

EARLY ARABIC-PERSIAN LEXICOGRAPHY: THE *ASĀMĪ* AND *MAŠĀDIR* GENRES

John R. Perry

University of Chicago

1. Introduction

In the genesis and systematization of New Persian, the principal vehicle of Eastern Islamic literature from the fourth century A.H./tenth century C.E., the Arabic language sciences naturally served as models for the organization and metalanguage of their counterparts in Persian. Thus the metrical system of Classical Persian verse is described in terms of the feet and metres of the system of *'arūd* attributed to al-Ḥalīl b. Aḥmad, and continues to be studied and taught within this matrix even after detailed research by medieval scholars such as Šams-i Qays ar-Rāzī revealed, implicitly – and that of modern scholars has confirmed explicitly – that Persian metrics is by origin and nature quite different from Arabic, and the convoluted rules devised in order to derive many Persian metres from Arabic models are patently artificial¹. Grammatical terminology, too, has been taken mostly from Arabic, and remains so in most modern textbooks, even though Persian is structurally much more akin to English than to Arabic. Happily, this sort of imitation has not kept Persians from appreciating and composing poetry in both traditional and modern modes without conscious reference to Arabicate schemes of scansion, nor are modern Iranian linguists intimidated from coining new terms where necessary to analyse Persian within novel matrices such as generative semantics. The traditional terms are labels, no more and no less useful within their domains than their Greco-Latin analogues such as 'iambic' or 'gerund' in English poetics and grammar.

¹ See Elwell-Sutton 1976, esp. 57-82.

Where the needs of language are more important than the convenience or prestige of metalinguistic labels, reliance on Arabic models can be seen to be negligible. In the sphere of lexical borrowing, where the influence of Arabic on Persian is most immediately apparent, it has been shown that the morphological assimilation of Arabic etyma into Persian proceeds in accordance with intuitive Persian semantic categories, not by analogy with syntactically-conditioned variants or morpholexical patterns of Arabic; i.e., words ending in the phonologically ambivalent Arabic feminine marker *-a(t)* are definitively lexicalized in Persian borrowings as either *-at* or *-a* (both phonologically and orthographically), according to the extent to which they exhibit contrastive features such as mass noun/count noun, tangible/intangible, action noun/instance noun, etc. (Perry 1991.)

Lexicography is a field where one would expect an initial dependence on, and imitation of, Arabic models. New Persian does not appear in literary form (in Arabic script) for some two centuries after the Arab Muslim conquest of Iran; the early Islamic intellectuals of the region (including probable crypto-Zoroastrians like Ibn al-Muqaffa⁴) wrote in Arabic. Not only were the early monolingual Arabic dictionaries prestigious achievements with no surviving analogue in earlier Persian, but several of them were compiled by ethnic Iranians (Ibn Qutayba of Marv, az-Zamahšarī, al-Ġawharī of Fārāb), some of whom also compiled bilingual Arabic-Persian dictionaries (az-Zamahšarī, Abū Ġa'far al-Bayhaqī). This is not to argue that the vernacular spoken by such lexicographers (which in some cases was an Iranian language other than Persian) could have influenced their methodology; Arabic was the language in which they wrote – and most likely thought – and likewise the main object of their linguistic inquiries. It remains pertinent, however, that the early period of Arabic-Persian lexicography (ca. 1040-1280 C.E.) is contemporaneous with the middle period of a still vigorous and changing tradition of Arabic monolingual lexicography, involving some of the same scholars; and that several peculiarities of arrangement in Arabic dictionaries have their counterparts in Arabic-Persian dictionaries. It is the object of this preliminary inquiry to assess whether this similarity

is the result of unthinking imitation, or a conscious adoption or adaptation of tried and trusted methods; and to what extent some quite different methods used were more suitable to Persian lexicographical needs.

The importance of early Arabic-Persian dictionaries to Islamic cultural history is considerable. Beginning as reference books for the bilingual writers of the Eastern Caliphate and its independent emirates, they increasingly become records and to some extent arbiters of the flood of Arabic loanwords and calques into Persian, recording the first stage in the formal and semantic processing such words underwent in their further journeys into Turkic, Indic and other languages of the cultural ecumene.

