

Hence it must be understood that RV.¹ &c. &c. denotes that a word occurs in the whole literature—both Vedic and Post-Vedic—beginning with the R̥g-veda, while Mn. &c. signifies that the use of a word is restricted to the later literature beginning with Manu.

And again, when a word had not yet been met with in any published literary work, but only in native lexicons, it was decided to denote this by the letter L.

As to the words and meanings given on my authority and marked MW., many of them have been taken by me from commentaries or from the notes which I made after conversations with learned Pandits in their own country. For it seems to me that Sanskrit Dictionaries ought sometimes to give important modern words and meanings as used by modern educated Sanskrit scholars in India—such, for example, as the meaning of *prāṇa-pratishṭhā*² (see Additions under **Prāṇa**, p. 1330).

Then a third improvement in the present edition, as every true scholar will admit, is the accentuation of words occurring in accentuated texts, although it will be found, I fear, that occasional accidental omissions occur, and in cross-references the accent has often been designedly dropped. Many accents, too, which are only known from Pāṇini and the *Phit-sūtras* have been intentionally omitted.

It is admitted that accentuation is *marked* only in the oldest Vedic texts, and that in later times it must have undergone great changes—so far at least as the *spoken* accent was concerned. And this led me to decide that in preparing a practical Dictionary which employed so many complicated diacritical marks, it would be better not to increase the complication by adding the marks of accentuation. All accentuation was, therefore, designedly omitted in the first edition. But the careful study of Pāṇini's grammar, which my higher lectures, during the period of my active occupancy of the Boden Chair (1860–1888), obliged me to carry on, forced upon me the conviction that, inasmuch as at the time when the great Indian Grammarian—the chief authority for both Vedic and classical grammar—elaborated his wonderful system, every word in Sanskrit, as much in the ordinary language as in the Vedic, had its accent³, a knowledge of accents must be often indispensable to a right knowledge of the meaning of words in Sanskrit.

And in real truth the whole of Pāṇini's grammar is interpenetrated throughout by the ruling idea of the importance of accentuation to a correct knowledge of words and their meanings.

For example, we learn from Pāṇ. vi, 1, 201, that the word **kshāya** means 'abode,' but **kshayā** with the accent on the last syllable means 'destruction.' And again, from Pāṇ. vi, 1, 205, that **datta**, 'given,' which as a p. participle has the accent on the second syllable (*dattā*) is accentuated on the first syllable (i.e. is pronounced *dātta*) when it is used as a proper name. On the other hand, by Pāṇ. vi, 1, 206, **dhṛishṭa** has the accent on the first syllable, whether as a participle, or as a name (not *dhṛishṭā* at p. 519).

Further, by Pāṇ. vi, 1, 223 and vi, 2, 1 all compounds have different meanings according to the position of the accent. Hence **Indra-śatru** means either 'an enemy of Indra' or 'having Indra as an enemy,' according as the accent is on the last or first member of the compound (*Indra-śatru* or *Indra-śatru*; see Additions, p. 1321). These examples may suffice to show the importance of accentuation in affecting meanings.

That this holds good in all languages is shown by the careful way in which accentuation is marked in modern English Dictionaries. How, indeed, could it be otherwise when the transference of an accent from one syllable to another often makes such important alteration in the sense as may be noted in the words 'gállant' and 'gallánt,' 'récord' and 'recórd,' 'présent' and 'présent,' 'aúgust' and 'augúst,' 'désert' and 'desért.' The bearing, too, of Sanskrit accentuation on comparative philology will be evident to any one who has noted the coincidences between the accentuation of Greek and Sanskrit words.

Manifestly then it would have been inexcusable had we omitted all accentuation in the present enlarged and improved work⁴. It must be admitted, however, that incidence of accent has not been treated with exact uniformity in every page of this volume.

In Pāṇini's system, as is well known, the position of the accent is generally denoted by some indicatory letter, attached to the technical names given by him to his affixes and suffixes, including the terminations

¹ Rig-Veda has now become an Anglicized word, and the dot under the R has been omitted in the Dictionary for simplicity.

² I am sorry to have to confess that imbued as I once was with false notions as to the deadness of Sanskrit, I have sometimes omitted to give the meanings of important modern words like *prāṇa-pratishṭhā* in the body of the Dictionary.

³ The absence of accent was only permitted in calling out to a person in the distance, Pāṇ. i, 2, 33.

⁴ The importance of correct accentuation and intonation in a language, the very sound of which is held by the Hindūs to be divine, and the bearing of Sanskrit accentuation on that of Greek, had become so impressed on me, that when I was sent as a Delegate to the Berlin International Congress of Orientalists by the Government of India in 1881, I requested Pandit Śyāmaji

Krishna-varmā (who was also a Government Delegate) to illustrate my paper on Vedic hymns by repeating them with the right accentuation. The Pandit's illustrations were not only much appreciated, but received with grateful acknowledgments at the time by the eminent Chairman, Prof. A. Weber, and other Sanskrit scholars present, but were misconstrued by one of my auditors—the well-known and most energetic Hon. Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society. That gentleman made the Pandit's illustrative additions the subject of an extraordinary criticism in a paper on 'Oriental Congresses,' written by him and published in the *Calcutta Review*, No. CLXI (1885), and quite recently reprinted. A letter lately received by me from Professor A. Weber, and printed last year in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, expresses the astonishment which we both felt at the statements in that paper.