AUFSÄTZE / ARTICLES

Hasmik Kirakosyan

Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Matenadaran, Armenia
hasmik.kirakosian@matenadaran.am

Ani Sargsyan

University of Hamburg, Germany
ani.sargsyan@uni-hamburg.de

On the Appropriation of Lexicographic Methods of Kemālpaşazāde's (1468–1534) Glossary *Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ*[1]

Abstract:

The glossary *Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ* by Kemālpaşazāde is a valuable lexicological work that demonstrates the appropriation of medieval lexicographic methodologies as a means of spreading knowledge of the Persian language in the Transottoman realm. The article aims to analyse this Persian-Ottoman Turkish philological text based on the Arabic and Persian lexicographic traditions of the Early Modern period. The advanced approaches to morphological, lexical and semantic analysis of Persian can be witnessed when examining the Persian word units in the glossary. The study of the methods of the glossary attests to the prestigious status of the Persian language in the Ottoman Empire at a time when Turkish was strengthening its multi-faceted positions. Taking into account the linguistic analysis methods that were available in the sixteenth century, contemporary philological research is suggesting new etymologies for some Persian words and introduces novel lemmata, which make their first-time appearance in Persian vocabulary.

Keywords: methodology, morphology, lexicological, grammatical, Persian-Ottoman Turkish bilingual dictionary, Transottoman

1. Introduction

By the sixteenth century, Ottoman Turkish had established itself as the official court language in the Ottoman Empire used in Divan poetry, prose works and chancery records, albeit Persian continued to maintain its primary role in the literary cultural discourse. Men of letters made ample use of Persian *belles-lettres* while continuing to add massive amounts of Persian vocabulary to Ottoman Turkish along with stylistic and grammatical elements. Ottoman literacy was also intertwined with the knowledge of Persian, and an intellectual man that had his own place at the court was considered a carrier of that prestigious knowledge, which was in wide circulation in the Transottoman context.

---

1   We are grateful to Prof. Ludwig Paul for his comments on an earlier draft of this article.

Since Ottoman Turkish literature was closely connected to classical Persian poetry,[2] and the absorption of Arabic and Persian vocabulary helped Ottoman Turkish fit the quantitative poetic meters becoming an integral part of the language, it required of its readers to have supplementary lexicographic works at their disposal for reference.[3] Moreover, linguistic works, philological essays and grammatical treatises on Persian written in Arabic, Ottoman Turkish and Persian languages (*elsine-i ẕelāse*) were used alongside bilingual and trilingual dictionaries to teach Persian language and literature in (in)formal educational and vocational institutions, e.g. palace schools (*enderūn mektebi*), primary schools (*ṣibyān mektebi*) and Mevlevi convents (*tekke*),[4] which were widespread across the Ottoman Empire.

Ottoman lexicography is explicitly linked with Arabic and Persian lexicographic models. The history of Persian lexicography dates back to the period of Middle Persian, cf. the Avestan-Pahlavi *Frahang-ī Oīm*,[5] *Oīm-ēwag*, the Middle Persian *Frahang ī Pahlawīg* (seventh century). *Frahang-ī Oīm* was an educational manual of the Avestan language. The *Frahang ī Pahlawīg*, which featured words organised according to topics, served a similar purpose.[6]

The origins of Persian and Turkish defining dictionaries should be investigated in the context of early Arabic bilingual and trilingual dictionaries, which were compiled from the eleventh century onwards in Iran and Central Asia, when New Persian gained prestige as a literary language, and Arabic literature was being translated into Persian.[7]

The process of appropriation and translation of Persian literary works in the Ottoman Empire established the compilation of the Persian-Ottoman Turkish dictionaries using transferred or circulated lexicographic models.[8] Thus, Ottoman lexicography should be examined within the Transottoman context, which would allow us to raise questions such as: Can the methods used in the Ottoman dictionaries be analysed in terms of a 'traveling concept'?[9] Was the late medieval knowledge in the Ottoman realm cultivated through the process of appropriation and localisation, and, if so, how did the main agents and intermediaries appropriate the traditions formulated in this Transottoman context?

---

2   İnan 2017, 671–689. See also Gibb 1902, 5, 12; Krymskij 1910, 39; Smirnov 1891, 427; Pala 2004, 122–123; Yücel and Sevim 1991, 216–217.
3   Darling 2012, 173. See also Kuru 2016, 558–559; İnan 2019, 78.
4   Schmidt 2014, 852; İnan 2019, 82–84.
5   The names of the Ottoman authors and quoted passages and lemmata from Ottoman Turkish are transcribed using the IJMES system. The Persian words, passages and the names of the Persian authors are following the transliteration table proposed by the journal *Iranian Studies*.
6   Perry 1993, 251. See also Baevskii 2007, 46–47.
7   Baevskii 2007, 117.
8   For the list and the descriptions of the Persian-Turkish dictionaries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see Öz 2016, 82–147.
9   For 'traveling concepts', see Bachmann-Medick 2016, 119–136.

