tongue, are we therefore not to do what we really can to promote intercourse and communion between kindred races united under one government and descended from the same ancestors? If our great Indian Paṇḍits are made familiar with our graphic systems, will they not be more likely to study our language and literature, to benefit by our knowledge, and to use our numerous appliances for economizing time, labour, and money? In short, is it fatuous to expect our fellow-subjects to imitate us in adopting a common system of symbols for a common line of cognate languages?—a system, be it thoroughly understood, not to be confounded with our English 'free and easy' abandonment of all system in our treatment of the Roman alphabet—but a system capable of complete adjustment to the expression of Āryan sounds, whether Roman, Greek, Welsh, English, or Indian, and probably little more different in form from the present Nāgarī than that Nāgarī is from the characters prevalent in India when Sanskṛit was first committed to writing*. For since the fact is patent, that the further we go back, the more plainly do the Indian alphabets point to a foreign origin, the power of ancient and sacred association cannot certainly be pleaded for the maintenance of the present Nāgarī.

Nor can our Indian brethren shelter themselves under any plea of impossibility, when all the logic of historical facts is against them. Is any nation more tenacious of everything national than the Jews? and yet have they not abandoned their ancient character for a more modern form? Have not also the Arabs and Persians, not to mention the Keltic and Teutonic races, done the same? Have not the Hindūs themselves renounced many of their most ancient usages, and allowed the rigidity of caste to relax under the pressure of steam and other European forces. Even in the very matter of alphabets the facts of their own history are also against them, for if they deny the foreign origin of their venerated Nāgarī, they have confessedly adopted the modern Persianized Arabic alphabet—a consonantal, if not a purely syllabic system—to express Hindūstānī. Now, Hindūstānī, notwithstanding its flood of Arabic and Persian words, is as much a form of Hindī—the language of 'pakka' Hindūstān—as English with its flood of Norman French is of Anglo-Saxon. Surely then all must admit that Hindūstānī, at least, has a far better right to the Indo-Romanic alphabet derived from kindred British rulers, than it has to be saddled with the consonantal system of foreign Muslim invaders. For that system, be it noted, is wholly Semitic in its essential features, and therefore quite unsuited to the fundamental Āryan structure of a Persianized Āryan dialect.

If after what I have thus advanced, our great Indian Paṇḍits remain, as I fear some of them will, unconvinced, let any ordinary scholar who consults the pages of this work say whether they do not derive much of their typographical clearness from certain apparently trifling, but really important contrivances, possible in our Indo-Romanic, impossible in the usual Nāgarī type. One of these, of course, is the power of leaving spaces between the words of the Sanskṛit examples given. Will any student say that such an example as *sādhu-mitrāṇy akuśalād vārayanti* does not gain in clearness by being properly spaced†? Again, the power of using capitals and what are called italics (to say nothing of 'Egyptian' and other forms of European type) is manifestly an advantage to be placed to the credit of Indo-Romanic typography. Who will deny the gain in clearness by the ability to make a distinction between smith and Smith—brown and Brown—bath and Bath? And will any one examine the pages of this Dictionary, and then compare those of the Śabda-kalpa-druma, without admitting the advantage gained in the power of employing italic type? Lastly, the

* It is certainly remarkable that the whole Vyākaraṇa of Pāṇini, unlike the Greek grammar or γράμμα, appears to ignore written symbols, as if Sanskṛit was never intended to have any peculiar graphic system of its own. In South India Sanskṛit is written in different characters; and the first inscriptions found on rocks are in Pāli and Prākṛit, not in Sanskṛit. They are referred to the Buddhist sovereigns who possessed political power in India about three centuries B.C. The present form of Nāgarī is thought to be little older than the tenth or eleventh century of our era.

† What should we think of an English Dictionary which, disdaining to aid our overtried vision by any typographical contrivances at the supposed sacrifice of euphonic propriety, should insist on presenting the corresponding example in proper phonetic conjunction thus—'goodfriendsguardfromevil?'