

the *Ṣiḥāḥ* or *Kámoos* or both, when not one word thereof, nor even an indication, is found in either of those originals:* and that much of what Freytag has given as from the *Kámoos* is from the Turkish Translation of that lexicon, of which I have before spoken, a work of considerable learning, but of no authority when no voucher is mentioned in it.† I have myself occasionally cited the Turkish Translation of the *Kámoos*, but only when I have not found what I wanted in any other work, and, in a case of this kind, only when I have felt confidence in its correctness, or when I have desired a confirmation of my own opinion. In very few instances have I adopted its explanations; having often found them to be glaringly incorrect; in some cases, from its author's having partially misunderstood what he had to translate; but in more cases, from his having altogether failed to understand, and therefore having given literal renderings which are far from conveying the meanings intended.

Proper names of persons and of places, and post-classical words and significations, I have, with very few exceptions, excluded from my lexicon. A dictionary of words of the former class, such as would satisfy the wants of students, would of itself alone form a large volume; for the sources from which it might be drawn are abundant, and not difficult of access. A dictionary of post-classical Arabic, worthy of being so called, could not be composed otherwise than by a considerable number of students in different cities of Europe where good libraries of Arabic manuscripts are found, and by as many students in different countries of Asia and Africa; partly from books, and partly from information to be acquired only by intercourse with Arabs; and several of those who should contribute to its composition would require to be well versed in the sciences of the Muslims. In excluding almost all post-classical words and significations, I have followed the example of every one of the most esteemed Arabian lexicographers; and the limits that I have assigned to my labours have certainly been rather too wide than too narrow, as will be sufficiently shown by the fact that the quantity of the matter comprised in the first eighth part of my First Book (1 to ٨ inclusive) is treble the quantity of the corresponding portion of Freytag's Lexicon, although I leave rare words &c. for my Second Book.

I have inserted nothing in my lexicon without indicating at least one authority for it, except interwoven additions of my own which I have invariably distinguished by enclosing them between square brackets. Throughout Part I of the First Book, I have generally made the indications of the authorities as numerous as I conveniently could; but I have not thought it desirable to do so throughout, as these indications occupy much space, and what is most important is to note the oldest authority mentioned in any of my originals, with one or more of good repute to confirm it. A table of the authorities inserted in this preface will show which of them I have cited through the medium of the *Táj el-'Aroos* or the *Lisán el-'Arab*. Such authorities I have often indicated without any addition.‡ When two or more indications of authorities are given, it is to be understood that they agree essentially, or mainly; but not always that they agree in words. When any authority is, in an important degree, less full, or less clear, than another or others by which it is accompanied, I distinguish it by an asterisk placed after the initial

* By this remark, I may perhaps provoke the retort that, in composing an Arabic-English lexicon wholly from Arabic sources, I am myself doing what may be resolved into something like reasoning in a circle. But such is not the case; for the words employed in explanations in the Arabic lexicons are generally still used in the senses in which they are there employed; and the intended meanings of words that are not still used in such senses are, with few exceptions, easily determined by examples in which they occur, or by the general consent of the learned among the Arabs in the present day. Of the exceptional difficulties of interpretation, I have already said enough; and for my own sake, as well as for the sake of truth, I by no means wish to underrate them.

† In Freytag's first volume, the authorities are seldom indicated.—

Sometimes explanations given by Golius as from the *Ṣiḥāḥ* or *Kámoos* or both, and not found in either of those works, are copied by Freytag without his stating such to be the case, and without his indicating the authorities or authority assigned by Golius: for example, three such instances occur in the short article *دج*.

‡ In a few instances, in the *Táj el-'Aroos*, where its author has drawn from the *Tahdheeb* or the *Mohkam* through the medium of the *Lisán el-'Arab*, I have found the *Tahdheeb* erroneously named as his authority instead of the *Mohkam*, or the *Mohkam* instead of the *Tahdheeb*.— Sometimes an authority is mentioned by a surname borne by two or more, so that the person meant is doubtful.