

will be clear if we write the important word **Rishi** in the way German scholars write it, namely **R̥si**, and then omit the dots thus, **Rsi**.

In regard to the nasals I have in the present edition adopted *ñ* for ण and *ṅ* for ङ. In these changes I am glad to find myself in accord with the Geneva Transliteration Committee.

As to the method of using italic *k*, *kh* for क, ख and italic *g*, *gh* for ग, घ—adopted in the ‘Sacred Books of the East’—the philological advantage thought to be gained by thus exhibiting the phoretic truth of the interchange of gutturals and palatals, appears to me to be completely outweighed by the disadvantage of representing by similar symbols sounds differing so greatly in actual pronunciation. For instance, to represent such common words as ‘chinna’ by ‘*khinna*’ and ‘jaina’ by ‘*gaina*’ seems to me as objectionable as to write ‘*Khina*’ for ‘China’ and ‘*Gapan*’ for ‘Japan.’ The plan of using Italics is no safeguard, seeing that in printing popular books and papers the practice of mixing up Roman and Italic letters in the same word is never adhered to, so that it is now common to find the important Indian sect of Jains printed and pronounced ‘Gains’<sup>1</sup>.

Having felt obliged by the form in which this Dictionary is printed to dwell at full length on a matter of the utmost importance both in its bearing on the more general cultivation of Sanskrit and on the diffusion of knowledge in our Eastern Empire, I must now repeat my sense of the great assistance the cause of the transliteration of Indian languages into Romanized letters formerly received at the hands of the late Sir Charles Trevelyan. He was the first (in his able minute, dated Calcutta, January, 1834<sup>2</sup>) to clear away the confusion of ideas with which the subject was perplexed. He also was the first to awaken an interest in the question throughout England about forty-two years ago. His arguments induced me to take part in the movement, and our letters on the subject were published by the ‘Times,’ and supported by its advocacy. Since then, many Oriental books printed on a plan substantially agreeing with Sir W. Jones’ Indo-Romanic system, have been published<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, on more than one occasion I directed the attention of the Royal Asiatic Society<sup>4</sup>, and of the Church Missionary Society<sup>5</sup>, and Bible Society, to this important subject, and at the Congress of Orientalists held at Berlin in September, 1881, I read a paper, and submitted a proposal for concerted international action with a view to the fixing of a common scheme of transliteration. The discussion that followed led to the appointment of the first Commission for settling a common international system of transcription, and it may, I think, be fairly assumed that the agitation thus set in motion, and carried on for so many years, was one of the principal factors in bringing about the proposed international scheme issued by the Transliteration Committee of the Geneva Oriental Congress in September, 1894.

## SECTION V.

### *Acknowledgment of Assistance Received.*

In the Preface to the first edition I made special mention of the name of an eminent scholar who was a member of the Oxford University Press Delegacy when the publication of that edition was undertaken—Dr. Robert Scott, sometime Master of Balliol, afterwards Dean of Rochester, and co-author with Dr. Liddell of the well-known Greek Lexicon. He had been one of my kindest friends, and wisest counsellors, ever since the day I went to him for advice during my first undergraduate days at Balliol, on my receiving an appointment in the Indian Civil Service, and I need scarcely repeat my sense of what this Dictionary, in its inception, owed to his support and encouragement.

Nor need I repeat the expression of my sense of obligation to my predecessor in the Boden Chair, Professor H. H. Wilson, who first led me to the study of Sanskrit about sixty years ago (in 1839), and furnished me with my first materials for an entirely new system of Sanskrit lexicography (see p. xi). All the words and meanings marked W. in the following pages in the present work rest on his authority.

<sup>1</sup> Surely we ought to think of our Indian fellow-subjects who in their eagerness to learn the correct pronunciation of English would be greatly confused if told that such good old English words as *pinch*, *catch*, *chin*, *much*, *jump*, *jest*, ought to be written *pink*, *cah*, *kin*, *muk*, *gump*, *gest*.

<sup>2</sup> This will be found at p. 3 of the ‘Original Papers illustrating the History of the Application of the Roman Alphabet to the Languages of India,’ edited by me in 1859.

<sup>3</sup> Among other numberless publications a most accurate edition

of the R̥ig-veda itself, edited by Professor Aufrecht, was printed in the Roman character, and published in two of the volumes of Professor Weber’s *Indische Studien*.

<sup>4</sup> See especially my paper read before the R. A. S., April 21, 1890.

<sup>5</sup> In 1858 I wrote strong letters to the Rev. Henry Venn, deprecating the system of transliteration then adopted by the C. M. S. It has been recently remodelled on the lines of the Geneva Congress report.