One example of Arabic-Persian lexicography is indisputably a straightforward adaptation, virtually a translation, of a monolingual Arabic work. *aṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ* of al-Ġawharī, completed at Nishapur about 398/1007, was abridged as *aṣ-Ṣurāḥ min aṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ* by Abū l-Faḍl Ġamāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad Qarṣī at Kašgar in 681/1282. Using the same arrangement by rhyme and keeping the citations from the Koran, *Hadīṭ* and Arabic proverbs, Qarṣī dispensed with the verse *ṣawāḥid* and glossed each of the 40,000 entries with a single Persian word or expression. It proved to be a continuing success, inspiring numerous editions and commentaries in Iran and, later, in India (Munzavī 1958, 306-309). It was acknowledged as the source of the material in several subsequent dictionaries, notably the popular *Kanz al-luġāt* of Muḥammad b. Maʿrūf, written for the ruler of Gīlān ca. 870/1465. Such obvious influence does not concern us here; more interesting is the possibility of creative imitation or adaptation of individual Arabic dictionaries, or of genres of dictionaries, where this is not acknowledged.

2. Goals and Techniques

The first Arabic dictionaries, of the 2nd-3rd/8th-9th centuries, were compiled by scholars for scholars. An outgrowth of the grammatical sciences inaugurated by Sībawayhi and al-Ḥalīl, works such as the *Ki-tāb al-ʿayn* and *al-Ġamhara* were arranged paradigmatically, according to

the morphological patterns assumed by the lexical radicals; they were research tools for the lexicographer and his colleagues, whether phonologist, philologist or prosodist.

The earliest Persian monolingual dictionaries, appearing almost three centuries later, were by poets for poets; eschewing subcategorization, they arranged their vocabulary in alphabetical order of the final letter, i.e., by rhyme. Despite their often bearing Arabic titles (a fashionable convention), Persian dictionaries confined themselves strictly to native Persian vocabulary, and did not regularly include Arabic loanwords until the seventeenth century. The first of them, early in the 5th/11th century, is said to have been a *farhang* ('school[book], dictionary') by the musician and reputed first New Persian poet, Abū Ḥaḥṣ Ṣuġdī (i.e., of Sogdia, in the region of Samarqand and the Pamir foothills); some fifty years later (ca. 1050) appeared the *Luġat-i furs* of Asadī Tūsī, and the now inextant *Tafsīr* (or *Tafāsīr*) *fī luġat al-furs* of Qaṭrān of Tabriz (Nafīsī 1958:178-179, 186).

The timing and locations are significant. During the tenth century, the Sāmānid dynasty had established the dialect of New Persian known as Darī as the court and literary language of their empire centred on Bukhara. This dialect, though originating in the Old and Middle Persian of southwestern Iran, was established on former Parthian territory and had a substratum of vocabulary from indigenous northeastern Iranian languages, chiefly Sogdian and Choresmian (Khwarazmian). The Persian of southern and western Iran, known as Pārsī, remained closer to literary Pahlavi of Sasanian times, and included elements of other Iranian languages such as (pre-Turkish) Azeri in the region of Tabriz². The prestigious Persian of the Sāmānid court, a vehicle of translation from Arabic (e.g., both the *Ta'riḥ* and the *Tafsīr* of aṭ-Ṭabarī) and of original poetry and prose, was expanding its domain westward during the 5th/11th century, into Persian-speaking lands ruled by Iranian dynasts (the Buwayhids) where, paradoxically, the court and literary language was still Arabic. Abū Ḥaḥṣ and Asadī of Tūs were celebrating the vocabu-

² See Lazard 1975 and 1990.

lary of the fashionable poetry of their time, and teaching it as the vocabulary of their own clime to the less fortunate poets of western Iran; one of these was Qatrān of Tabriz who, as we learn from Nāṣir Ḥusraw, 'could not speak Persian very well' and was anxious to copy down the Khurasanian traveller's glosses on the vocabulary of the Sāmānid poet Daqīqī – thus forming the nucleus of his dictionary?³

