



Akademik Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (AJESS Journal)

The Logical Term: Structure and Concept in al-Farabi's Kitab al-'Ibara (The Book of Interpretation)

Rafaoui Liazid, University of Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Setif 2 University, Algeria
Lyazidrafaoui3@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 31/07/2026; Accepted: 28/08/2026; Published: 01/09/2026

Abstract

This study examines the logical term in Al-Farabi's Al-Ibara (De Interpretatione), focusing on two complementary levels: the linguistic structure of terms and the logical concepts they designate. It also investigates Al-Farabi's methods of defining and explaining terms through definition, description, functional explanation, examples, division and contrast. The study argues that Al-Ibara is not a specialized dictionary in the strict lexicographical sense, yet it contains a dense terminological material and systematic definitional practices that perform some functions associated with specialized lexicography. The analysis shows that Al-Farabi treats terms as elements within a coherent logical system rather than as isolated lexical units, and that he relies on conceptual relations, oppositions and illustrative examples to delimit their meanings.

Keywords: logical term; structure; concept; definition; Al-Ibara; Al-Farabi.

Introduction:

Abu Nasr al-Farabi's Kitab al-'Ibara (The Book of Interpretation) is one of the logical texts in which attention to wording intersects with attention to the meanings and propositions within which they are organized. The book is not limited to presenting abstract logical issues; rather, it begins with meaningful expressions and distinguishes between the noun, the verb, and the particle, then moves on to compound expressions and the functions they perform in constructing discourse, eventually reaching assertoric statements, categorical and conditional propositions, modality, and other concepts upon which logical inquiry is based. The edition by Muhammad Salim Salim, published in 1976, confirms that Kitab fi al-Mantiq: al-'Ibara (The Book of Logic: The Book of Interpretation) constitutes a specific body of al-Farabi's logical heritage and serves as the textual corpus adopted in this study.

The importance of studying terminology in this book stems from the fact that al-Farabi does not merely use terms; in many passages, he also reveals their conceptual boundaries and their relationships with neighboring terms. Therefore, studying logical terminology in his work requires moving beyond examining the term merely in terms of its form to considering the concept he defines and the function it performs within the logical system.

Accordingly, this study seeks to answer the following questions: How does al-Farabi deal with the logical term in Kitab al-'Ibara? What are the structural features of the terms he employs? What means does he use to determine their concepts? And does the density of terminological material and definitional practices in the book allow it to be described as a specialized dictionary, or is it more accurate to regard it as a logical treatise with a clear terminological and lexicographical dimension?

To answer these questions, we adopt a descriptive-analytical approach. We begin by defining the concept of the term linguistically and terminologically, as well as the philosophical term, definition, and concept. We then proceed to analyze selected examples of simple and compound terms, concluding by identifying the principal methods of terminological definition employed by al-Farabi.

First: The Term: Linguistically and Terminologically

1-The Term Linguistically:

The root šād-lām-ḥā is based on a single fundamental meaning indicating the opposite of corruption.

ⁱ Al-šālāḥ means the opposite of corruption; šālāḥa, as in mana'a and karuma. Šālāḥahu means to reconcile with him or to make peace with him, while mušālāḥah and šilāḥ denote reconciliation and accord, as do ištālāḥā.ⁱⁱ

This linguistic root is useful for understanding the term as an expression whose usage becomes established among a group of scholars with a specific meaning.

2- The Term Terminologically:

Al-Sharif al-Jurjani defined it as follows: "Convention is an agreement among a group of people to designate a thing by a name transferred from its original usage."ⁱⁱⁱ This definition highlights the elements of collective agreement and semantic transfer. Al-Kafawi defined it as follows: "It is the agreement of a group of people to designate a thing; it has also been said to be the removal of a thing from its linguistic meaning to another meaning in order to clarify what is intended."^{iv}

In this definition, al-Kafawi links convention either to the agreement of a group of people on the designation of a thing or to transferring a word from its linguistic meaning to another meaning in order to clarify the intended meaning.

Taken together, these conceptions make it clear that a term derives its value not merely from its linguistic structure, but from its established usage within a scholarly community and from its reference to a specific concept.

On this basis, the present study views the logical term as a linguistic unit that refers, within the logical system, to a specific concept. Its analysis is not complete without clarifying its structure, its relationship to neighboring concepts, and its function in constructing a proposition or statement.

