

# GLOSSARY

OF  
JUDICIAL AND REVENUE TERMS,

AND OF

USEFUL WORDS OCCURRING IN OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF  
BRITISH INDIA,

FROM THE

ARABIC, PERSIAN, HINDUSTÁNÍ, SANSKRIT, HINDI, BENGÁLÍ, URÍYA, MARÁTHÍ,  
GUJARÁTHÍ, TELUGU, KARNÁTA, TAMIL, MALAYÁLAM,  
AND OTHER LANGUAGES.

COMPILED AND PUBLISHED UNDER THE  
AUTHORITY OF THE HONORABLE THE COURT OF DIRECTORS

OF THE

EAST-INDIA COMPANY.

BY

H. H. WILSON, M.A. F.R.S.

LIBRARIAN TO THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY, AND  
BODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,  
&c. &c. &c.

LONDON:

WM. H. ALLEN AND CO.

BOOKSELLERS TO THE HONORABLE EAST-INDIA COMPANY.

—  
M DCCCLV.

V2, 8 = (P111)k

A255

111020

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM MAJOR WATTS,

PRINTER TO THE HON. E. I. COMPANY'S COLLEGE, HAILEYBURY.

Registered  
No. 1320.  
Collector  
13/4

F. F. Arbuthnot  
Collector.

## P R E F A C E.

Numerous documents relating to the administration of the government of India by the East-India Company which have been printed, and the still more voluminous correspondence which remains in script, have, from the earliest to the most recent dates, been thickly studded with terms adopted from vernacular languages of the country, and commonly inserted without any explanation of their purport. Various reasons may be assigned for a practice which, to say the least of it, is attended with considerable perplexity to those who have not studied the languages of India at all, and is not free from embarrassment to many by whom those languages have been in part only, or imperfectly acquired. In many cases, notwithstanding, it might be difficult or impossible to discover exact equivalents for the native words in English, and the use of the original term most expressively conveys its meaning to those to whom the occasion of its employment is familiar, although they be not Oriental scholars: *Ryot* and *Ryotwár*, for instance, suggest more precise and positive notions in connexion with the subject of the land revenue in the south of India, than would be conveyed by cultivator, or peasant, or agriculturist, or by an agreement for rent or revenue with the individual members of the agricultural classes: in this and similar instances the employment of the original native term is recommended by the advantages of conciseness and precision.

In the far greater number of cases, however, the practice cannot be vindicated by an equally cogent plea, and must be ascribed to other considerations. It may sometimes, perhaps, be assigned to a pedantic affectation of conversancy with the native languages, but it may more frequently be attributed to indolence—to a reluctance to take the trouble of ascertaining the proper sense of the word, and of seeking for a suitable equivalent, even where such an equivalent is at hand, and where the original term denotes nothing peculiar or technical. It is scarcely necessary, for example, to introduce the word *Midde* in its native dress, when it signifies only “an Upper-storied house;” and “Widow” is quite as much to the purpose as *Ávirá*, especially when the latter is barbarously transmuted to *Obeera*. It is very obvious, however, that whatever may be the familiarity acquired in some instances with the spoken language of the Courts of Justice and Revenue, that familiarity is restricted to a few of the dialects, and that a critical acquaintance, even with those that are understood, is far from common. This is very evident when, as is sometimes the case, an attempt has been made by officers of unquestioned efficiency in other respects, to analyse etymologically the terms they employ, particularly in regard to the languages of the south of India. Thus it is said by a functionary of more than ordinary merit, and one who was specially selected for his knowledge of the languages, that the last syllable of *Dessaye* is a Canarese term for “mother,” when it is nothing more than the abridgment of *adhi*, “over—one who is placed in authority over a district.” The same functionary explains *Desmukh*, literally the head or chief (*mukhya*) of a country (*des*), as meaning “ten blows,” confounding evidently the Sanscrit *des*, “a country,” with the Hindi *das*, “ten,” and *mukha*, “face,” with the Hindustani *muth*, “a fist.”—East-India Selections, iv. 798. In fact, the whole linguistic stock of the major portion of the Civil Service was for many years a little Hindustani and less Persian; and it is only recently that attempts have been made to extend the range of attainment, and place it upon a sound and comprehensive basis.

Whatever the acquirements, however, of those with whom Indian official documents originate, it is undeniable that many of those to whom they are addressed, or for whose information they are designed, members of the Court of Proprietors, of the Court of Directors, of the Board of Control, the Houses of

Parliament, the British public, pretend to no acquaintance with the languages of India, and to interpretation of the native words which come before them is indispensable. They may have become naturalized by repetition, but by far the greater number remain unintelligible. Even of the few which however have been longest and most extensively current, precise ideas are not always obtained; it may be doubted if there are many persons, of those who have not been in India, or who have only had of Hindustani, who possess a ready and correct conception of the import of such words, as *Adalat* and *Zamindár*.

But besides the great proportion of those who may feel it their duty to consult the records of the governments for information, without pretending to any conversancy with the Indian languages, many of those who have been educated for the service of the Company will be occasionally perplexed by the appearance of native terms with which they are unacquainted. The Company's servants at the three Presidencies are not expected to be proficient in the languages spoken in the territories of other Presidencies than their own, and yet they must find it of material benefit to be able to consult their records; while in their own branch of the service, they will not unfrequently be crossed by unusual designations. A Persian or Hindustani scholar will not, therefore, always be competent to appreciate the value of the Sanskrit and Arabic vocables which constitute the language of Hindu and Mohammedan law. These languages, but imperfectly prepare the Bengal civilian for Hindí, Bengálí, and Panjábí: they will be of equally little avail in the peninsula for the interpretation of terms pertaining to Tamil, Telugu, Karnáta, and Malaya, and they will but lamely help the Bombay servant over the intricacies of Maráthí and Guzeráthí, and nothing of Sindhí and Marwárá. Even with the scale of acquirements extended as far as may be reasonably expected, the great variety of the prevailing forms of speech in India renders it impossible, perhaps, that all those which would be of service may be so mastered, that words derived from them will always convey the meanings they bear independently of such explanation as is to be looked for from a Glossary or Lexicon.

Supposing, indeed, that a much more comprehensive and critical acquaintance with the languages of India existed than that which usually prevails, such knowledge will still not be always sufficient to enable the possessor to recognise a native word, however familiar to him in its original characters, in the unusual and often preposterous form in which it appears when represented by the English alphabet. Of course, English documents cannot admit Oriental letters; and Indian words, when transferred from their native garb to English dress, are often so strangely disguised, that it is always difficult, sometimes impossible, to identify them. The causes of their transfiguration are easily understood: they may have been written down by the European functionary from native enunciation, agreeably to his conception of the sound, without advertence to the original characters, the only guides entitled to reliance: the ear is far from accurate, particularly the English ear, which is unaccustomed to a definite system of pronunciation in its own alphabet, especially as regards the vowel sounds. The consequences are, an entire misrepresentation of the original spelling, and a total want of consistency, the very same word being written in every possible variety of orthography. Another source of error is the employment of a native amanuensis, who knows a little English, to write the word, and in all likelihood, he will diverge still farther from accuracy than his European superior. The term thus incorrectly and blunderingly set down has to be transcribed repeatedly by native copyists for transmission to higher authority, and eventually, perhaps, to England; and every time that it is re-written there is a renewed probability of error. In this state it comes home, and is here re-copied by English clerks, who are, of course, unable to correct the most palpable mistakes, and are fully qualified to commit more. In the last place, it has to be transferred to the press, the correction of which is entrusted to incompetent revision; and by which fresh blunders are copiously grafted on the already abundant crop. Many printed documents, of the first importance as to their subjects, and upon which very great expense has been incurred by the Company, have been rendered almost useless by the innumerable inaccuracies which disfigure almost every page. The collection, for example, known as *Selections from the Judicial and Revenue Records*, in four folio volumes, containing many most important and valuable documents, is all but spoiled by the perpetual recurrence of such errors as *Lohar* and *Sohar* for *Lohar*; *Sale* for *Lal*; *Derk* and *Desh* for *Derh*; *Pottar* for *Pot-úr*; *Swinjammy* for *Sarinjami*; *Kadarnaibh* for *Kadárambam*. Such as these admit of correction: others are more puzzling, but may be corrected conjecturally: *Bazar-heetick*, is no doubt intended for *Bazar-báithak*; *Mohcuddum Quaz* appears from the context to be designed for *Mukaddam-karz*;

and *Oqlaim kaley* and *Muddyn kaley* are intended for *Uttama káli* and *Madhyama káli*. Others, again, baffle conjecture. It passes my ingenuity to propose probable substitutes for *Barhee Mutputti*, *Herymut desa*, or *Quacem seodi jumma*. The Selections are not singular in this respect, and strange perversions find their way into official reports, even when printed in India, where competent revision is more plentiful than it should be in this country. In the reports of the judicial proceedings in the Zila Courts we have *Jummee*, and even *Jemmy* for *Janmi*, "one who holds a birthright;" and *Halfan*, "by or upon oath," is metamorphosed to *Hál Fun*. Documents emanating from the highest authority are not exempt from such disfigurement. In the Instructions to the Settlement Officers from the Governor of the North-west Provinces we have *Dhurkast* for *Durkhast*; and in the Decisions of the *Sadr Ádálát* we find *Tun-khaw* for *Tankhwáh*, and *Joonmoohoostes* for *Junum-moohoortes*, "the hour of nativity." Now, whether these be blunders of transcription or typography, they are calculated to perplex even Oriental scholars, and are grave blemishes in documents emanating from authority, and intended to communicate information on which implicit reliance may be placed.