Persian monolingual dictionaries thus had adequate autochthonous motivations for both their sociolinguistic function and their alphabet-final form (as rhyming aids). Certainly the famous Arabic *Siḥāḥ* had already appeared before them (and likewise under the Sāmānid aegis); but the concept of a rhyming dictionary was by no means confined to Arabic (Indian lexicographers had already exploited the form), so the case for Arabic methodological influence here is unproven. Persian dictionaries of pre-Islamic times were exegetical in motivation and arranged topically: such are the *Frahang-i Oīm*, which glosses Avestan vocabulary into Middle Persian, and the *Frahang-i Pahlavīk*, which transcribes the Semitic heterograms of Pahlavī into phonetic Iranic realizations (Klíma 1968:48). These belonged to an entirely separate tradition of religious scholarship which, by Sāmānid times, was alien and forgotten and could not have been influential.

Arabic-Persian dictionaries, an obvious prerequisite for the ambitious translation program sponsored by the Sāmānid *amīrs*, began to appear immediately after the Persian monolingual ones. An early example which appears to owe nothing in conception to Arabic models is Adīb Naṭanzī's *Dastūr al-luḡa*, also known as *Kitāb al-ḥalāṣ*, composed in 1090, possibly for the celebrated Seljuk vizier, the Niẓām al-Mulk. Assuming literate bilingual users, Naṭanzī glosses some of his 7,000 Arabic entries in everyday Arabic rather than Persian; and evidently desiring a practical reference work for prose translation or chancellery composition, he arranges the bulk of his work alphabetically by initial, and appends a brief Arabic grammar in (Arabic) verse. His work was also the first to distinguish by diacritics the six letters representing

³ See Lazard 1975:595-606; Thackston 1986:6.

Persian consonants not found in Arabic⁴. Naṭanzī is also credited with the composition of *al-Mirqāt* (also known as *aṣ-Ṣaḥā'if*), a Persian-Arabic vocabulary for beginners divided topically into twelve chapters (Munzavī 1958:272). Similarly motivated, and independent of Arabic models, was the contemporaneous *Tarǧumān al-Qur'ān* of the *qādī* Abū 'Abdallāh Ḥusayn az-Zawzanī (Zawzan lies between Herat and Nishapur). This was the first of many Persian glossaries of the Koran, which were generally arranged in order of *sūras*; they thus functioned more like commentaries or interlinear translations than true dictionaries, and probably owed their inspiration rather to the now universal science of *tafsīr* than to Arabic lexicography.

3. *Asāmī and maṣādir: Arabic antecedents*

During the same period there began to appear the first Arabic-Persian dictionaries using the terms *asmā'* (plural of *ism* 'noun') or the double plural *asāmī*, and *maṣādir* (plural of *maṣdar* 'verbal abstract, *nomen actionis*') in their titles. For this there are precedents in the Arabic monolingual lexicographical and lexicological tradition. Abū 'Ubayd in the seventeenth book of *al-Ġarīb al-muṣannaḥ* exemplifies sixty-nine *bābs* of nominal paradigms, and there are similar though shorter such sections on *asmā'* in Ibn Qutayba's *Adab al-kātib* and *al-Ġambara* of Ibn Durayd. The impetus for these separate listings seems to have been the desire to showcase unusual forms, such as the pattern *fi'cīl* and the proper noun *Ṣuraḥbīl* in Abū 'Ubayd; certainly these anomalies lend themselves less well to systematization under radicals. Such precedents may have led in the Arabic tradition to an elaboration where a single nominal paradigm is exemplified exhaustively, as in *Kitāb mā ḡā'a min al-mabnī 'alā fa'āl* of 'Alī b. 'Isā ar-Rab'ī (d. 420/1029)⁵.

⁴ Brockelmann 1937-42 I, 343; Munzavī 1958:270-271.

