

slight extent, that such and such classes of words have no representatives in Sanskrit and it appears to me to be best that such words should not be left wholly unnoticed in an English-Sanskrit Dictionary.

4. To the second objection, I cannot so strong reply as I cannot be the judge of my own work. But I have already stated in the preface to the first volume, that I have differed from my predecessors only when I have considered their labours not very successful. My views may be faulty—my labours may have been wasted, but it is not correct to say that I have paid no attention to their teachings.

5. It is a notorious fact that the first workers in a field are led away by superficial identities and I will be pardoned for attributing the same fault to some of my predecessors. Every title page of a Bengali Book shows the stamp of English idiom\*. Good many of the Bengalized words shew touchy consideration for the roots of words†. But the evil is not confined to the vernacular. It is very prevalent among many of the comparatively modern Pandits. The Sanskrit translation of geometry made by Yogadhyāna Miśra about 50 years ago, is so faulty in this respect that with the new light of Kern's Āryabhaṭīya, I regret very much that I had recourse to it for geometric terms. Not confining to using words in senses in which they are never used and of coining words where there were good equivalents, he retains the whole English alphabet and calls his figures by अ, ब, स, ड, etc. which neither in sound nor in appearance nor in sense resemble English a, b, c, d, etc. for which they stand.

6. To the third objection, I will remind my readers that I do not undertake a comprehensive Dictionary. Even such a work as Webster's Dictionary—the labour of many years on the relies of many learned scholars, is not only deficient in such words as Trench has commented on, but also such common phrases as *be over, get into, get up* (intrans). Mine is a much humbler undertaking and it cannot contain all the words of the English language.

7. But these are mere fleshy excrescences, the knowledge of which will not materially assist in learning a language—labours on which will be always subject to diverse criticisms. The words which form the backbone of a language—about which there is but one opinion and which should be thoroughly learnt both to understand it and to make one's thoughts intelligible to others, have received far greater attention from me. Even in these, I am conscious of my frailties and the very imperfect state of my work. But I do hope that my labours have not been wholly wasted and some success attained.

8. To make my meaning intelligible, I give a few instances. Take the Sanskrit word नव,, Latin *novus*, Greek *neos*, Persian *nao*, Anglo-Saxon *niwe*, English *new*. Webster devotes seven paragraphs to it, and gives the following meanings.

- (1) Having existed or having been made, but a short time, having originated or occurred lately; recent; fresh . . .
- (2) Not before seen, made acquainted with, or known . . . . .
- (3) Starting anew, renovated; commencing . . . . .
- (4) Not ancient; modern, not of ancient existence . . . . .
- (5) Not worn out, defaced by use or the like . . . . .
- (6) Not habituated, not similar; unaccustomed . . . . .
- (7) Fresh from anything; newly-come . . . . .

both to shew the nature of the work and illustrate its teachings. “मृदुर्नकेन घातेन दण्डकालेषु ताडयेत् । तीक्ष्णं मध्यं पुनर्द्विभ्यां जघन्यं निष्ठुरैस्त्रिभिः । उपवेशे च निद्रायां स्खलिते दृष्टचेष्टिते । बडवालोकनौत्सुक्यं बहुगवितह्वेषिते । सन्त्रासे च दुरुत्थाने विमार्गगमने भये । शिक्षात्यागस्य समये सञ्जाते चित्तविभ्रमे । दण्डः प्रयोज्यो वाहानां कालेषु द्वादशस्वपि । ग्रीवायां भीतमाह्वयात् त्रस्तं चैव च वाजिनम् । विभ्रान्तचित्तमघरे त्यक्तशिक्षञ्च ताडयेत् । प्रहेषितं स्कन्धबाह्वोर्वडवालोकितं तथा । उपवेशे च निद्रायां कटिदेशे च ताडयेत् । दृष्टचेष्टितं मुखे हन्यादन्मार्गप्रस्थितं तथा । जघने स्खलितं हन्यान्नेत्रमार्गे दुरुत्थितम् । यः कुण्ठप्रकृतिर्वाजी तं सर्वत्रैव ताडयेत् ।

\* It is good English to say that a *work is by so and so*. But it is not Bengali to say *अभूक पूछक अभूककृत*. Yet the Anglicism is retained in every book almost imperceptibly.

† Hippopotamus is rendered सिन्धुघोटक evidently because it means in Greek *river-horse*. But I believe the author of the word never saw the animal and it is doubtful whether he would have called it a घोटक if he had seen it,