One of the earlier Ottoman lexicographers is Ḥalīmī Luṭfullāh b. Abī Yūsuf, an Ottoman poet, a ḳāżī of Iranian origin from Amasya (d. 902?/1497),[10] who wrote three compendia, *Baḥru l-ġarāyib*, *Lüġat-i Ḥalīmī*[11] and *Niṣāru l-mülk* between 1455–1468. He was one of the intermediaries who employed Persian and Arabic lexicographic traditions and whose works are also referenced by Kemālpaşazāde in his *Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ* ('Subtleties of Truth', hereafter DḤ) written between 1523 and 1534. Şams-al-din Aḥmed b. Süleymān b. Kemāl Paşa, also known as Kemālpaşazāde (873–940/1468–1534), was born in Tokat, grew up in Adrianople (Edirne) and, following in his ancestors' footsteps, served as a soldier in Vizier İbrāhīm Pasha's camp. After the expedition, he became the pupil of Mollā Luṭfi and other reputable teachers in Adrianople. He would then continue his career as a *müderris*, *ḳāżī* of Edirne, *ḳāżīʿasker* of Anatolia, and later advance to the highest rank *Şeyḫü-l Islām*.[12]

Kemālpaşazāde is the author of letters to the Safavid Shah Tahmāsp,[13] as well as of 19 Ottoman Turkish, 7 Persian and 183 Arabic works on history, philosophy, Islamic Jurisprudence, Sufism, linguistics and literature.[14] He was one of the most accomplished scholars of the period and there is plenty of information available on his pedagogical career and on him as a transformer of knowledge.[15] It is not a secret that his students became 'attendants' (*mülāzım*), *medrese* teachers, translators, *ḳāżī*s, *müftī*s, etc.[16] Looking through the dictionaries written during and after his time may allow us to get a better grasp of Kemālpaşazāde's expertise in lexicography. His contemporaries praised him in their works and relied on his work as a useful and successful template for gaining Persian knowledge. He was often addressed as 'Kemālpaşazāde, a unique [person] of the period' (*ferīd-i ʿaṣr Kemālpaşazāde*), as written in a dictionary by Niʿmetullāh (1550) or as 'the superior expert' (*fāżıl-ı muḥaḳḳaḳ*), mentioned by Dervīş/Deşişe Meḥmed b. Mustafā b. Şeyḫ Luṭfullāh in *Tuḥfetü s-seniyye ile l-Ḥażreti l-Ḥaseniyye* (1580).[17] However, these authors, in their dictionaries, were also critical of his explanations of the lemmata.[18]

DḤ, a core subject of this paper, relied on the highly prestigious status of Persian. In the preface, the author explains that the work is devoted to the details and subtleties of Persian morphology and semantics (f. 27v):

---

10   Ṭāhir M. Bursalı 1333 [1915], 273.
11   Lutfullah b. Ebu Yusuf el-Halîmî 2013.
12   Gibb 1902, 347–363. See also Ménage 2012.
13   Riyahi 1990, 196.
14   For a list of works by Kemālpaşazāde see Atsız 1966, 73. See also Brunschvig 1963, 50; Yediyıldız 1986, 65–70; Arslan 1986, 87–122; Turan 1986, 141–149; Öçal 2000; Jeremiás 2003 [2002], 79–107.
15   Şahin 2013, 22.
16   Kılıç 1994, 55–70.
17   See Sargsyan 2021.
18   Öz 2016, 152.

بورسالۀ رنگین كلالۀ و شيرين مقالۀ ترتيب قلدوم. اشجار اشعارده اولن ازهار اسرارى اظهار له اول لسان روشن بيانک
گلشن پر صفا سنک تماشا سنه ابناى زمانى ترغيب قلدم متشا به لغتلرک حقيقتلرنه متعلّق دقيقه لرى مشتمل اولدوغندن
اوتورى آدينى دقايق الحقايق اوردم مجلس صفا افزاى آصف راى حضرت
ابراهيم پاشايه كه صاحب ديوان سليمان زمان در تحفه اتمكه لايق گوردم[19]

Bu risāle-i rengīn külāle ve şīrīn maḳāleyi tertīb ḳıldum. Eşcār-ı eşʿārda olan ezhār-ı
esrārı iẓhārla ol lisān-ı rūşen beyānuñ gülşen-i pür ṣafāsınuñ temāşāsına ebnā-yı
zamānı terġib ḳıldum. Müteşābih lüġatlerüñ ḥaḳīḳatlerine müteʿallıḳ daḳīḳeleri
müştemil olduġından ötüri adını Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ urdum. Meclis-i ṣafā-efzā-
yı Āṣaf-rāy-ı Ḥażret-i İbrāhīm Paşaya ki ṣāḥib-dīvān-ı Süleymān-ı zamāndur, tuḥfe
itmege lāyıḳ gördüm.