⁵ See Rybalkin 1990:39-41. -

al-Kisā'ī (d. 189/805) wrote the oldest treatise on the morphology of Arabic nomina actionis (*maṣādir*), and was followed by at least eight other grammarians, including al-Farrā', who confined their corpus to the Koran. According to Yāqūt, one Dalāmīzu Buhlūl wrote a treatise on rare forms of *maṣādir*. Lexicographically, Abū 'Ubayd, again, treats five types of *maṣādir* in his nineteenth *kitāb*, under the rubric of entiosemes (*addād*). Curiously, neither in form nor in function do his words exemplify what one normally thinks of as a *maṣdar* in the sense of *nomen actionis*: listed are denominatives (those derived from parts of the body, those with which no finite verbs are associated, those derived from numbers), idiomatic constructs (those occurring as *maf'ūl mutlaq*), and those of the anomalous form *maf'ūl* (Rybalkin 1990:37-38). Like his *asmā'*, and as in the treatise of Dalāmīz, Abū 'Ubayd's *maṣādir* are presented as *nawādir* 'curiosities', not as a semantically unified form class of thousands to be listed together with the relevant verbs.

Mentioned among compilers of early, now inextant, Arabic collections of *maṣādir* (perhaps issued as independent works?) were two Iranians, Niftawayhi (d. 323/935) and Abū Zayd al-Balḥī (d. 322/934) (Rybalkin 1990:38). However, it is not until the early twelfth century that we hear of an independent Arabic dictionary devoted to a systematic listing of everyday *maṣādir*; and this was by an Iranian scholar who also compiled the most successful of the early Arabic-Persian *maṣādir* collections, as we shall see below.

4. Arabic-Persian *asāmī*

It thus appears that both *asāmī* and *maṣādir* came into their own as distinct and categorically sophisticated lexicographical genres only with Arabic-Persian bilingual dictionaries from the late eleventh century on. The two labels, like most grammatical terms, were lifted from Arabic, but the use to which they were put was more in keeping with Persian lexicographical needs than Arabic; though the appropriate evolution took some time.

In Nishapur in 1104, Abū l-Faḍl Aḥmad al-Maydānī, a prolific contemporary of az-Zamaḥṣarī and al-Bayhaqī, produced *as-Sāmī fī l-asāmī*, 'The Sublime [Dictionary] of Nouns': this was arranged topically, under four *kitābs*: (1) religion, (2) animals, (3) the celestial, (4) the terrestrial. Interesting is that the Persian glosses are absent from some of the manuscripts⁶; since the introduction and explanatory apparatus is in Arabic, and makes no specific reference to Persian, perhaps the work was conceived initially as a monolingual dictionary, and Abū l-Faḍl's son or another later retrofitted it as a bilingual Arabic-Persian dictionary. At any rate, forty years later his son, Abū Sa'd Sa'īd al-Maydānī, issued an expanded Arabic-Persian version under the appropriate title *al-Asmā' fī l-asāmī*, with a Persian introduction (Munzavī 1958: 275). This work, surviving only as a fragment, thus marks an important stage in the rise of New Persian as a scholarly language in its own right, and anticipates the relegation of Arabic in the Islamic East to its post-Mongol status as a dead language – still essential as a key to the classics and a fund of vocabulary, but no longer the only acceptable medium of expository prose.

Approximately a hundred years later, during the thirteenth century, the *Muhaddib al-asmā'* by the *qāḍī* Maḥmūd b. 'Umar (an Arab by descent, resident near Samarqand), introduced further innovations. Dispensing with citations, it included particles, adjectives and collocations, arranged the material in 28 *bābs* alphabetically by initial, and further subcategorized them (*fasl*) by first vowel! This very modern and un-Semitic procedure was not widely imitated; other improvements were – notably the use of standard abbreviations such as *ma'rūf* to designate a noun so common as not to need definition, and the letter *ġīm* (for *ġam'* 'plural') (Munzavī 1958:301-303; Storey 1984:92). Some glosses comprise not native Persian words but assimilated Arabic loans: e.g., *al-arab* ('need') is explained as *ḥāġat*, not as, say, *niyāz*, as might have been expected. The anonymous and roughly contemporaneous *Tahdīb al-*

