PREFACE TO SECOND VOLUME

By Anundoram Borooah

In the preface to the first volume, I have fully explained the plan of my work. But some parts of it have been misunderstood in certain quarters and objections have been taken first to my including words which have no equivalents in Sanskrit, secondly to my differing from my predecessors in coining equivalents for scientific and philosophical terms, and thirdly to my not giving all English words.

2. To the first objection, I plead guilty with the whole body of respectable European Lexicographers. They have felt that positive knowledge is as much of use as negative knowledge—it is as good to know that a word has its representative in another language as to know that it has no representative: and I am not sorry that I have deferred to their combined authority. It is a truism which cannot be denied, that words which have no equivalents in another language are to be retained in that language, when it is found that coined words would be as unsuitable to express their sense as long round about sentences, and the analogy of languages shews that, in such cases, the words are to be assimilated to the languages in which they are adopted. For homely examples, I may refer to the words which have been bodily adopted in English from the dialects of India.

But I will not rest there. Sanskrit itself contains abundant examples to illustrate my meaning. होरा* and हरिज†, सेर and मण‡, भिल्ल¶ and पह्लव§ and hundreds of similar tersm unmistakeably shew that in adopting foreign words Sanskrit does not lose sight of putting a Sanskrit garb on them. This serves a double purpose—of naturalizing the words and of fixing their spelling, neither of which is to be disregarded. It will probably be admitted that these considerations require that all English words are to be retained in an English-Sanskrit Dictionary.

3. There is another reason. I do not pretend to a comprehensive and thorough knowledge of Sanskrit. Words that are considered by me to have no representatives are either known to other scholars to have representatives or may hereafter be found to have representatives with the light of unpublished and hitherto unexplored texts. Some years ago, while I was reading with a highly respected if not distinguished Sanskrit scholar, we were told that the fruits imported from Cabool had no names in Sanskrit. The Bhāva Prakāśa is now with me, and I can authoritatively say how far the opinion of the learned scholar is correct. So with other classes of words. Till the whole field of Sanskrit Literature is fully explored*, it is presumptuous not only for a man of my limited knowledge, but for the highest and most deeply read scholar to lay down, except to a very

---

* Su. xiii. 78. Gr. 'ōra.

† Ja. v. 17. 92. Gr. 'orizon.

‡ Lilāvatī. Admittedly taken from the Mahomedans.

¶ "गा: साम्प्रतं हरसि भिल्ल इव" Dhanañjaya Vijaya.

§ V.p. iv. 3. 21.

* Almost every branch of science had special works and only a few are beginning to be printed. I may mention special works on elephants, horses, chariots etc. "कश्चित् सूत्राणि सर्वाणि स्टह्लासि भरतर्षभ ! हस्तिसूत्राश्वसूत्राणि रथसूत्राणि वा विभो ॥" Mah. ii. 5. 120. Nīla Kaṇṭha, who is a modern commentator, is satisfied with stating "अश्वादीनां लक्षण-परीक्षाचिकित्सौषधोद्दीपनोन्मादनादिप्रकारप्रतिपादकग्रन्थान्." But we learn more from the commentaries of Mallinātha. To "विनीतनाग: किल सूत्रकारैरेन्द्रं पदं भूमिगतोऽपि भुंक्ते" of Raghu. iv. 27, he adds "सूत्रकारैर्गजशास्त्रकृद्भि: पालकादिभिर्महर्षिभि:", In his notes to the fifth canto of Siśupāla Vadha, he mentions three works on horses—Haya Lilābatī, Revata, and the compilation of Bhoja Rāja. The Sūtras have probably gone away with time. But modern compilations have not all perished. Our Calcutta friends, with abundant leisure, will do well to turn the attention to this field, which has not yet been touched by any scholar eastern or western, but nevertheless of immense interest to the readers of Sanskrit. I will here quote second-hand a passage from Bhoja Rāja (Mallināth's note to Śiśupāla Vadha v. 10.)—