I compiled this treatise [as] colourful ringlets and charming words. I composed it
in clear language by showing buds of the secrets on the trees of poetry, I wanted
my contemporaries to watch the joyful rose garden of this clear language. I called
my book 'Subtleties of Truth' because it contains the right nuances of the words
having similar meanings. And this work I found worthy to present as a gift to the
joyous Asaph-adorned seat of his Majesty İbrāhīm Pasha, the owner of the divan
of Süleymān of the time.[20]

DḤ also combined traditional and established new methodological content with
morphological and grammatical methods, which will be discussed on some selected
entries stored in the text.

2. An Examination of the Methodology of the DḤ

The glossary DḤ was primarily compiled by Kemālpaşazāde as a manual for learning
Persian and included the lexicographic methodology of the time: pronunciation, par-
allel translation, literary documentation and grammatical examination methods.

2.1 Layout of Words

The arrangement of words in DḤ does not follow the usual methodology of medieval
lexicography.[21] In contrast to the arrangement and word selection typical of medieval
dictionaries, this glossary is arranged arbitrarily. For example, in ff. 33rv *payām u*

---

19   This citation and, in general, the examination of the article is based on the MS 196, ff.
     27v–174r (1564), held in the Arabic Script Depository of the Institute of Ancient Manu-
     scripts Matenadaran of Yerevan. The manuscript is one of the earliest and most complete
     copies of DḤ. For a list of other copies of DḤ, see Öz 2016, 153. For the description of
     the MS 196, see Kostikyan 2017, 87–88, also Kirakosyan and Sargsyan 2018, 169.
20   All the translations from Ottoman Turkish and Persian are ours. We attempted to translate
     word for word to remain true to the text. There may nevertheless be stylistic mistakes.
21   On the arrangement of lemmata in early Persian lexicographic works, see Baevskii 2007,
     153–154; Öz 2016, 27–29.

pasukh, 'commandment and answer', is followed by *pārsī u darī u pahlawī*, 'Persian and Dari and Pahlavi', in ff. 34r–35v.

DḤ may also be considered to be a rhyming dictionary, as it includes entries that consist of words with identical or homographic endings or suffixes. Thus, in ff. 35v–37r, the basis for the words *gulistān u dilsitān*, 'garden and beloved', are the homographic suffixes *-stān*, 'place of', and *-sitān*, the short present participle of the verb *sitāndan*, 'to take, to get'.

2.2 Method of Indicating Pronunciation

The entries in DḤ begin with the spelling and pronunciation of the words in question. The method of indicating pronunciation was used in Persian lexicography and presently, it is accepted along with *ḥarakat*s. To describe this method, we will take the glossary entry *sukhan u guftār*, 'talk and speech' (f. 28v), which begins by providing two alternate pronunciations. The first is *sakhun – ḥarf-i sīnüñ fetḥası ve ḥarf-i ḥānun żammesiyle müstaʿmeldür*, 'the letter *sin* with *fatḥa* and the letter *ha* with *zamme*', with a quotation from a verse by Nezāmī Ganjavī:

> *Fātḥa-yi fikrat u khatm-i sakhun*
> *Hamd-i khudāy-ast bar ō khatm kun.*

> 'The beginning of [any] thought and the end of [any] speech,
> Is the gratitude to God, [therefore] end with it.'

The second pronunciation of *sukhan* is explained by *ḥarf-i sīnün żammesi ve ḥārf-i ḥānun fetḥasıyla da müstaʿmeldür*, 'the letter *sin* with *zamme* and the letter *ha* with *fatḥa*':

> *Basā jāyhā gufta'and īn sukhan*
> *Bikun, nagōy u bi-daryā fikan.*

> 'In many places they told these words,
> Do it, do not say and throw it into the sea.'

Thus, the compiler used quotations from poetry to illustrate the correct use of a word and the variations of its pronunciation. Occasionally, analogies were also employed for these purposes.

Kemālpaşazāde's glossary contains valuable clues on the history of vocalisation of Persian and Arabic loanwords which came to Turkish via Persian. The palatal and velar adaption processes in the vowel system are documented in Arabic manuscripts since the beginning of the sixteenth century. Sometimes, the author uses a descriptive method for establishing the spelling and pronunciation of Ottoman Turkish words in the glossary, providing data that shows the processes of palatal and velar adaptation of vowels in Ottoman Turkish loanwords.[22] In some cases, the author indicates that Ottoman poets did not try to adapt Arabic loanwords to Ottoman Turkish phonolo-

---

22   For more see Stein 2006, 144.

gy. For instance, in the explanation of the Persian word *abrash*, 'spotted horse', on f. 174r, Kemālpaşazāde notes, '*elif* in the word *abrash* in Turkish is pronounced with *madda*, [though] correct without *madda*'. The author emphasises that, due to Ottoman Turkish phonological adaptation, the word must be sounded *ebraş,* a rule, by which the poets and literati did not abide.