The deficiencies in this respect, of the published and unpublished documents relating to India, as well as the want of a more comprehensive key to the numerous native terms employed than any previously compiled, having been brought to the attention of the Court of Directors in August 1842, it was resolved to adopt measures for forming a Glossary of words in current use in various parts of India, relating to the administration of public business in every department, the want of which had long been found a source of much inconvenience. Under an impression that this could not be effected without the co-operation of the Company's servants locally employed in all parts of India, instructions were given to the Supreme Government of India to call upon the functionaries at the several Presidencies for their assistance. In order to serve as a guide for their proceedings, a rough Glossary, alphabetically arranged, was compiled in the India-House, taken chiefly from a list of words collected by the late Mr. Warden during his residence at Bombay, and from sundry printed collections; and a sufficient number of printed copies were transmitted to India for distribution to the several officers. In this Glossary the words were inserted purposely as they were met with, without any attempt to correct them, or to reduce their spelling to a uniform system; as, in the absence of the native characters, any attempt to represent the words in those of Europe might only have multiplied the obvious inaccuracies of the original collection: their correction was left to the Indian authorities, by whom the proper native orthography could be most readily ascertained, and they were instructed to return the lists in an accurate form, and accompanied by the native characters of the district in which the words were current. The authorities were also directed to add to the collection the many words that were known to be wanting, and to subjoin full, careful, and accurate explanations of their meaning. The copies were printed in such a shape as to admit of the insertion of the requisite additions and emendations, and several hundreds were sent out from time to time, with an expectation expressed that they would be returned in six months from the time of their distribution. The final arrangement of the whole work was to be committed to the compiler of the present publication.

After a much more protracted interval than that of six months, the rough Glossaries found their way back from Bengal and partially from Madras: from Bombay none returned. The latter default was not much to be regretted, for however judicious the design, its execution at the other Presidencies proved almost an entire failure. Many of the lists came back blank; of several the leaves had not been cut; in the far greater number, a mere pretence of doing something was displayed by the insertion of a few terms neither novel nor important; a few afforded some serviceable materials, especially when, as was frequently the case, the task had been transferred to the subordinate officers, Munsiffs, Amíns, Sadr-amíns, and Deputy-collectors, the uncovenanted servants of the Company. Some of these did furnish lists of native terms, of a useful description, written in both the English and native characters. Several of the native officers, however, misapprehended the object of the collection, and admitted a copious infusion of words which had no peculiarly official significations. More than one, indeed, in Upper India, turned to Shakespear's Hindustani Dictionary, and deliberately covered the blank pages of the Glossary with words taken at random from the Lexicon. The practice was too glaringly obvious to be doubted; but it was confessed to me by one of the perpetrators, Mir Shahamat Ali, whom I taxed with it when in England. He was an individual eminently qualified to have responded to the intentions of the Court as an efficient public officer, a scholar, and a man of ability; but so little interest was felt in India in the subject, such was the unwillingness to devote any time or trouble to the task, that even he evaded its performance. The same feelings pervaded the service in Bengal. At Madras, matters

were not good letters. The returns were collected by the Persian and Telugu translator to the Government, Mr. C. P. Brown, and embodied in one compilation. The character which he gives of those returns shows that they were equally meagre and insufficient as those of Bengal. He has since printed them, enlarged with additions of his own, under the denomination of a *Zillah Dictionary*, the utility of which is somewhat impaired by the erroneous explanations derived from the documents with which he had been furnished. From his aggregate collection in manuscript, some useful terms, however, have been obtained, although their accuracy has been rendered occasionally questionable by the observations of the Board of Revenue on the printed form which was not received in time to be made much use of. From Madras, also, came two serviceable lists supplied by the Residents at Mysore and Hyderabad, Generals Cubbon and Fraser. From Bombay, as already observed, not a single list has been returned. The fate which has attended a measure so judiciously conceived, and so well calculated to have brought together a large body of valuable information of the most authentic character, is far from creditable to the public zeal and philological proficiency of the East-India Company's Civil Service.

One honourable exception must, however, be acknowledged. "Observing with regret that the call for information had not been responded to, except to a very limited extent, by any of the officers under the control of the Board of Revenue of the North-western Provinces," of which he was then a member, the late Sir Henry Elliot—whose early death has deprived the Bengal Civil Service of a most zealous and accomplished Oriental scholar and an enlightened and efficient public officer—undertook to supply the deficiency, and to put together the information he had collected respecting the tribes, the customs, and the fiscal and agricultural terms current in Upper India. The collection was printed under the modest designation of a Supplement to the Glossary, and contains a number of local terms of the most useful and authentic description, arranged alphabetically according to the order of the English alphabet, but accompanied by the native characters of the Azoie and Souds, it, and expressed according to the modified system of spelling devised by Dr. Colebrooke as well as that of Sir William Jones. The greater portion of the contents of this collection are embodied in the present, but some, especially the articles relating to the different Hindu clans and tribes, have necessarily been abbreviated or omitted, as assuming a higher character than that of the mere items of a Glossary, being, in fact, memoirs subservient to the History of India. The north-west provinces of Hindustan limit the extent of the compilation of course to Hindi and Urdu terms, and unfortunately, also, the compilation stops with the letter J. As far, however, as the Supplement goes, it is a contribution to the compilation contemplated by the Court, of which the value and merit cannot be too highly estimated.

The first returns of the blank Glossaries from India having proved that little aid was to be expected from that quarter, it became necessary to look round for other sources of information; and in the first instance, at least, to make use of such as were in print. Of this class were Gladwin's Dictionary of Mohamadan Law and Revenue Terms, Rousseau's Vocabulary of Persian Words in common use in India, and the Indian Vocabulary of Lieutenant Robertson. For the south of India there were the technical terms attached to Morris's Telugu Selections, Brown's Gentoo Vocabulary, and Robertson's Glossary in Tamil and English of words used chiefly in the business of the Courts. There were also, for general reference, the Indices of the Regulations, whether attached to them separately, or as collectively formed by Dale, Fenwick, and Smail, the Glossary of the Fifth Report, and, above all, the Dictionaries of all the principal languages, in which a great number of technical terms are necessarily comprised, although the explanations are not always as full and particular as could be wished. The most comprehensive of them in this respect are Major Molesworth's Marathi Dictionary, Reeves's Karnata Dictionary, and Mohammad Kasim's Dictionary of Guzarathi. The Bengali Dictionaries of Carey and Houghton are singularly defective in technical and colloquial words. Steele's Summary of the law and custom of Hindü castes in the Presidency of Bombay affords a mass of very valuable information respecting the west of India, although sadly disfigured by an uncouth and unsystematic representation of the original words. These were, in the first instance, available: manuscript materials were at first less abundant, and the only collections in the India House were a Glossary of Marathi terms of some extent and authenticity, compiled for the use of the Bombay Government, and a collection of Malayalim words compiled by the late Mr. Graeme. The stock of manuscript materials was, however, speedily and importantly augmented.

A collection of Indian technical terms had been for some time in progress, made by my friend Richard Clarke, Esq., whose connexion with the Privy Council in the matter of Indian appeals had impressed him with the necessity of a general compilation of this description, and whose high position when in India as a judicial servant of the Madras Government, and whose attainments as a Tamil scholar, fully qualified him to

ingly been diligently engaged in the collection and arrangement of materials which have accumulated a large quantity of the most useful words selected from the Regulations, Decisions of the Committees of Parliament at different dates, from the Selections from the Records, Decisions decided in the *Sadr Adalat* of Calcutta, from Harington's Analysis of the Decisions of the *Sadr Adalat*, from *Munro's* *Central India*, *Buchanan's Travels and Eastern India*, and other authorities. He had also formed lists of Mohammadan law terms, extracted from the *Mohammadan Law*, and *Baillie's Digest*, and of Hindu law terms from *Colebrooke's* *Practical Treatise on the Law of the Hindus*, *Macnaghten's Hindu Law*, and my *Sanskrit Dictionary*. There were also some lists of the languages of the south of India, accompanied, in some instances, by the native characters. These had been classed and arranged alphabetically, and constituted an aggregate of about 100,000 words. They were written according to the system of Sir William Jones, but not according to the original characters. The whole of these materials were most liberally placed at my disposal. I learned that I was occupied in a similar task; and the greater portion of them, all those which were not included in the present compilation, have been incorporated with it, after verifying them by reference to the sources whence they were taken, and supplying, wherever practicable, the original native letters. From the materials furnished by these different sources, it was very soon evident that the supply was not exhausted, and that a great number of words employed in official documents still remained to be collected. Public documents respecting the judicial and revenue and other departments of the Government, which have of late years been communicated to the public through the press with a liberality which has not in many respects of great public utility, might perhaps be now curtailed with a parsimonious extent of the publications may appal some who would wish to consult them, and thus depriving themselves of the information. Thus we have in print Monthly Reports of Cases decided in the Courts of Appeal at Calcutta, Agra, Madras, and Bombay; Monthly Reports of the Decisions of the *Sadr Adalat* and subordinate Courts of Bengal, the North-west Provinces, and Madras, which have been published about 500 pages each, or 6000 pages per annum, or, altogether, 18,000 octavo pages per annum. These, the Settlement Reports of the Revenue Officers of the North-west Provinces have been published for many years past have been published, or at least have been published in some of the Presidencies, Extracts from the Records for many years past have been published, or at least have been published in some of the Presidencies. All these documents abound more or less with native terms, which, if not in all cases, are treated as officially current, and are therefore in need of interpretation. All these documents have for several years past, from 1846 to 1853, and such words as were not previously included in the compilation.

However ample, are not the only authorities which it has been thought advisable to refer to. Public documents are in print, calculated to supply additional materials, such as the Circulars of the *Diwani Adalat*; Instructions to Settlement Officers emanating from the Government of the North-west Provinces; the particulars of the Settlement *Misil*, or Collection of Official Forms; and other authorities. Others, originating with private intelligence, have been also found of service, such as *Zamindari Accounts*; the clever Tract in Urdu and Hindi, termed *Khet-karm*, or Field Accounts, an amusing and instructive "Revelations of an Orderly;" and a host of contributions to the *Asiatic Researches*, the *Transactions of the Bombay Literary Society*, the *Transactions and Journal of the Asiatic Society*, and the *Journals of the Asiatic Society and Agricultural Society of Bengal*, of the *Asiatic Society of Madras*, and of the *Branch Asiatic Society of Bombay*. The great extent of these several authorities renders it impossible to have bestowed upon them more than a cursory examination, and there are abundant materials to be gathered from them; but they have been consulted with more or less care, and these and other works incidentally referred to, the collection has been carried far beyond the limits which were anticipated when the task was undertaken. The Index of the Glossary exhibits an aggregate of about 100,000 words; and although many of them are mere varieties of spelling, yet the far greater number are new words, in their correct orthography, agreeably to the system which has been followed in the present compilation, in words by the letters of the Roman alphabet.

