

Furthermore, the plan now first carried out of arranging all verbs formed from roots by prefixing prepositions in their proper alphabetical order and at the head of their own derivatives, will be noted as a marked feature of originality and individuality. The labour entailed by the simple process of thus re-arranging the verbs in a language so rich in prepositions, can only be understood by other lexicographers*. But even this re-arrangement has not caused so much difficulty as the attempt to exhibit what may be termed *the kinship of words*, by distributing the greater part of the vocabulary of the language in families, or rather, if I may so express myself, in family-groups†. These groups are, as far as possible, collected under roots or leading words, which stand, as it were, at the head of the family, and are always distinguished from the rest by Nāgarī type in the manner more fully explained in the table of directions at the end of the Preface. Such a re-distribution of the vocabulary has often necessitated the separation of roots and homonyms under two, three, or more heads, each with its train of derivatives, subderivatives, and associated words, which in other Dictionaries would be brought together under one article‡. An abundant return, however, has been reaped, if philological precision has been thus promoted, and facility afforded for viewing synoptically and comparing together the etymological history of the words so collocated.

Besides the obvious advantage of this arrangement to the philologically-minded student, great saving of space has been thus effected; all necessity for repeating derivations under each head being thus avoided, and the power gained of leaving many meanings to be inferred from one or other member of a group, instead of constantly reiterating them. For it must be borne in mind that all the series included under the same heading in Nāgarī type are to be regarded as cohering; so that all derivatives, whether primary or secondary, and all compound words following in regular sequence, may be studied in their mutual bearing and correlation both as illustrating each other and as contributing to throw light on the modifications of meaning evolved from the radical idea. These meanings, too, have not been thrown together in a heap, as they have been hitherto in some Oriental Dictionaries, but an attempt has been made to set them forth according to their logical development. The further advantage gained in space by the free use of Roman type will be explained under Section 4.

Conspicuously, again, in an enumeration of the more noteworthy features of the present publication, should certainly be placed the introduction of abundant comparisons from cognate languages, which no other Lexicon published by English scholars has,* I believe, hitherto attempted to the same extent. I must at once distinctly notify that for these comparisons I have not trusted to my own judgment, but have followed the authority of the eminent German scholars whose names will be mentioned subsequently.

Another distinctive characteristic of this Dictionary consists in the articles on mythology, literature, religion, and philosophy, which will be found scattered everywhere throughout its pages. By consulting Professor Aufrecht's catalogues, Dr. Ballantyne's works, Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall's writings, Dr. Muir's Sanskrit Texts, Professor M. Müller's Ancient Sanskrit Literature, Dr. Weber's Indische Studien, Wilson's Vishṇu-Purāṇa, some Oriental Articles in Chambers' Encyclopædia—written, I believe, by the late Professor Goldstücker,—and my own collection of notes, I have been able to furnish the student with much valuable information on many subjects not hitherto treated of in any

root as *svad* is probably nothing but a compound of *su* and root *ad*, and such roots as *stubbh*, *stumbh*, *stambh* are plainly mere modifications of each other.

* Why should not Sanskrit lexicons have been brought into harmony with Greek in this respect long ere this? Greek is almost as free in its use of prepositions, e.g. *συμπαράβαλλον*, *συμπαράθεζομαι*.

† Even in English this might advantageously be done, as, for

example, it would be very instructive to see such words as *share*, *shire*, *shore*, *shears*, &c. arranged under '*shear*,' to cut off, separate. Richardson in his great Dictionary has to a certain extent carried out this idea. See on this subject 'Archbishop Trench on the Study of Words.'

‡ See, for example, the roots 1. *su*, 2. *su*, 3. *su*, 4. *su*, at p. 1117, and 1. *kāla*, 2. *kāla*, at pp. 224, 225.