vowel or consonantal power should not be represented by two letters, but by some modification of a single symbol. For example, the long form of the vowels *a*, *i*, *u* should not be denoted by two letters, as in our word 'hoop,' but by some mark or stroke placed over these vowels (so that 'hoop' should be written 'hūp'). Similarly, the aspiration of *k*, *t*, *p*, ought not to be represented by two letters as in *kh*, *th*, *ph*, but by some mark attached to *k*, *t*, *p*; thus such a word as *phala* should be written *ṕala*, and *dhana*, *ďana*; or perhaps according to the Anglo-Saxon method with a horizontal stroke above, as in đ for the *dh* sound of *the*.

Tried by these rules, the Nāgarī alphabet shows itself in many respects superior to the old Roman alphabet, and certainly to our use or *abuse* of the Roman symbols commonly called the English alphabet. But tried by the same rules, it will be found, I believe, inferior to the Indo-Romanic system, by which name I call the modification of Sir William Jones' method of applying the Roman alphabet to the languages of India, adopted in the present Dictionary.

The fact of the matter is, that Hindū grammarians have so overdone the true theory of the necessary vocalization of consonants, that they declare it impossible for any consonant to stand alone without its associated vowel, not only in a single word, but in a whole sentence, unless, indeed, the consonant come at the end of all, when the mark ◟, called a Virāma or stop, must be employed. Moreover, the dependent position of a consonant is so insisted on that every simple consonant must perforce possess an inherent vowel by a necessary condition of its own existence, so that when it is written without vowel or stop the vowel 'a' must always be pronounced after it. Hence, such a word as 'bind,' would have to be pronounced 'binada,' unless a conjunct symbol be employed, compounding *n* and *d* into one letter, the use of the Virāma or stop, except at the end of a sentence, being an infraction of orthographic laws. Thus it arises that an immense assortment of conjunct consonants is needed. More than this, the excessive elaboration of their vowel-system by the Hindūs necessitates the introduction of two new vowels, *ṛi* and *ḷṛi*. Again, each of the fourteen vowels (except *ă*) has two symbols, according as it is initial or non-initial, and the form of some of these obliges them to be printed before the letter after which they are pronounced and in various awkward places, thereby exposing them to fracture, and increasing the general complication. So that with unusually numerous vowel-symbols, with thirty-five consonants and an almost indefinite number of intricate conjunct consonants, the number of distinct types necessary to equip a perfect Sanskṛit fount amounts to about 500 (see the table opposite to page 1).

Now will any one maintain, that in these days of railroads, electric telegraphs, cheap printing, and the Suez canal, such an overstraining of alphabetical precision can be maintained much longer for the expression of any language belonging to the same family as our own, and in any country forming an integral part of the British Empire? Indeed Sanskṛit ought to be made a potent instrument for uniting England more closely with India, and a powerful means for exciting more real sympathy and fellow-feeling between Englishmen and their Indian fellow-subjects; but on this very account it requires every facility to be conceded to its acquisition, and every contrivance to be adopted for harmonizing it with those kindred European tongues whose structure it is above all capable of illustrating.

Be it remembered that we are not expecting either absurdities or impossibilities. We are not so foolish as to suppose that the Hindūs will ever abandon their own national forms of speech. On the contrary, we expect that they will tenaciously adhere to them, even as their brethren of Wales hold to their own separate and distinct branch of the same speech-stem. But because we cannot change the organs of speech or fuse the twenty-two languages* of India into one common

* Viz. Sanskṛit, with its kindred Hindī, Marāṭhī, Gujarātī, Bengālī, Uriya, Asamese, Panjābī, Gurumukhī, Sindhī, Nepalese, Kaśmīrī, the Singhalese of Ceylon; the Pushtū of Afghānistān; the five Drāviḍian languages, Tamil, Malayālam, Telugu, Kanarese, Tulu; the half Drāviḍian Brahū-ī; the composite Urdū or Hindūstānī current throughout India; and lastly Burmese.