

general trustworthiness of the present Dictionary, its compilers can yet be keenly alive to its thoroughly human character.

Speaking for myself I may say that blended with my thankfulness for the longevity that has enabled me to see a protracted undertaking brought to a completion, is a deep consciousness that I am not young enough to consider myself infallible. Indeed it is at once the joy and sorrow of every true scholar that the older he grows the more he has to confess himself a learner rather than a teacher, and the more morbidly conscious he becomes of his own liability to a learner's mistakes.

From all true scholars I do not fear, but court, criticism. Such critics will understand how a sense of responsibility may increase with advancing age, putting an author out of conceit with his own performances, and filling him with progressively intensified cravings after an impossible perfection. They will make due allowance for the difficulties besetting the production of so many densely printed pages, often comprising column after column of unbroken serried type, and abounding with countless dots and diacritical marks. Nor will they be surprised at occasional inequalities of execution in a work representing efforts spread over numerous years. Nor will they need to be reminded that occasional distractions, trials of health and weariness of spirit are unavoidably incident, not only to the responsible head of a prolonged undertaking, but to his several assistants. Indeed it is no disparagement to those who have contributed to the detail of this work to admit that a compilation, which is the result of the collaboration of so many different personalities, must in some degree reflect the idiosyncrasies and infirmities peculiar to each.

Yet notwithstanding my desire that due weight should be given to such considerations, I may be pardoned if I express my confident expectation that the volume now offered to students of both Sanskrit and comparative philology, will supply them with the most complete and useful one-volumed Sanskrit-English Dictionary ever yet produced—a Dictionary, too, which in its gradual progress has, I trust, kept pace with the advancing knowledge and scholarship of the day.

At all events I feel sure that I may affirm for my collaborators, as well as for myself, that we have earnestly striven to secure for this new volume, even more than for the old, the possession of four principal characteristics, namely:—
1. Scholarly accuracy; 2. Practical utility; 3. Lucidity of arrangement, designed to set forth, as clearly as possible, the etymological structure of the language, and its bearing on that of the cognate languages of Europe; 4. Completeness and comprehensiveness, at least to the fullest extent attainable in the latest state of Sanskrit research, and to the utmost limit compatible with compactness and compression into a single volume.

And here it is my duty to notify, in justice as much to my assistants as to myself, that I must be held primarily responsible, not only for the plan, but for the general character of the whole Dictionary. This will be understood when I state that I have from the first exercised a strict superintendence over the details of both editions—not only in carefully supervising the manuscript, but in adding new words, in modifying or amplifying meanings, in subjoining explanations from my own literary notes—made during my sojourning at the chief seats of learning in India—in examining and re-examining every proof-sheet.

I ought to state, however, that during occasional attacks of illness I have been