I may yet request leave to inform any mere *Ćhidrānveshin*, of whom it may be said *ćhidram nirūpya sahasā pravišati*, that no one can be more keenly alive to the flaws and defects of this volume than I am myself. No one, indeed, can be more desirous to criticize it, with a view to its improvement in a future edition.

If any real scholars-always considerate and temperate even if severe-having had practical experience of lexicography, will aid me in my efforts to attain greater accuracy, I shall be thankful. From them I do not fear but rather court criticism. Such critics will quite understand how a compiler's sense of responsibility may grow with the growth of a work like this, putting him out of conceit with his own performance, and filling him with earnest cravings after an accuracy more than human. Such critics will appreciate the difficulties besetting the production of so many closely printed pages abounding with countless dots and diacritical marks. Nor will they be surprised at inequalities of execution and occasional inconsistencies in a work representing efforts spread over numerous years. Nor will they need to be reminded that occasional distractions, trials of health and weariness of spirit, are incident not only to a human compiler but to his human assistants. Indeed it is no disparagement to those who have contributed to the detail of this work to assume that a compilation which has passed through many different hands must reflect the infirmities of all. No other apology will here be attempted for its errors and inadvertencies; nor do I ask that the blame be laid at the door of any one but myself, who alone am responsible. Some explanation, however, of a few intentional inconsistencies and almost unavoidable defects is here appended.

In the first place, there has not been absolute consistency in the collocation of words connected by a common etymology. I have not bound myself in this respect by any fixed rules. Hence some words are given in the usual alphabetical order of the Nāgarī type which might be expected to fall under a previous classification in the Indo-Romanic order. Facility of reference has been my only guide in this matter.

Again, in the arranging of a whole chain of words etymologically allied, some formations have been placed under compounds which ought properly to have a separate line assigned to them. Others again have separate lines which ought more consistently to come under compounds. For example, abstract nouns formed with the affixes  $t\bar{a}$  and tva, and possessive adjectives formed with vat, mat, &c. are placed in the order of the compounds, when they are really not compounds at all. Still it is plain that such a word as  $sv\bar{a}mi$ - $t\bar{a}$ , 'ownership,' is really equivalent to  $sv\bar{a}mi$ - $bh\bar{a}va$ , and such a word as  $\acute{s}r\bar{\imath}$ -mat, 'possessed of fortune,' to  $\acute{s}r\bar{\imath}$ -yukta. In these cases my motive for sacrificing absolute consistency has rather been to gain space. Other liberties indulged in with regard to the use of the hyphen are noticed in the table of directions following the Preface.

With regard to the nominative cases of adjectives and of a few participles—such as those of Parasmai-pada Intensives—and even of a few substantives, I fear this Dictionary cannot always be quite trusted; though it may perhaps be conceded that I have improved upon my predecessor in this respect. In point of fact it has not been possible to settle with certainty the nominative cases, especially in the feminine forms, of all adjectives. The German Wörterbuch avoids exhibiting the nominative cases of adjectives and participles, and rarely gives their feminines, leaving also the nominative cases of substantives to be inferred from their gender. Although I studied Pāṇini's chapter on feminine formations with great care, I was unable to discover either in his Grammar or in any other Grammar or Dictionary a solution of all my difficulties. My rule has been to give the nominative cases both of substantives and adjectives in all their genders wherever there was ground for certainty or for a reasonable inference,