz der ungenauen geographischen Angabe, **Krakau**)" as well as that in

note 10 on page 79 of the same work: "Ebenso ausgeschlossen ist es, in Karak nur das mongolische Wort für „Festung" (karak, von syr. Karkâ, vgl. Vladimircov, Ar., wie unten S. 243, Anm. 17, S. 77) zu sehen," stated:

". . . Spuler, 297, estime que Käräk est « manifestement Cracovie »; à la p. 79, il écarte, comme exclue, toute explication par « le mot mongol pour forteresse, *karak* »; ceci ne valait pas d'être dit, car il n'y a pas de mot mongol *karak*, « forteresse », mais seulement un document fragmentaire en mongol daté de 1262, qui émane du gouverneur de Kérak à l'Est de la Mer Morte, et où ce nom de lieu sémitique fameux est transcrit naturellement."

The solution of the problem must be left to the competence of a specialist in Near Eastern Studies. For remarks concerning the well-known Karak at the time of the Mongolian occupation, however, cf. Claude CAHEN, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940), p. 707 and p. 714.

[6] For the name *Ötemis* (~ *Ötemiš* in line 4 below) cf. C. BROCKELMANN, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Maḥmūd al-Kašγarīs Dīvan Luγāt at-Turk* (Budapest-Leipzig, 1928), page 251: "Utamyš Männername."

In the entry on "Utar" on pages 184-185 of his *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or* [= *Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot II*] (Paris, 1949), Paul PELLIOT remarked (p. 184): "Utar serait « le Gagnant ». En ce cas, il est à séparer, au point du vue étymologique, du nom اتَمِش de Kāšγarī (I, 89[3]; Brockelmann, 251); si le texte est correct, celui-ci est forcément *Utamïš (avec les autres possibilités théoriques *o-*, *ö-*, *ü-*), tiré d'un verbe *uta-* ou *ota-*, et non plus *ut-*; Houtsma a adopté Ötämiš."

That BROCKELMANN's "Utamyš" is an incorrect vocalization and that HOUTSMA's "Ötämiš" is a correct one is clear from the fact that the word is attested in the "Third Manuscript" of the *Qutadγu Bilig*. On page 745 of S. E. MALOV's article "Из третьей рукописи Кутадгу Билик" ("Extrait du troisième manuscrit de Qutadγu bilig") in Известия Академии Наук СССР. 1949 (*Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS*), N° 9, VII Серия, Отделение Гуманитарных Наук (VII Série, *Classe des Humanités*), pp. 737-754, we read:

[QB 158]

. . . . . .

(31) Ötämiš bołur sän ra'yjat χaqy, sän utru χaqyn qoł, ai älči aqy.

. . . . . .

(31) Когда ты выполнишь свои обязанности к подданным, то и сам требуй относительно своих прав, о щедрый посланник.

[(31) When thou fulfillest thine obligations to the subjects, then also thyself demand concerning thy rights, O liberal envoy.]

On page 407b of S. E. MALOV's Памятники древнетюркской письменности [*Monuments of Old-Turkish Literature*] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1951) we find the word *ötä-* registered and defined as follows: "*ötä-* выполнять, QBW, 158$_{27}$; RC., I, 1264" ["*ötä-* to fulfill, QBW, 158$_{27}$; R (ADLOV) Dict (ionary), I, 1264"].

The name *Ötemiš* literally means "The One Who is Said to Have Fulfilled."

[7] For the orthography *möna* with the front vowel (*ö*) in the first syllable see note 2 above.

For the expression *möna qoyin-a* = *mona qoyin-a* cf. note 132 on page 116 of "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1362 . . . ," where this example is cited. (For *mön-a qoyin-a* in line 4 of the note read *möna qoyin-a*.)

[8] Lit., "let him make." See note 10 below.

[9] The reading *iraqmad* was proposed by one of my former students, Dr. Herbert SCHURMANN, on 24 November 1948. It is unquestionably the Arabic رحمت *r(a)ḥ-m(a)t* "mercy" with the prothetic vowel which regularly appears in words of foreign origin with an initial *r-*. For other examples of the prothetic vowel cf. note 9 on page 62 of "The Mongolian Documents. . . ."

