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Introduction

In introduction to his 1878 Calcutta edition of “A Sketch of the Turki language as spoken in Eastern Turkistan (Kâshgar and Yarkand), the political agent of her Majesty in Kâshgar, Robert Barkley Shaw, used an “Oriental Saying” that compared three different languages from the different language groups to Turki. These languages were Arabic, Persian (Farsi) and Hindi. The claim that the author made was as follows: “Arabic is Science; Persian is Sugar, Hindi is Salt; Turki is Art.” The “oriental saying” was in written in Urdu due to Mr. Shaw’s obvious connection to the British Raj in India. This grammar did not take in consideration the other Turkic dictionaries that were dedicated to the various languages of Central Asia that were published in the 19th century. The primary purpose of this article is to create a cohesive bibliographic picture of various Turkic language dictionaries as they appear from the earliest 11th century work by Mahmud al- Kashgari until the end of the 19th century in various languages.

I have emphasized the survey of the 19th century Turkic language dictionaries in this article for several specific reasons. First, the emergence of these dictionaries can be considered as a function of the scramble by the British and Russian Imperial authorities for political dominance in Central Asia. Second, besides “The Great Game,” the spread of publishing in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century led to the emergence of several Ottoman Turkish dictionaries. The Ottoman Empire remained a force to be reckoned with for both the British and Russians in the 19th century. As the process of standardization of Ottoman Turkish was problematic, the dictionaries that were published in the Empire represent as a group an interesting phenomenon. These dictionaries can be examined as literary objects that highlight an inherent tension that exists in a literary space of a multicultural, multilingual empire. The existence of multiple cultures and languages in one state meant the whole diversity of dictionaries came into existence in the 19th century. Although, the first printing press for Ottoman Turkish in the Empire was established in 1729 for Arabic script materials, one must note that there were early printing presses in Istanbul that published in Armenian.

The development of the 19th century Turkic lexicography signifies efforts to provide not only standardization for various Central Asian languages, but it also provides conscious efforts by the part of those who colonized the region inhabited by the Turkic people or strived for the

---

1 Menges, Karl H. The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968. Print. I have used the term Turkic instead of Turkish to denote the common ethno-linguistic provenance with shared histories of the group of people instead of the narrow term Turkic.
4 For Turkic languages, I have adopted the classification by Csato and Johnson. Csató, Éva A, and Lars Johanson. The Turkic Languages. London: Routledge, 1998. Print. I have
direct or indirect control of the region. One exception to the proposed hypothesis is the fact that the language of the Ottomans was a Turkic language and the theories of colonization and competition for the territories, that one can apply with varying degree of success to both the British and Russian Empires, cannot be applied to the Ottoman Empire that was in the process of losing its territories in the second half of the 19th century.

The research questions that I have set from the outset of this article are as follows,

1. What kind of early Turkic dictionaries appeared in the aftermath of Kashgari’s *Divan-i lughat Türk*? How were these dictionaries arranged? Where are some of the early manuscripts of these dictionaries located?
2. What were the dictionaries of various Turkic languages published in 19th century? Where were they published and in what languages?
3. What are the digital surrogates of the paper copies of these dictionaries currently available to scholars?

**Scope and Limitations:**

The primary focus of this article is to survey the world of Turkic dictionaries of the 19th century. I have limited this article primarily to survey of English, Russian and Ottoman Turkish dictionaries. There were early Turkic dictionaries in French, German and Italian languages that I have tried to index as a part of my data gathering. For the purpose of this article, I have looked at only at the general dictionaries instead of specialized dictionaries of the 19th century in European languages. I have gathered the data only tangentially about the dictionaries in other languages like Turkish-Urdu, Turkish-Persian, or Greek-Turkish, etc.

I have searched for the dictionaries from Turkic to other languages and also from the other languages to Turkic languages. I did not take in consideration the dictionaries in Turkish languages only. However, I have provided brief descriptions of early Turkic manuscript dictionaries in order to contextualize the structure of early dictionaries.

