

of Ibn-Seede, a copy in eight volumes.—4. The “Tahdheeb el-Abniyeh wa-l-Af’ál,” by Ibn-El-Kattāa, in two volumes.—5. The “Lisān el-’Arab,” by the Imām Jemāl-ed-Deen Moḥammad Ibn-’Alee El-Ifreekee, [whose appellations I have more fully given before, commonly called (in the Tāj el-’Aroos) “Ibn-Mandḥoor,”] in twenty-eight volumes, the copy transcribed from the original draught of the author, during his life-time: [of this copy I have often made use in composing my own lexicon; and I have found it very helpful, especially in enabling me to supply syllabical signs, which are too often omitted in the copies of the Tāj el-’Aroos:] its author followed closely, in its composition, the Ṣiḥāḥ, the Tahdheeb, the Moḥkam, the Nihāyeh, the Annotations of Ibn-Barree [and El-Buṣṭee on the Ṣiḥāḥ], and the Jemharah of Ibn-Dureyd: [he also drew from innumerable other sources, to which he refers in his work.]—6. The “Tahdheeb et-Tahdheeb” of Abu-th-Thenā Maḥmūd Ibn-Abce-Bekr Ibn-Ḥāmid Et-Tanookhee, a copy in five volumes, [of which, as I have already mentioned, I possess the last,] the original draught of the author, who closely followed, in its composition, the Ṣiḥāḥ, the Tahdheeb, and the Moḥkam, with the utmost accuracy: he died in the year of the Flight 723.—7. The “Kitāb el-Ghareebeyn” of Aboo-’Obeyd El-Harawee.—8. The “Nihāyeh fee Ghareeb el-Ḥadeeth,” by Ibn-El-Atheer [Mejd-ed-Deen] El-Jezeree.—9. The “Kifāyet el-Mutaḥaffiḥ,” by Ibn-El-Ajdābee, with Expositions thereof.—10. The “Faṣeeḥ” of Thaālab, with three Expositions thereof.—11 and 12. The “Fikḥ el-Logḥah” and the work entitled “El-Mudāf wa-l-Mensoob,” each by Aboo-Manṣoor Eth-Tha’ālibee.—13 and 14. The “’Obāb” and the “Tekmilch fi-ṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ,” each by Er-Raḍee Eṣ-Ṣaghānee, in the library [of the mosque] of the Emceer Ṣarghatmish.—15. The “Miṣbāḥ” [of El-Feyoomce].—16. The “Takreeb” of Ibn-Khaṭeeb.—17. The “Mukhtār eṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ,” by Er-Rāzee.—18, 19, and 20. The “Asās” and the “Fāik” and the “Mustakṣee fi-l-Amthāl,” all three by Ez-Zamakḥsheree.—21. The “Jemharah” of Ibn-Dureyd, in four volumes, in the library [of the mosque] of El-Mu-eyyad.—22. The “Iṣlāḥ el-Mantiḳ” of Ibn-Es-Sikkeet.—23 and 24. The “Khaṣāiṣ” of Ibn-Jinne, and the “Sirr eṣ-Ṣinā’ali” of the same author.—25. The “Mujmal” of Ibn-Fāris.—Many other works of great value are included in the same list. And the Annotations on the Kāmoos by his preceptor, Moḥammad Ibn-Eṭ-Ṭeiyib El-Fāsee, (before mentioned, in my account of the Lāmi’), must be especially noticed as a very comprehensive and most learned work, from which the seyyid Murtaḍā derived much valuable matter to incorporate in the Tāj el-’Aroos. From these Annotations of Moḥammad El-Fāsee, which have often served to explain to me obscure passages in the Tāj el-’Aroos, and from several others of the most celebrated of the works used by the seyyid Murtaḍā, I have drawn much matter which he omitted as not necessary to Eastern scholars, but which will be found to be highly important to the Arabic students of Europe. He made very little use of a commentary on the Kāmoos entitled the “Nāmoos,” by Mullā ’Alee el-Kāri, as it is not a work held in high estimation, and he was most careful to include among his authorities none but works of high repute. It must also be mentioned that he has bestowed great pains upon the important task of settling the true text of the Kāmoos, according to the authorities of several celebrated copies; and that he has inserted the various readings that he regarded as being worthy of notice. And here I may state that most of the illustrations of the text of the Kāmoos that are incorporated in the Turkish translation of that work, whenever I have examined them, which has often been the case, I have found to be taken from the Tāj el-’Aroos, of which the Translator (’Āṣim Efendee) is said to have had a copy in the author’s handwriting: but generally speaking, what is most precious of the contents of the latter work has been omitted in that translation.

As the Tāj el-’Aroos is the medium through which I have drawn most of the contents of my lexicon, I must more fully state the grounds upon which I determined to make so great a use of it. Not long after I had become acquainted with this enormous work, I found it to be asserted by some persons in Cairo that the seyyid Murtaḍā was not its author: that it was compiled by a certain learned man (whose name I could not ascertain) who, coming to Cairo with this work, on his way from Western Africa to Mekkeh as a pilgrim, and fearing to lose it in the desert-journey, committed it to the seyyid Murtaḍā to be safely kept until his return: that he died during his onward-journey, or during his return towards Cairo: and that the seyyid Murtaḍā published it as his own composition. This grave accusation brought against the reputed author of the Tāj el-’Aroos, unsupported by the knowledge of the name of the person whom he is thus asserted to have wronged, I did not find to be credited by any of the learned, nor do I myself believe it: but it imposed upon me the necessity of proving or disproving,