

only, the treatises of MAITREYA, MAHĀVA, and others on Sanscrit roots, though furnishing important materials towards a complete dictionary of the language, have been very little employed in the present work; and a particular reference to them was unnecessary, as authority will be found in the commentaries on AMERA, for any thing which may have been taken from those treatises.

#### VI. The Scholia of classick writings.

Passages from the works of celebrated writers are cited by the commentators on the *Amera cōsha*; and the scholiasts of classick poems frequently quote dictionaries in support of their interpretation of difficult passages. In the compilation of a copious Sanscrit dictionary, an ample use may be made of the Scholia. They have been employed for the present publication so far only as they are expressly cited by the principal commentaries on the *Amera cōsha* itself.

Should the reader be desirous of verifying the authorities, upon which the interpretation and notes are grounded, he will in general find the information sought by him in some one of the ten commentaries of AMERA, which have been before named; and will rarely have occasion to proceed beyond those which have been specified as the works regularly consulted.

In regard to plants and animals and other objects of natural history, noticed in different chapters of this vocabulary, and especially in the 4th, 5th and 9th chapters of the 2d book, it is proper to observe, that the ascertainment of them generally depends on the correctness of the corresponding vernacular names. The commentators seldom furnish any description or other means of ascertainment besides the current denomination in a provincial language. A view of the animal, or an examination of the plant, known to the vulgar under that denomination, enables a person conversant with natural history to determine its name according to the received