PREFACE

The aim of the present work is to satisfy within the compass of a comparatively handy volume all the practical wants not only of learners of Sanskrit but also of scholars for purposes of ordinary reading.

When I began my task in 1886 there was no available work which supplied the deficiency. The only one having a somewhat similar end in view, the Sanskrit-English Lexicon of my respected teacher, the late Theodore Benfey, was already out of print. By the time, however, that my manuscript was half finished, no fewer than three small Sanskrit dictionaries had been published. It may perhaps be advisable to indicate some of the points in which the present work differs from and compares with them. In the first place, it is much more copious. Excluding all words and meanings which occur in native lexicographers, but cannot be quoted from actual literature, my book contains nearly double as much material as any of the dictionaries in question. The present work is, moreover, the only one of the four, which is transliterated. It can thus be used, for example, by comparative philologists not knowing a single letter of the Devanâgarî alphabet. None of the others is etymological in any sense. This feature of my dictionary increases both its usefulness from a linguistic point of view and its practical value to the student, who will always better remember the meaning of a word, the derivation of which is made clear to him. Lastly, this is the only one of the lexicons in question which indicates not only with respect to words, but also to their meanings, the literary period to which they belong and the frequency or rarity of their occurrence. This addition I regard as both scientifically and practically important.

**Scope of the Work**. The present dictionary is intended to supply the vocabulary of post-Vedic literature in general, while including those portions of Vedic literature which are readily accessible to the student in good selections. All out-of-the-way technical terms, such as those of medicine, botany, astronomy, and ritual, are excluded, except in so far as they have found their way into ordinary literary works, or occur in selections which I have expressly included. Specifically legal and philosophical terms are, on the other hand, largely represented, owing to the inclusion in my list of the most important works belonging to the corresponding departments of literature. Having acquired a rather extensive experience of native commentaries in connexion with my lectures to students preparing for the Honour School of Oriental Languages at Oxford, I have introduced a considerable number of grammatical and rhetorical terms also, these being necessary for the comprehension of such works as for instance the glosses of Mallinâtha. A good many words and explanations will thus be found, which either do not occur in the Petersburg dictionaries, or are, I think, less correctly given there. (Compare e. g. articles arthântaranyâsa, bahuvrîhi, yathâ tathâ, vâkyabheda, vyadhikara*n*a, sâpekshatva, etc.)

The list of books to which my dictionary specially refers, and which I drew up, when planning the

work, after consultation with a pupil of Professor Bühler's, the late Dr. Schönberg, then resident in

Oxford, I here append.

**Books specially referred to**. Bhagavadgîtâ, Bhart*ri*hari, Bhâshâpari*kkh*eda, Da*s*akumâra*k*arita, Gîtagovinda, Harsha*k*arita, Hitopade*s*a, Kâdambarî, Kâmandakîya-nîtisâra, Kathâsaritsâgara, Kirâtâr*g*unîya, Kullûka, Kumârasa*m*bhava, Mahâvîra*k*arita, Mâlatîmâdhava, Mâlavikâgnimitra, Manu, Meghadûta, Mitâksharâ (on Yâ*gñ*avalkya), M*rikkh*aka*t*ikâ, Mudrârâkshasa, Naishadha, Nala, Pa*ñk*atantra, Raghuva*ms*a, Râ*g*atara*m*ginî, Râtnavalî, *Ri*tusa*m*hâra, *S*akuntalâ, *S*a*m*kara (on the Vedânta-sûtras), *S*i*s*upâlavadha, Tarkasa*m*graha, Uttararâma*k*aritra, Vâsavadattâ, Vedântasâra, Ve*n*îsa*m*hâra, Vikramâṅkadeva*k*arita, Vikramorva*s*î, Yâ*gñ*avalkya. Besides all the post-Vedic selections contained in the Readers mentioned below, the list finally includes the second edition of Böhtlingk’s *Indische Sprüche*, a florilegium of the aphoristic poetry in which Sanskrit literature is pre-eminent, well deserving to be made accessible to the English-speaking student.