2.3 The Method of Parallel Translation

The method of parallel translation used in the DḤ glossary for citing Turkish or Arabic versions of Persian lemmata is one of the established methods that was circulated in bilingual and trilingual Turkish, Arabic and Persian medieval dictionaries. For instance, on f. 43v Kemālpaşazāde explains the synonyms *nēk u nēkō* as follows: *nēkuñ maʿnāsı eyüdür, muḳābili beddür ki yaramazdur*, '*nēk* means *eyü*, good, in Turkish and is the antonym of *bad,* bad, *yaramaz,* mischievous, scamp'. Or on ff. 90r–91v Kemālpaşazāde discusses the word *chōn*: *Türkī dilde kimesnenüñ ḫālinden istifsār itmelü olsalar nicesin dirler, ʿAcem çūnī dir, ʿArab keyfe ente dir*, 'in Turkish if one wants to know how someone else is, one would say *nicesin*, in Persian *çūnī*,[23] in Arabic *keyfe ente*'.

2.4. Literary Documentation

Quotations illustrating word usage have been commonly used by Persian lexicographers since the eleventh century. The authors introduce such citations with the words *buzurgī gōyad* or *buzurgī farmāyad*, 'a great [poet] says', and similar expressions.[24] Kemālpaşazāde, in his investigation of Persian words, frequently quotes Ferdowsī, Saʿdī, Nezāmī Ganjavī, Khāqānī and other Persian writers; rarely Arabic or Turkish authors. The quotations are introduced by *bu beytlerde işāret vārdur*, 'it is mentioned in this verse', *nitekī bu beytde zāhirdür*, 'thus it is shown in this verse', *vāḳiʿ olıpdur / vāḳiʿdür*, 'it occurred in', or *ẕikr olınupdur,* 'it is alluded to'.

2.5 The Structure of the Entries

As mentioned in 1.1, the lemmata in DḤ are arranged neither according to rhyme (*kafiye*) nor alphabetical order. In the entries, the author focuses on homographs, homonyms, synonyms, antonyms and words with homonymous and homographic suffixes, and uses methods of grammatical and lexicological analysis in parallel with the abovementioned lexicographic methods. Moreover, in the same passage, the author sometimes examines the words provided in the literary quotations. We selected some of the more exhaustive entries that showcase a clear structure.

---

23 The phrase *çūnī* (spelled *chōnī* in Persian) with the meaning 'How are you?' is not used in Modern Persian.
24 Baevskii 2007, 168.

In ff. 38r–39v, the homographs *marghzār*, 'meadow', and *murgh (-i) zār*, 'crying, mourning bird', are discussed. The author provides a sample of these words' usage in an Ottoman Turkish verse from an anonymous writer (possibly the author himself):

Var her bir kūşede biñ murġ-ı zār
kūy-i yāre beñzemez bir murġzār.

'And there are thousands of crying birds in every corner,
But not one meadow resembles the place where the beloved [is].'

First, the formation of *marghzār*, 'meadow', is examined: *margh*, 'sort of grass' + the suffix *-zār*, which in Persian is used in nouns to indicate abundance. The author attests the Ottoman Turkish equivalents of the suffix *-zār*, cf. *-lıḳ, -luḳ, -lik, -lük*, and provides examples of their usage: Persian *gulzār*, 'field of flowers', Ottoman Turkish *güllük*; Persian *namakzār*, 'place rich in salt', Ottoman Turkish *tuzluḳ*; Persian *panbezār*, 'cotton place', Ottoman Turkish *pambukluḳ*; Persian *gilzār*, 'swamp', Ottoman Turkish *balçıḳlıḳ*; Persian *sabzazār*, 'greensward', Ottoman Turkish *sebzelik*; etc. But the author does not discuss the origin of the suffix *-zār*.[25]

The second part of the entry concerns *murgh (-i) zār*,[26] 'crying bird'. The author explains the morphology of the word as derived from *murgh-*, 'bird', + *-zār* < *zārā-*, 'crying', interpreting the latter as a short form of the present participle of *zārīdan*, 'to cry' > *zārā-*, 'crying'. Kemālpaşazāde, taking into account the peculiarities of Arabic script, emphasises that the components of the word *murgh (-i) zār* should be written separately. In Ottoman Turkish, the Persian loanword *zār* is an adjective carrying the meaning 'crying, mourning',[27] which confirms the author's explanation. These details recommend that the word *zār* be investigated as both a noun and an adjective. In this regard, the Persian noun *zār* (also *zārī*, 'mourning, cry') originated from the Old Iranian **zāra-* < **zar-*, 'to voice, make a noise' > *zārīdan*, 'to cry, to mourn', cf. *dar zār girīstan*, 'to cry bitterly'; and the adjective *zār* with the meaning 'deplorable, lamentable, crying, and sad' originated from the verb *zārīdan*, 'to cry, to mourn', and is a short form of the present participle *zārā*, cf. *nāla-yi zār*, *girya-yi zār*, 'plaintive, moanful'.[28]

On f. 40r, the author cites *dārsunb* for 'woodpecker' and explains that the Turkish *aġaçdelen* was formed from *aġac*, 'tree', and *-delen*, 'pecker'. In the Persian *dārsunb*, the component *sunb* is, in our opinion, the short version of the present participle of the verb *suftan*, 'to peck, to thrill' < **dārsunbā-*, 'pecker', is obsolete, cf. *dārkōb*, also rarely *dārbur*. The coverage of this word in DḤ is novel for Persian vocabularies.