The expression *iraqmad kitügei* is literally, "let him make mercy." In Часть III (Part III) of his Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб [*Mongolian Dictionary Mukaddimat al-Adab*] N. N. POPPE registered the word *raḥmat* on page 495, column 3, of the Указатель монгольских слов ["Index of Mongolian Words"] with references to pages 214, 213, 347 of the *Dictionary* and on page 546, column 3, of the Указатель тюркских слов ["Index of Turkish Words"] with references to pages 128, 207, and 214 of the *Dictionary*. The example on page 313, column 1, of the *Dictionary* reads: "*raḥmat kibe tündü* [misprint for *tündü*—F.W.C.] بۀ رحمت كيبه توندو *raḥim qïldï anqa* انقه قيلدى رحهم оказал ему милосердие ['showed mercy to him'] 990." The absence of the prothetic *i-* in the examples of the word *raḥmat* in the Mukkaddimat al-Adab clearly show that it is not a "naturalized" form.

For examples of *raqmat* and *raxmät* in Turkish cf. MALOV, Памятники, p. 418a.

[10] Between the words *Ötemiš* and *Karag-un irgen* of line 4 there is a word which is almost illegible, because the ink has, in great part, disappeared, just as in the case of the final *n* of the word *nayibayin* (line 2) of which there remains nothing more than the point and a part of the terminal stroke. For its identification I am indebted to the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT who, in a letter dated 22 August 1953, remarked:

". . . Il me semble que le mot en question peut être lu *nayib*. *Ötemiš nayib* "le *nayib Ötemiš*" est d'ailleurs ce qu'on attend ici. Qu'ici le mot ait été écrit correctement *nayib*, en regard de *nayiba-* de la ligne 2, ne signifie pas grand'chose, à mon avis."

[11] In the word *medelün* we seem to have a *converbum modale* in *-n* (with the union vowel in *-ü-*) of an unattested verb **medel-* "to govern."

In his letter dated 22 August 1953 the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT remarked:

". . . Il est vrai qu'un verbe *medel-* n'est pas attesté, que nous sachions. Mais il se pourrait que nous ayons ici une forme secondaire de *mede-*. Cf. mo. *čakil-* qui existe à côté de *čaki-*, et *muskil-* à côté de *muski-*, etc. Voir Ramstedt, *Verbstammbildungslehre*. §4."

As I have remarked above (p. 482), one would have expected *Ötemiš nayib Karag-un irgen-i meden bükü-dür bičibei.*

[12] For the transcription of this Arabic subscript cf. Robert P. BLAKE and Richard N. FRYE, "History of the Nation of the Archers (the Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc'," *HJAS* 12 (1949) .269-399 (p. 390, n. 61). For its translation cf. HOUDAS, *op. cit.*, p. VI, and BLAKE and FRYE, *op. cit.*, p. 390, n. 61.

[13] The word *k(i)tāb* was translated, as we have seen (p. 478), "*la lettre (ou l'écriture)*" by HOUDAS (*op. cit.*, p. VI) and "the letter" by BLAKE and FRYE (*op. cit.*, p. 390, n. 61).

[14] For *al-amīr* cf. note 12 (*al*) on page 64 of "The Mongolian Documents . . ." and note 36 (*amīr*) on page 99 of the same article.

[15] For the name S(a)if al-Dīn "Sword of the Religion" cf. the list of "laḳabs avec dīn se trouvant jusqu'au 7e siècle de l'Islām" on page 67 of J. H. KRAMERS' article "Les noms musulmans composés avec Dīn" in *Acta Orientalia* 5 (1927) .53-67.

[16] For *nā'ib* see note 5 above.

[17] For *al-K(a)r(a)k* cf. HOUDAS (*op. cit.*, p. VI). Cf. also BLAKE and FRYE, *op. cit.*, p. 390, n. 61.