be characterised and presented in terms of complexity, plurality, multi-layered way of life.

Vahe Boyajian-Sureniants
Caucasian Centre for Iranian Studies, Yerevan

The King's Dictionary: The Rasulid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol, trans. Tibor Halasi-Kun, Peter B. Golden, Louis Legeti, and Edmond Schütz, with introductory essays by Peter B. Golden and Thomas T. Allsen, Leiden: "Brill", 2000, 418 pp.

This book has long been in preparation and before its publication Professors Halasi-Kun, Legeti and Schütz passed away so that the final revision process went on without their aid. Prof. Schütz' absence is felt in the numerous mistransliterations of the Armenian, but the ability of one scholar to work with all of these languages in Arabic transliterations is more than reason could request. The editor has wisely and courageously given the reader a facsimile of the original manuscript, indices for all languages and frequent asterisks and question marks when a clear reading is impossible. Therefore, any corrections noted here are never meant as criticism of the editor's scholarship.

The Armenian vocabulary will concern us in this review, yet one must begin with a general overview of the work. This parallel vocabulary was prepared by the ruler of 14th century Yemen, Al-Malik al Afdal al-'Abbas b. Ali (1363-1377). He was a noted writer over a wide range of topics and the scion of a Turkic dynasty that had gained power under the Ayyubids. That Aden, his seat, was the link between Indian, African and Mediterranean trade goes a long way to explain the creation of the topical vocabularies here translated and the reasons for the languages selected.

Prof. Golden's essay covers the historical background for the various languages and economies discussed, while Prof. Allsen's masterful piece explains the sudden need for multilingual expertise among the merchants of Eurasia and Africa, brought about by the linking of trade centers under the Mongol Peace. His exposition of the translation bureaucracies and schools of the Mongol Empire and their early turning to printing technologies is especially enlightening. Whatever one may argue concerning the de-ethnicization of Turkic and its growing use as a *lingua franca* throughout that Empire, it is equally true that the Mongols

encouraged the maintenance and use of local languages. At this time, all of the languages included were being used by powerful military and economic powers in the region. The inclusion of Armenian is entirely justified by the trade going through Cilician Armenian ports; however, there are some Armenian connections that are not considered. Prof. Dadoyan of Beruit has recently published a monograph through Brill examining the Armenian vezirate under the Fatimids. These same Armenians founded Muslim and Christian offshoots, and it may very well be that the Greek and the Armenian items come from one source, this person being also connected to Mamluk Egypt. Moreover, in the century after this, Armenian merchants were representing the Ethiopian kings before the Popes and their presence in the area would be no more surprising than that of the Rasulid family itself.

The Armenian dialect from which the vocabulary is taken is definitely Western, and I will comment on some interesting forms below; the transliterations used and the phonetic explanations introducing the texts leave much to be desired. The Arabic script cannot distinguish *p* or *b*, or *g* or *k* and the numerous affricated phonemes are usually undifferentiated or even given two outcomes in the same word (*fasinč* for *očinč'*); however, certain vocabulary items point to Anatolia as the origin of the Armenian informant or his/her ancestors. *Akṙayk'* is the word corresponding to tooth rather than Eastern *atamn*, and the transliteration *mec adam* is used to gloss large tooth. The transliteration *mart* for man when the Persian column has *mard* and *dari* for year equally suggest that the Western two-way, voiced-voiceless distinctions were the norm for the speaker.

Any transliteration of an ancient language with an ancient orthography opens an opportunity for phonetic and dialectal investigations. Unfortunately, the limitations of the Arabic script and its vowellessness hamper most conclusions. Furthermore, the transcriptions in the text are often without distinguishing dots or vowels markings although these are almost always supplied in the Persian.

These facts are in no way helped in the case of Armenian by the notes on the transliteration offered as an introduction to the text itself (pp. 52-58). On page 52 Arabic *b* is illustrated with the Armenian word *byṙa'n*, mouth, yet this is glossed by a supposed item written in Armenian letters, *p'eran*. A different problem arises with the single non-Arabic use of the Arabic heavily aspirated *h* as

the initial consonant of the Armenian word *hmar*. The base meaning of 'mad/insane' is hardly served by a reference in Armenian letters to *yamar*, "stubborn/self-willed", when an alternative word *yimar* is closer in meaning. It might be of interest that initial *h* whether original or derived from *y* is highly aspirated in Armenian dialects of the Van region, but there is only this one example in the corpus under consideration. The homorganic consonants that developed before initial *e* or *o* in the Armenian are also usually ignored but see *fasinč* above.

One interesting irony is the existence of a unique error that might go far in explaining a curious item in Rivola's Latin-Armenian Dictionary of 1621. Because of a spacing mistake in the copying of the columns in the Hexaglot, Armenian *arew* "sun" seems to gloss Arabic *qamar* "moon" (MS 192). This same mistake is found in Rivola, where both *ghamar* and *aregakn* gloss the Latin word for "sun". It would be interesting to know if a copy of the Aden manuscript could have been used by Rivola in Milan.

Virgil Strohmeyer
Kent State University

Copyright of Iran & The Caucasus is the property of Brill Academic Publishers and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.