⁶ Storey 1984:81-82; Munzavī 1958:273-274; Brockelmann 1937-42 I, 344, Suppt. I, 506-507.

asmā', also known as *Tāğ al-asāmī*, includes wordier definitions of its material in Arabic. It treats nouns only; these are likewise arranged in the first instance alphabetically by initial, but subcategorized by root final⁷. This arrangement was to prove the most popular with later Iranian and Indo-Persian lexicographers until the eighteenth century, since it combined the best of both worlds – alphabetical by initial, for general reference of words (not roots), and alphabetical by final within this scheme, for use as a partial rhyming dictionary.

5. Arabic-Persian *mašādir*

Qāḍī Abū 'Abdallāh Ḥusayn az-Zawzanī (d. 1093) compiled several dictionaries besides the Koranic glossary already mentioned, including a [*Kitāb*] *al-mašādir*. This early model of the genre was not a user-friendly vernacular glossary, its 5,000 entries being arranged much like one of its Arabic precursors in order of morphological complexity of the infinitives and the characteristic vowels of conjugated forms (Munzavī 1958: 268; Storey 1984:80-81). However, it evidently sensed a need and anticipated a trend. Some fifty years later, Abū Ġā'far al-Bayhaqī (Bū Ġā'farak, to give him his familiar Persian form) expanded az-Zawzanī's work, without acknowledgement, to 10,000 entries and arranged it in strict alphabetical order within the morphological sections. This *Tāğ al-mašādir* was an immediate success: since Bū Ġā'farak reputedly never left home except to visit the mosque, scholars flocked to his house in Nishapur to hear and memorize his dictionary. The author of the *Tārīḥ-i Bayhaq* claims to have memorized both az-Zawzanī's and Bū Ġā'farak's *mašādir* (Munzavī 1958:279-280; Storey 1984:84-85). The latter was published in a Bombay lithograph edition as late as 1301/1884.

The *Tāğ* was no dry listing of infinitives, but a compendium of Arabic verbal morphology and an illustration of the idiomatic disambiguation of polysemous action nouns. For example (p. 677 of the lithograph) under the entry *ḥal'* we read one example *ḥala'a 'anhu tawbahu*,

⁷ Munzavī 1958:303-304; *Tāğ al-asāmī* 1988, Editor's introduction.

glossed three ways as *ġāma'aš-rā bīrūn kard/...bar kand/...bīrūn kašīd* 'he took off his robe'; and another, *ḥala'a imra'atabu*, glossed as *zanaš-rā ḥal' kard and zan-i ḥud-rā ba-kāvīn furūht* 'he divorced his wife'. What we might call 'homonymic glosses' such as *ḥal' kardan* are quite common; other instances are *al-muwāfaqa - ba-kasī muwāfaqat kardan* 'to agree with someone'; *al-mukāfāt - mukāfāt kardan* 'to requite'. In the last example, the final *tā'* of the Arabic entry is written (at least in some manuscripts) as *tā' mamdūda*, as in the assimilated Persian loanword; even if this is merely a scribal lapse, it indicates – together with the incidence of homonymic glosses – that such dictionaries were increasingly becoming lists of Arabic *Lehnwörter* in Persian rather than *Fremdwörter*. As historical records of Persian idiom, especially of the incorporation of Arabic *mašdars* in Persian complex and phrasal verbs, such works are still valuable today.

Bū Ġa'farak is said to have also compiled an Arabic monolingual *Kitāb al-mašādir*, influenced structurally by Abū Ibrāhīm Iṣḥāq al-Fārābī's *Dīwān al-adab* of two centuries before (ca. 950 A.H). The latter was divided morphologically into six sections, each subdivided between nouns (*asmā'*) and verbs (*af'āl*); in effect, Bayhaqī extracted the *mašdars* from, or 'nominalized', the verbal moiety of the *Dīwān al-adab*⁸.