Second: The Philosophical Term

Philosophy has addressed a wide range of subjects, seeking, in the midst of them, to arrive at the truth of the essence of things and refusing to accept ideas inherited by people without examination or reconsideration. It is "the search for the truth and essence of things and the pursuit of what is most beneficial. It is characterized by comprehensiveness, unity, and depth in its investigation and interpretation of the truth of things, as it studies what lies beneath appearances rather than appearances themselves."^v Logic is one of the subjects through which the philosopher proceeds in his philosophical inquiry. It functions like an instrument that guides him in his philosophizing; without it, he would fall into error and contradiction. Because of its importance, it gave rise to a discipline indispensable to all sciences, namely, the science of methods. Aristotle held that "logic is not a part of philosophy, but rather an intellectual discipline preparatory to it."^{vi} This discipline reached a high degree of maturity with Aristotle, who was therefore called the First Teacher. He named it the *Organon* (the instrument or law), because it served as a law that protected the mind from falling into error. When we say that logic developed, this means that its concepts were defined in a manner reflecting the propositions it addressed, and that its terminology was likewise established, such as the proposition and its types, categorical and conditional; the concept and its referent; quantifiers; the ways in which propositions are generated and judgments are made about them; and other terms and concepts that constitute the logical terminology and reflect specific concepts. This is what we shall seek to demonstrate through a study of some of the terms found in al-Farabi's *Kitab al-'Ibara*.

Third: Definition and Concept

1- Definition and the Definer

1-1- Definition:

Definition is the verbal means by which concepts are conveyed to others.^{vii}

2-1- The Definer (the Explanatory Statement)

1-2-1- Definition of the Definer:

It is also called an "explanatory statement." It is the verbal means through which the conception of a particular thing or meaning is conveyed, with regard to the individual term whose mental image is sought to be formed, or through which it is distinguished from other things. It is subject to certain rules that must be observed for it to be sound and capable of leading to a correct conception or a clear distinction.^{viii}

2-2-1- Conditions of the Definer:

The definer by which the mental conception of an individual term is explained to the addressee must fulfill two essential conditions:

- * It must be exactly equivalent to the individual term being explained.
- * It must be clearer and more explicit than the conceptual term being explained.

These are the two fundamental conditions of a sound definition. There is also a third condition that may be understood as implicit in them: knowledge of the definition must not depend on prior knowledge of the definer; otherwise, this would entail circular reasoning, which is rationally impermissible.^{ix}

3-2-1- Types of Definers:

Logicians have classified valid definers, or explanatory statements, and found that they fall into two principal categories: definitions (*hudud*) and descriptions (*rusum*).

It is noteworthy that definitions apply only to essences composed of two or more elements, whereas simple entities can only be defined by means of descriptions.^x

1-3-2-1- Definitions (Hudud):

1-1-3-2-1- Definition of Hudud:

These are definitions that include the essential attributes of a thing and through which the conceptual individual term is explained.^{xi} It is called a *hadd* because, in the language, *hadd* means restraint or prevention. This meaning is also present in the terminological sense of *hadd*, because it prevents anything other than the defined entity from being included within it and prevents any part of the defined entity from being excluded from it.^{xii}

2-1-3-2-1- Types of Hudud:

2-1-3-2-1- A- The Complete Definition (al-Hadd al-Tamm): Logicians held that when a definition contains all the essential attributes of the thing being defined, it constitutes the most complete and perfect form of definition. When this is the case, they call it a complete definition.^{xiii}

It is a definition of a thing through the mention of all its essential attributes, that is, by stating its proximate genus and proximate differentia, or something equivalent to them.^{xiv}

2-1-3-2-1- B- The Incomplete Definition (al-Hadd al-Naqis): When a definition contains some of the essential attributes of the thing being defined and these are sufficient to distinguish the thing defined from other things, it occupies, in their view, the second rank and is called an incomplete definition.^{xv} It is a definition of a thing by mentioning some of its essential attributes that distinguish it from other things.^{xvi}

2-3-2-1- Descriptions (Rusum)

1-2-3-2-1- Definition of Rasm:

A rasm is a definition that contains none of the essential attributes of the thing being defined, or contains some of them but does not use them to distinguish the thing defined from others. Rather, it consists of accidental attributes through which the thing is defined and distinguished from everything else. The rank of descriptions is lower than that of definitions.^{xvii} It is called rasm because, linguistically, rasm means a trace or mark, and a characteristic is one of the traces of the reality to which it points and by which it is distinguished from other things.^{xviii}

2-2-3-2-1- Types of Rusum:

Logicians maintain that descriptions have several types, arranged in different ranks, some lower than others. These include the complete description, the incomplete description, the verbal definition, the definition by example, and ^{xix}the definition by division, that is, by mentioning the divisions into which the individual term being defined is divided.

