civilized world are being drawn into closer intercommunion. The rapid advance of science in England, Germany, France, and Italy has forced natural science upon us as a necessary element of all mental culture, making also an interchange of thought between these countries indispensable. Eastern languages too, both Semitic and Āryan, are pressing peremptorily on the attention of our Universities*. Hebrew and Aramaic must now be studied by all our younger clergy, if they are to hold their own in the conflict of theological parties or present a bold front towards sceptical assailants. A knowledge of Arabic is essential to a right understanding of the literature, religion, and social institutions of the millions of our Muslim fellow-subjects. Some of the dialects of India must be mastered by all who have communication with the tens of millions of our Hindū brethren. Lastly, all the branches of the two great stems of speech are now proved to be so closely interdependent, and the permutations of sounds in passing through the varying organs of varying types of the human family are shewn to obey such curiously definite laws, that a new science has been established†. This science has for its field of investigation not any one particular language, but the whole area of human speech, and as it inquires into the laws governing the living organs of utterance as well as the living organic growth of the actual sounds themselves, may be said to trench not only on Ethnology, but even on Biology. This 'science of language' might with more propriety be called 'Glossology' than Philology. In its method of investigation it has much in common with the natural sciences, and though its analogy to these ought not to be strained beyond a mere analogy, yet as a veritable science dealing with one of the grandest distinctive attributes of human nature, it can no more be left out of any modern educational programme than any of the natural sciences properly so called. With the 'Glossologist' every spoken word is like a plant or animal in the hands of a Biologist; its birth, growth, transformations, and decay must all be accounted for; its whole structure dissected limb by limb; every appendage traced to its appropriate use and function; its deepest internal constitution analyzed.

Will it be denied, then, that Sanskṛit is destined to increasing cultivation, as the one typical scientific language whose structure is a master-key to the structure of all languages, whose very name implies 'Synthesis,' and whose literature, commencing with the Ṛig-veda about 1500 B.C., extends in a continuous line for nearly 3000 years, throwing a flood of light on the operation of linguistic laws?

In point of fact the Hindūs may be said to be the original inventors of the 'science of language.' Like the Greeks, they are the only nation who have worked out for themselves the laws of thought and of grammar independently. If their system of logic is inferior to that of Aristotle, they are unequalled in their examination into the constitution of speech. The name Vyākaraṇa, which they give to their grammar, implies 'decomposition' or 'resolution of a compound into its parts,' just as Saṇskaraṇa implies the re-composition or re-construction of the same decomposed elements. Every single word in their classical language is referred to a Dhātu or Root, which is also a name for any constituent elementary substance, whether of rocks or living organisms. In short, when we follow out their grammatical system in all the detail of its curious subtleties and technicalities, we seem to be engaged, like a Geologist, in splitting solid substances, or, like a Chemist, in some elaborate process of analysis.

* See the notes on the Semitic and Āryan languages at pp. viii, ix of this Preface. Cambridge is at this moment engaged in establishing both a Semitic and Indian languages Tripos. Although our system of 'Schools' at Oxford is somewhat different, yet, I hope, we shall not be behind the Sister University in our encouragement of these languages.

† The debt which we English scholars owe to Professor Max Müller for having first introduced us to this science by his well-known lectures, is too universally acknowledged to require notice here. I am not sure whether twelve lectures on the principles of linguistic science by William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskṛit in Yale College, are quite so well known in this country. If they are not, I here commend them to all interested in the study of language, merely remarking that their excellence is too obvious to require any praise from me.