practical plan, which, although raised as far as my powers went, to the level of modern scholarship, so as to be a sufficiently trustworthy aid in studying the chief departments of literature, including the Veda, should yet be procurable at a moderate cost, and not extend beyond the limits of one compact volume. This leads me therefore to

Section 2.

Plan and Arrangement of the Present Work.

Those who appreciate the value of Sanskṛit in its bearing on the philosophy of language will understand my motive in endeavouring so to arrange this lexicon as to exhibit most effectively that peculiarity of construction which distinguishes the highest type of the great Indo-European line of speech. Such persons will comprehend without much explanation the plan pursued by me throughout these pages in the collocation of words connected by mutual affinities. For the benefit, however, of younger students, I now proceed briefly to point out the one grand distinctive peculiarity of the Āryan dialects which the arrangement of the present Dictionary is intended to demonstrate—a peculiarity separating them by a sharp line of demarcation from the other great family of human speech usually called Semitic*.

Happily it is now a familiar fact to most educated persons that the Indo-European or Āryan languages (of which Sanskṛit is the eldest sister†, and English one of the youngest) proceeded from a common but nameless and unknown parent, whose very home in Asia cannot be absolutely fixed, though the locality may conjecturally be placed somewhere in the region of Bokhāra, near the river Oxus. From this centre radiated, as it were, eight principal lines of speech; first, the two Asiatic lines, 1. Indian, 2. Īrānian, (the former eventually comprising Sanskṛit, Pāli, Prākṛit, and the modern Prākṛits or spoken languages of the Hindūs, such as Hindī, Marāṭhī, Gujarātī, Bengālī, &c.; the latter comprising (*a*) Zand, old Persian, Pahlavī, modern Persian, and Pushtū; (*b*) Armenian); and then the six European lines, viz. 1. Keltic, 2. Hellenic, 3. Italic, 4. Teutonic, 5. Slavonic, 6. Lithuanian, each branching into various sub-lines or ramifications as exhibited in the present languages of Europe‡. Now, if the question be asked, What most striking feature distinguishes all

* I use the term 'Semitic' out of deference to established usage, though it leads to some confusion of ideas, because if 'Semitic,' or more properly 'Shemitic,' be used for the languages of the descendants of Shem, then 'Japhetic' (instead of 'Āryan') should be used for the descendants of Japhet. We cannot, however, give up the epithet Āryan (from the Sanskṛit *ārya*, 'noble') for our own Indo-European languages, suited as it certainly is to that noblest of all families of speech. The Rev. F. W. Farrar suggests adopting the term 'Syro-Arabian' as well as Semitic for the other family. Still the name Semitic may well be applied to Hebrew, Aramaic [including perhaps one set of cuneiform inscriptions, Chaldee and Syriac], and Arabic, because in the tenth chapter of Genesis, Shem is represented as father of Elam (who peopled Elymais), Assur (Assyria), Lud (Lydia), Aram (Syria), and of Arphaxad, grandfather of Eber, from whom came the Hebrews—or Trans-Euphratian race, the name Hebrew really meaning 'one who lives beyond a river'—and Joktan, father of Sheba, father of Himyar, whence came the Arabians. Mr. Farrar states in his useful lectures that the Semitic nations may number about 40 millions, compared with about 400 millions of the Indo-Europeans. Among Semitic races come the people of Abyssinia. These have special languages of their own, viz. the Ethiopic or Geez, which is their sacred and literary language only, and the spoken dialects called Tigré, Tigriña, for the north and north-east, and Amharic, for the centre and south; the former being nearer to Ethiopic than the latter, and all being connected with the Semitic, as derived through the ancient Himyaritic Arabic of South Arabia (Yaman).

† Though the younger sisters sometimes preserve older forms.

‡ As this is the first Oriental Dictionary put forth by any English scholar which attempts to introduce abundant comparisons between the various members of the Indo-European family, I here append a brief account of the Āryan cognate languages beginning with the Indian. 1. By Pāli or Pālī is meant one of the oldest forms of the ancient provincial Hindū-ī language of which Sanskṛit is the learned form, (see p. xiii of Preface.) It must have been spoken either in Magadha or in some district not far from Oude, where Buddha flourished, and being carried by the Buddhists into Ceylon became their sacred language, and is preserved in their canonical scriptures called Tri-piṭaka. Prākṛit is the name given to other and later provincial forms of Sanskṛit, which were the precursors and parents of the present Hindū dialects, Hindī, Marāṭhī, &c., see note, p. xvii. These latter may be called modern Prākṛits. 2. Now as to the Īrānian: (*a*) Zand or Zend (old Bactrian) is to old Persian and Pahlavī what Sanskṛit is to Pāli and Prākṛit. It is that ancient language of Persia in which the sacred books are written, called Zand Avastā, belonging to the Pārsīs (or fugitives from Persia scattered on the coast of India, and still believers in the religion founded by Zardusht or Zoroaster). Old Persian is a name given to the dialect preserved in one set of cuneiform inscriptions, about contemporaneous with Zand. Pahlavī (sometimes written