2-2-3-2-1- A- The Complete Description (al-Rasm al-Tamm): It is a definition of a thing by mentioning its proximate genus together with its necessary, comprehensive differentia; that is, by mentioning an essential attribute that applies to all of its instances and is specific to it, or something equivalent to this in status and force.^{xx}

2-2-3-2-1- B- The Incomplete Description (al-Rasm al-Naqis): It is a definition of a thing by mentioning its necessary and comprehensive particular characteristic alone, or together with its remote genus, or with its common attribute, or by mentioning accidental attributes whose combination is specific to its reality.^{xxi}

2-2-3-2-1- C- Verbal Definition: This is the definition of one term by another synonymous term that is known to the addressee. The synonym of a thing is, in reality, one of its particular characteristics.^{xxii}

2-2-3-2-1-D- Definition by Example: This is the definition of a thing by mentioning one of its examples. An example of a thing is, in reality, one of its particular characteristics.^{xxiii}

2-2-3-2-1- E- Definition by Division: This is the definition of a thing by mentioning the divisions into which it is divided. It is evident that the divisions of a thing constitute one of its particular characteristics.^{xxiv}

2-2-3-2-1- F- Definition by the More General: An example of this is defining a human being as an animal. Such a definition causes the addressee to include in their conception particular instances that are not human beings, such as horses, snakes, and other animals. Therefore, it is an incorrect definition. Similarly, defining a human being merely as an animal is like defining it as a living, growing, sensitive body.^{xxv}

2-2-3-2-1- G- Definition by the More Specific: An example is defining an animal as a sensitive, moving, rational body. This definition applies only to human beings, while the human being is more specific than the animal. Thus, it causes the addressee to exclude from their conception particular instances that are animals, making it an incorrect definition. Likewise, defining a word as a noun and a verb is an incomplete definition because it defines it by what is more specific: the particle is also one of the divisions of the word, and therefore the definition is incorrect.^{xxvi}

2-2-3-2-1-H- Definition by the Contrasting Other (al-Mubayin): Examples include defining a stone as a liquid that quenches the thirst of the thirsty, defining a human being as a neighing animal or a singing bird, and defining Mecca as Jarwal or Ajjad. The latter is a definition by means of a part, and a part of a thing is distinct from its whole.^{xxvii}

Definition by the contrasting other causes the addressee to conceive the individual being explained in a manner that contradicts its actual nature and reality. It is therefore an incorrect definition; indeed, it constitutes an outright falsehood.^{xxviii}

2- Concept

1-2- Definition of the Concept According to Logicians:

By "concept," logicians mean the mental meaning evoked by a word in the mind, while the word constitutes a verbal indication of that meaning.^{xxix}

Fourth: The Logical Term in al-Farabi's Kitāb al-'Ibārā

The application reveals that the terminological material in Kitāb al-'Ibārā can be organized according to its linguistic structure and the methods used to define it. The examples will be divided into simple terms, compound terms, and complex terminological constructions, with an indication of their structure, concept, and method of explanation.

1- Simple Terms: Structure and Concept

1-1- Key Terms for Which No Direct Definitive Definition Is Given

1-1-1- Al-'Ibārā [The Interpretation]^{xxx}:

The term has a simple structure and performs both a titular and conceptual function in the book. At the beginning of the work, al-Farabi does not provide a direct lexicographical definition of the term. Rather, its concept becomes clear from

the overall body of material dealing with expressions and constructions that signify meanings and with the formation of logical statements. Therefore, it is more accurate, from an analytical perspective, to regard the concept of al-‘ibara as derived from the systematic context of the book rather than from an explicit lexicographical definition.