With regard to Vedic literature I have taken in all that is contained in the second edition of Böhtlingk’s *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie*, in Hillebrandt’s *Veda-Ghrestomathie*, in Lanman's Reader, and in Windisch's *Zwölf* *Hymnen des Rigveda*, besides those hymns which are prescribed to the candidates of the Honour School of Oriental Languages at Oxford (Rig-veda X, i to xxii). Peterson’s ‘Selected Hymns of the Rig-veda’ would also have been taken in, had they been published soon enough. The majority of the hymns contained in that selection are, however, already included. Apart from passages supplied in Readers, the Brâhma*n*a period is represented by the Aitareya-Brâhma*n*a, while the Dharma-sûtra of Gautama and the Âsvalâyana and Pâraskara G*ri*hya-sûtras are specially selected from the latest phase of Vedic literature.

Important Vedic words, even though not occurring in the selections, have found a place in my dictionary mainly on linguistic grounds.

The number of hymns from the Rig-veda, being nearly all the best in that collection, is about one hundred and twenty. As a list of them will probably prove a convenience to students, it is here subjoined.

Ma*nd*ala I: 1, 13, 24, 32, 39. 41, 42. 50, 65, 67, 85, 92, 97, 113, 115, 118, 143, 154, 161, 162, 190; II: 12, 27, 38; III: 33, 35, 59, 62; IV: 19, 27, 30, 33, 42, 51, 52 52; V: 11, 24, 32, 40, 81, 83, 84, 85; VI: 9, 50, 54, 74; VII: 6, 28, 33, 34, 46, 49, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 76, 83, 86, 87, 88, 89, 102, 103: VIII: 14, 29, 30, 85, 91; IX: 1, 38, 41, 112; X: 1-22, 33, 34, 39, 51, 52, 85, I08, 117, 118, 127, 129, 137, 145, 146, 154, 168, 185.

**Arrangement**. In my original plan I had contemplated making a separate article of each word, simple and compound, printed in Devanâgarî type as well as transliterated. Reflection, however, soon led me to abandon this scheme for that of arranging compounds in a group under a heading word, the latter only being printed in Devanâgarî, while only the second member of the remaining compounds is given in transliteration (see, for instance, article am*ri*ta). When the number of such compounds is large, they have been split up into several groups with reference to the initial of the second member (see p. 173). The result of this change has been a saving of about 100 pages on the estimate of 480 pages according to the earlier plan, and that too although I have introduced rather more matter than I had then intended. I believe that this saving of space will moreover prove an actual advantage from the practical point of view, because the eye will find a word more quickly thus than if it had to run down columns of separate articles. A glance at pages 173 to 175 will probably convince the student of the correctness of this opinion. A dictionary being a means to an end, a saving of time in its use is obviously an important object.

As to the arrangement of individual articles, the transliteration of the Devanâgarî word is followed, in the case of nouns, by the derivation (in brackets) where this cannot be made sufficiently clear by the employment of hyphens in the transliteration (see e.g. bh*ri*gu, muhûrta, loka). Next follow the meanings in close juxtaposition, so that the eye may take them all in at a glance if possible. My aim has been to give the senses of all words in the historical order of development. Then come the special uses of the cases, and last of all idiomatic combinations (see buddhi, manas). When cases are mentioned, they are given in the order of Sanskrit grammar. The feminine form of adjectives is given in parentheses immediately after ‘a.’; thus ‘paurusha, a. (î)’. When no feminine is stated, it must be assumed to be **â** or else not quotable.

Adjective compounds ending in participles are described as participles, e.g. su-gata, *s*rotra-peya. This enables me to make an important distinction in sense without adding a long explanation. Thus *s*u*k*i-smita is described as an adjective, because smita is here really a noun at the end of a Bahuvrîhi compound. Again, any confusion in the mind of the beginner between secondary adjectives like sama*ñg*an-îya and future participles like bodhanîya is by this means avoided.

At first I thought of employing figures to indicate distinct differences of meaning. But the difficulty, in many cases, of determining a full interval of meaning, and the large waste of space involved, induced me to reject their use for this purpose, especially as the need is sufficiently met by the employment of the semi-colon (see Punctuation). I have therefore only used figures either to distinguish words which have the same form but differ etymologically (as verbs like ruh or nouns like sam-udra and sa-mudra), or to clearly mark off groups of meaning (as in dar*s*ana).

Unnecessary repetition has often been avoided by the use of parentheses. Thus when samâhita-mati is defined as ‘(having an) attentive (mind)’, the meaning intended is, that its equivalent is strictly speaking ‘having an attentive mind’, though it may ordinarily be rendered by ‘attentive’. The same object is attained by the use of dashes, implying that an obvious word or words are to be supplied from what precedes or follows. Thus sat-kîrti is defined as ‘f. good reputation; a. having a –‘, which of course must be understood to mean ‘having a good reputation’ (cp. also dîrgha-sattra, pâtana, vidhâtavya).

