

from each other by the figures 1, 2, 3, &c., placed before the Indo-Romanic or Indo-Italic transliterated forms :— see, for example, अशीत 1. *a-śīta*, अशीत 2. *aśīta* (p. 113)<sup>1</sup>; 1. *Āpya*, आप 2. *āpya*, आप 3. *āpya* (pp. 142, 144); बृह 1. *bṛih*, बृह 2. *bṛih*, बृह 3. *bṛih* (p. 735).

In regard to the roots of the language, it will be observed that they are treated of in the present work—both in respect of the meanings and of the exhibition of tenses, participles, and verbal forms evolved from them—more thoroughly and exhaustively than has hitherto been attempted in a Dictionary<sup>2</sup>.

Furthermore, all the verbs formed from the roots with prepositions (as, for example, अनुक *anu-√kṛi*, p. 31, समभिषाह *sam-abhi-vy-ā-√hṛi*, p. 1156) are arranged according to the method followed in Greek and Latin Lexicons; that is to say, such verbs are to be looked for in their own alphabetical order, and not under the roots *kṛi* and *hṛi*. The practical convenience resulting from this method, and the great advantage of exhibiting the connexion of every verb and its meanings with its derivatives, constitute in my opinion an invaluable gain, especially to the student who studies Sanskrit as he would Greek and Latin, and makes it a guide to the study of the other members of the Indo-European family. At all events it forms one of the unique features of the present work, stamping it with an individuality of its own, and differentiating it from all other Sanskrit Dictionaries. The labour entailed in the process—necessarily a wholly *pioneering process*—of thus rearranging the verbs in a language so rich in prepositions, can only be understood by those who have undergone it.

As to the separation of meanings it must be noted that mere amplifications of preceding meanings are separated by a comma, whereas those which do not clearly run into each other are divided by semicolons. A comma, therefore, must always be taken as marking *separate shades of meaning*, except it occurs in parenthetical observations.

Let it be observed, however, that all the meanings of a word belonging to a group are not always given in full, if they may be manifestly gathered from the other members of the group. This applies especially to participles and participial formations.

Observe too that all remarks upon meanings and all descriptive and explanatory statements are given between ( ), all remarks within remarks and comparisons with other languages between [ ].

I was told by a friendly critic, soon after the appearance of the first edition, that meanings and synonyms had been needlessly multiplied, but when the book had been fairly tested by repeated and extended application to various branches of the literature, it was found that apparently superfluous synonyms often gave the precise meanings required to suit particular passages. In the present edition—to save space—some synonyms which seemed mere surplusage have been rejected; and I fear I may have occasionally gone too far in sanctioning some of these rejections. For experience proves that the practical utility of a Dictionary is less impaired by a redundancy than by a paucity of meanings.

Again, a glance at the following pages will show that the arrangement of compound words under a leading word, as introduced in the edition of 1872, and continued with modifications in the present edition, is entirely novel.

It may perhaps be objected that there are too many of these compounds; but once more it may be urged that a Sanskrit Dictionary must not be tried by ordinary laws in this respect, for Sanskrit has developed more than Greek and German and any other Aryan language the faculty of forming compounds. The love of composition is indeed one of its most characteristic features. To exclude compounds from a Sanskrit Lexicon would be, so to speak, to 'unsanskritize' it. Not only are there certain compounds quite peculiar to Sanskrit, but, in the grammar, composition almost takes the place of Syntax, and the various kinds of compound words are classified and defined with greater subtlety and minuteness than in any other known language of the world. When a student is in doubt whether to translate compounds like **Indra-śatru** as Bahuvrīhis or Tatpurushas, the Dictionary is surely bound to aid in clearing up his perplexity. Even as it is, many useful compounds have, I fear, been sacrificed to the exigencies of space. The meanings of these, however, can be easily inferred from the meaning of their component members. Take, for example, such a word as **samyuktākshara**, 'a compound or conjunct letter.'

Another distinctive peculiarity of this Dictionary consists in the articles on mythology, literature, religion, and philosophy, scattered everywhere throughout its pages. My own collection of notes from various sources, especially those made during my three Indian journeys and published in the books named in the Preface to this volume (see p. vi, with note), have enabled me to furnish students with much useful information on many subjects not hitherto treated of in Sanskrit Dictionaries. It will, I feel

<sup>1</sup> In this first case the hyphen used in the transliterated form is no doubt sufficient to distinguish the two forms from each other. Hence, to economize space, the figures have occasionally towards the end of the work been omitted (see *samāntā, Sa-māna*, p. 1160).

<sup>2</sup> I must, however, here repeat the acknowledgment of my original indebtedness to 'Westergaard's Radices;' nor must I omit to mention Whitney's valuable Index of Roots, Verb-forms and Primary Derivatives.