A faithful and trustworthy representation of an Indian word is its native costume: it can never be thoroughly understood in English documents, and is addressed to those to whom it is addressed, and is illegible, it is the especial object of the present compilation to give it as faithful an approximation as possible, in the values of letters and the peculiarities of national enunciation will permit,

attaching to it at the same time, as a check upon the copy, the original delineated its own alphabet, wherever verifiable, for the use of those who are qualified to be able to appreciate, however, the intention of the copy, and to make use of it so that the principles upon which it has been developed should be properly understood.

The extreme and contradictory variety which prevails in the spelling of Oriental words made the subject of remark, and not unfrequently of censure. The latter may not be those who condemn are not always qualified to judge, and they often extend to a perverse determination not to be set right. Above a century ago the most common was established by their example how *Mohammed* should be spelled, or nearly so, and that it still is most common to write it *Mahommed*, and even *Mahomet* is still in use so long as this disregard of exactitude is so universal it little imports what animadversion the want of it by incompetent judges; but those who should know better, those who are conversant with the original languages, are inexcusable when they write the native words without reference to the original and without any consistent or systematic mode of expressing them, each individual writes as he thinks he hears it articulated, and without paying any attention to its original alphabet. It is undoubtedly true that many of those who are in the habit of hearing and uttering words of official duty are unfamiliar with their written forms, and will not take the trouble to learn of their alphabet. Even, however, when acquainted with the characters, they are negligent of acquiring a systematic plan of representing them, but write them according to their own fancy and with a total indifference to consistency which produces the most needless and absurd representations of one and the same word, to an extent that would scarcely be thought of if substantiated by daily experience, even in the most ordinary and simple words. It is almost thought impossible to represent *Lakhiraj* (from *la*, "without," and *khiraj*, "tax,") by the disciples of the two chief propounders of schemes of Oriental orthography, Sir William Jones and Dr. Gilchrist, would unhesitatingly concur in the representation; yet notwithstanding the different systems, and the simplicity of the original word, we meet with *Lakhirdj* under the name of *Lakerage*, *Lackeradge*, *Lackiruz*, *Lackerage*, *Laqueerauz*, and *Leeakeerazee*. It is a monstrous error that should no longer be perpetrated or tolerated, and that the only remedy which can be applied—the authoritative enforcement of a uniform system for the representation of the characters of those of the English alphabet. For this purpose a system must be devised, and then it must be enforced. The cause of the confusion is, chiefly, neglect of the latter. We have systems, good enough in themselves, but few or none will take the trouble to study and apply them.

The representation of Oriental words by Roman characters has not now for the first time been the question was most ably discussed nearly seventy years ago by Sir William Jones, and is on a right footing in his *Memoir*, which judiciously prefaces the *Researches of the Asiatic Society* commences the first volume, printed in 1788. There are but two principles involved in the representation of one alphabet to another: 1. an analogous classification of the letters themselves, according to their original arrangement; or, 2. the representation of their sounds in equivalents of similar other words, the one principle is analogy, the other, pronunciation. Sir William Jones adopted the more simple, universal, consistent, and scientific, and as exempt from the anomalies at which the English alphabet presents, in which, as he ingeniously pointed out, every vowel may be used to articulate one and the same sound, as in the sentence "a mother bird young," in which every vowel of the alphabet and the combination *ou* has the sound of *u* in some instances, in the quotation from *Maleherbe*, the absurd results that would follow an attempt to represent the original French passage according to even its French pronunciation,—an absurdity which, though not invariably, avoid in ordinary life by writing foreign names, not according to their original spelling. No one would think of writing *Paris* "Paree," *Rousseau* "Roosseau," a conundrum, *Toulon* and *Toulouse*, "Too long" and "Too loose;" and it would be a sorry jest to write *Grisi* into "Greasy." We do not, therefore, follow sound alone in the Anglicising of words; and the principle is, if possible, still less applicable to the languages of the East.

Not very long, however, after the system of Sir William Jones had been adopted by the British in Bengal, the principle of pronunciation was taken up by Dr. Gilchrist, with relative



language as written in the Arabic and Persian alphabet; and by his ingenuity he devised a system of expressing the letters of one alphabet by the other, according to their prevailing sounds. This was executed with an earnestness which savoured something of extravagance; but his scheme, as finally embodied in his Hindee-Roman Orthoepical Ultimatum, was, with one or two exceptions, exceedingly well adapted to its object, that of expressing with uniformity and consistency the Oriental characters in English letters in such a manner that English readers, unacquainted with the former, would be enabled to articulate with a very near approach to their correct pronunciation. Here, then, is all that is wanted—two systems, one based on analogy, one on pronunciation; and it is only requisite that a person who writes Oriental words in Roman letters should make himself familiar with one or the other. It is not congenial, however, to the natural indolence and self-sufficiency of writers on Indian subjects to be obliged to blunder on without any previous preparation, to put down words at random, and to do so with all sorts of incongruous creations.

It is not fully adequate to the determination of the principles on which the mutual adjustment of the Arabic and Roman alphabets ought to be grounded, yet some of the details of the two systems have been thought worthy of improvement, and different modifications of both have been from time to time proposed. The system of Sir William Jones was scrupulously adhered to by Mr. Colebrooke, and prevails in the Asiatic Researches, in the Journals of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and of the Royal Asiatic Society; it was used, somewhat modified, by Sir Charles Wilkins, in his edition of Richardson's Persian Dictionary, and in Shakespear's Hindustani Dictionary; nearly unaltered in Rottler's Tamil, Campbell's Telugu, and Bailey's Malayalam Dictionaries; and, in a mixed form, in Reeves's Karnáta Dictionary. Major Molesworth, in his Maráthí Dictionary, follows generally Dr. Gilchrist's system. The public authorities in Bengal also usually observe a modification of Gilchrist's spelling, when they follow any system at all; but there is little uniformity in this respect. In 1834, a vigorous effort was made in Bengal to establish what was termed the Romanizing system, the substitution of the Roman letters for the characters of the country, in all printed books, and the project is still in operation to a limited extent. Competent scholars from different Missions, Dr. Duff, and Messrs. Pearce, Yates, and Thomas; and distinguished Members of the Company's Service, Mr. H. T. Prinsep, the late Mr. J. Prinsep, Mr. John Tytler, and Mr., now Sir Charles Trevelyan, took part in the discussion, and their several communications were collected and printed at Serampore. The different modes of writing the Oriental words in Roman letters were then fully and fairly considered, and a system nearly identical with that of Sir William Jones was adopted. Again, in 1845, an intelligent and ingenious treatise on the mode of writing Oriental words, having especial reference to the present Glossary, by Mr. Crow, Deputy Collector, was published in Calcutta, who was wrong only in supposing that the crude spelling of the Draft Glossary was final. Still more recently, the subject has been taken up by the Missionaries of England and America, and some eminent German Oriental scholars and philologists; and several conferences were held, under the auspices of Chevalier Bunsen, for the purpose of fixing a standard in Roman characters for the expression of foreign forms of speech, whether possessed of alphabets or without them. Proposals for a Missionary alphabet founded on these discussions, have been published by my friend Maximilian Müller, Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Oxford. There is no lack, therefore, of careful and competent investigation of the subject; and although uniformity of practice has not been, and probably will not be, the result, yet an approximation has been made to it, and the principle of analogy, where alphabets exist, is recognised as preferable to that of pronunciation. Where the language is unwritten, sound must be more or less the guide; but with such forms of speech we have no concern, all the languages of the civilised races of India being provided with alphabets.

In the following pages the principle of analogy has been preferred, and the system of Sir William Jones has been pursued, with some modifications of detail, which will be particularised in the remarks on the equivalents, which will presently be given. Their object will be rendered more obvious by prefacing a few general rules for the conversion of one set of characters into another, and the observations which they suggest. The rules are in general harmony with those acknowledged as the basis of the Missionary Alphabet. The observations have also reference to the propositions for its development.

The same letter should be invariably used to represent the same letter or the same sound: if *a* be used to be representative of the short vowel, it should never be allowed to alternate with *e* or *u*, *o* or *æ*.

The same letter should never be used to express two different letters or sounds.

On this account I object to the proposal to represent both *k* and *ch* by *k*, although etymologically there be an affinity between them, as pointed out half a century ago by Dr. Gilchrist, in his recognition of *kirk* and *church*. Etymology, however, is admitted to be a somewhat unsafe guide; and I will not add to its guttural duties, on the same principle as, inconsistent with this rule, I conceive it objectionable to give a double office to *g*, although it has such a duality in English, as in *gin* and *gun*. It is proposed to distinguish both the *k* and the *g* by printing them in italics when palatals, but the distinction is as it is one of form, not of value, and is both uncouth and likely to be overlooked. My friend Müller's "Kingis khan" will be much more consistently and correctly written "Jagatai Chingis khan," *k* each having but one power.

III. Simple letters should, as far as possible, be used for simple letters.

On this ground, objections may be taken to the use of *ch*; but although written as two letters in English the power of but one: and although the nations of the Continent express it by combining *c* and *h*, an uncouth appearance, yet, as symbols have to be devised for sounds which are foreign to the alphabet, there is no good reason why one should not borrow of another. *Ch*, as a novelty, is not more than *k* as *ch*; and the one has an existence, which the other has not. On this, and on the use of simple letters, we shall have further occasion to animadvert.

It is sufficiently obvious, that if an alphabet of twenty-four letters is to express one of fifty or more, contrivance must be had recourse to, to extend the elasticity of the former. If the sounds are wholly radically strange, new symbols must be invented; but if, as is most usual, they are only qualifications of sounds, of which, in the unmodified form, symbols exist, the latter may be adapted to these expressions conformably to the following:—

IV. Diacritical signs, lines, accents, or dots, are to be attached to the Roman letters, in order to enable them to represent modifications of the symbols or sounds which they themselves express.

