

of traditions; for the point upon which turns the title to reliance is not the copiousness of the collection, but the condition of genuineness, or correctness. [The judgment thus expressed, as to the rank and celebrity of the *Şihâh*, in comparison with the *Ķámoos*, I have found to agree with the opinion of the most learned men among the Arabs with whom I have been acquainted. But to insinuate that the words and significations added in the latter of these lexicons to those of the former are generally less genuine, or less correct, is not just: they may be truly said to be generally less chaste, inasmuch as they are less usual: but their collector has undoubtedly rendered a great service to the students of Arabic by these additions, which have of late years caused the copies of his lexicon to become much more numerous than those of the *Şihâh*. The value of the *Şihâh* consists in its presenting a very judicious collection of the most chaste words, with critical illustrations from the best of the lexicologists, and examples from the best of the classical poets. The *Ķámoos* is little more than what may be termed an enormous vocabulary; a collection of words and significations from preceding lexicons and similar works, (for otherwise, according to the principles of Arabic lexicology as universally taught, they would be of no authority,) mainly from the *Moĥkam* and the *'Obáb*; with very few critical observations, many of which are false,\* and scarcely any examples from the poets. Thus it resembles the *Moĥcet* of Ibn-'Abbád, before mentioned. In order to make room for his numerous additions, desiring that the bulk of his book should be nearly the same as that of the *Şihâh*, the author has often abridged his explanations in such a manner as to render them unintelligible to the most learned of the Arabs, and has omitted much of what is most valuable of the contents of the latter work. But he has frequently deviated from this his usual practice for the purpose of inserting criticisms of others, without acknowledgment, and apparently some few of his own, upon points in the *Şihâh* in which its author is asserted to have erred; and this he has often done so as to lead to the belief that the author of the *Şihâh* has affirmed what he has merely quoted from another. Many of these criticisms I have found to have been borrowed from the Annotations on the *Şihâh* by Ibn-Barree and El-Bustee, or from the Supplement to the *Şihâh* by Eş-Şaghánee: generally when they are false, (which is often the case,) though sometimes when they are correct, from the latter of these works. I have felt it to be my duty to make these remarks in defence of El-Jowharee, and for the sake of truth. Abundant proofs of their correctness will be found in my own lexicon. They may surprise many, who have not known the fact that the *Ķámoos* is very little more than an abridged compilation from other works: and another fact, to be mentioned in the next paragraph, which will be in a measure supplementary to this brief account of the *Ķámoos*, will probably surprise them more.—This is the latest of the lexicons noticed in the *Muzhir*: therefore I have no further occasion for the use of the square brackets to distinguish my own statements or opinions from those of the author of that work, which has thus far afforded me so much aid in my account of the principles of Arabic lexicology, and of the most celebrated Arabic lexicons, as well as in my remarks on the history of the language. My own, most valuable, manuscript-copy of the *Ķámoos*, which I have already described, has been of very great use to me, though its text is generally most correctly given in the *Táj el-'Aroos*. I have also constantly had before me the edition printed at Calcutta. This is certainly more accurate than most of the manuscript-copies; but it contains countless false readings, which show that, in many instances, the editor, notwithstanding his unquestionable learning and his possession of eleven copies, did not understand what he edited. It seems that he must often have given the worst of the readings of his originals, from neglecting to study the passages in which they occur. I have not thought it necessary to mention *all* of the false readings in his edition; but I have mentioned *many* of them.]

The "Lámi" of El-Feyroozábádee. Its full title is "El-Lámi' el-Moĥlam el-'Ojáb el-Jámi' beyn el-Moĥkam wa-l-'Obáb." From some words in the preface to the *Ķámoos*, it has been inferred that the author of that work had composed a lexicon in sixty volumes, bearing the foregoing title, from which, chiefly, he composed, or abridged, the *Ķámoos*, in two volumes. But in a very learned work, of Annotations on the *Ķámoos*, by Moĥammad Ibn-Eţ-Teiyib El-Fásee, it is clearly

\* The judgment and memory of its author are often in fault: for instance, in article *بيض* he disallows the expression *الأيام البيض*, and in art. *وضح* he uses it; and in article *ضح* he disallows *ضح* as syn. with *ضح*, and in article *ضح* he authorizes it: and many similar instances might be mentioned.