

9. Wilson, who gave an English form to the then existing Sanskrit lexicons, says of नव simply "new". Monier Williams, who admittedly inverted his Dictionary in 1851, apparently concluded from this that नव was restricted only to the first of the above senses and gives different equivalents under the subheadings "modern", "not ancient", "never occurring before", "not habituated", "not familiar", "not before used." Little did he think that when "new" is used in any of these senses, it always retains the idea of "newness" and conveys something different from the equivalents specified under these heads. A "new empire" is different from "a modern empire", many new empires of old being ancient and not modern empires. A "new metal" is not the same as a "metal never occurring before", it being a metal newly discovered and retaining that name after discovery, until it is considered old; and so on.*

10. The history of the word is probably the same in every Aryan language, and with a few exceptions, the same word has risen through perceptible stages into the advanced ideas of "new man", "new hand" etc. The examples I have quoted from standard Sanskrit writers will clearly illustrate this as regards Sanskrit and similiar examples will be found in most of the languages of this family.

11. But the similarity of growth is not confined to words clearly traceable to the same origin. It is seen even in words whose common origin is at least exceedingly doubtful. Take for instance the English "great", Sanskrit महत्. Originally applied to things, both the words have gradually grown to apply to a variety of ideas as will appear from the examples I have given. Monier Williams gives a large paragraph to it, but except the first word and the last few lines partially, the whole of it is quite irrelevant and out of the mark.

12. As another example, take the English word "honour" and Sanskrit मान. Each has the same history and is applied to the same variety of ideas. Monier Williams gives it the more insignificant place and even there, not correct in assigning its gender.†

13. From words the study of which must be of great interest to the historical students of language, I turn to words the full appreciation of which must be eagerly sought by every careful student of Sanskrit. Take for example, the common verb ज्वल् as applied to the burning of lights. It is a sense of every importance being the only representative of the English idea in Sanskrit, as may be seen from some of the vernaculars; and yet it does not find a place in the Dictionaries I have consulted, and for this reason that the verbs have been completely neglected by our home lexicographers.

14. Turning to nouns, take the pair of words वयस् and आयुस्, which are clearly distinguished in every vernacular I know and never confounded by any Sanskrit writer of repute. The first is the exact equivalent for English "age", while the second means *life-time—the whole of a man's age* as it is or as it should be. For instance, when we wish a man a long life, we never apply the word वयस् to it: when we say a man is of middle age, we never apply the word आयुस् to it. But in a few examples, आयुस् may be rendered into English by the word "age." *In such cases* not that आयुस् loses its proper sense, but "age" is applied to "whole age", "life", "life-time". This has led to a great deal of confusion among English writers. For instance, Wilson says शतायुस् (mfn.)="a man a hundred years old". Monier Williams follows him and inverting, gives twice under "hundred" and again under "old" *a hundred years old*=शतायुस्. But the compound can never have the meaning

* I am sorry that I have not by me to compare the Dictionaries of Benfey, Roth, Gold-stuker and the Sanskrit Dictionary of Monier Williams. But considering that some of the mistakes are repeated in the latest Dictionary in preparation, I presume I have not been anticipated in all that I say.

† मान् in the sense of measure is neuter, in the sense of honour always masculine. Wilson has noted this, as well as other Dictionaries I have consulted. The rules of Pāṇini on gender and derivation shew this clearly.