

from this point of view useful to the class of readers for which it is destined, actual experience must show. I hope, however it will be acknowledged that I have always endeavoured not only to put together words with words, but also to give the full development and connection of meanings from their first radical origin up to the various ramifications which appear in the texts enumerated above or are of universal interest. Here we must, of course, distinguish between the old simple words and the comparatively younger derivatives and compounds, which generally are easy and transparent enough to admit of an insight into their origin and growth even by the help of a simple translation. This is also the reason why I abstained from giving a formal analysis of words, such as would, in each individual case, trace the compound back to its constituent parts and the simple word to its root or stem. In the first place, nine tenth of all cases are so clear in themselves, that even for the beginner, if he only has worked his way through the euphonic rules and the elements of word-formation, they need no explanation whatever. The last tenth, on the other hand, offers numerous difficulties, which it would be impossible to remove without altogether changing the elementary character of this book. There are, moreover, two excellent guides through this domain of studies, WHITNEY's *Roots* and LANMAN's *Reader*, of which the one furnishes ample material for Sanskrit and the other for comparative etymology, so that a book, which in a certain degree is intended to be a completion or continuation of both, may well be for the most part restricted to purely lexicographic matter.

There are still a few remarks to be made about some particulars of the outer plan and arrangement of this dictionary. On the whole, it offers only *authenticated matter*, i.e. such words, word-forms, genders, accents etc. as are actually *found* in the works of Sanskrit writers, but not such as are merely *taught* by grammarians and lexicographers (with a few exceptions, which are always recognizable as such; cf. p. viii). To accommodate myself to the English custom, and to be in accordance with WHITNEY's system, roots and stems are throughout given with *r* (instead of *ar* or *r̥*), e.g. १ and ३३ (instead of *अर्* & *कृ*). The adjective generally shows only the masculine stem, the regular feminine and neuter being always omitted, except where they have developed a specific signification; *ī* is always treated as the irregular feminine to *a*. Of verbal forms only the present stems are completely enumerated (including the secondary conjugation, causative, desiderative etc.). The so-called past participle is usually put immediately after the present, with which it forms as it were a kind of a-verbo and serves to keep the homonymous roots apart. In a great many cases, however, I have treated this verbal form as a separate word, first because it is no doubt the most frequent of all forms, which the beginner will most particularly like to find sub voce, secondly, because it has very often developed a pregnant meaning, and thirdly because it frequently forms the first part of compounds, at the head of which it is most properly sought and found. Wherever this principle has been carried out, reference has been made at the end of the root to the participles in question. No less have the forms in *anīya*, *tāya* etc., a great many infinitives and gerunds, and in general such forms as belong to the verb only systematically, but actually are felt as separate words, found a separate treatment according to their alphabetical order. Brevity has always conscientiously been striven after; I trust, however, that I have not gone too far in this respect and proposed riddles instead of solving them. If, for instance, I say, *वाक्वाच* a. & n. 'boasting', everybody will understand that the word 'boasting' is to be taken in the one case as an adjective and in the other as a noun of action. Likewise an article