

sure, be admitted that the knowledge gained by me from personal contact with Indian Pandits and educated men in their own Universities, and with all sorts and conditions of Hindūs in their own towns and villages, has been a distinct advantage to this Dictionary. It has enabled me to give much useful information not found in other works, and to avoid many mistakes made by Sanskritists who have only a book-knowledge of India.

A further peculiar feature is the introduction of a large number of names of persons and places. This may be objected to as a needless extension of the scope and limits of a Dictionary. In extenuation I contend that greater liberty ought to be allowed to a Sanskrit Dictionary in this respect than to Greek and Latin Lexicons, because Oriental alphabets have no capital letters enabling such names to be distinguished from ordinary nouns.

Then again, in regard to the names of works, which are also multiplied to an unusual extent, Sanskrit literature is so vast that, although—as I hold—very little worthy of attention remains to be edited, yet it may often be of great importance to have attention drawn to unknown treatises, or to commentaries on well-known works ascertained to exist in manuscript in the libraries of Europe or India.

As to plants and trees, the adjective qualifying the name of a plant, as well as the name of the plant itself, ought occasionally to be marked, according to the rules of botanical science, with an initial capital letter. But it is often difficult for a non-botanist to decide as to the correct usage. It was therefore thought better to use capital letters for both substantive and adjective, especially as in the new edition, to save space, the word 'plant' is omitted. Hence the second capital letter, though often inappropriate, serves as a symbol for denoting that the epithet is that of a plant.

I need scarcely draw attention to the comparisons from cognate languages which manifestly constitute a special feature of this volume. Many doubtful comparisons have been eliminated from the present edition. A few questionable ones have, I fear, been retained or rashly inserted, but they will be easily detected (e.g. under **Ayāsa**, p. 85).

In regard to what may be thought a needless multiplication of indecent words and meanings, offensive to European notions of delicacy, I am sorry to say that they had to be inserted, because in very truth Sanskrit, like all Oriental languages, abounds with words of that character, and to such an extent, that to have omitted them, would have been to cut out a large percentage of the language. A story is told of a prudish lady who complimented Dr. Johnson on having omitted all bad words from his English Dictionary; whereupon he replied: 'Madam, it is true that I have done so, but I find that you have been looking for them.' In point of fact students of Sanskrit literature cannot sometimes avoid looking for such words. Nor have I, except in rare instances, veiled their meaning under a Latin translation which only draws attention to what might otherwise escape notice.

In extenuation it may fairly be urged that in India the relationship between the sexes is regarded as a sacred mystery, and is never held to be suggestive of improper or indecent ideas.

After the foregoing explanation of the general plan of the work it remains to describe some of the more noteworthy changes and improvements introduced into the present edition.

And let me at once say that, as it was intended to give explanations of even more Sanskrit words than are treated of in the great Wörterbuch of Böhtlingk and Roth, and in the later Wörterbuch of the former, and, as it was decided that to prevent its expansion beyond the limits of one compact volume, the number of pages in the new edition should not be augmented by much more than a hundred and fifty, it became a difficult problem to devise a method of making room for the ever-increasing number of words which, as the work grew under our hands, continually pressed more and more for admission into its purview.

Let any critic, then, who may feel inclined to pass a severe judgment on the contrivances for abbreviation in the present edition of the Dictionary, think for a moment of the difficulties in which its compilers found themselves involved. It was only gradually that the actual fact revealed itself—the very startling fact that we had to provide for the treatment of about one half more Sanskrit words, simple and compound, than in the first edition. That is to say, calculating as I had done that the number of Sanskrit words—simple and compound—in the first edition amounted to about 120,000, it became evident to us, as the work proceeded, that the number to be provided for in the new edition could not be reckoned at less than 180,000. It was as if a builder employed in repairing one of his own buildings had been told that he had to provide for the crowding of 1,800 human beings into a room, originally constructed by him to hold only twelve hundred.

Or perhaps the difficulty may be better illustrated thus:—A traveller, after having made a voyage round the world, starts some time afterwards for a second similar journey. The rules of the ship in