On ff. 48r–49r, the homonyms and synonyms *pādāsh*, 'gratuity, reward' (Turkish *cezā*), *pādāsh*, 'companion, friend', and *hampā*, 'prompt step, companion', are con-

---

25   Cf. *-zār* < Middle Persian *-zār*, Parthian *-zhār* < Old Ir. **char(ana)-*; cf. Persian *charidan*, 'to graze, to pasture', or < Av. *charāna-*, 'farm', < **kar-*, 'plough'. For more see Hassan-dust 2014, s.vv.

26   Please note that different spellings of *murgh (-i) zār* (Ott. Turkish *murġ-ı zār*) are due to different systems of transliteration.

27   Zeki 2009, 397.

28   Rubinčik 1970, 751.

templated. The author does not define *pādāsh* as 'earnings, wages', but rather claims that it means 'companion, friend', being formed from the noun *pāy-*, 'foot', and *-dāsh*, the Turkish suffix indicating 'equality, combination, and belonging'. However, *pādāsh*, 'companion, friend', with this Turkic suffix is not attested in Persian dictionaries, nor has it been preserved in Modern Turkish. Kemālpaşazāde states that the Ottoman Turkish *ayakdaş* has the same meaning and substantiates it with Ottoman Turkish verse. He also mentions that in Persian *tāsh* means 'friend, companion', the Ottoman Turkish equivalent of which is *ortak*. We have reason to believe that the Turkic suffix *-tāş* has been present in Persian since the eleventh century,[29] and in DḤ the following words with this suffix are examined in the same passage: *khʷājetāsh*, 'one of the servants of the same master (*hoca*)', which according to the author is a distorted form of *ḳūşdāş*;[30] *khēltāsh*, 'two people belonging to the same military battalion'. The dictionaries preserved several meanings for *khēltāsh*, including 'an army consisting of members of the same tribe' and 'a group of servants of the same tribe';[31] and Bosworth, in the commentaries to *Tarikh-e Beyhaqi*, explains it as 'commander of the army'.[32] Kemālpaşazāde considers *baktāsh* an Ottoman Turkish word formed from *bek-*, 'solid, hard', + *-tāş*, 'stone'. He does not mention its real meaning but states that it is a synonym for *khēltāsh* and cites the following verse from *Golestān* by Saʿdi:

Chō khʷash guft baktāsh bi-khēltāsh,
Chō dushman kharāshīdī ayman mabāsh.

'How truthfully to *khēltāsh*, *baktāsh* said
As you wounded your enemy, then live not free from dread.'[33]

We believe that this explanation of the word does not correspond to the meaning of *baktāsh* as 'one of the servants of the same master' or 'the leader of the tribe, the military commander'[34] and that it is formed from *bek/bey*, 'big' < *büyük* + *-tāş*, 'companion, friend'.

The author examines *hampā* and notes that it is different from *pādāsh*, illustrating this with the following word pairs: *hamrāh – yoldaş*, 'companion'; *hamrāz – sırdaş*, 'confidant'; *hamsar – başdaş*, 'spouse'. He also compares it with other words that have the prefix *ham-*: *hamsāl*, *hamzād*, 'peer, coeval'; *hamdam*, 'friend'. The difference between *hampā* and *pādāsh* is founded upon the author's stylistic choice: *pādāsh* is a poetic word and these synonyms do not differ significantly in meaning. In fact, Kemālpaşazāde notes that the word *pādāsh* in Persian conveys the meanings 'companion, prompt step', which are not given in other Modern Persian dictionaries.

