

adaptation of it to the expression of Sanskrit like our chaotic adaptation of it to the expression of English; or like the inaccurate use of it by native writers themselves in transliterating their own Indian words<sup>1</sup>. Quite the reverse. The Roman alphabet adapts itself so readily to expansion by the employment of diacritical points and marks, that it may be regarded as a thoroughly scientific instrument for the accurate expression of every Indian sound, and probably of nearly every sound in every language of the world. And it may, I think, be confidently predicted that before the twentieth century has closed, man's vision, overtaken by a constantly increasing output of literary matter, will peremptorily demand that the reading of the world's best books be facilitated by the adoption of that graphic system which is most universally applicable and most easily apprehensible. Whether, however, the Roman symbols will be ultimately chosen in preference to other competing systems as the best basis for the construction of a world's future universal alphabet no one can, of course, foretell with the same confidence.

One thing, I contend, is certain. Any ordinary scholar who consults the present work will be ready to admit that it derives much of its typographical clearness from certain apparently trifling, but really important, contrivances, possible in Romanic type, impossible in Nāgarī. One of these, of course, is the power of leaving spaces between the words of the Sanskrit examples. Surely such a sentence as *sādhu-mitrāny akusālād vārayanti* is clearer than *sādhumitrānyakusālādvārayanti*. Again, who will deny the gain in clearness resulting from the ability to make a distinction between such words as 'smith' and 'Smith,' 'brown' and 'Brown,' 'bath' and 'Bath?' not to speak of the power of using italics and other forms of European type. And, without doubt, the use of the hyphen for separating long compounds in a language where compounds prevail more than simple words<sup>2</sup>, will be appreciated by all. I can only say that, without that most useful little mark, the present volume must have lost much in clearness, and still more in compactness; for, besides the obvious advantage of being able to indicate the difference between such compounds as **su-tapa** and **suta-pa** which would have been impossible in Nāgarī type, it is manifest that even the simplest compounds, like **sad-asad-viveka**, **sv-alpa-keśin**, would have required, without its use, an extra line to explain their analysis<sup>3</sup>.

Fairness, however, demands that a few of the obvious defects of the Indo-Romanic system of transliteration adopted in this volume should be acknowledged. In certain cases it confessedly offends against scientific exactness; nor does it always consistently observe the rule that every simple vowel-sound should be represented by a single symbol. For instance, the Sanskrit vowels *ॠ* and *ॡ* are not represented in this Dictionary by the symbols *r* and *r̄*, according to the practice of some German scholars—a practice adopted by the Geneva Transliteration Committee—but by *ri* and *rī*. And my reason is that, inasmuch as in English Grammar *r* is not regarded as a semi-vowel, *r* and *r̄* are unsuitable representatives of vowel-sounds. Moreover, they are open to this objection, that when the dot under the *r* is accidentally dropped or broken off, as often happens in printing, especially in India, the result is worse than if the *r* were followed by *i*. For example, *Krshna* is surely worse than *Krishna*.

So again in the case of aspirated consonants, the aspiration ought not to be represented by a second letter attached to them. Indeed, in the case of *ch* employed by Sir W. Jones for the palatal *च*, and *chh* for *छ*, the inconvenience has been so great that in the present edition I have adopted (in common with many other Sanskritists) the simple *c* for *च*, the pronunciation being the same as *c* in the Italian *dolce* or as *ch* in 'church,' the latter of which would, if a Sanskrit word, be written 'curc.' Similarly *ch* has been adopted for *च*<sup>4</sup>.

As to the transliteration of the palatal sibilant *श*, I have preferred *ś* to the *ś* employed in the first edition, and I much prefer it to the German and French method of using *ç*. Experience proves that the cedilla is often either broken off in printing or carelessly dropped, and as a consequence important words such as *Aśoka* are now often wrongly printed and pronounced *Acoka*.

So also I should have preferred the symbol *ṣ* for the cerebral sibilant, but have felt it desirable to retain *sh* in the present edition. There is the same objection to *ṣ* as to the *r* mentioned above. This

<sup>1</sup> Take, for example, the following transliterated words in a recent pamphlet by a native:—*Devi, puja, Durga, Purana, ashtami, Krshna, Savitri, Acoka, Civa* &c. I have even seen *crab* written for the Hindūstānī *ḥharāb*, 'bad.'

<sup>2</sup> Forster gives an example of one compound word consisting of 152 syllables. This might be matched by even longer specimens from what is called Campū composition.

<sup>3</sup> We may, at least, entertain a hope that the hyphen will not be denied to Sanskrit for the better understanding of the more complex words, such, for example, as *vaidikamanvādipraṇīta-smṛititvāt, karmaphalarūpaśarīradhārijīvanirmitatvābhāvamā-treṇa*, taken at haphazard from Dr. Muir's Texts. We may even express a hope that German scholars and other Europeans,

who speak forms of Āryan speech, all of them equally delighting in composition, may more frequently condescend to employ the hyphen for some of their own Sesquipedalia Verba, thereby imitating the practical Englishman in his Parliamentary compounds, such, for example, as *Habeas-corporis-suspension-act-continuance-Ireland-bill*.

<sup>4</sup> In the paper on transliteration, which I read at the Berlin International Congress, I proposed a kind of mark of accentuation to represent aspirated consonants, as, for example, *k̄, p̄*. To say (as at p. xxxvi) that aspirated *k* or *p* is like *kh* in *inkhorn* or *ph* in *uphill* is to a certain extent misleading. It is simply *k* or *p* pronounced as in Ireland with a forcible emission of the breath.