Mainly for the sake of convenience in attaching suffixes and the second members of compounds, nouns have been given in the weak or middle bases. Verbal roots have similarly been given in their weak forms with a view to uniformity. Though I do not think that I have been absolutely consistent in this respect, I believe I have been sufficiently so for practical purposes.

I have sometimes been obliged to sacrifice a strictly scientific treatment to practical exigencies by admitting such suffixes as -tâ and -maya in long articles made up of compounds (such as that under mitra). Otherwise I should have been compelled to divide a long paragraph in the middle merely in order to print an unimportant word in Devanâgarî type. Not much harm can after all result from this, as not even the tyro would be likely to confound such suffixes wifch regular words. To obviate the difficulty by placing such words out of their regular alphabetical order would have entailed a much more serious drawback on the practical side. In the case of important proper names I have generally added a few concise remarks together with approximate dates as far as these can be determined in the light of the most recent research (see e.g. Bhavabhûti). As definitions of technical terms are sometimes almost unintelligible without illustrative examples, the latter have been added where it seemed necessary (see, for instance, sâmasokti).

In articles treating of verbs, the conjugational class is first stated together with the voice in which it is conjugated. When the latter is omitted, the verb must be understood to be both active and middle. Next comes the present base or bases in transliteration, followed by the meanings of the verb arranged on the same principle as in the case of nouns, the idiomatic uses being stated at the end. After this are added the present passive (generally omitted) with the past passive participle, the causal, the desiderative, and the intensive (when these forms occur), with their respective perfect participles passives in this order.

The principle I had in view in treating the perfect participle passive, was to give it under the verb when the meanings are merely verbal, but to make a separate article of it where adjectival senses predominate. I feel that I have not been thoroughly consistent in this respect. It is, however, not a matter of great moment.

The verbal prepositions are arranged in alphabetical order after the last form of the simple verb with which they are used. A scientific as well as a practical consideration determined me to concentrate them in this manner. On the one hand, these prefixes are separable in the Veda, while on the other, a large amount of space is saved by making a single article of a verbal root and the prepositions with which it may be combined. Otherwise separate head-lines in Devanâgarî as well as transliteration would have to be printed. Four times as much space would thus be occupied as under the alternative system. Nor would anything be thus gained in convenience, unless (to obviate reference to the simple verb) the present base and other forms were added. This would involve a further waste of space.

**Exclusion of References**. I have acted on the principle that a dictionary should give all references or none. The former alternative was, of course, out of the question in a practical work. It might, it is true, have been useful to state where a word occurs which is not to be found in other dictionaries. My rare deviations from the rule are, however, solely limited to passages in which the meaning of a particular word is unknown, or where the definition is made clearer by the reference, as in the case of samudga or sarvatobhadra. Partial references have, I think, a tendency to make students too dependent on them in determining the meaning of a word in any given passage. The omission of such references is more than compensated for by the method which I have followed. I have endeavoured to limit the meaning of a word as far as possible to parallel instances by indicating the case which it governs, the word in context with which it is employed, the literary period or department to which it belongs, and the frequency or rarity of its occurrence. An examination of such articles as lohita or √2. ruh will illustrate my meanings.

**Alphabetical Order**. From this order (see p. xii) I have, from considerations of practical utility, never deviated, with one very slight and rare exception. I have sometimes transposed the order of two words, either to obviate breaking up a paragraph or to avoid repeating a definition (e.g. smarya). The words being in immediate juxtaposition, neither of them can be missed.

Under this head I ought to add a few remarks in order to remove some common stumbling-blocks from the path of the beginner. Owing to variety of spelling, especially in Indian editions, words with initial व v and श *s* may not be found under those letters. They will be discovered by looking up ब b and ष sh or स s respectively. The reverse also applies. The alphabetical position of Anusvâra followed by a semivowel or sibilant is before क k. Thus संवर sa*m*vara and संशय sa*ms*aya precede सक saka. On the other hand, the Anusvâra which occurs before a mute of one of the five classes and is interchangeable with the nasal of that class, occupies the place of the class nasal. Thus संकक्ष sa*m*-kaksha (= सङ्कक्ष saṅ-kaksha) immediately follows सघृण sa-gh*rin*a. Similarly, the unchangeable or necessary Visarga (i. e. preceding a hard guttural or labial) comes after a vowel before any other consonant. Thus अन्तःकरण anta*h*-kara*n*a and अन्तःपुर anta*h*-pura follow अन्त anta and precede अन्तक anta-ka. On the other hand, the Visarga which precedes a sibilant, and may be assimilated to it, is treated as if it were that sibilant and placed accordingly. Thus अधःशय adha*h*-saya and अधःशायिन् adha*h*-sâyin follow अधःश्चरण adha*s*-*k*ara*n*a and precede अधस् adhas.

