

Dictionary. Let him observe, for instance, what is written under the words Vishṇu, Śiva, Veda, Manas, Sāman, Soma, Sāṅkhya, Sautika-parvan. It will be doubtless said that too many names of persons, places, and books are introduced. In excuse I have to plead that greater liberty ought to be allowed to a Sanskrit Dictionary in this respect than to Greek and Latin Lexicons, because Oriental alphabets have no capital letters. As to the names of books, it may often be useful to have attention drawn to works, still unprinted, ascertained to exist either in Europe or India.

It may perhaps be objected that there are too many compound words; but again it may be urged that a Sanskrit Dictionary must not be tried by ordinary laws in this respect, for here again Sanskrit stands eminently forth as the grand typical representative of the whole Āryan line of speech, which is throughout distinguished by its love of composition. To exclude compounds from a Sanskrit Lexicon, would be, so to speak, to 'Unsanskritize' it. Not only are there certain compounds quite peculiar to Sanskrit, but in the grammar composition almost takes the place of syntax, and the various kinds of compound words are classified and defined with greater subtlety and minuteness than would be possible in any other known language of the world. When a student is in doubt whether to translate compounds like *Indra-śatru* as Bahuvrīhis or Tatpurushas, the Dictionary is surely bound to aid in clearing up his perplexities. Moreover, as few examples are given or passages quoted in the present work, a limited admission of compounds, under certain restrictions, serves to illustrate the use of a leading word; for to such words, let it be observed, they have always been subordinated. After I had formulated my plan, and a large portion of the work was in type, the Sanskrit Dictionary of Professor Benfey appeared*, and I was glad to find that, working independently, I had devised a system supported in some of these particulars by that philologist. All must agree that as Sanskrit exceeds every other language in its infinite capacity for composition, no Sanskrit Lexicon, if it admits compounds at all, ought to treat them as if they were independent entities entitled to a separate existence of their own.

Nevertheless I could never have followed Professor Benfey in placing compound words under their last member. This method, however philosophical, seems to sacrifice at the shrine of logical propriety what I have set before myself as a paramount consideration in arranging my own Dictionary—*facility of reference*. For a further explanation of points of detail the student is referred to the table of directions at the end of the Preface. I now therefore pass on to my third point.

SECTION 3.

Extent of Sanskrit Literature comprehended.

I have sometimes been gravely asked by men learned in all the classical lore of Europe, Has Sanskrit any literature? Such a question proves the urgent need for a work like the present, which aims at facilitating and making more general the study of a language closely allied to our own, and still more closely connected with the spoken dialects of our great Indian Empire—a language, therefore, about whose history every well-educated Englishman ought surely to know something.

Conscious, then, as my present office has made me of the general ignorance prevalent on Indian subjects, I may be excused if I preface this part of my Introduction by stating precisely what I conceive to me implied by the words Sanskrit and Sanskrit literature. By Sanskrit, then, is not meant any really spoken language of India or even, I hold, any once generally spoken language. What the word Sanskrit properly represents is, I conceive, *a certain form* of the

* The Sanskrit-French Dictionary of M. Emile Burnouf, which also appeared after much of my work was in type, is an independent working out of some ideas similar to my own.