The choice of these diacritical or distinguishing marks is matter of taste, or, more correctly speaking, of convenience. Sir William Jones objected to the ordinary modes of characterising long and short vowels as properly belonging to prosodial distinctions; and as the use of accents was familiar to some of the European languages, he preferred their employment, and distinguished the long vowels by the acute accent in the middle of words, and by the grave accent in the last syllable: he also characterised the cerebral consonants by the accent. Dr. Gilchrist's representation of the vowels proceeded on a different plan altogether, and he expressed them by special equivalents. In his earliest scheme he distinguished peculiar consonants by small circles above them, as *i*, *d*, &c.; but in his final alphabet he substituted dots underneath *t*, *d*, *s*, *z*, *z*, and the like. Mr. Shakespear, in his Hindustani Dictionary, uses both, lines above or below, and dots underneath, as *ā*, *ī*, *k̄h*, *ṣ*, *ṣ*, &c.; and Mr. Crow proposes, in various instances, a line, or a line and dot, below the letter, as *ā*, *ī*, *k̄*, *k̄*. It seems inexpedient, however, to diversify the diacritical marks beyond the distinction of vowels and consonants, and the acute accent may be reserved for the long vowel, and dots underneath for the peculiar consonants: the latter have the advantage of being typographically more convenient, of being unobtrusive to the eye, and of being easily multiplied with any number of modifications of the original sound, as will be hereafter shewn.

V. The vowels are to have the powers which they enjoy in most languages except English, and especially in Italian; and, as in Latin, quantity is not to be represented by a difference in the letter, the long and short vowel being held to be one and the same letter, the former being distinguished by the acute accent in whatever part of the word it may occur, as *a*, *á*, *i*, *í*, *u*, *ú*.

It is in this respect that Dr. Gilchrist's system differs radically from that of Sir William Jones, and violates the rule with which we set out, as well as the preceding, in representing one vowel, varying only in the accident of quantity, by two or more, as the short *a* by *u*, the long by *a*, the short *i* by *i*, the long by *ee*, the short *u* by a new character, which he proposed to be *ω*, and the long *u* by *oo*. There is no doubt that these equivalents represent to an English eye and ear the sounds of the original vowels more readily than the unaccented *a* or the accented *í* and *ú*; but they do not represent the original letters, and do not preserve alphabetical identity. A vowel is the same letter, whether it be long or short, and in most languages, in our own, is so written. To represent the long vowel by one symbol and the short by another is to create a distinction where none exists, and to disjoin words which are closely connected. To change the short *a* and leave *á* to represent the long, divides words which are essentially identical, and places one at the head and the other at the tail of a dictionary. *Dabee*, for instance, and *dubea*, are radically the same

## PREFACE.

latter occurs in Sir Henry Elliot's Supplement at an interval of forty pages from the former; in the compilation, as *Dábi* and *Dabíá*, they come as they should do together. However accommodating, to national peculiarities, the Gilchrist vowel system will never be universally adopted; and accented *á* does not form an element in any of the schemes proposed for the Missionary alphabet. We shall on a further occasion advert to this part of the subject.

VI. Consonants of the same elementary sound, modified only by pronunciation, but expressed by different symbols, are to be expressed by one and the same symbol, distinguishing it as the equivalent of the original sign by dots underneath the letter, multiplying them according to the multiplied variety of the original sounds.

The multiplied modifications of sounds may be expressed by separate signs in the same alphabet, but they may occur in different alphabets with their respective representations. Thus we have five or six nasals in the Hindu alphabets, and five modifications of *z* in the Semitic alphabets, each of which it is necessary to represent separately, both with regard to the appropriation of the word to the language to which it belongs, and to discriminate between words of very different significations, although very nearly similar forms. Thus, in Arabic, *ku* means "all;" in Karnáta, *ku* is a payer of government revenue: they are not the same word, however, even in form: the final *l* of the Karnáta word being peculiar to its alphabet in figure, and slightly, perhaps, in pronunciation: it is therefore distinguished from the ordinary *l* which the same alphabet also possesses by a dot underneath. *Pát*, in Hindi, is "a leaf;" *Pát*, in Maráthí, is "a plank:" the difference is in the *t*, which in the latter, is the cerebral, in the former, the dental letter: the cerebral then is to be distinguished by the dot. *Túr*, Persian, is "a wire;" *Túr*, Hindi, "a palm-tree:" the hard *r* indicated by the dot marks an essential difference. In the mouth of a native there is no doubt a different enunciation of these apparently identical words, but the distinction is not easily caught by the European ear; and as the general articulation is the same, it does not require to be represented by any other than a modified symbol. In proportion as these varieties increase, the diacritical dots may be multiplied to any required extent without becoming obtrusive or uncouth, as would be the case with accents; *ñ*, for instance, is typographically less offensive than *ñ*. In some cases the marks may be dispensed with, as in that of the nasals, the value of which is commonly determined by the following letter, and *n* before *k* or *g* would be necessarily the guttural nasal, and *n* before *ch* and *j* the palatal letter; and, except for the sake of systematic consistency, would not need to be distinguished as *ñ*, *ñ*. It has been proposed in the scheme for the Missionary alphabet to represent peculiar consonantal symbols by italics, or the cerebrals of the Nágari alphabet for instance, *t*, *d*, by *t*, *d*; but, besides that the presence of an oblique italic letter amongst the upright broad-faced Roman letters were offensive to the eye, the contrivance would be able to represent only a single modification. It could not, in the case of *t* be extended to the Arabic *to* (*ط*), and it could not be possible to repeat an italic *z* three times over to represent the Semitic letter *z* (*ظ*), although that may be easily typographed as *z*. The argument in favour of the italic letter is, that all founts are already provided with *them*, and not with dotted letters: the latter can, however, be provided with equal facility, if required.

VII. The aspirates of the original letters must be represented in European alphabets by a double letter, or the proper equivalents with the addition of *h*, as *kh*, *gh*, &c., considering the composite as representing a single sound.

We have here some slight difficulty as regards the English alphabet in the forms and powers of *ch*, *th*, *sh*: these, to be consistent, should be treated as aspirates, which they are not; and they therefore constitute exceptions to the rule, that a single consonant with *h* added is to be regarded as a single aspirated letter. In order to avoid the dilemma, Sir William Jones proposed to distinguish the aspirates by an apostrophe, separating the aspiration above, as in *aswat'ha*; Dr. Gilchrist, by a comma below, as *b,h*, *k,h*, &c.; but these distinctions are inconvenient and scarcely necessary. There can be no misconception as to *ch* and *sh*, which in English and in Russian, as well as in the Indian alphabets, are simple sounds. *Th* with the sound of *theta* is not of frequent occurrence, and, if it be thought expedient, may be distinguished by a diacritical mark as a line underneath it, *th*, or even the Greek letter Θ might be borrowed, as it would harmonise well enough with the Latin characters. So, if it be considered indispensable that a single symbol should be always employed for a single unaspirated sound, the Russian *ch* (ч) and *sh* (ш) might be pressed into the service.

VIII. When it is necessary, as it is in the monosyllabic languages, and in some of those of barbarous nations, to express intonations, these may be designated by conventional marks or figures placed above or

PREFACE.

the letters, as has been proposed in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. IV. No. 2, by C.W. Bradley, late Consul at Amoy; but we have no concern with these at present in the languages of the people subject to the government of British India.

In conformity to the tenor of the rules thus laid down, I have adopted for the representation of the principal words that occur in the subsequent pages the system of equivalents described in the following Table, in which it will be observed that the characters of the English alphabet have been enabled to represent letters, in nine alphabets of thirteen Indian languages, without the introduction of a single new character. I may not be found invariably to have adhered to the scheme as it appears in the Table, partly from my not having definitively determined all the equivalents when the compilation was commenced, partly from occasional inattention or forgetfulness, and partly for special considerations strongly recommending a departure from uniformity. These deviations are, however, only occasional, and the Table may be accepted as embodying the plan which I have conclusively adopted, and which I think will be found to provide for the representation of all the alphabetical symbols hitherto known in India. The progress of events may bring other alphabets within the range of similar representation, and to them the principles of the scheme will admit, it may be expected, of its adaptation.

ENGLISH.	ARABIC. PERSIAN. URDU.	SANSKRIT. HINDI. MARATHI.	GUJARATHI.	BENGALI.	URIYA.	TELEGU.	KARNATA.	TAMIL.	MALAYALAM.
a	ا	अ	અ	অ	అ	ఆ	ಆ	அ	അ
á	آ	आ	આ	আ	ఆ	ఆ	ಆ	ஆ	അ
â	ع	अ	అ	অ	అ	ఆ	ಆ	ஆ	അ
Ai ai	آئ	आइ	આઈ	আই	ఆ	ఆ	ಆ	ஆ	അ
Au au	آؤ	आऊ	આઠ	আউ	ఆ	ఆ	ಆ	ஆ	അ
B b	ب	ब	બ	ব	బ	బ	ಬ	ப	ബ
Bh bh	بھ	भ	ભ	বھ	బ	బ	ಬ	ப	ബ
Ch ch	چ	च	ચ	চ	చ	చ	ಬ	ச	ച
Chh chh	چھ	चह	ચહ	চহ	చ	చ	బ	ச	ച
D d	د	द	દ	দ	ద	ద	ಬ	த	ദ
Dh dh	دھ	दह	દહ	দহ	ద	ద	బ	த	ദ
D d	د	द	द	द	ద	ద	బ	த	ദ
Dh dh	دھ	दह	दह	दह	ద	ద	బ	த	ദ
E e	ع	इ	ઇ	ই	ఇ	ఇ	ಬ	ஏ	ഇ
E é	ع	इ	इ	ই	ఇ	ఇ	బ	ஏ	ഇ
F f	ف	फ	ఫ	ফ	ఫ	ఫ	ಬ	ஃ	ഫ
G g	ج	ग	గ	গ	గ	గ	ಬ	க	ഗ
Gh gh	جھ	गह	గ	গ	గ	గ	బ	க	ഗ
Gh gh	جھ	गह	गह	গহ	గ	గ	బ	க	ഗ
H h	ح	ह	హ	হ	హ	హ	ಬ	ஃ	ഹ
H h	ح	ह	ह	হ	హ	హ	ಬ	ஃ	ഹ
H h	ح	ह	ह	হ	హ	హ	ಬ	ஃ	ഹ
H h	ح	ह	ह	হ	హ	హ	ಬ	ஃ	ഹ
I i	ي	इ	इ	ই	ఇ	ఇ	బ	இ	ഇ
I í	ي	इ	इ	ই	ఇ	ఇ	బ	இ	ഇ
J j	ج	ज	జ	জ	జ	జ	బ	ஃ	ജ
Jh jh	جھ	जह	जह	জহ	ज	ज	బ	ஃ	ജ
K k	ك	क	క	ক	క	క	బ	க	ക
K k	ك	क	क	ক	క	క	బ	க	ക

PREFACE.

