

shown that the words from which this inference has been drawn really signify that the author of the *Lámi'* *commenced* (not that he *completed*) this work, and made it, as far as it extended, to surpass every other work of a similar kind; but that he imagined it would be, in sixty volumes, too large for students to acquire or read; and, being requested to compose *before it* a concise lexicon, he applied himself to the composition of the *Ḳámoos*, and abridged the matter of which the *Lámi'* was to have consisted, so as to comprise the essence of each thirty of the intended volumes in one volume. Thus the words in question are so far from being a proof of the completion of the *Lámi'*, that their literal meaning indicates the very contrary of this. They are not, however, the only evidence that we have on this point: for the same eminent scholar to whose Annotations on the *Ḳámoos* I have referred above quotes, from the biographical memoir of the author of the *Lámi'* in the “*Ṭabaḳát en-Noḥáh*” of Es-Suyooṭee, the direct assertion that this work was never completed. He also states, as does likewise the author of the *Táj el-'Aroos*, that more than one writer has transmitted, on the authority of the handwriting of its author, a proof of its non-completion: for they relate the fact of his having written upon the back of the *Lámi'* that, if he had been able to complete it, it would have composed a hundred volumes, [of what size he does not give the least notion,] and that he completed five volumes of it. This, it should be observed, is not inconsistent with what has been said before: it appears that the work would have consisted of a hundred volumes, each of the size of one of the five volumes that were completed; or would have composed sixty *larger* volumes. But I rather incline to think that its author roughly calculated, at one time, that the whole would consist of a hundred volumes; and at another time, that it would consist of sixty; and that both estimates are greatly beyond the truth. The non-completion of the *Lámi'* is therefore certain; but this is not so much to be regretted as some persons might imagine from its author's statement respecting it in his preface to the *Ḳámoos*; for the work appears, from its title, to have been, as far as it extended, with respect to the words and significations, mainly a compilation uniting the contents of the *Moḥkam* and the *'Obáb*, and neither of these lexicons has been lost to the world. From a reference to it in article ٤٥ of the *Ḳámoos*, (in which the author asserts his having disproved an opinion respecting the signification of ٤٤٤ without stating that El-Azheree had done so more than five centuries before,) it seems that the *Lámi'* (seeing how small a portion of it was completed) followed the order of the *'Eyn* and the *Moḥkam*; for article ٤٥ is in the third of the main divisions of these two works, but in the last but two of those of the *Ḳámoos*. Considering this fact, and that the main divisions of the *'Eyn* and the *Moḥkam* necessarily decrease in length from first to last, I suppose that the author of the five volumes of the *Lámi'* wrote them, agreeably with a common practice, with large margins for additions, and calculated that, with these additions, each of the five volumes would form at least three.

The “*Táj el-'Aroos*,” the enormous extent of which I have mentioned in the second paragraph of this preface, is said to have been commenced, in Cairo, soon after the middle of the last century of our era, by the seyyid Murtaḍà Ez-Zebeeḍee. At the end of a copy of it in his own handwriting, he states that it occupied him fourteen years and some days. According to the modern historian of Egypt, El-Jabartee, he was born A.D. 1732 or 1733: came to Cairo A.D. 1753: finished the *Táj el-'Aroos* A.D. 1767 or 1768: and died A.D. 1791 (in the year of the Flight 1205). And the same historian says that Moḥammad Bey Abu-dh-Dhahab, for the copy of that work which is in the library of his mosque, gave him a hundred thousand dirhems (or drachms) of silver. It is a compilation from the best and most copious of the preceding Arabic lexicons and other lexicological works, in the form of an interwoven commentary on the *Ḳámoos*; exhibiting fully and clearly, from the original sources, innumerable explanations which are so abridged in the latter work as to be unintelligible to the most learned men of the East; with copious illustrations of the meanings &c., corrections of mistakes in the *Ḳámoos* and other lexicons, and examples in prose and verse; and a very large collection of additional words and significations, mentioned under the roots to which they belong. Of the works from which it is compiled, though I believe that it was mainly derived in the first instance from the *Lisán el-'Arab*, more than a hundred are enumerated by the seyyid Murtaḍà in his preface. Among these are—1. The “*Ṣiḥáh*,” a copy in eight volumes, in the handwriting of Yáḳoot Er-Roomee, with useful marginal notes determining the correct readings &c. by Ibn-Barree [and El-Buṣṭee] and Aboo-Zekereeyà Et-Tebreezee; in the library [of the collegiate mosque] of the Emeer Ezbek.—2. The “*Tahdheeb*” of El-Azheree, a copy in sixteen volumes.—3. The “*Moḥkam*”