A further economy has been effected by employing the symbol √ for root.

In this new edition, too, the letters 'mfn.' placed after the crude stems of words, have been generally substituted for the forms of the nominative cases of all adjectives, participles, and substantives (at least after the first 100 pages), such nominative forms being easily inferred from the gender. But it must be borne in mind that nearly all feminine stems in *ā* and *ī* are also nominative forms. In cases where adjectives make their feminines in *ī* this has been generally indicated, as in the previous edition. Occasionally, too, the neuter nominative form (*am*) is given as an aid to the eye in marking the change from one gender to another.

Other contrivances for abbreviation scarcely need explanation; for instance, 'N.' standing for 'name' is applicable to epithets as well as names, and when it applies to more than one person or object in a series, is omitted in all except the first; e.g. 'N. of an author, RV.; of a king, MBh.' &c.

Also, the figures 1, 2, 3 &c. have been in some cases dropped (see note 1, p. xv), and the mention of cl. 8 is often omitted after the common root *kṛi*.

Finally, I have thought it wise to shorten some of the articles on mythology, and to omit some of the more doubtful comparisons with the cognate languages of Europe.

SECTION III.

Extent of Sanskṛit Literature comprehended in the Present Edition.

I stated in the Preface to the first edition of this work—written in 1872—that I had sometimes been asked by men learned in all the classical lore of Europe, whether Sanskṛit had any literature. Happily, since then, a great advance in the prosecution of Indian studies and in the diffusion of a knowledge of India has been effected. The efforts and researches of able Orientalists in almost every country have contributed to this result, and I venture to claim for the Oxford Indian Institute and its staff of Professors and Tutors a large share in bringing this about.

Nevertheless much ignorance still prevails, even among educated English-speakers, in respect of the exact position occupied by Sanskṛit literature in India—its relationship to that of the spoken vernaculars of the country and the immensity of its range in comparison with that of the literature of Europe. I may be permitted therefore to recapitulate what I have already said in regard to the term 'Sanskṛit,' before explaining what I conceive ought to be included under the term 'Sanskṛit literature.'

By Sanskṛit, then, is meant the learned language of India—the language of its cultured inhabitants—the language of its religion, its literature, and science—not by any means a dead language, but one still spoken and written by educated men in all parts of the country, from Cashmere to Cape Comorin, from Bombay to Calcutta and Madras[1]. Sanskṛit, in short, represents, I conceive, the learned form of the language brought by the Indian branch of the great Āryan race into India. For, in point of fact, the course of the development of language in India resembles the course of Āryan languages in other countries, the circumstances of whose history have been similar.

The language of the immigrant Āryan race has prevailed over that of the aborigines, but in doing so has separated into two lines, the one taken by the educated and learned classes, the other by the unlearned—the latter again separating into various provincial sub-lines[2]. Doubtless in India, from the greater exclusiveness of the educated few, and the desire of a proud priesthood to keep the key of knowledge in their own possession, the language of the learned classes became so highly elaborated that it received the name **Saṃskṛita,** or 'perfectly constructed speech' (see p. xii), both to denote its superiority to the common dialects (called in contradistinction **Prākṛita**) and its more exclusive dedication to religious and literary purposes. Not that the Indian vernaculars are exclusively spoken languages, without any literature of their own; for some of them (as, for example, Hindī, Hindūstānī, and Tamil, the last belonging to the Drāviḍian and not Āryan family) have produced valuable literary works, although their subject-matter is often borrowed from the Sanskṛit.

Next, as to the various branches of Sanskṛit literature which ought to be embraced by a Dictionary aiming, like the present, at as much completeness as possible—these are fully treated of in my book 'Indian Wisdom' (a recent edition of which has been published by Messrs. Luzac & Co.). It will be

[1] A paper written by Pandit Śyāmajī Kṛishṇa-varmā on 'Sanskṛit as a living language in India,' was read by him at the Berlin Oriental Congress of 1881, and excited much interest. He argues very forcibly that 'Sanskṛit as settled in the *Ashṭâdhyāyī* of Pāṇini was a spoken vernacular at the time when that great grammarian flourished.' In the same paper he maintains that Sanskṛit was the source of the Prākṛits, and quotes Vararuci's Prākṛita-prakāśa xii, 2 (Prakṛitiḥ saṃskṛitam, 'Sanskṛit is the source'). Of course the provincialized Prākṛits—though not, as I believe, derived directly from the learned language, but developed independently—borrowed largely from the Sanskṛit after it was thus elaborated.

[2] It has been recently stated in print that Russian furnishes an exception to the usual ramification into dialects, but Mr. Morfill informs me that it has all the characteristics of Āryan languages, separating first into Great and Little Russian and then into other dialects.