2-1-1- The Proposition^{xxxi}:

This is a simple term with a logical terminological meaning. Al-Farabi does not restrict its definition to a brief formal definition; rather, he explains its constituent elements and function, particularly its connection with a statement that may be either true or false. This approach shows that a concept may be formed gradually through a set of characteristics rather than being presented in the form of a single definition.

2-1- Terms Defined by Formal Definition or Explanation

1-2-1- The Noun^{xxxii}:

Al-Farabi defines it as “an expression signifying a single meaning that can be understood by itself alone, without indicating, through its structure, except accidentally, the determinate time in which that meaning exists.” The definition is based first on identifying the genus, followed by stating the characteristic that distinguishes the noun from the verb, namely, that its structure does not indicate determinate time. Here, the relationship between the linguistic structure and the logical function of the term becomes particularly significant.

2-2-1- The Verb^{xxxiii}:

Al-Farabi defines it as a simple expression signifying a meaning that can be understood by itself, while its structure indicates determinate time. This definition reveals that al-Farabi distinguishes the logical term through a set of semantic and structural features, rather than treating it merely as a linguistic equivalent.

3-2-1- Command, Supplication, and Request^{xxxiv}:

Al-Farabi distinguishes among them according to the situational relationship between the speaker and the addressee. A command proceeds from a superior to an inferior, supplication from an inferior to a superior, while a request occurs between equals. These examples reveal the use of definition by division and distinction, whereby the concept of each term is determined through its contrast with terms closely related to it.

3-1- Terms Combining Explanation and Example

1-3-1- The Particle^{xxxv}:

Al-Farabi defines it according to its function. It is an expression signifying a single meaning that cannot be understood by itself unless it is combined with a noun or a verb. He then provides examples such as “min” (from) and “‘ala” (on). This demonstrates his reliance on functional definition supported by illustration.

2-3-1- Modality^{xxxvi}:

It is the expression that is attached to the predicate of a proposition and indicates the manner in which the predicate exists for its subject. Al-Farabi gives examples such as the possible, the necessary, the probable, and the obligatory. This example highlights the function of the term within the proposition rather than merely its lexicographical structure.

2- Compound Terms

The terminological material in Kitab al-‘Ibara is not limited to individual words; it also includes terminological constructions consisting of more than one word and functioning as precise semantic units within the logical system. Here, a distinction should be made between “construction” as a linguistic structure and “compound term” as a construction that has acquired an established technical meaning within the field of logic.

1-2- Compound Terms with Descriptive Structure

1-1-2- The Assertoric Statement^{xxxvii}:

This is a descriptive construction consisting of a noun described and a qualifying attribute. Al-Farabi defines it as a statement of which its speaker may be said to be either truthful or untruthful, thereby linking it directly to the criterion of truth and falsehood. Modern sources citing the book likewise confirm that the assertoric statement consists of a subject and a predicate and constitutes a fundamental focus of the logical inquiry addressed in the work.

2-1-2- Existential Expressions^{xxxviii}:

This is a terminological construction describing words that are attached to the predicative noun and indicate its relation to the subject, its existence for the subject, and the determinate time. This example demonstrates functional definition, since the term cannot be understood from its individual lexical components but rather from the function it performs in constructing the statement.

3-1-2- The Modified Proposition and the Nullative Proposition^{xxxix}:

Al-Farabi employs conceptual contrast to distinguish between them. The modified proposition is based on the attachment of negation to the predicate in such a way that it becomes part of it, whereas the nullative proposition is associated with a predicate that indicates the absence of a disposition or the absence of existence according to the logical context. The significance of this approach lies in the fact that a concept is not determined in isolation, but through its relationship with an opposing concept.

2-2- Compound Terms with Genitive Structure

1-2-2- The Negation of Possibility^{xl}:

This is a genitive construction whose concept is determined by its being a proposition that negates possibility and entails existence. This reveals the close relationship between the elements of the construction and the components of the logical concept.

2-2-2- The Negation of Necessity^{xli}:

This is likewise a genitive construction, whose meaning is based on negating necessity and affirming existence. Here, the function of terminological specification becomes evident, as the word “negative” adds a specific logical meaning to “possibility” or “necessity”.

3- Complex Terminological Constructions

The material under study includes terminological formulations that go beyond the individual word and the short construction, such as “the proposition whose matter is necessary” and “the proposition whose modality is possible.” It is more accurate to describe these formulations as complex terminological constructions, not because they are grammatically indivisible, but because they perform, within their context, the function of naming a specific concept.

