

hitherto published of the great Sanscrit Dictionary, compiled by Boehtlingk and Roth. The explanations of these terms there given (as well as those of many words of the Saṁhitâ) are nothing but guesses, having no other foundation than the individual opinion of a scholar who never made himself familiar with the sacrificial art, even as far as it would be possible in Europe, by a careful study of the commentaries on the Sûtras and Brâhmaṇas, and who appears to have thought his own conjectures to be superior to the opinions of the greatest divines of Hindostan, who were especially trained for the sacrificial profession from times immemorial. These defects of a work which is in other respects a monument of gigantic toil and labour, and on account of its containing numerous references and quotations extremely useful to the small number of Sanscrit scholars who are able to make independent researches, have been already repeatedly pointed out by Professor Theodor Goldstücker, one of the most accurate Sanscrit scholars in Europe. Although his remarks excited the wrath principally of some savans at Berlin, who had tried to praise up the work as a masterpiece of perfection and ingenuity almost unparalleled in the history of lexicography, they are, nevertheless, though in some points too severe, not quite so undeserved and unjust, as the defenders of the Dictionary made them to appear. Goldstücker justly does not only find fault with its explanation of ritual terms, but with the meanings given to many words in the Saṁhitâ. Though I am far from defending