

the archetype of all our Mss.; but such a solution is too problematic to allow us to change the spelling. On former attempts at explanations and on the Mongol felt and cloth figures, cf. *Y*, I, 257-259. The information on this last subject might be supplemented to a considerable extent, but that would take up more space than the scope of the present notes permits.

296. NEGODAR

gorobar LT

nogadir VB

nogodar F, FA

negodar V, VA, VL

noghodar TA¹, TA³

nugodar F; R

nogadar FB, VB

I have preferred the « Negodar » of V, VA, VL (supported by the « Hegodar » of S) to the generally accepted « Nogodar », because it is the form which corresponds to what I believe to be the true name. The usual Persian transcriptions *نکودار* or *نکودار* give no clue as to the first vowel; nevertheless VULLERS (II, 1344) writes *نکدر* as the name of the tribe which has been associated with the name of « Negodar », and, although I do not know what VULLERS's authority may be for the spelling, it represents a *nä-*, not a *nö-* or *nü-*, in the first syllable.

BLOCHET (*Bl*, II, 158, 563; *Moufazzal*, 556) has said that « Nigueuder » (= *Nigödär) was Mong. *nigädügär* (*nigädü'är*), « first », but I cannot agree with him. Classical Mong. *nigän*, « one » (pronounced *nikän* in the Mongol period, and still *nikän* to-day by the Moghols of Afghanistan), would have no labial vowel in the second syllable, and *-dügär* (*-dü'är*) ought not to result in *där* (moreover with a brief *-ä-* since it is not always noted in Arabic writing). As in the case of *Tägüdär*, I do not doubt that we have to do here with the suffix *-där* which appears also in such names as *Yäsüdär* (see « *Iesudar* »), *Tümändär* (WANG Hui-tsu¹, 25, 5 b; SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 219), *Tämüdär* (*Bl*, II, 160; *Ha*¹, II, 182; WANG Hui-tsu¹, 35, 5 a), *Qutudar* (WANG Hui-tsu¹, 28, 5-6), *Baidar* (who went to Hungary), perhaps *Bäktär* (Chinghiz-khan's half-brother), etc. Unfortunately, I have not yet noticed any mention of the name *Nägüdär* (for one of *Tägüdär*, see « *Acmat*² ») in Mongolian texts or in Chinese transcriptions. But I think that the first element is probably the same as in *Nägübai*, often mistranscribed « *Nikpāi* » or « *Nikbāi* » from the Arabic spelling *نکبای*, which however occurs in Chinese as the name of several individuals, under the transcription *捏古伯* *Nie-ku-pai*, i. e. *Nägübai* (cf. *JA*, 1927, II, 266; WANG Hui-tsu¹, 31, 11 b). I am somewhat doubtful about the real value of *nägü-*. The most natural hypothesis seems to be that it represents, with the usual slurring of final *-n*, a sonant form of *näkün*, « servant », « slave-woman », unknown to modern Mongolian, but which is well attested in the Middle Ages and which has survived in the Manchu *nehu* (cf. *TP*, 1930, 45).

On the ambiguous Persian transcriptions giving « *Tägüdär* » for « *Nägüdär* » and *vice-versa*, see « *Acmat*² » and « *Caraunas* ». Under « *Caraunas* », I have discussed the identity of the « king *Negodar* ».