On f. 59v, the word *rang*, 'mountain goat, ibex, antelope', and its synonym *buz* are examined. *Rang* seems to belong to Northern and Eastern Iranian dialects (cf. Wakhi

29   Beyhaqi 2011, 11.
30   Probably *ḳovūştaş*, which means 'roommate'.
31   Dehkhodā 1993, s.vv.
32   Beyhaqi 2011, 11.
33   See Shekh Muslihu'd-din Sadi of Shiraz 1979, 143.
34   Dehkhodā 1993, s.vv.

raŋ) and is used by Khorasani and Transoxianian poets. Kemālpaşazāde provides the Turkish equivalent *ime* (or? *ima*), 'wild mountain goat, antelope', which is attested in Kadirli, Adana's Turkish dialect.[35]

The words for 'horse' are examined in the entries *asb* and *sutōr* (ff. 170r–174r), where Kemālpaşazāde gives the following epithets and explanations related to horses. For *asb*, he gives the Ottoman Turkish equivalent *at,* and for *sutōr,* 'cattle, quadruped', *binek.*

He explains *shēda,* 'bay', as the color of the sun: *güneşe beñzer at.* Examining *bōr/pōr,* 'reddish', Kemālpaşazāde states that *pōr* also has the meaning 'boy', Turkish *oğul.* For *bāra/bārak,* 'draught horses', he brings the synonym *bāragī.*

Navand, 'spirited horse', is explained as a swift horse, from the agentive noun *navanda* (*nav- + -andak < *-antaka*) < *navīdan,* 'to shake, to move', without the suffix *-a < -ak.*

According to Kemālpaşazāde, *samand,* 'dun', is 'the horse that has a colour of *kül* (ash)'. This word was in use in Ottoman Turkish. Based on his explanation, we suggest the following etymology for the Persian *samand,* cf. Persian *ās,* Middle Persian *ādurestar,* Balochi *īs, es, hes,*[36] 'ash', < **āθrya- < *āθr-,* 'fire', and the suffix *-manda*; **āsa-manda- >* *samand,* 'having the colour of ash'.

The word *khing,* 'white horse', was in use in Ottoman Turkish and the author explains it as simply 'white', Ottoman Turkish *aḳ.* The other 'white horse' term, *charma/jarma,* is also discussed by Kemālpaşazāde, but this word is not used in Turkish: cf. Iranian > Armenian *čermak,* 'white'.

In the dictionary, *dīza,* 'black horse', is given with the Ottoman Turkish equivalent *yağız at.* The author observes that *dīz* meaning 'black' also appears in the Persian word *shabdīz.*

The last word for horse in the glossary is *abrash,* which has an Arabic origin.

2.6 Grammatical Examination

Persian grammatical elements have been explained in the *farhang*s as early as the eleventh century.[37] DḤ was one of the dictionaries where, apart from the lemmata-related observations, the compiler also included morphemes as independent entries. The grammatical notions in DḤ are also used for the origins of the words and word formations, which bear witness to the analytic and scientific approach of the time. In the glossary, on ff. 107r–107v, Kemālpaşazāde discusses the word-building suffixes *-var* and *-vār,* giving their semantic equivalents: the Arabic *ẕu-* and the Ottoman Turkish suffix *-lu.* The author explains the etymology of the suffix *-var* as *āvardan,* 'to bring', > *āvarā-,* 'bringer', > *-āvar,* or the short form *-var,* and gives the examples *sukhanvar* and *sukhanāvar,* 'orator, poet', as spelling variants, + *sarvar,* 'leader', *dilāvar,* 'brave, courageous',

---

35   *Türkiyede Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü* 1974, 2534. For more see Clauson 1972, 158; Tietze 2016, 608.
36   Hassan-dust 2011, 32.
37   Baevskii 2007, 147.

hunarvar, 'artist, artificer'. Of course, Kemālpaşazāde's explanations do not meet modern philological standards. The synonymous form *var* used in poetry is explained in the glossary as the short form of *wa-,* 'and', + *-agar,* 'if'. Kemālpaşazāde also states that the suffix *-vār* means 'like, able' and cites the example *shāhvār,* 'shah-like'; but he does not mention the other meaning of *-vār* < Old Iranian **bāra-* < **bar-,* 'to carry', as attested in the words *sōgvār,* 'mourner', and *gōshvār,* 'earrings'.

After presenting the semantic differences between *sarkh^wash,* 'jocund, lighthearted, ebullient, ecstatic', and *mast,* 'drunk', on ff. 56rv, Kemālpaşazāde provides etymological and morphological analysis, giving a short description of the morphology of the compound adjective, especially the combination of a noun (*mevṣūf*) with an adjective, whether the noun is prepositive to the adjective, as *sarkh^wash* (< *sar-i kh^wash*), *sarsām* (< *sar-i sām*), 'thoughtful, pensive, also foolish', or postpositive: *sabuksar* (< *sar-i sabuk*), 'light, quiet', *sabukbār* (< *bār-i sabuk*), 'light, quiet', *lāgharmiyān* (< *miyān-i lāghar*), 'slender'.

The author thus examines the origins of some words in the glossary accompanied by grammatical analyses. The sampled morphological explanations display evidence of erroneous analyses. In spite of that, he provides practical knowledge of Persian grammar, which was in demand in the language acquisition process. In this regard, we could observe how this work could have effectively promoted knowledge transfer.

3. Conclusion

The practical process of Persian language acquisition facilitated knowledge mobility in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire, which was implemented in (in)formal educational institutions via linguistic works, bilingual dictionaries and philological works such as textbooks. In fact, these manuals transmitted Persian knowledge, assuming the appropriation and the localisation of lexicographic models and methods.

Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ ('Subtleties of Truth') written in the years 1523–1534, combined the lexicographic methodology of that time: pronunciation, parallel translation, literary documentation and grammatical examination methods. Kemālpaşazāde's work is significant as it employs lexicological methodology to provide practical knowledge of Persian. In fact, Kemālpaşazāde appropriated and 'localised' the 'traveling concepts', such as the principles and models of earlier Arabic and Persian grammatical and lexicographic works, to the Ottoman environment.

With his advanced knowledge of Persian and authority on the subject, Kemālpaşazāde contributed to the appropriation of Persian vocabulary by his Ottoman contemporaries and paved the way to its influence in a larger, Transottoman context.

Bibliography

Unpublished Primary Source:

Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts. Matenadaran, Yerevan, Armenia

Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ, Ms.196. 1564. ff. 27v–174r.

Secondary Sources:

Arslan, Ahmet. 1986. 'Kemal Paşazade'nin felsefi görüşleri, *Şeyhülislâm İbn Kemâl Sempozyumu. Tebliğler ve Tartışmalar*. No. 36. 87–122.

Atsız, Nihal. 1966. 'Kemalpaşaoğlu'nun Eserleri'. *Şarkiyat Mecmuası*. 6. 71–112.

Baevskii, Solomon and Vovin, Alexander (ed.). 2007. *Early Persian Lexicography. Farhangs of the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Centuries*. Translated by N. Killian. Reviewed and updated by John R. Perry. Folkestone, Kent: Global Oriental LTD.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2016. 'From Hybridity to Translation. Reflections on Travelling Concepts'. In Bachmann-Medick, Doris et al. (eds.). *The Trans/National Study of Culture. A Translational Perspective*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. 119–136.

Beyhaqī, Abu'l-Fażl. 2011. *The History of Beyhaqi. The History of Sultan Mas'ud of Ghazna. 1030– 1041*. Vol. III. Translated and commented by Clifford Edmund Bosworth. Reviewed by Mohsen Ashtiany. Boston, Washington D.C.: Ilex Foundation, Center for Hellenic Studies Trustees for Harvard University.

Brunschvig, Robert. 1963. 'Kemâl Pâshâzâde et le persan'. *Mélanges d'orientalisme offerts à Henri Massé*. 48–61.

Bursalı, M. Ṭāhir. 1333 [1915]. ʿOs̱mānlı Müʾellifleri. Vol. 1. İstanbul: Maṭbaʿa-i ʿĀmire.

Cheung, Johnny. 2015. 'The Persian Verbal Suffixes -ān and -andeh (-andag)'. In Bläsing, Uwe; Arakelova, Victoria and Weinreich, Matthias (eds.). *Studies on Iran and the Caucasus*. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 271–290.

Clauson, Sir Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Darling, Linda T. 2012. 'Ottoman Turkish. Written Language and Scribal Practice. 13th to 20th Centuries'. In Spooner, Brian and Hanaway, William L. (eds.). *Literacy in the Persianate World. Writing and Social Order*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 171–196.

Dehkhodā, ʿAli-Akbar. 1372 [1993]. *Loghat-nāme*. 14 vols. Tehran: Enteshārāt-e Dāneshgāh-e Tehran.

Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson and Browne, Edward (eds.). 1902. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. Vol. 2. London: Cambridge University.

Hassan-dust, Mohammad. 1389 [2011]. *Farhang-e tatbiqi – mowzuʿi-ye zabānhā va guyeshhā-ye irāni-ye no*. Vol. I. Tehran: Farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi, Āsār.

Hassan-dust, Mohammad. 1393 [2014]. *Farhang-e risheshenākhti-ye zabān-e fārsi*. Vol. 3. Tehran: Farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi, Āsār.

İnan, Murat Umut. 2017. 'Rethinking the Ottoman Imitation of Persian Poetry'. *Iranian Studies*. Vol. 50. No. 5. 671–689.

İnan, Murat Umut. 2019. 'Imperial Ambitions, Mystical Aspirations. Persian Learning in the Ottoman World'. In Green, Nile (ed.). *The Persianate World. The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua Franca*. Oakland: University of California Press. 75–92.

Jeremiás, Éva M. 2003 [2002]. 'Kamālpāšāzāda as Linguist'. In Jeremiás, Éva M. (ed.). *Irano-Turkic Cultural Contacts in the 11th–17th Centuries*. Piliscsaba: The Avicenna Institute of Middle Eastern Studies. 79–110.

Kılıç, Mustafa. 1994. 'Kemal Paşa-Zâdenin (İbn Kemal) Talebeleri'. *Belleten*. 58, no. 221. 55–70.

Kirakosyan, Hasmik and Sargsyan, Ani. 2018. 'The Educational Role of the Late Medieval Persian-Ottoman Turkish Bilingual Dictionaries. The Codices of the Matenadaran'. *Turkic Languages*. 22/2. 167–175.