**Abbreviations**. A full list of these together with their explanations will be found on p. xii. It is, however, perhaps advisable to add a few remarks showing how some of these symbols should exactly be understood to apply. When a sign such as V. (= Vedic) is added in parentheses after a form, a grammatical symbol, or a meaning, its application is restricted to these only. Thus under √yam, **yáma** (V.) means that that present base is exclusively Vedic; a. (V.), m. (V.) signify that as an adjective or as a masculine noun, the word in question is exclusively Vedic; when ‘sád- as, n.’ is defined as ‘seat, place, abode, dwelling (V.)’, the meaning is that all these synonymous senses are Vedic. The application of such notes as ‘ord. mg.’ (= ordinary meaning) is similar. Thus under 1. mâna, all the preceding words separated by commas, viz. 'respect, regard, honour, mark of honour’, are indicated as included in the ordinary meaning of mâna (cp. Punctuation). If, on the other hand, a symbol followed by a colon is used *before* a meaning, its application is carried on till another symbol occurs. For example, under v*ri*ddhi the sense ‘growth’ is indicated to be both Vedic and Classical, ‘delectation, delight’, Vedic, but all the significations from ‘adolescence’ onwards post-Vedic only.

**Type**. The small Devanâgarî character is used for all articles except the verbs, for which the large type is reserved. Ordinary Roman type is employed for transliteration immediately following a word in Devanâgarî; but when a word occurs in transliteration only, it is printed in thick type so as to catch the eye at once (as in article akshara). When there is no object in attracting the attention, as for instance when Sanskrit words occur in definitions or explanations, they are not made conspicuous in this manner.

To the special use made of italic type, I attach considerable practical value. Its occurrence in definitions always implies amplification or elucidation, whereas the ordinary Roman type represents as far as is possible the exact literal equivalent of the Sanskrit word. Thus sa*m*vara*n*a-sra*g* is defined as ‘wreath *given by a girl to the man* of *her* choice’ (compare also samâna‿upamâ). By this means needless repetitions and waste of space are avoided, while much is gained in clearness of definition at one and the same time.

**Punctuation**. The **colon** immediately before a transliterated word or suffix, indicates that the latter must be attached to the end of the preceding Sanskrit word. Thus **:-ka** after the heading, word losh*t*á is to be read as losh*t*a-ka. This is in no way affected by the intervening special uses of cases or idioms often added at the end of an article. Thus **:-kesarin** under vi-krama must of course be understood as vikrama-kesarin, in spite of the inflected forms of vikrama which immediately precede -kesarin. The special significance of the **semi-colon** is, in addition to marking off distinctly different meanings, to separate within a paragraph the latter halves of the compounds which it contains. Thus **;-*k*akshus** under lola-kar*n*a, is to be read as lola-*k*akshus, and the following **;-tâ** as lola-tâ. Had a colon preceded the latter, it would have meant lola-*k*akshus-tâ. The semi-colon will sometimes be found instead of the colon when it is perfectly obvious that nothing else could be done with the following word but attach it to the end of the preceding one. This is for instance the case with ;-kâra after loha. The **comma** is employed, as has already been indicated, to separate more or less synonymous meanings, while the semi-colon marks off distinct differences of sense. The other specific use of the comma is in paragraphs with compounds to show that the following word is to be applied exactly in the same way as a preceding one introduced by a colon. Thus sat-kârya followed by **:-vâda** and subsequently by **,-vâdin**, must be read as satkârya-vâda and satkârya-vâdin.

**Transliteration**. The system is that which has been adopted in the ‘Sacred Books of the East’, and already followed by me in my edition of Professor Max Müller's Sanskrit Grammar. Had I been guided exclusively by my own judgment I should have preferred c **and** j to represent the hard and the soft palatal. I should have retained the italic *t* and *d* for the linguals, but made the lingual ष sh also an italic *s*, representing the palatal sibilant श by ç. The connexion of these two sibilants with the mutes of their classes would thus have been clearly indicated. The employment of a double letter sh, the latter half of which otherwise represents an aspiration, to express the simple sound of a spirant, is not strictly scientific, though convenient for the Anglo-Saxon. It is, however, not a good thing to multiply systems.