During the data gathering phase, I have limited the scope to the first editions of the work. All other subsequent editions in some aspects can be considered to be separate works; however the first edition was the starting point for the appearance of subsequent iterations of this first edition. I also excluded phrasebooks or textbooks of Turkic/sh languages from this analysis. I acknowledge the fact that some of the textbooks might have had glossaries in the back of the work.

**Literature Review**

There have been several works in 18th, 19th and 20th centuries that examine the historical development of Turkic lexicography. However, these works have often examined the development of Turkic lexicography in the context of the influence of the other languages on Turkic languages. In some cases, the introduction to Turkic lexicography has served as a segue into other topics such as the learning of particular language. The spread of Islam and conquering of the region of Central Asia by the Arabs, and later dominance due to the Persian extension of influence in the region, meant that the early works on Turkic lexicography involve use of Arabic and Persian in the dictionaries of this early period.

---

7 Terent’ev, Mikhail A. *Grammatiki Turetinskai̇a, Persidskai̇a, Kirgizskai̇a i Uzbekskai̇a*. SPb: Tip. Imperatorskoi̇ akademii nauk, 1875. Print.
While discussing the early Turkic lexicography, Haywood has argued, “Until fairly modern times, lexicography in Turkish meant chiefly the explanation of Arabic and Persian vocabulary used in the language – and this in turn, meant the translation of Arabic and Persian lexicons.”¹¹

In some cases, some Turkic words were translated in Arabic or Persian dictionaries.¹² However, in majority of cases, it was an exact opposite. Arabic and Persian loan words formed part of Turkic lexicons in the region. For example, al-ʻAintabi in the 18th century translated into Ottoman Turkish, an Arabic dictionary Qamus. This dictionary was published in 19th century in Istanbul.¹³ Vanquli’s 16th century translation of Sihah in Turkish serves as an example of translation of Arabic dictionaries in Turkish.¹⁴

The Russian expansion in the Central Asia and occupation of Bukhara in 1868, and turning of Khiva into a Russian protectorate in 1873, meant that the need for understanding of the local culture and language by the Russians who colonized the region. This in turn Russian by the region stimulated construction of Russian-Turkic lexicons. However, I argue that the development of Russian-Turkic lexicons in Imperial Russia should not be understood as a sole function of the Russian occupation of Central Asia. Russian lexicography of Turkic language was much earlier phenomenon. Nugmanov in his 1969 work “Russko-tatarskie rukopisnyye slovari XVII-XVII vekov” has examined the history and collections of the manuscript dictionaries of Russian and Tatar languages that were produced as early as 17th century.¹⁵ The Russian Empire, as a multinational state, had a large Turkic populations in it. The census of Imperial Russia, that was conducted in 1897, shows that in Central Asia there were 587,992 Russian speakers and 6,618,750 Turkic-Tatar speakers.¹⁶ This mandated obviously policy adjustments from the Russian Imperial government that in turn reflected upon creation of multilingual dictionaries and text books of Tatar, Uzbek and other Turkic languages.

The recent works by Nadir Ilhan (2007),¹⁷ Emin Eminoğlu (2010)¹⁸ and Paşa Yavuzarslan (2009) provide us with glimpses of the bibliographic universe as well as the nature of these dictionaries in contemporary Turkic context.¹⁹ Eminoğlu’s work “Türk dilini sözlükleri ve sözlükçülük kaynakcası” represents a comprehensive effort to index all of the Turkic language dictionaries except it does not take in consideration in some cases the dictionaries from other languages into Turkish. In cases of languages like Hindi/Urdu it does not take in consideration any of the 19th century dictionaries that were published in South Asia. The author

---

indexes all dictionaries under the general rubric of Turkish dictionaries. For example, Türkçe (Azerabaycan Türkçesi or Çağatay Türkçesi)

**Early Turkic Dictionaries**

**Mahmud al-Kashgari’s Dīwan lughat al-Turk**

Mahmud al-Kashgari’s Dīwan lughat al-Turk can be considered to be the first comprehensive written dictionary of Turkic languages. Mahmud al-Kashgari’s Dīvan lughat al-Turk’s only surviving manuscript is in Istanbul in the Millet Genel Kütüphanesi. Dankoff has suggested that this is the later copy of the original as the text is fully vocalized. The colophon date for copying of this manuscript from the original autograph is 1266. Dankoff has provided a detailed overview of the eventual translations and reprints of Kashgari’s works in his book.