ENGLISH.	ARABIC. PERSIAN. URDU.	SANSKRIT. HINDI. MARATHI.	GUJARATHI.	BENGALI.	URIYA.	TELUGU.	KARNATA.	TAMIL.	M
Kh kh	خ ک	ख	ख	খ	ख	ఖ	ಖ	க	ख
L l	ل	ल	ल	ল	ল	ల	ಲ	ல	ल
M m	م	म	म	ম	ম	మ	ಮ	ம	म
N n	ن	न	न	ন	ন	న	ನ	ந	न
O o	و	ओ	ओ	ও	ও	ఓ	ಓ	ஓ	ओ
P p	پ	प	प	প	প	ప	ಪ	ப	प
Ph ph	ف	फ	फ	ফ	ফ	ఫ	ಫ	஫	फ
R r	ر	र	र	র	র	ర	ರ	ர	र
Ri ri	ر	रि	रि	রি	রি	రి	ರಿ	ரி	रि
S s	س	स	स	স	স	స	ಸ	ச	स
Sh sh	ش	श	श	শ	শ	శ	ಶ	ச	श
T t	ت	त	त	ত	ত	త	ತ	த	त
Th th	ث	थ	थ	থ	থ	త	త	த	थ
U u	و	उ	उ	উ	উ	ఊ	ಊ	ஊ	उ
V v	و	व	व	ব	ব	వ	ವ	வ	व
W w	و	व	व	ব	ব	వ	ವ	வ	व
X x	خ	ख	ख	খ	খ	ఖ	ಖ	க	ख
Y y	ي	य	य	য়	য়	య	ಯ	ய	य
Z z	ز	ज	ज	জ	জ	జ	ಜ	ஜ	ज
Zh zh	ز	ज	ज	জ	জ	ज	ज	ஜ	ज
Z z	ز	ज	ज	জ	জ	ज	ज	ஜ	ज
Z z	ز	ज	ज	জ	জ	ज	ज	ஜ	ज
Z z	ز	ज	ज	জ	জ	ज	ज	ஜ	ज

## PREFACE.

### R E M A R K S.

*A* *a* represents the short *A* of the Indian alphabets; it is found in English plentifully as an initial, as in "more, amend, above." It occurs also as a medial in "woman," and as initial and final in "America," in all which has the dull sound of the common English *u* in "bud, but." It is the equivalent proposed by Sir William Jones, although he allows its alternating with *E*, a licence incompatible with our Rule I. The *A* has had the concurrence of Sir Charles Trevelyan, of the Calcutta Missionaries, Mr. Shakespear, Mr. Crow, and has been most usually adopted in the Transactions and Journals of the several Asiatic Societies. The proposed Missionary alphabet suggests for the short vowel *æ*, *ě*, or *ǒ*; but these are not necessary, and would be inconsistent with Rule I. The same objection applies to Dr. Gilchrist's representation of *a* short, by *u*, however more congenial that may be to the practice of our own language, and although the *a* as representing the short vowel, constitutes a stumbling block in the way of English articulation, which, it must be admitted, it is almost impossible to overcome. It is very difficult, almost impossible, to induce an English reader to pronounce *Man* as *Mun*, *Pan* as *Pun*, *Sab*, *Sub*, *Thag*, *Thug*, and the like; but the difficulty may be surmounted with a little perseverance, and the spelling must be adhered to if consistency is to be observed. In conformity, however, to the prevailing prejudice, I have frequently inserted, in leading Hindustani words, especially, the Gilchrist reading, as in *Man*, *Mun*, *Thal*, *Thul*, as parallel with the more correct form. Since, in the Index the letter *U*, either as an initial or medial, occurs twice over, the words that first come being identical with those having an initial or medial *A*, those that succeed having the proper vowel or Italian *U*, they are separated by a short line, thus, *Bhuda*, *Bhudahur*, equivalent to *Bhada*, *Bhadahar*, and the like, precede and are distinct from *Bhu*, *Bhuband*; and *Bubool*, *Buboor*, precede and are distinct from *Bû*, *Bub*, *Bubu*, and the like. Leading words commencing with *U* as *A*, or as the vowel proper, are also separately classed.

The short *A* of the other Indian alphabets is pronounced commonly in Bengálí as *O*, but it is not so written, the Bengálí being essentially the same as the Nágari alphabet, and the value thus given to the vowel is merely provincial, and, in some degree, a vulgarism. I have not, therefore, altered the spelling, as the object of all the above equivalents is not the sound but the symbol, the letter as it stands in its own alphabet, and not as it may happen to be enunciated.

*Á á* is our letter in "far, car," expanded sometimes, in the pronunciation of Arabic and Persian words into a broader sound, as in "ball, fall, water." It is admitted by all the systems as representing the long vowel. In the table it is distinguished, after Sir William Jones, by the acute accent. Dr. Gilchrist uses it unaccented, as he does not need to distinguish it from the short *A*; Mr. Shakespear marks it by the prosodial mark, a line above the letter; Mr. Crow would designate it by a similar line underneath; but there does not seem to be any reasonable objection to the accent.

The Arabic letter *ع* has always constituted a difficulty, owing not only to its peculiar articulation; but to its combining with the different vowel-sounds of *a*, *i* and *u*. Hence Meninski proposed to retain it unaltered, in which he has been followed by Richardson, Sir Charles Wilkins, and Mr. Johnson, and, in an abbreviated form, by Mr. Shakespear. Sir William Jones adopted this modification in his Grammar, but proposed in his Memoir to distinguish it by a circumflex, as *á*, *í*, *ú*, which plan has been here adopted; the appearance of the character itself in the midst of English letters being anomalous, and, to persons not acquainted with the Arabic alphabet, unintelligible, as for *DuÁát*, *Duġát*, or for *Áhd*, *ġahd*, for *RabÁ*, *Rabġ*, for *Khildt*, *Khilġt*: Sir Charles Trevelyan agrees with Dr. Gilchrist in expressing it by a dot under the vowels: Mr. Crow would employ two dots; but as the letter is a peculiar one, it is perhaps best distinguished by a peculiar diacritical mark of its own. Its representation by 'h' in the proposed Missionary alphabet would be wholly inadequate to its verification, as in *Ámlah*, *Ílm*, *Ómr*, and the like.

The diphthong *Ai* occurs in the word "aisle." For *Áu* we have only, in English, the representative sound of *ou*, as in "hour," but the compound is *a+u*, not *o+u*; and the above therefore follows Sir William Jones's plan, which is generally concurred in. Dr. Gilchrist proposed to express them by *ue* and *uo*, but few even of his disciples have followed him. Mr. Elliot generally writes them *ei* and *ou*, as in *Beis* for *Bais*, *Gour* for *Gaur*.

*B* is uniformly rendered, as in "beat, bad." The aspirate *Bh*, as Gilchrist observes, may be represented in "abhor" dropping the initial; but it may be doubted if we have any exact equivalents in English for these

aspirated letters other than by the addition of the *h*, which, with the unaspirated letter, is to be regarded, as it is in the Oriental alphabets, a simple sound.

The scantiness of the Tamil alphabet, comprising but eighteen consonants, has compelled the assignment of multiplied powers to certain of the letters, to enable them to express the Sanskrit words with which the language is copiously infused: hence the equivalent of *B* □ is also that of *Bh*, and is not especially the representative of *P* and *Ph*: the differences of value depend, in this case and in the analogous instances of *K* and *T*, upon the position of the letter. As an initial, the □ represents *P*, and so it does when double in the middle of the word; but when single as a medial it represents either *B* or *Bh*. Thus, *Mahábhāra* is written in Tamil letters *Makápúrata*, but it is pronounced by native scholars correctly according to Nágari valuation. Some difficulty occasionally occurs with regard to the reduplication of these letters as medials. According to Beschi, the reduplication has only the effect of preserving for the letter its proper sound, as *pagaippán* is nothing more than *payaipán*. Rhenius, however, says that both are to be pronounced hard, as in *iruppu*, not as Beschi would make it, merely *irupu*. The preservation or rejection of the duplicate can only be determined by practice, the only essential point being the retainment of what may be considered the especial value of *P*, *K*, and *T*, as a medial when repeated.

*C*, except in the combination *Ch*, does not occur in the above scheme. Sir William Jones employed it to represent the *K* of the Nágari alphabet, retaining the *K* for the harsher Arabic guttural; but in that case we employ two letters to represent but one, for the Arabic is only a modification of the guttural, not a distinct power. *C*, in English also, is an inconsistent letter, having, in fact, no power of its own but that of *K* before *a* and *o*, and of *S* before *e* and *i*: its use is therefore apt to mislead. It took me some time to read Sir William Jones's *Cocila*, not as *Kosila*, but *Kokila*, as it should be: so in a word in common use, *Circar*, we have one letter for two sounds, and two sounds for one letter, a breach of all system. *C* is therefore altogether discarded, except in the form of *Ch*, which, although written with two letters, is as much a simple sound in English as it is in Sanskrit. Mr. Crow proposes to represent it by *C*, but all other English orientalists retain the combination. The sound is peculiar in some degree to English and Russian, although the Italians have it in *ce* and *cio*; and its representation as *tch* or *tsch* in French and German is no doubt somewhat uncouth. For this reason, as well as to distinguish it from the guttural *ch*, as in *macht*, *nicht*, the German orientalists have latterly represented it by *κ* with an asterisk, as *κ'*, and in the proposed Missionary alphabet the italic *K* is suggested. To this I have already objected, as employing one letter to represent two different letters, and therefore a violation of an important principle. There seems no reason for the non-adoption of the English form: in either case the equivalent is conventional: *κ'* or *K*, with the sound of *Ch*, is quite as much an innovation as would be the graft of *Ch* itself on the German alphabet. The power it possesses must be explained and agreed upon in either case equally, and its being confounded with the guttural *ch* might be obviated by a diacritical point or *çh*. If, however, a single symbol that could not be mistaken for any thing else were thought indispensable, it would be preferable to borrow the Russian *ч*. For English uses, however, it will be far the most convenient to preserve the combination. The aspirate of *Ch* or *Chh* is to be considered as a single sound.