I must here refer to some practical applications of transliteration which I have made.

When one or more letters in thick type are added after a Sanskrit word either in parentheses or following a semi-colon, colon, or comma, the meaning is that that letter or those letters are to be substituted for precisely the same number at the end of the word in question. Thus ‘paurusha, a. (**î**)’, ‘yamaka, a. (**ikâ**)’ signify that the feminine of the former adjective is paurushî and that of the latter yamikâ. Similarly ‘samâna-mûrdhan, a. (**nî**)’ indicates that this word has the form samâna-mûrdhnî in the feminine. The letters **:i-ka**, referring to a preceding paurâ*n*a, must be read as paurâ*n*i-ka.

**Accent**. Wherever the accent is known from Vedic texts it has been given in the transliteration, the Udâtta (acute) accent being marked in the usual way (e.g. vádhar) and the svarita (circumflex) accent being indicated by a curve above the vowel (e.g. svãr).

When an accented word is exclusively Vedic this is indicated by a V., while if nothing is stated, it may be assumed to be post-Vedic also, e.g. vî́*n*â. As the meanings of an accented word may be partly Vedic, partly post-Vedic, and partly common to both periods, this is broadly indicated by the symbols V. (= Vedic in general), C. (= post-Vedic in general), and V. C. (= both Vedic and post-Vedic), as for example in the article vratá. Unaccented words may be assumed to be post-Vedic, since in the rare cases when they happen to belong to the Vedic period, this is noted. Sometimes I distinguish subordinate periods, as Br. = Brâhma*n*a, S. = Sûtra, E. = Epic, P. = Purâ*n*a. It would, however, have been beyond the scope of the present work to go into details of this kind. That would belong rather to the sphere of an exclusively etymological dictionary. I may mention in passing that άπαξ λϵγόμϵνα are indicated, a single occurrence in the Rig-veda, for instance, being marked as RV., just as words and meanings quotable only from native grammarians and lexicographers are made recognisable by an asterisk. This is an important safeguard; for the signification of the former class of words is often very doubtful, while the genuineness of the latter is uncertain. I have frequently seen non-quotable words, without any indication that they are such, used by comparative philologists, as well as άπαξ λϵγόμϵνα made the basis of far-reaching conclusions. Thus I remember a few years ago hearing an Oriental scholar, who was not a Sanskritist, using as an argument for Babylonian influence the word manấ, to which the older Petersburg dictionary in one passage attributed the meaning of ‘a certain weight of gold’, and which was therefore supposed to be identical with the Greek μνα̑ . This meaning no longer appears in the smaller edition of that work.

Compounds arranged under an accented heading word, must be assumed to be unaccented and there-fore post-Vedic unless any indication to the contrary is given. Thus **-ketu** under vi*g*ayá is to be read as vi*g*aya-ketu. It follows as a matter of course that, if the second half of a compound has an accent, that is the accent of the whole word. Thus **-máya** occurring under lohá represents loha-máya.

**Etymology**. My original plan was to make the present work a comparative as well as a practical Sanskrit dictionary. After a good deal of reflection I abandoned this project on the ground that while greatly swelling the bulk of the volume, the etymological material would not in this combination admit of being grouped and classified from various points of view as it should be in a thoroughly valuable and scientific etymological dictionary. The treatment of this material in a separate volume which I had contemplated, may be rendered superfluous by a work that is, I understand, in preparation at Strassburg. My taste for etymological studies I trace in great part to Professor Fick’s lectures on Comparative Greek Grammar, which I attended when a student at Göttingen. Though not comparative, the dictionary is nevertheless historical and etymological in its character. It is historical inasmuch as the meanings are not given in an arbitrary order, as in the Indian dictionaries, but are arranged as far as possible in accordance with their chronological development, while the literary period to which both words and their senses belong, is plentifully indicated. It is etymological from the Sanskrit point of view inasmuch as all words, except the small number - far smaller than in any other Aryan language - which defy analysis, have been broken up into their component parts in the transliteration either by means of hyphens, as in ya*g*-*ñ*a, or of hooks where vowel coalescences occur, as in m*ri*ga‿îksha*n*a for m*ri*geksha*n*a. Where these means are insufficient, the derivation has been concisely added in brackets, as under √mûr*kh*, yaksha, rû*dh*i. I have inserted in brackets a not inconsiderable number of roots, the former existence of which, though not occurring as verbs, is either deducible from Sanskrit derivatives alone or is proved by the evidence of comparative philology also (e.g. √ma*ñg*, √1. rudh). The structure of Sanskrit words being so much clearer than that in any other Aryan tongue, I have thus availed myself of the opportunity of supplying students of the language with an easy instrument of linguistic training.