One of the shortcomings of the Brockelmann’s edition, as noted by Dankoff, is the fact that Brockelmann used the Killisi Rifat’s edition as he did not have access to the manuscript. Dīwan lughat al-Turk is the earliest surviving lexicon of the Turkic language.

Dankoff has described al-Kashgari’s work as an “encyclopedic lexicon,” as it also contains notes on the travels of the author in the Turkic world and a wealth of other relevant information. It is dedicated to the Caliph al-Muqtadī whose status was dependent on the Seljuk overlordship. That might be one reason why this dictionary appeared during al Muqtadī’s reign. The dictionary is modeled after the existing Arabic dictionaries of the time. al-Kashgari lived and worked in Baghdad, and many Arabic lexicon’s were available in Baghdad at time, for example, the al-Khalīl ibn Ahmad’s Kitab al-‘Ayn that documents all the roots in Arabic of that time period. al-Kashgari’s lexicon is modeled after Abu Ibrahim Ishaq ibn Ibrāhim al-Fārābi’s Diwān al-Adab fi Bayan lughat al-‘Arab that is based on the rhyme order. Kashgari had to adapt this model while accounting for the differences of Arabic and Turkic sound structures.

'Abū Ḥayyān al-‘Andalusī’s Kitāb al-‘idrāk li-lisān al-‘Atrāk

The second important manuscript that serves as a sort of the compendium of the Turkic words is ’AbūAḤayyān al-‘Andalusī’s Kitāb al-‘idrāk li-lisān al-‘Atrāk. It was completed on May 10, 1335. According to Ermer, the author had already written extensively on Turkic languages. Ermer cites authors Kitab al- ‘af ‘ail fi lisan at-Turk as one example. Ermer’s translation into English of this manuscript reveals the authorial intent to its creation as follows,

“The purpose of this book is to record a large part of the language of the Turks in lexicography, morphology and syntax. I registered this language consonant by consonant and arranged the lexicographical part according to the consonants of the alphabet in the Turkic language. In this book I first mention the Turkic word and its equivalent (murādifihā) in the Arabic language.”

Besides the fact that the author explicitly states the purpose behind this dictionary, I would argue that there could have been other reason that could have motivated this author in compiling this dictionary. We know that ’AbūAḤayyān al-‘AndalusīAndalusilusī' considered hin

---

immigrant to Egypt.  

According to Ermers there are three surviving manuscripts of this work; two are in Istanbul and one is in the National Archives in Cairo. Ermers observes further that this work, besides the Divan, is only two works that contain Turkic-Arabic word lists instead of Arabic-Turkic word lists. The author also has differentiated words that had entered Turkic language from Persian and Turkman. Here we see a sort of confusion when it comes to distinguishing between what is meant by Oguz (Turkman) and Turks. This dictionary has a detailed section on grammar of Turkic language. The list of words was first collated by Caferoğlu and Ermers modified it to include Turkic words from the first two parts of the books, i.e. from morphology and syntax. At the time of writing of this article, I could not find any study in a North American or Western European context that was based on the manuscript that is in the National Archives of Egypt (Dar al-Kutub) in Cairo.

**Kitab at-Tuhfat az-Zakiyya fi'l-lugah at-Turkiyya**

According to Fazylov, Ziaieva and Kononov, the first mention of this manuscript is by Köprüli in his 1922 Zeitschrift. This manuscript is in the Bayezid library holdings in the folder no. 3092. However, I was unable to locate this manuscript in the holdings of Bayezid library’s online catalog. The first facsimile reproduction of this manuscript was by Halasi Kun in 1942. Its translation into contemporary Turkish was done by Atalay in 1945. The text has both Arabic and Qipchaq Turkic elements. The Arabic words that are listed in this dictionary are both of the Syrian and Egyptian usage of the time. Fazylov describes this manuscript to be made of 180 pages and the Arabic words are written in black ink and Turkic words in Red ink in Naskh script. This undated manuscript does not have the author’s name. However, one can establish the date of this manuscript to be sometimes in the 15th or 16th century based on the fact that the document mentions the assassination of the Mamluk sultan Nasir Muhammad in 1495. This dictionary has 3,600 words listed that are divided into chapters like verbs, nouns, etc. There are 64 different chapters in this manuscript and in some cases, when the compiler did not know the Arabic equivalent in Turkic, we see a blank space in front of the Arabic term.