Here, again, we have a case of the assignment of more than one power to one symbol in the Tamil alphabet, and *Ch* can only be expressed by *ç*, which has to do duty also for *J*, for *S*, and for *Sh*. It has the power of *Ch* when double, as a medial following certain letters or *ç*, or when single following *t*, as in *kúniyátchi*. In Telugu, *Ch* before certain vowels has the sound of *Ts*, as *J* has that of *Dz*, but these are dialectical peculiarities, and do not alter the identity of the letter.

*D* and *Dh*, as dentals, require no comment: they are the same in all systems. But we have another *D* and *Dh* which are cerebrals, and are pronounced harder than the dentals, the *d* especially often becoming in pronunciation like a rough *r*, as *ghoda* is pronounced *ghora*. The letters, however, are the same. We have only to deal with modifications of sound, and these may be distinguished in all the consonants by a dot or dots underneath. Sir William Jones distinguished them by accents; but besides the advantage of confining the accent to the vowels, the form of the *d* renders an accent over it, as *đ*, typographically inconvenient. Dr. Gilchrist's final use of the dot, concurred in by Mr. Shakespear and Sir C. Trevelyan, has been adopted.

The representation of *D* in the English alphabet by the same letter in the Oriental alphabets has one exception, and we have nothing for it in Tamil, as observed above, but *T*, which has the power of *T*, *Th*, *D*, or *Dh*, according to its position: it is *T* as an initial, or as a medial when double; it is *Th* or *D* when medial and single.

*E* has the power of the vowel in French or Italian rather than in English, but we have it in the word "there." In Sanskrit, it is always a long vowel, but in some of the languages of the south of India a more prolonged sound is sometimes given to it, and different symbols are employed for it. Sir William Jones and Dr. Gilchrist both represent it by one symbol, *E*: the former accents it, as in *Véda*; but I have thought it better to retain the accent for the more prolonged sound. The proposed Missionary alphabet suggests the italic *E* for the long letter.

*F* occurs with the same power in the Semitic alphabets. In the Indian dialects it has no representative, but the aspirated *P* or *Ph* takes its place, as *Faisala*, *Phaisala*.

*G* is the English letter in "go, gun," *Gh* in "ghost." In the two leading systems *Gh* is written *g'h* and *g,h*, but Mr. Shakespear and Sir Charles Trevelyan are satisfied with *gh*. The harsh Arabic guttural is a mere modification of the same sound, and is therefore indicated by *Gh*. Jones and Gilchrist rendered it simply by *gh*. Shakespear underlines it *gh*.

For reasons already urged—the inconsistency of representing two different symbols by one, although in this case sanctioned by the practice of our own alphabet—I must object to the use of *G* with the power of *J*, as in "gin, general," as adopted by the German orientalists in the form of *G'*, or as in the proposed Missionary alphabet in that of the italic letter *G*.

*H* occurs in various modifications in the Oriental alphabets, but they are mere modifications of the simple breathing, and may therefore be easily discriminated by dots: the two that are derived from the Arabic alphabet are not very nicely distinguished in Indian pronunciation. One may be something harsher than the other, and so far agrees with the strong Sanskrit aspirate, whilst the softer breathing of the Nágari alphabet, the Visarga, or sign of the nominative case, may be regarded as peculiar. Sir William Jones distinguishes the harsher forms by an accent, as *Ahmed*. Gilchrist and Shakespear distinguish it by a dot underneath it. I have transferred the dot to the softer Arabic aspirate, as otherwise it would have been applied to two letters instead of one, which would be typographically less convenient. I am afraid, however, I have not always observed or rightly applied the diacritical mark, having for some time hesitated as to its preferable application. The representation of the unmodified flatus by an apostrophe, in the proposed Missionary alphabet, as *ve'ement* for "vehement," is too uncongenial to European habits to be readily concurred in.

*I* short is as familiar to English as to the Continental languages, as in "kin, king." *I* long is less familiar, but we have it in "police, pique, ravine." The accent is according to Sir William Jones. Gilchrist, as observed above, represents it by *ee*, which is objectionable on principle.

*J* in English, as in "just, join," corresponds exactly with the same letter in the Oriental alphabets. Foreign alphabets have it not, and, as has been observed, German writers propose to render it by *g'* or by the italic *G*; but this has been already objected to, as using one letter to represent two sounds; and, as of *Ch*, it may be said there seems no good reason why so convenient a symbol should not be borrowed from the English alphabet. The objection as relates to German is its present power in that language of *Y*; but as *g'* for *J* is equally strange to that alphabet, there is no ground for preferring one conventional sign to another, especially when the one is a fact as regards English, the other a fiction as regards both English and German. The aspirate *Jh* will follow the general analogy.

*K* is generally employed with its simple guttural power, as in "keep, king." The strong choking guttural of the Arabic alphabet is only a modified sound, which may be expressed by a dot underneath, as *K*. Sir William Jones, as above stated, reserved the *K* for the Arabic letter, and employed *C* for the simpler guttural. Gilchrist employed for the former, *Q*, without its usual qualification *Qu*, as in *Qazi*, in which he is followed by Sir C. Trevelyan. Shakespear marks it, as here proposed, by a dot underneath, which seems the simplest and most consistent mode of distinguishing it. To the use of *k'* or the italic *K* as the representative of *Ch*, I have already objected. The aspirate *Kh* is analogous to the preceding aspirates, and is to be regarded as a simple sound. There is also a minor aspiration as a final in Hindustáni, arising from the omission of the following short vowel in the original, as *Bhukh* for *Bhukha*. This may be distinguished by a dot under the *h*, as *h Bhukh*; but it is not perhaps material. Mr. Shakespear distinguishes it by a double dot under the *h*, as *hh*.

*L*, as in "Lord," needs no remark; but there are two other modifications of this semivowel which require to be distinguished. One of them, the *L* of the Vedas, is used in Maráthí, and in several of the languages of the south, being a rather harsher sound: this I have denoted as *L*. The other is peculiar to Tamil. Beschi says it is an *L* "quod crassiori sono reflexa omnino ad interiorem palati partem linguâ pronunciat. Anderson calls it a cerebral *r* when medial, a cerebral *l* when final. Rhenius directs it to be pronounced



as *lr*; but the late Mr. Ellis represented it *sy zh*, and he is followed by Mr. Clarke. As, however, there is sufficient authority for its being a modification of *L*, I have preferred adhering to that letter, marking it by two dots, as *ḷ*. The enunciation is singularly obscure, and cannot be precisely represented by any written characters.

*M*, as in "mbuth, mother," is the same labial in the Oriental languages as in English. In Hindustani it is often represented before a labial by *n*, as in *Bambu*, sometimes written *Banbu*.

*N* offers a greater variety of symbols. There are four in the Nágari alphabet, all which exist in English although not distinguished by separate letters, the distinction not being in the letter itself so much as in the influence exercised upon it by the letter that follows it, as a guttural, palatal, cerebral, or dental, as in the words "sink, change, ant, end," as I have shewn in my Sanskrit Grammar, p. 5. Hence it is, perhaps scarcely necessary to provide the symbols severally with diacritical points, but they are added for the sake of consistency, as *n̄*, *n̆*, *n̈*, *n̊*. There is another *n* which is peculiar to the Tamil alphabet, although little different from the dental nasal in sound; this I have marked as *ṅ*. Again, in Hindustáni, and still more in Guzeráthi and Maráthi, there is a nasal, usually a final, though sometimes a medial, which is scarcely sounded, although it gives a sort of nasal quality to a preceding vowel, like the *n* in the French *bon, soins*: this it is proposed to denote by a small circle below the letter *ṅ*. These marks, however, have not been very rigorously retained in the following pages.

*O*, like *E*, is in Sanskrit always long, but in the southern dialects there is a still more prolated quantity of it, which has been therefore marked by the accent. Perhaps it were more correct to treat the former letter as a short *e* or short *o*; but they are scarcely as short as our *e* and *o* in "bed" or "gone." They hold more of a middle place, and are as often as not of Sanskrit derivation.

*P* requires no remark: it is the English letter in "parent, pair." *Ph* is to be treated as a simple aspirate, as in "up-hill," not as an *F*, although, as there is no equivalent for it in the Indian languages, *Ph* is always used for such Arabic words as begin with *F*, as *Fakír, Phakír*. The use of the Tamil *P* (𑀧) to represent *ph* as well as *b* and *bh* has already been pointed out.

*Q* is discarded from our system. Its employment for the Arabic *K*, as proposed by Dr. Gilchrist, has been noticed.

*R* offers various modifications. The usual semivowel has the sound of the letter in our "round, ruin." We have next a rougher *ṛ*, and its aspirate *ṛh*, which, in Hindustani, alternate with the cerebral letters *ḍ, dḥ*. Gilchrist, considering it as a nominal deviation from *ḍ*, did not think it necessary to assign it a separate symbol; but Mr. Shakespear discriminates it as here done, by a dot underneath. The alphabets of the south, Telugu, Karnáta, and Tamil, have a second and harsher *r*, which is similarly distinguished as *ṙ*. As, however, it is not, like the Hindustáni letter, an alternation of *ḍ*; and as it offers some peculiar changes, it would have been better to have given it its peculiar mark, and written it with two dots, or *r̈*. In that case the third *r* of the Malayálam alphabet should be distinguished by three dots, not by two, as has been done in the following pages. The *ṙ* of the Tamil and the *r̈* of the Malayálam are also, in some respects, identical, as, when doubled, they have the power of a double *rr̈*; thus *Arri* becomes *Arrï*, in which form it appears in the Glossary, this being one of the cases in which a departure from systematic uniformity could scarcely be avoided.