**Sources**. The present work derives its material mainly from the newer Petersburg dictionary. It could not be of much value were this not the case. I have of course also carefully worked through Böhtlingk and Roth's older dictionary, on account of the vast array of quotations and references which it contains. The consultation of these was necessary in the laborious process of verifying meanings.

The rapid strides made by Sanskrit studies during the last thirty years, are chiefly owing to the lexicographical labours of those two great scholars. Sanskrit lexicography being a product of the present century, it was for the subject indeed a fortunate combination of circumstances, that the task was undertaken in an age when strictly scientific methods had begun to be applied to scholarship, and that the work fell into the hands of two scholars of such eminent ability. The result has been that Sanskrit lexicography, not having had gradually to clear away the unscientific accumulations of previous centuries, is already in a more advanced state than that of the classical languages. This is indeed indicated by the fact that the large Petersburg dictionary contains more than double the amount of matter supplied by the last edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

I have also used throughout Grassmann's Lexicon to the Rig-veda, as well as a copy of Benfey's dictionary annotated by the author himself. To the latter half of Apte's dictionary I owe some quotable compounds not to be found in the Petersburg dictionaries. Down to about the end of the vowels I am indebted to Cappeller's *Wörterbuch* for some Sanskrit equivalents of Prakrit words occurring in Sanskrit plays. I had reached this point when I was informed by the author that he intended translating his lexicon when complete into English. I accordingly at once ceased referring to it, and have not looked at it since. From the same work I have borrowed the very convenient abbreviations -° and °-.

I have further consulted Whitney's Sanskrit Roots, the glossaries contained in the Readers of Lanman, Hillebrandt, and Windisch, as well as in Johnson's Hitopade*s*a, Kellner's and Monier-Williams's Nala, Stenzler's and Johnson's Meghadûta, and Burkhard's *S*akuntalâ, besides the Index to Pischel and Geldner's *Vedische Studien*. I have also made use of Prof. Aufrecht's *Catalogue Catalogorum*, various articles in the Journal of the German Oriental Society and Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, as well as one by Prof. E. Leumann in the *Festgruss* (to Böhtlingk, on his jubilee), and Prof. Bühler's lexicographical notes in the Vienna Oriental Journal. In addition to what it derives from these sources of information, my book embodies all the matter with which it is concerned from the numerous appendices of the smaller Petersburg dictionary, besides words, compounds, and meanings collected by myself from post-Vedic works, such as the Pa*ñk*atantra.

For etymological purposes I have consulted the large Petersburg dictionary, Grassmann's *Wörterbuch*,

Lanman's Glossary, Brugmann's *Grundriss*, and Fick's Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-European

Languages.

Having' utilised all these sources of information, I venture to think that this work may be regarded as registering the advance of Sanskrit lexicography up to the present time.

Sir M. Monier-Williams's Sanskrit-English lexicon has not been consulted, partly because it is based on the older Petersburg dictionary, and having been published twenty years ago contains no new material, and partly because I wished to avoid being influenced by the system of a work of which a new edition is in preparation.

I take this opportunity of expressing my sincere gratitude to Prof. E. B. Cowell for the kind way in which he assisted me during the course of the work in solving difficulties I submitted to him in the departments of grammar, philosophy, and rhetoric. It is no exaggeration to say that in combined knowledge of these subjects he surpasses all other Sanskritists. The generous manner in which he sacrifices his leisure in the interests of those who wish to avail themselves of his great learning, is well known to his pupils, but not so well known to others as it ought to be.

In conclusion I must not omit to express my belief that the fact of this book having been printed by the University Press at Oxford, under the eye of its Oriental Header, Mr. J. C. Pembrey, whose skill could not be surpassed, is in itself a sufficient guarantee of accuracy.

7 Fyfield Road, Oxford,

*September*, 1892.

ARTHUR A. MACDONELL.