1-3- The Proposition Whose Matter Is Necessary^{xliii}:

Al-Farabi defines it as a proposition whose predicate cannot, in principle, be separated from its subject at any time. He then follows this definition with an example. The construction here consists of a described noun followed by a relative clause, together with a genitive construction, resulting in an extended structure composed of multiple elements.

2-3- The Proposition Whose Modality Is Possible^{xliii}:

Al-Farabi relates it to the presence of the expression “possible” in conjunction with the proposition and provides an example illustrating how the concept is realized in usage. This model shows that the length of the term is related to the need to express a precise relationship between matter and modality, two concepts for which a single word alone is insufficient in this context.

4- Methods of Terminological Definition in al-Farabi

The preceding analysis reveals a number of methods employed by al-Farabi in establishing and defining his terminology:

1- Definition by hadd or definition based on distinguishing features: This appears in his definitions of the noun and the verb, where elements are stated that help distinguish each from the other.

2- Functional definition: This is evident in the particle, modality, and existential expressions, where the concept is determined through the function performed by the term within the statement or proposition.

3- Definition by illustration: Here, definitions and descriptions are accompanied by practical examples that help transfer the concept from abstraction to actual usage.

4- Definition by division and contrast: This appears in the case of command, supplication, and request, as well as in some types of propositions, where the concept becomes clear through its relationship with corresponding or neighboring concepts.

5- Definition through systematic context: This occurs when al-Farabi does not provide a direct definition of a term, but instead constructs its concept through the body of issues addressed throughout the book. This method is particularly important in the study of Kitab al-‘Ibara, because some key terms cannot have their concepts reduced to a single definitional statement.

Summary of the Applied Analysis

The analysis has shown that, for al-Farabi, the term cannot be separated from the concept or from the logical function it performs within the system. Its structures vary between simple terms, compound terms, and extended constructions, while the methods used to determine their meanings vary between formal definition, functional explanation, illustration, division, contrast, and contextual interpretation. These findings confirm that the study of al-Farabi’s terminology benefits from combining linguistic analysis with conceptual analysis, since focusing on structure alone does not reveal the terminological value of the term.

Conclusion

The study concludes that Kitab al-‘Ibara is a logical text characterized by considerable terminological and conceptual density, and that al-Farabi paid particular attention to the expressions through which statements and propositions are constructed, relating them to the concepts and logical functions they perform. It has also become clear that the terms do not follow a single structural pattern: some are simple, some are compound, while others take the form of extended constructions.

The analysis has further shown that al-Farabi employs a variety of methods to establish and define concepts, most notably formal definition, functional explanation, illustration, division, contrast, and contextual interpretation. This diversity reflects an awareness of the importance of terminological precision in constructing logical discourse. Accordingly, describing Kitab al-‘Ibara as a “conceptual dictionary” should be understood as a functional description rather than as a strict lexicographical classification. The book is not a specialized dictionary in terms of its form and purpose, but it contains terminological and definitional practices that make its use in lexicographical and terminological studies both legitimate and fruitful.

In light of this, the study proposes that future research should expand the investigation to include a comparison between the terms found in Kitab al-‘Ibara and those used by Aristotle in *Peri Hermeneias* (*De Interpretatione*), as well as the terminology that became established after al-Farabi in Arabic logical works, in order to trace the processes of transmission and development of terminology within the logical heritage.

References

- 1- Dawabit al-Ma‘rifa wa Usul al-Istidlal wa al-Munazara (Principles of Knowledge and the Foundations of Reasoning and Debate): Abd al-Rahman Hasan Habannakah al-Maydani, Dar al-Qalam, Damascus, Syria, 4th ed. (1993).
- 2- Fanniyyat al-Khitab al-Falsafi (Techniques of Philosophical Discourse): Zarroukhi al-Darraj, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of M’Sila, 1st ed. (2019).

