

An Āryan root on the other hand, as best typified by a Sanskrit radical, is generally a single monosyllable, which may be compared to a malleable substance capable of being drawn out to express every modification of an original conception. And this malleability, as it were, arises chiefly from the circumstance that the vowel is recognized as a constituent part of the radical; blending with its very substance, and even sometimes standing alone as itself the only root. Sanskrit exhibits better than any other member of the Āryan line of speech this characteristic root-expansibility. More than this, it exemplifies better than any other that excessive *root-accretiveness* (if I may use the term) by which not only terminations and prefixes are grafted upon or welded into the original monosyllabic stock, but affix is affixed to affix, prefix is prefixed to prefix, derivative is derived from derivative, compound is compounded with compound in an almost interminable chain. In illustration of this the student is referred to such roots as 1. *kṛi*, p. 245; 1. *bhū*, p. 714; 1. *śru*, p. 1026; 1. *sthā*, p. 1145 of this volume.

Hence it becomes evident that the original plan of Professor Wilson, by which every single word would have been represented in regular sequence, growing, as it were, from its own parent stem, would have realized the true conception of a perfect Sanskrit Dictionary. Verily if Greek lexicography has been occasionally so treated, much more has Sanskrit, the great type of linguistic constructiveness, a right so to be.

I have now to show how far the present work satisfies this ideal. It is sometimes calculated, that there are about two thousand distinct roots in this language. If it be supposed that there are about eighty thousand distinct words growing out of these two thousand roots, a Dictionary on the usual alphabetical plan must have consisted of a series of eighty thousand monographs, each independent of the other; and, indeed, such a Dictionary might have been thought most agreeable to the common notion of a really practical work. It seemed to me, however, that a Dictionary so planned would have afforded little effective aid to the study of Sanskrit, in its connection with comparative philology. On the other hand, it must be confessed that the idea of taking root by root, and writing, as it were, two thousand biographies, each giving a connected history of a distinct family allied together by a common pedigree was a philological dream too impractical to be wholly realized. Some middle course, therefore, satisfying the requirements both of philology and of ordinary practice seemed most to be desired, and the following publication, though not answering the perfect philological ideal, is intended as an attempt at combining a partial root-arrangement with a convenient alphabetical order suited to ready reference.

In unison with this design, the roots of the language—always brought prominently before the eye by large Nāgarī type—will be found treated more exhaustively in the present work, both as regards the meanings given and the forms exhibited, than in any other Sanskrit-English Dictionary yet published*. It is evident that a great many of these roots, or Dhātus, as they are called by native lexicographers, are not really elementary radicals, but compounds or developments of simpler elements. I have not always ventured to pronounce categorically as to which of two or more roots is the simplest form, but when roots are evidently allied, their connection is conspicuously indicated in the following pages. Thus I hope to have drawn attention to a point which English scholars have hitherto greatly overlooked†.

* I cannot sufficiently acknowledge my debt to Westergaard's Radices. The copy I have had for about thirty years tells a tale of constant reference. Indeed we have to thank Danish, quite as much as German scholars, for what they have done towards promoting linguistic culture.

† The number of distinct radical forms in Wilkins' collection is 1750, but as many forms having the same sound have different meanings, and are conjugated differently, they are held to be

distinct roots, and the number is thereby swelled to 2490. Probably, the real number of elementary radicals in Sanskrit might be reduced to a comparatively small catalogue. Some roots containing dentals have been cerebralized or vice versa, and both forms are allowed to co-exist, as *bhan* and *bhaṇ*, *dhan* and *dhaṇ*; others whose initials are aspirated consonants have passed into other aspirated consonants or retained only the aspirate; and all forms co-exist in *bhṛi*, *dhṛi*, *dhuṛi*, *hṛi*, &c. Again, such a