---

24 In the beginning of the manuscript the author states that he was an immigrant in the Land of Egypt.
27 Ibid. P.25
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
Rasûlid Hexaglot: A multilingual dictionary

The other interesting manuscript from the Yemeni private collection is the Rasûlid Hexaglot or a dictionary in six languages that includes Turkic vocabulary. The manuscript is dated from the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. The editors Halasi-Kun and Golden observe that this manuscript contains a list of “Turkic words that are a mixture of Oguz and Qipcaq elements as is typical of the Mamluk glossaries, where it was not always possible to distinguish between the two”. The author of the manuscript is al-Malik al-Afdal al-‘Abbas b. ‘Alî. According to the editors of this published manuscript, the hexaglot essentially is made up of different glossaries combined together in one manuscript. The lists are not continuous as in some cases there are all six language present, namely Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Mongolian, Persian, and Turkic, and in other parts of the manuscript four languages are used. The editors also note that there are several words that are repeated in these glossaries. Thus the manuscript is a sort of a compendium rather than a work that was written as one piece. This dictionary like the preceding manuscripts uses Arabic script that was adapted for Turkish sounds.

al-Durrah al-mu‘tah fi al-lughah al-Turkiyah:

This is another 14th century manuscript that has been sometimes attributed to Abū Ḥayyān al-al-Gharnaṭī. It is located in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence. The manuscript’s shelf mark is as follows: Orient 131 (24 folios). According to Robert Ermers, this manuscript should be treated as an anonymous treatise that was composed during Mamluk era. Ermers also notes that the manuscript contains no grammatical information. This manuscript contains a list of Arabic and Turkic words that are contained in this manuscript. Most of this vocabulary has been published in a series of articles by the Polish scholar Ananiasz Zajączkowski.

Codex Cumanicus:

The early Turkic language dictionaries were primarily created using the Arabic script as an aid to the rulers, and to those who ruled, the Codex Cumanicus represents Hungarian efforts to create a sort of manual that would allow either the missionaries or traders to communicate with Cumans who were the nomadic people of the steppe. Golden argues that the Codex is a compilation of several works and it can be divided in two parts. The first part is a type of textbook for Cuman language that includes also the vocabularies of Cuman, Latin, Italian and Persian. Cuman was a Qipcaq language that was spoken by Cumans who lived in Dniepr region. The detailed description of their migration to the West is provided in the fifth volume of

---

the Encyclopedia Islamica.\textsuperscript{42} The text of this codex is located in the Biblioteca Nazionale of the cathedral of San Marco in Venice.

**Methodology:**

I searched for Turkic language dictionaries using both the Worldcat as well as Hathi Trust Digital Library. I used both subject searches as well as Keyword searches to gather my data in over the period of one week.\textsuperscript{43} There were several sets of subject search terms that I used to conduct my data gathering. One of such example is as follows, su: [English language Dictionaries Turkic., German language Dictionaries Turkic, and so forth]. I also used the following search subset to get additional data: su: [Ottoman Turkish Dictionaries English, etc.] and su: [Ottoman Turkish dictionaries or Turki].

For the keyword searches, I used several combined terms like Russian Turkic/Turkish dictionaries and others such as Turkic lexicon to gather the data. Besides conducting searches using the English terms, I used the following non-English words to get additional data like Türkçe, Türk. These words were lexicon, lughat/lügat, qamus, slovar’, sozlug/k/q, sözlük. These searches revealed additional items. I also searched for the items using the combination of subject terms such as Arabic language Dictionaries- Turkish Early works to 1900, or Turkic languages -- Dictionaries -- Hungarian.