- 3- Al-Qamus al-Muhit (The Comprehensive Dictionary): al-Fayruzabadi, al-Risalah Center for Studies and Heritage Verification, Al-Risalah Foundation, 3rd ed. (2012).
- 4- Kitab fi al-Mantiq (al-'Ibara) (A Book on Logic: The Book of Interpretation): Abu Nasr al-Farabi, ed. Muhammad Salim Salim, Dar al-Kutub Press, (1976).
- 5- Al-Kulliyyat (The General Principles): Abu al-Baqa' al-Kafawi, ed. Adnan Darwish and Muhammad al-Misri, Al-Risalah Foundation, Damascus, Syria, 2nd ed. (2012).
- 6- Mu'jam al-Ta'rifat (Dictionary of Definitions): Ali ibn Muhammad al-Sharif al-Jurjani, ed. Muhammad Siddiq al-Minshawi, Cairo, Dar al-Fadilah, 2012.
- 7- Maqayis al-Lugha (Standards of Language): Ahmad ibn Faris, ed. Anas Muhammad al-Shami, Dar al-Hadith, Cairo, Egypt, (2008).
- 8- Al-Mantiq wa Tarikhuhu min Aristu ila Russell (Logic and Its History from Aristotle to Russell): Robert Blanché, trans. Muhammad Ya'qubi, Dar al-Kitab al-Hadith, Egypt, 1st ed. (2004).

ⁱ Maqayis al-Lugha: Ahmad ibn Faris, ed. Anas Muhammad al-Shami, Dar al-Hadith, Cairo, Egypt, (2008), entry: "š-l-h"; p. 491.

ⁱⁱ Al-Fayruzabadi, Al-Qamus al-Muhit: al-Risalah Center for Studies and Heritage Verification, Al-Risalah Foundation, 3rd ed. (2012), p. 229.

ⁱⁱⁱ Mu'jam al-Ta'rifat: Ali ibn Muhammad al-Sharif al-Jurjani, ed. Muhammad Siddiq al-Minshawi, Cairo, Dar al-Fadilah, 2012, p. 27.

^{iv} Al-Kulliyyat: Abu al-Baqa' al-Kafawi, ed. Adnan Darwish and Muhammad al-Misri, Al-Risalah Foundation, Damascus, Syria, 2nd ed. (2012), p. 107.

^v Fanniyyat al-Khitab al-Falsafi: Zarroukhi al-Darraji, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of M'Sila, 1st ed. (2019), p. 75.

^{vi} Al-Mantiq wa Tarikhuhu min Aristu ila Russell: Robert Blanché, trans. Muhammad Ya'qubi, Dar al-Kitab al-Hadith, Egypt, 1st ed. (2004), p. 62.

^{vii} Dawabit al-Ma'rifa wa Usul al-Istidlal wa al-Munazara: Abd al-Rahman Hasan Habannakah al-Maydani, Dar al-Qalam, Damascus, Syria, 4th ed. (1993), p. 25.

^{viii} Ibid., p. 59.

^{ix} Ibid., p. 61.

^x Ibid., p. 65.

^{xi} Ibid., p. 62.

^{xii} Ibid., p. 63.

^{xiii} Ibid., p. 62.

^{xiv} Ibid., p. 63.

^{xv} Ibid., p. 62.

^{xvi} Ibid., p. 64.

^{xvii} Ibid., p. 62.

^{xviii} Ibid., p. 63.

^{xix} Ibid., p. 62.

^{xx} Ibid., p. 65.

^{xxi} Ibid., p. 66.

^{xxii} Ibid., p. 66.

^{xxiii} Ibid., p. 66.

^{xxiv} Ibid., pp. 66–67.

^{xxv} Ibid., p. 60.

^{xxvi} Ibid., p. 60.

^{xxvii} Ibid., p. 60.

^{xxviii} Ibid., p. 61.

^{xxix} Ibid., p. 45.

^{xxx} Kitab fi al-Mantiq (al-'Ibara): Abu Nasr al-Farabi, ed. Muhammad Salim Salim, Dar al-Kutub Press, (1976), p. 7.

^{xxxi} Ibid., p. 32.

^{xxxii} Ibid., p. 7.

^{xxxiii} Ibid., p. 7.

^{xxxiv} Ibid., p. 17.

^{xxxv} Ibid., p. 7.

^{xxxvi} Ibid., p. 42.

-
- ^{xxxvii} Ibid., p. 17.
^{xxxviii} Ibid., p. 10.
^{xxxix} Ibid., p. 32.
^{xl} Ibid., p. 49.
^{xli} Ibid., p. 49.
^{xlii} Ibid., p. 47.
^{xliii} Ibid., p. 47.