In connexion with *R* we have further to provide for the vowel-sounds of Sanskrit *ri* and *ri̇*, modified in the southern dialects as *ru* and *ru̇*. A dot under the *ṙ*, as proposed by Dr. Gilchrist, is a sufficient distinction, *ri̇, ri̇, ru̇, ru̇*.

The modifications of the sibilant, as occurring in the same, or in different alphabets, require diacritical designations. The simple sibilant of the European and Indian alphabets, whether of Arabic or Sanskrit origin, is expressed by *S*, as in "sun, sound." The palatal *S* of the Nágari alphabet has no exact equivalent in English, but may be indicated by *s̆*, as by Shakespear: it is the *ś* of Sir William Jones. In the dialects it is commonly pronounced, in words of Sanskrit origin, as *sh̆* somewhat softened, and it is so represented by Molésworth, Stevenson, Reeve, and others. The main objection to this is its being confounded with the more genuine representation of *sh̆* in the Sanskrit cerebral, and in our "shore, shun;" and it is not exactly *sh̆*, although a thickened sound of the *s̆*. However, in conformity to a practice so general, I have given, in many instances of leading words, both forms, as *s̆* and *sh̆*. The Arabic alphabet has another form of *s̆*, that called *s̆ád* or *s̆wád*, which, in India at least, is a simple sibilant, although among the Arabs it may have a modified sound; by Erpenius it is called *Dad*, and by De Sacy, *Dhad*, making it a dental, but this is

not observed in India: to distinguish it from the Persian *sh* and Sanskrit *ś* and *ṣ*, two dots are subjoined, as *ṣ́*. A third modification of *S*, agreeably to Indian pronunciation, occurs in what is more properly the English lisping sound of *th*, as "thin, then;" so that *hulth* becomes in India undistinguishable from *suls*. In order to denote the difference it is written in the scheme with three dots below, as *ṣ̣̣̣*. In the Niskh alphabet it is termed *thai muthalatha*, or the trebly doted *th*, the dots being above, as *ثثث*. The *sh* of the Nāgarī alphabet finds an exact representation in the English *sh*, which is not to be considered as an aspirate. It is a continental difficulty; but there seems no great reason why it should not be borrowed from the English alphabet, unless the Russian form be preferred, which has the advantage of being a single symbol.

*T*, the simple dental, has the same power in both families of languages as in English "tune, time." It occurs also as the cerebral letter in the English "ten, trumpet," and the Italian *tutto*. Its representation of *d* in Tamil has been explained above. In some of the dialects of the west and south, the dental *T* is pronounced almost like the English *th* in "thin;" but this is provincial, and the alphabetical character is merely *T*. *Th* and *T̄h*, dental or cerebral, are to be regarded as simple aspirates, and never as the English *Th* in "think." If ever necessary to represent this sound, it might be done by placing the dot under *h*, as *T̄h*, or by the use of the Greek Theta. The Arabic *to* (*b*) has, in that language, its peculiar articulation, but it is still only a modified *T*, and in India no difference is made. It is sufficient to distinguish it by a double dot as *Ṭ̣*, as is done by Mr. Shakespear.

Although, as a principle, the representation of pronunciation is not attempted in the present scheme, yet occasional departure from the rule is not always to be avoided, as has been instanced in the case of the double *r* of the Tamil and Malayalam becoming double *tt*. So, in the latter language, the cerebral *t̄*, although correctly written, is with a singular perversity, so constantly pronounced as a cerebral *d*, and that in words of constant recurrence, that to have adhered to the proper form would have tended to produce greater perplexity than a breach of the rule; thus *kud̄i*, and its derivatives *kud̄iān*, &c., are properly written *kuti*, and *nād̄* is written *nāt*; but they would not be recognisable under the correct spelling, and in these cases *d* has been substituted for *t̄*.

The vowels *U* and *Ū* have the Italian sounds proposed by Sir William Jones, and concurred in by Sir Charles Trevelyan, Mr. Shakespear, and the majority of authorities: we have the sounds as well as symbols in "full" and "rule." Shakespear marks the long vowel by the prosodial mark *ū*; Mr. Crow by the same under the letter *u*. Dr. Gilchrist adopts *oo* for the long *u*, and suggested a new combination, *ω*, for the short. His disciples, however, have abandoned this form, and are content to write both the vowels in the same manner, as in the English words, "foot, fool." The proposed Missionary alphabet distinguishes the long vowel by the italic letter *u*.

*V* has the same sound in Sanskrit as in English; but in Bengali and Uriya it is always changed to *B*, in symbol as well as in sound; as *b̄ari* for *v̄ari*, *barsha* for *varsha*. The same change is not unfrequent in Hindi, as *baras* for *varsha*, *sambat* for *samvat*, whilst, in Guzarathi, if we may trust the Dictionary, there is a curious propensity to reverse this arrangement, and write *v* for *b*, as *vighu* for *bigha*, *vmo* for *blma*. In all the dialects, also, there is a perpetual tendency to approximate the sound of *v* to that of *w*, or to substitute the latter altogether. Even in Tamil, in which the pure pronunciation of *v* is preserved according to Anderson and Rhenius, the change is not uncommon, and *v̄aram* is most frequently written *w̄aram*. According to Mirza Ibrahim, the *wau* of Persian should be pronounced *vau*, yet in Hindustani words derived from Arabic and Persian it is quite as often *w* as *v*, as *wakil*, *vakil*, *wazir*, *vazir*. In Marathi, according to Stevenson, we have both sounds, but for the same letter, *v*, the one exactly *w*, the other more like *v*, especially when before *i*, *ī*, and *e*, and combined with *ri* or *r*. In Malayalam, Spring says it is *v*, and only *w* in composition, as *Swarga*. Peel and Bailey make it *w*; but the fact is that which is intimated by Mr. Clarkson, in his Guzarathi Grammar, the uneducated approximate the sound to *v*, the educated to *v*. The use of *w* for *v* is, in fact, a sort of Indian Cockneyism, but as it is very prevalent, I have admitted the *w* to be the representative in various words of the Sanskrit *v*. As a final letter, *v* in the dialects often assumes the power of *u*, as in Guz. *pav* is pronounced *pau*.

It has been sometimes the practice to represent the Sanskrit *ks̄h* by the letter *x*, and there is no great objection to the equivalent; but *ks̄h* is an acknowledged compound of *k* and *sh*, and its representation, therefore, by a single letter would be unsystematic, neither is it necessary; and I have therefore, in the Glossary, always retained the compound form.

The semivowel *Y* finds unequivocal representatives in both classes of alphabets, as in "yoke, young." In Bengali, when uncompounded, its power is that of *j*, a curious contrast to the German, which gives to *j* the power of *y*. The proposed Missionary alphabet retains *y*.

It is quite a characteristic distinction between the Sanskritic and Semitic dialects of India, that the former are utterly destitute of the symbol and the sound of *Z*, whilst in the latter we have no fewer than five modifications. In the original Arabic these letters have individual powers, but with the exception of *zh*, the sound which were best represented by the French *j* in "jour," no difference of pronunciation is made in India. As it is, nevertheless, necessary to preserve the distinctions of the form, for the sake of identifying the Roman with the Arabic orthography, this is effected by the same method that is followed in the case of other multiplied modifications by the number of dots, and the several symbols occur, as *z*, *ż*, *z̈*, *z̄*; *zh* requires no mark, but it is to be regarded as representing a single letter.

By these simple arrangements, then, which do not pretend to the merit of originality, but are derived from the practice of those Orientalists who have devoted the most careful consideration to the subject, the various characters of nine alphabets current in India, amounting to sixty-four, have been, without any difficulty, represented by the twenty-four letters of the English or Roman alphabet. It is no part of the present inquiry to extend the application of the scheme more widely, but the principle could no doubt admit of its extension to all the modifications of those sounds which the similar conformation of the organs of speech in all the races of man establishes in all spoken and written languages. There may be occasional novelties, but the greater portion of articulate sounds must be the same in all languages, and their modifications do not change their identity. The Tamil *l* or *lr* is still an *l*, and the Arabic *kúf* is a *k*; and they may, therefore be expressed by those letters, indicating their modified enunciation and use by diacritical signs. Of course, for the purpose of expressing such signs, special characters must be added to the types now employed in English alone; but the use once established, there would be no more difficulty in furnishing the Roman type intended for printing any foreign tongue, than there is now in equipping a fount with italic letters and the marks of punctuation.

This supposes a systematic plan for the representation of foreign tongues and Roman letters, but without insisting upon a very rigorous observance of the laws of such a system, it is obvious that it is very possible to introduce a scheme of equivalents which will advantageously displace the arbitrary, unphilosophical, and conflicting modes of writing Oriental terms, by which most publications regarding British India have hitherto been disfigured.

Any representation of the words of a language by other than its own characters will, however, be more or less unsatisfactory, and will fail to inspire implicit reliance, unless checked by a comparison with the original letters. I have therefore endeavoured to ascertain the original forms of the words in their respective characters, and place them in contiguity with their English representatives. As the Oriental characters are not given in the official documents, their verification has been effected only by a laborious search through Dictionaries and original authorities. In a very few cases I have been unable to verify the original spelling, and in that case, if the authority was questionable, have omitted the word: when, however, there was reason to believe it genuine, I have inserted the term with a mark of interrogation, as "Máō-Mawása (?) II." In some cases, the doubt has extended to the language, as in the case of "Hari, Haria," where the interrogation takes the place of the initial representing the language. In the case of the slang of the Thags, the words are taken from Colonel Sleeman's Vocabularies, which do not contain the native characters, and rest entirely upon his authority, the English spelling which, in his lists, follows the system of Dr. Gilchrist, having been adapted to that used in the Glossary. The names of the servile tribes, as given in the various public reports on the subject, are also unaccompanied by native characters; and, in general, sad havoc has been made with their orthography. In some cases they have been traced to their originals, and the names of others have been verified, by which, also, a source of much misapprehension, occasioned by looseness of language, has been corrected; as where it is said, in the Bengal Reports, that the slaves are termed *kaits*, *kumars*, *chasas*, *kairatts*, and the like. They are no such thing: these are the names of castes who, for the greater part, are free and independent, but who furnish domestic or prædial slaves, their children being sometimes sold to slavery, or they become bond slaves themselves. There are, no doubt, slaves of these castes, but not by virtue of the caste, which is not necessarily servile.