During the data gathering phase, I was able to identify 67 dictionaries that were published in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. The distribution of these dictionaries by the years of publications was as follows:

Table 1: The distribution of print Turkic dictionaries by years of publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800-1850</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1899</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see from the table above, 30\% of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century Turkic dictionaries were published before 1851. The distribution by the places of publication of these dictionaries is indicated in the table below.

Table 2: The distribution of print the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century Turkic dictionaries by places of publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
<th>No. of dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baku</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildesheim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{43}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruse (Rustchuk/Ruschiuk)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Petersburg</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, one can see that the majority of Turkic dictionaries in the 19th century were published in the territories of Ottoman Empire. Out of 67 dictionaries, 33% were published in the capital of the Ottoman Empire-Istanbul, and 13% of the dictionaries were published in the territories of the Russian Empire. In the territories of the British Empire and Great Britain, a total of 16% of the dictionaries from the examined sample were published.

In the beginning of this essay, I had mentioned the Great Game in Central Asia that played out between the Russian and British Empires in the 19th century over the control of the region. These dictionaries per se could not be used as reliable evidence that supports the notions of the Great Game among the British and the Russians. However, the publishing of these specific titles in the territories of the British and Russian Empires shows an increased interest in the
region and its culture. Russia’s interest in Central Asia remains a well-documented fact.\(^{44}\) One of the first dictionaries of Uzbek language was published in Samarkand in 1899.

This bilingual dictionary had 4000 terms.\(^{45}\) The purpose of this dictionary as stated on its title page was to empower its user to be able to communicate with the “aborigines” of the region.\(^{46}\)

The distribution by the language in which these dictionaries were published is provided in the table below. I have specifically used terms like Chagatai instead of Ottoman where I was able to establish that the dictionary was in another form of Turkish than the prevalent Ottoman Turkish. In places where I have not used any notion of Turkic or Turkish, the reader should assume that I mean the other language to be Ottoman Turkish.

Table 2: The distribution of the 19th century Turkic print dictionaries by languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>No. of Dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{46}\) Туземец literally from the other land has been translated as an aborigine. The Imperial mode of thinking meant the dictionary that was published in Samarkand called the residents of that region from that land, instead of considering the Russians who had colonized these lands in 19\(^{th}\) century during the phase of Russian Imperial expansion.
The same distribution can be shown graphically as follows,

Table 3: A graphical representation of no. of dictionaries by languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. of Dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic, Persian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagatai Turkish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circassian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, Persian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian, Armenian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman Turkish</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of Ottoman Turkish dictionaries that were printed in the 19th century, according to the data, comprises 21% of the total sample size. Russian language dictionaries of Turkish
represent 16% of the 19th century periodicals. Both German and English language dictionaries made 13% and 12% of the sample size.\textsuperscript{47}

**The Open-Access and the Turkic language Dictionaries**

Although these 19th Turkic dictionaries were created for different purposes and with different users in mind, their historical journey as information objects remains of interest. For lexicographers and linguists, these dictionaries represent a sort of archive where the use of a particular Turkic word might be contextually different than when it was indexed in these dictionaries. Since most of these dictionaries are located in a handful of the libraries globally, it becomes important to examine the issues related to the open-access to these objects. As a part of my study, I also looked for the presence of electronic access to these dictionaries.

Electronic access can allow for multiple users to object the information that is contained in these dictionaries without actually leaving their locations. Second, these dictionaries are over century old, which means their physical condition might not allow for the direct user access unless it is warranted under some exceptional circumstances. Third, the electronic version allows users to search within the text provided the digital version has been rendered optical character recognition ready.

In this paper, while I was gathering the bibliographic information on various Turkic dictionaries, I also gathered data to see if any of these dictionaries were available to their users under the open access model. I was able to identify that out of 67 19th century dictionaries, 28 were available electronically. This represents 42% of the total dictionaries that I had examined. There were three distinct access points that allow users to retrieve these dictionaries. These were the Google Books project, the Hathi Trust Digital Library and individual university libraries. In some cases, the dictionaries that were accessible through the Google Books project were also accessible through the Hathi Trust Library. This duplication was caused by the fact that many North American University libraries participated initially in the Google Books project and then in 2008 the Hathi Trust digital library was created by agreement between the thirteen universities of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) and the University of California.