6. *The legacy of asmā' and mašādir*

A few more Arabic-Persian dictionaries of the *asmā'* genre were produced up until the early eighteenth century in Turkey and Iran, but *mašādir*-type dictionaries appear to have died out in the fifteenth. Neither genre is represented in the titles of dictionaries produced in India, where lexicographers of Arabic and Persian were the most active from the fourteenth century on. However, manuscripts of the best known exemplars are common in libraries of the Subcontinent; and if we examine the material treated and its arrangement, we find more than a trace of

⁸ Rybalkin 1990:38-39; al-Fārābī, *Dīwān*, Editor's introduction.

both of these pioneering methodologies in dictionaries of various types that appeared during the centuries following their demise.

The popular *Kanz al-luġāt* (ca. 1465) by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hāliq Maʿrūf took its material from the *Šurāḥ as-Šihāḥ*, as already mentioned. In its arrangement, however, it is a combination of our two genres, segregating *mašādir* from nouns and other words in each *kitāb* (Munzavī 1958:316-317). Maʿrūf tends to group together different *mašdars* of the same root, as, e.g., in the prudishly unhelpful entry: *al-muġāmaʿa, wa-l-ġimāʿ - maʿrūfān*. In this and most subsequent dictionaries that list alphabetically by initial then final (rather than second), strict alphabetical sequence is occasionally ignored in order (1) to list together words of identical paradigms such as *mafʿal, mufāʿala, tafʿīl*, etc., and (2) within this matrix, to group synonyms, sometimes having them share a gloss: e.g., *al-muʿāqada* and *al-muʿāhada* are glossed together, before the entry *al-muʿānada*. Thus in the *Tāġ al-mašādir*, the *Kanz al-luġāt*, the *Muntahab al-luġāt-i Šāhġahānī* (1046/1636-7), the *Farhang-i šīr o šakar* (18th century?) and several other Arabic-Persian dictionaries or Persian dictionaries that include Arabic loans and are arranged alphabetically by initial, the Arabic vocabulary that begins with formatives (especially *mīm* or *tāʾ*) is prominently displayed in paradigmatic groups.

This is useful in the first instance to the original learner or scholar, who finds words not only easy to look up but, in the case of verbal nouns and participles, grouped according to prosodic and semantic type: a choice of, say, *mufāʿala* words is available for the rhetorician to spice his sentences with rhymed synonyms and antonyms. In the second instance it is convenient for the modern researcher who may wish to make lexico-statistical or semantic comparisons. For instance, the total number of *mufāʿala* words in az-Zawzanī's *Kitāb al-mašādir* is 490; in al-Bayhaqī's expansion of this, 567; in the *Kanz al-luġāt*, 505; in the *Muntahab al-luġāt*, 228, which is little more than the number used as loans in modern written Persian. The extent to which actual items in dictionaries of different periods correspond to eventual *Lehnwörter*, and the relative proportions of vocabulary from various lexico-semantic patterns as between Arabic words that remained outside the Persian lexicon

and eventual Persian borrowings, are some of the questions that may help to fill in our scanty knowledge of the process of Persian borrowing from Arabic.

It is evident that from the rise of literary New Persian, which was incorporating Arabic vocabulary at a furious rate, scholars realised the need to control and record this process. Vocabulary was being assimilated not in the form of abstract roots, grammatically-conditioned particles and finite verb paradigms, but almost exclusively as substantives (including verbal participles and, especially, infinitives or *mašdars*). These latter were especially valuable in building up the intellectual vocabulary: already by the Middle Persian period, the primitive verb stock had become seriously impoverished, so that denominal derivation of new verbs was common even before the arrival of Arabic. Henceforth synthetic coinages like *gāratīdan* 'to plunder' and *fahmīdan* 'to understand' and, increasingly, analytic forms with auxiliaries, as *taqdīm kardān* 'to propose, proffer' and the examples already quoted from *mašādir* collections, were to continue to enrich Persian.