Kostikyan, Kristine. 2017. *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Matenadaran*. Yerevan: Nairi.

Krymskij, Agafangel. 1910. *Istorija Turcii i eja Literatury ot' razcveta do načala upadka*. Moskva: Lazarevskij Institut Vostočnyh' jazykov'.

Kuru, S. Selim. 2013. 'The Literature of Rum. The Making of a Literary Tradition (1450–1600)'. In Faroqhi, Suraiya N. and Fleet, Kate (eds). *Cambridge History of Turkey 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 548–592.

Lutfullah b. Ebu Yusuf el-Halîmî. 2013. *Lüğat-i Halîmî*. Edited by Adem Uzun. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

Ménage, L. Victor. 2012. 'Kemāl Pas̲h̲a-Zāde'. In Bearman, Peri J. et al. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia of Islam. Second Edition*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0480 (accessed: 17 June 2019).

Öçal, Şamil. 2000. *Kemal Paşazâdenin felsefî ve kelâmî görüşleri*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Öz, Yusuf. 2016. *Tarih Boyunca Farsça-Türkçe Sözlükler*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Pala, İskender. 2004. *Ansiklopedik Divân Şiiri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları.

Perry, R. John. 1993. 'Early Arabic-Persian Lexicography. The Asāmī and Maṣādir Genres'. In Dévényi, Kinga; Iványi, Tamás and Shivtiel, Avihai (eds.). *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Lexicography (C.A.L.L.)*. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University Chair for Arabic Studies, Csoma de Körös Society. 247–260.

Riyahi, Mohammad Amin. 1369 [1990]. *Zabān o adab-fārsidarqalamrov-e ʿosmāni. Zabān o adab-fārsi dar qalamrov-e ʿosmāni*. Tehran: Enteshārāt-e Pāzhang.

Rubinčik, Jurij. 1970. *Persidsko-russkij slovar'*. Vol. I. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Sovetskaja ènciklopedija.

Sargsyan, Ani. 2021. 'Persian-Turkish Dictionaries of the Mid-Fifteenth-Sixteenth Centuries. A Trajectory of Knowledge Mobility'. In Dierks, Dennis et al. (eds.). *Knowledge on the Move in a Transottoman Perspective. Dynamics of Intellectual Exchange from the Fifteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. [forthcoming]

Shekh Muslihu'd-din Sadi of Shiraz. 1979. *The Rose-Garden*. Translated by Edward B. Eastwick. London: The Octagon Press.

Smirnov, Vasilij. 1891. *Očerk' Istorii Tureckoj Literatury*. SPb.: Tipografija M. M., Stasjuleviča.

Schmidt, Jan. 2014. 'The Importance of Persian for Ottoman Literary Gentlemen. Two Turkish Treatises on Aspects of the Language of Kemalpashazade (d.1536)'. In Aynur, Hatice; Aydın, Bilgin and Ülker, Mustafa Birol (eds.). *Kitaplara vakfedilen bir ömre tuhfe. İsmail E. Erünsala Armağan 2. Edebiyat ve Tasavvuf Kütüphanecilik ve Arşivcilik*. İstanbul: Ülke. 851–864.

Stein, Heidi. 2006. 'Palatal-velar Vocalism of Arabic-Persian Loanwords in 16th Century Ottoman Turkish'. In Johanson, Lars and Bulut, Christine (eds.). *Turkic-Iranian Contact Areas, Historical and Linguistic Aspects*. Turcologica 62. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 143–158.

Storey, Charles Ambrosse. 1984. *Persian Literature. A Bio-bibliographical Survey*. Vol. III. Part I. Leiden: E. J. Brill LTD.

Şahin, Kaya. 2013. *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman. Narrating the Sixteenth Century Ottoman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tietze, Andreas and Lazard, Gilbert. 1967. 'Persian Loanwords in Anatolian Turkish'. *Oriens*. 20. 125–168.

Tietze, Andreas. 2016. *Tarihî ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugati*. Vol. 3. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi.

Turan, Şerafettin. 1986. 'İbn Kemalin Tarihçiliği ve Tarih metodolojisi'. *Şeyhülislâm İbn Kemâl Sempozyumu. Tebliğler ve Tartışmalar*. No. 36. 141–149.

Türkiyede Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü. 1974. Vol. VII. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Yediyıldız, Bahaeddin. 1986. 'Tarih kaynağı olarak İbn Kemâl'. *Şeyhülislâm İbn Kemâl Sempozyumu. Tebliğler ve Tartışmalar*. No. 36. 65–70.

Yücel, Yaşar and Sevim, Ali. 1991. *Klâsik Dönemin Üç Hükümdarı. Fatih – Yavuz–Kanuni*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Zeki, Bedros. 2009. *Türkçeden Ermeniceye Mükemmel Lügat*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.