\textsuperscript{47} I have rounded up to the nearest two decimal points.
In the table no. 4 below, one can see the distribution of the digital versions of the 19th century Turkic dictionaries by the place of publication. Out of 28 digital dictionaries, more than 64% are the ones that were published in the territories of the Ottoman Empire.

Table 4: The distribution of digital versions of the 19th century Turkic Dictionaries by the Place of Publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of publication</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥalab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥānyah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Казань</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hathi Trust Digital Library’s interface is relatively easy to use and it looks like the screenshot below:
This dictionary depicted above is the first volume of an 1880 Lügat-i Çağatayi ve Türkî-yi Osmani whose editor was Şeyh Süleyman el-Buhari, Özbeki.⁴⁸

Picture 2 The title page of the Lügat-i Çağatayi ve Türkî-yi Osmani.

⁴⁸ Şeyh, Süleyman -B. Lügat-i Çağatayi Ve Türkî-Yı Osmani. İstanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 1882.
Below, one can see the page of the dictionary as it was digitized. Besides an ability to access a particular digitized dictionary at will, the Hathi Trust also provides its user from affiliated institutions the ability to download either the chapter of a digitized book or the whole book.

Picture 3: The full-text view of the dictionary.

If both the Google Books and Hathi Trust platforms offer their users a view of these dictionaries in black and view color, the other access points are provided by the individual institutions. For example, the Harvard University Library offers an online access to Faḍl Allāh Khān’s Lughat-i Turkī. This dictionary was published in Calcutta in 1825 at the printing press of Shaykh Hidāyat Allāh.
The Harvard College Library digital platform allows users to cite the item properly as well as print out either the whole book or the desired page. While the Harvard College Library’s digital platform, the Hathi Trust or Google Book project offer access to various 19th century Turkic language dictionaries as a part of the North American digital initiatives, the Europeana Digital Library represents a similar initiative in Europe. However, my search on May 8, 2014 in the Europeana’s database revealed that only ten items were indexed at the time of searching. As shown below in picture 6, I was able to locate 10 items under the subject called “Turkic language texts”.
Picture 5: The Europeana Digital Library-Turkic languages

These results were arranged as shown in the picture 7 below:

Picture 6: The results for Turkic Languages search in Europeana Digital Library.
Each of these items can be opened either in the same window or in a new window. Each item has associated metadata displayed in a column next to it.

Picture 7: Abhandlung Über Die Sprache Und Schrift Der Uiguren. Berlin, 1812.49

Although, Europeana digital library acts as an aggregator of information and provides information from various national European institution, its individual records are linked to the local library catalogs. For example, as shown in the picture 9 below, the title, “Abhandlung Über Die Sprache Und Schrift Der Uiguren”, is hosted by the Bavarian State Digital library.

---

One can see from some concrete examples above that the digitization of these 19th century Turkic dictionaries offers their users a unique chance to access information that is contained with them remotely.

Conclusion:

The beginning of the Turkic dictionaries since Kashgari’s 13th century Divan-i lughat Turk to nineteenth century represents evolution of both form and the structure of these dictionaries. From the early manuscript forms of dictionaries to print dictionaries, the Turkic language dictionaries form an interestingly rich archive. One can see the gradual transition from manuscript form to the print forms with the later dominating the scene in the 19th century.

The world of 19th Century Turkic print dictionaries represents a rich archive of various languages that form the Turkic language group. This world was at least partially the function of colonial rivalries, linguistic diversities and different imperial strategies in the 19th century Central Asia. The contested political domains and geographic territories meant that both the British and Russian Empires engaged in creation and printing of these dictionaries. On the other hand, the Ottoman lexicographical tradition is represented by the dictionaries that were published in the various parts of Ottoman Empire. Although many of these dictionaries are available to the users in multiple formats including digital surrogates, a creation of a centralized database registry for these dictionaries might be of utility not only to the researchers in the field of Linguistics and lexicography but also to the specialists from other Humanities and Social Sciences disciplines.
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