

power of applying the hyphen to separate long compounds in a language where compounds prevail more than simple words\*, will surely be appreciated by all. I can only say, that without that most useful little mark, the present volume must have lost much of its clearness, and probably half its compactness, for besides the obvious advantage of being able to indicate the difference between such compounds as *su-tapa* and *suta-pa*, which could not be done 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†.

Notwithstanding all my advocacy of the Indo-Romanic graphic system, it is still my duty to point out that so long as the natives of India continue to use their own alphabets, so long is it incumbent upon us Englishmen who study Sanskrit in its bearing upon the Indian vernaculars, to master the Nāgarī character. Under any circumstances there must be a long transition period during which the Indian and Romanic systems will co-exist, and however the struggle between them may terminate, the end is not likely to be witnessed by the existing generation. For this reason the Nāgarī alphabet is by no means ignored in these pages. On the contrary, it is pressed into the service of the Romanic, and made to minister to a most useful purpose, being employed to distinguish the leading word of a group in a manner best calculated to strike the eye and arrest the attention.

Fairness, moreover, demands that a few of the obvious defects of the system of transliteration adopted in this volume should be specified. In certain cases it confessedly offends against philosophical exactness; nor does it always consistently observe the rules stated in a preceding paragraph. The vowels *ri* and *rī* ought to be represented by some one symbol—such as that used by many German scholars—though *r*, *ī* seem to me somewhat unsuitable for vowel sounds. So again the aspirated consonants ought not to be represented by a second letter attached to them. In the case of *ch* employed by Sir W. Jones for च and *chh* for छ, the inconvenience appeared to me so great that in the third edition of my Sanskrit Grammar, I ventured to adopt *č* for च, the pronunciation, however, being the same as *ch* in *church*, which might therefore be written *turb.* Had I dared to innovate further, I should have written *k̄* for *kh*, *t̄* for *th*, *p̄* for *ph*; and so with the other aspirated consonants, *c* being then employed for च. The fact, of course, is that an aspirated consonant is merely a consonant pronounced with an emphatic emission of the breath, much as an Irishman would pronounce *p* in *penny*, and to indicate this, a stroke placed on one side or over the letter seems more appropriate than the mark of the Greek hard breathing adopted by Bopp, which may well be used alone to utter a vowel, but is scarcely suitable to emphasize a consonant‡.

I also prefer the symbol *ʃ* for the cerebral sibilant. Should a second edition of this Dictionary be ever called for, some of these improvements may possibly be adopted. With regard to the letter *w*, I have discarded it, and retained only *v*, because the Nāgarī only possesses one character for the labial semivowel, viz. व, and to transliterate this or any other single Oriental character by two Roman representatives must certainly lead to confusion. As to the German method of using

\* Forster gives an example of one compound word consisting of 152 syllables. I rather think this might be matched by even longer specimens from Campū composition.

† At any rate, it is to be hoped that the hyphen will not be denied to Sanskrit for the better understanding of the more complex words, such, for example, as *vaidika-manv-ādi-praṇīta-smṛiti-vāt*, *karma-phala-rūpa-śarīra-dhāri-jīva-nirmūṭavābhāva-mātreṇa*, taken at hap-hazard from Dr. Muir's Texts. We may even express a hope that German scholars and other Europeans, who speak forms of Aryan speech, all of them equally delighting in composition, may condescend more frequently to the employment of the hyphen for some of their own Sesquipedalia Verba, thereby imi-

tating the practical Englishman in his Parliamentary compounds, such, for example, as *habeas-corpus-suspension-act-continuance-Ireland-bill*.

‡ A hint might be taken from Anglo-Saxon ð, as before observed, especially if ^ be used for long vowels. The mark ^ is perhaps too much like that required for accentuation. I hope, however, that the system of accentuating classical Sanskrit will never be allowed. Why complicate a subject already sufficiently intricate by introducing another element of perplexity which native scholars themselves do not sanction? Let accentuation be kept for the Veda; and in Vedic words a more upright and conspicuous stroke might, in my opinion, be used with advantage.