The intricately categorized, over-determined Arabic dictionaries which Iranian scholars had played a considerable part in elaborating for the purposes of Arabic philology were of little use in overseeing the transfer of actual substantives and nomina actionis into Persian. So by progressively simplifying the excesses of categorization, by arranging the material by rhyme or by initial consonant (of the word, not necessarily the root), and by restricting it to those word classes most in demand, bilingual lexicographers formed a bridge between Arabic and Persian monolingual dictionaries. As already noted, two of the early works of *asāmī* and *mašādir* produced by Iranian scholars of Khurasan (al-Maydānī and al-Bayhaqī) may have been drafted originally in Arabic only, and were later adapted as bilingual glossaries. The labels *asmā'*/*asāmī* and *mašādir* were lifted from their lexicographical precursors, but the form and content of the new genres had little in common with the fringe phenomena once studied for the sake of Arabic philology, and everything to do with the Arabicization of the Persian lexicon. By the seventeenth century, when 'Abd ar-Rašīd Tattavī introduced his

Muntahab al-lugāt-i Šāhghānī (with the hybrid syntax of its title) to the cultivated Muḡal court, as the first comprehensive dictionary of Arabic prose for students and general readers, the listing of nominal and verbal substantives had been amalgamated into what was, though ostensibly still an Arabic-Persian dictionary, in effect an alphabetical record of Arabic *Fremdwörter* (loans available) and *Lehnwörter* (loans in use) in Persian. It is significant that Persian monolingual dictionaries of this same period, such as the *Burhān-i qāṭi'* and Tattavī's own *Farhang-i Rašīdī*, were beginning to include assimilated Arabic loanwords in their entries.

REFERENCES

Unattributed remarks on the content of particular dictionaries are based on the author's examination of various manuscripts.

A. Primary sources

al-Fārābī, *Dīwān* = Abū Ibrāhīm Ishāq al-Fārābī, *Dīwān al-adab*.

Edited by Muḡtār 'Umar and Ibrāhīm Anīs. 4 vols. in 5. Cairo 1974/1394.

Nāšir Ḥusraw, *Safarnāma*. = Thackston 1986.

Tāğ al-asāmī (*Tabdīb al-asmā'*). Edited by 'Alī Awsaṭ Ibrāhīmī.

Tehran: Markaz-i našr-i dānišgāhī, 1988.

B. Secondary sources

Brockelmann, Carl. 1937-42. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 2 vols. and Supplement, 3 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Elwell-Sutton, L. P. 1976. *The Persian Metres*. Cambridge: The University Press.

Klíma, Otakar. 1968. "The Middle Persian Era". Jan Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature*, 25-65. Edited by Karl Jahn. Dordrecht: Reidel.

- Lazard, Gilbert. 1975. "The Rise of the New Persian Language". *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. IV, 595-632. Cambridge: The University Press.
- . 1990. "Parsi et dari: nouvelles remarques". *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4.239-242.
- Munzavī, ʿAlī Naqī. 1958. "Farhangnāmahā-yi ʿarabī ba-fārsī". *Luġatnāma-yi Dihhudā, muqaddima* [Fasc. 40, Preface] 265-372. Tehran: Sirius.
- Nafīsī, Saʿīd. 1958. "Farhangā-yi-fārsī". *Luġatnāma-yi Dihhudā, muqaddima* [Fasc. 40, Preface] 178-226. Tehran: Sirius.
- Perry, John R. 1991. *Form and Meaning in Persian Vocabulary: The Arabic Feminine Ending*. Costa Mesa: Mazda.
- Rybalkin, V. S. 1990. *Arabskaia leksikografičeskaia tradiciia*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Storey, C. A. 1984. *Persian Literature, A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*. Vol. III, Part I: *Lexicography, Grammar, Prosody and Poetics*. Edited by V. M. Shepherd. Leiden: Brill.
- Thackston, W. M., Jr., transl. and ed. 1986. *Nāser-e Khosraw's Book of Travels (Safarnāma)*. (= *Persian Heritage Series*, 36.) New York: Bibliotheca Persica.