The original alphabets amount to nine, the Arabic or Niskh character being applicable to Arabic, Persian, and Hindustáni, and the Devanágari to Sanskrit, Hindí, and Maráthí; the others have their respective individual alphabets. The preparation of so many unusual characters has been a matter of much cost, time, and trouble; but it is due to Mr. Watts, the printer of the Glossary, to acknowledge the invariable readiness with which he has supplied the requisite founts, constituting, with other Oriental types in his possession, a richness of Oriental typography which no other press in this country can boast, and which is rivalled only by the Imperial Press of Vienna.

Composition in such diversified and uncommon characters has unavoidably led to some inaccuracies, to the correction of which I have not been myself always sufficiently attentive. My friend, Professor Johnson, has supplied me with some errata, chiefly in Arabic and Persian, and it is probable that other Oriental scholars will discover more. In Tamil I have had the benefit, for the most part, of the revision of Mr. Clarke. But when all the circumstances are considered, the comparative infrequency of Oriental printing in this country, and the impossibility of obtaining qualified assistance in the correction of the press, it will not be thought, perhaps, that the errors are very serious, or exceed a limit that might reasonably be expected.

Some mistakes will, no doubt, be observable, which may be ascribed to an imperfect knowledge of the several languages from which the terms are taken, amounting to thirteen—Sanskrit, Hindí, Bengáli, Uriya, Maráthí, Guzaráthí, Tamil, Telugu, Karnáta, Malayálam, Arabic, Persian, and Hindustáni, besides a few from other dialects. Of course I do not pretend to be conversant with all these tongues. Of some of them I may have acquired more or less knowledge, but of the greater number I have little more than the letters and the most elementary rudiments, sufficient to enable me to consult a grammar and a dictionary. The interpretation of the terms collected, however, it must be remembered, does not usually rest upon my responsibility. Their application, and, in some instances, their explanation also, lies with the authors of the documents whence they have been extracted; and there is evidence that the words are not always consistently used or accurately defined. In general, however, the sense of the words may be made out from the context, and their use is not so much characterised by the want of correctness as by insufficiency of detail and absence of precision. Errors of explanation, however, do occur, as in one report, where *Be-dánistagi* is explained “knowingly,” when it implies exactly the reverse: it is possibly, however, a typographical error for *bú-dánistagi*, which would have the meaning of “with knowledge.” Difference of interpretation, however, may occur, without any mistakes being committed, as the word possibly bears a different sense in different places. *Ahar*, for instance, usually implies a small pond, but in some places it means a continuous embankment. *Chatwar* is explained in one place “the land between the houses of a village and its arable land,” and in another, “the homestead or ground adjacent to a house.” Perhaps this is rather want of exactitude than a different meaning. In a recent document, *Foras* is explained “waste land adjacent to cultivated land, and granted to the cultivators of the latter at a quit rent:” this is not wrong; but a subsequently printed report on the *Foras* lands of Bombay shews that it is not sufficiently comprehensive, the *Foras* lands forming an extensive part of the Island of Bombay reclaimed from the sea, which the inhabitants were encouraged to bring into cultivation by a low rate of rent. These are imperfections which the multiplication of authentic documents will gradually amend.

Even variations of spelling are not always to be regarded as originating in error: they may be local, arising from dialectic peculiarities; and the inability of one alphabet to express the letters of another. *Jarín* for *Zamín*, *Jamíndár*, or even *Jamídár*, for *Zamíndár*, are not wrong: they are the necessary forms which the Arabic words must take in the Hindí, Bengáli, and other Hindu characters, &c.; *Tálluka* necessarily becomes *Táluk* in its Hindu version; and *Máphi* and *Mámlá* represent what are originally *Mudáfi* and *Mudámlat*.

In the arrangement of the contents of the Glossary I have thought it advisable to bring compound and derivative forms under their general parent, as likely to give a more definite notion of their purport. This classification has recommended the occasional introduction of words that may be regarded as not at all technical. *Áb*, “water,” for example, is an ordinary Dictionary term, but I have inserted it at the head of its compounds, such as *Ábdár*, *Ábi*, *Ábistánt*, which have a special or technical application, the force of which will be better appreciated when the meaning of *Áb* is referred to. I have, however, been chary of this extension, and many such general words will not be met with.

\* As a consequence of arranging compounds and derivatives under their respective primitives and radicals, a strictly alphabetical order has been departed from, and this has imposed the necessity of adding an

Alphabetical Index. Such an addition was also indispensable, for another reason, constituting the main usefulness of the compilation. The forms under which native words occur in public documents are much more frequently wrong than right—corrupt and blundering misrepresentations of the original. Yet it is of them especially that the uninitiated reader requires to know the signification; and in order to provide him with this assistance, whatever corruptions have been met with have been inserted. There are probably still more to be found, for it is impossible to affix limits to carelessness and ignorance; but most of those which are most frequent have been, it is believed, included. In order to avoid repetition, as well as to shew what the words ought to be, the corruptions are grouped round the correct form; as, *Kabúliyat*, corruptly *Cabooleat*, *Kabooleat*, *Cubalyt*, *Quobooleut*, *Coobooleat*, *Kubooleeat*, *Kabooleet*, *Cuboolyat*; and the reader meeting with either of these has to turn to *Kabúliyat* only, for its signification; but of course, without a previous knowledge of the correct form, he will be unable to recur to it, and the Glossary would be an instrument of which he could only imperfectly avail himself. This difficulty is obviated by the Index, which is invariably alphabetical, and in which, it is hoped, will be found whatever term may be desiderated, whether correct or corrupt. The references to page and column will not be attended with any material embarrassment: that which is made to the line of each column may be less readily effected from the omission of the figures which should have been inserted at least in fives or tens in the margin; but the advantage of such addition did not occur to me until, far advanced in the work; a little practice, however, will soon render this reference also sufficiently easy, especially as every column contains the same number of lines, or forty-five. The preparation of this Index, the work of my own hand alone, has been attended with some labour and still greater delay, and has retarded the publication. It is, however, at last completed, and will, it is hoped, be found of use to the servants of the Company, and to all who, in England or in India, may wish to understand the objects and implements of the civil administration of the latter country.

Although these preliminary observations have perhaps rather exceeded the limits of an Introduction, it will probably be expected that some account should be given of the several languages from which the words of the following compilation are derived, especially for the benefit of those by whom the diversity of tongues that prevails in the territories of British India may be imperfectly appreciated. This unacquaintance with the polyglot nature of the current speech of India is not confined to individuals who have had no opportunity of personal observation, but may sometimes be evinced by those from whom more accurate information might be anticipated. A distinguished public character, for instance, a member of the late Committee of the Commons for the affairs of India, and long known to be conversant with its interests, observed to me, when I had occasion to mention Malayálam, that it was a language he had never heard of before; yet it is an ancient and cultivated form of speech current through an extensive and well-known tract of country, and the vernacular language of numerous suitors in several of the Judicial Courts and Revenue Collectorates under the Madras Presidency.

The languages of British India resolve themselves into two classes, although in somewhat unequal proportions; the speech that has grown up from an admixture of the original languages of the Mohammadan conquerors with those of the Hindus, Urdú or Hindustání, constituting one class, the other being formed of the different dialects of the Hindus. The former may be considered as perhaps more than equal in extent to any single form of the latter, but it is loosely spread, and at considerable intervals, over the surface. It is concentrated only at the still subsisting Mohammadan courts, as Delhi, Lucknow, Hyderabad. It is elsewhere restricted, in a great measure, to the Mohammadans, by whom, in many parts of India, especially in Bengal, it is greatly corrupted. It is very commonly in use among the native officers of our courts, especially in communication with their European superiors; and it is extensively, although not always accurately, understood by the commercial and trading classes. It is understood, after a fashion, by the Sipáhís of the Gangetic provinces, but the agricultural population are little, or not at all, acquainted with it, even in Upper India. In the South it is, of course, wholly unknown to them, and is very little understood by the other classes. When the College of Fort William was first organised, liberal encouragement was held out to native Hindustání scholars to become instructors, and many of the early teachers were men of high literary distinction among their countrymen. Several of them, under the guidance of Dr. Gilchrist, composed useful books, which were printed, and are still in use. Well-known Grammars and Dictionaries have also been compiled by different European scholars, and ample materials, therefore, are provided for facilitating the acquirement of the language. The Bengal civilian is required to master it as one condition of his employment in the

Lower Provinces; for although Bengálí be the language of the people in most of the districts, yet, besides the use of the Hindustání in the Sadr Courts and in Calcutta, it prevails, in greater or lesser approximation to Hindí in the Zilas of Bahár, Purnea, Tirhut, Sâran, Bhálgapur, and Sháhábád, and is therefore indispensable even in the Presidency of Bengal.

Under the Mohammadan Government the language of judicial and revenue proceedings was Persian, borrowing lavishly from Arabic, in which the principal legal authorities are written; and until within a comparatively recent period, the English Courts followed the example of their Mohammadan predecessors, and all the proceedings were recorded in Persian. Although this is no longer the case, yet the employment of that language, and of terms derived through it from Arabic for centuries, could not fail to influence the spoken languages of the country; and Hindustání comprises a large proportion, perhaps a third, of Arabic and Persian words. They are not wanting in Hindí; and even the purer Hindu dialects of the South, Tamíl and Telugu, are copiously interlarded with technical terms borrowed from this source, and more or less modified to suit the vernacular pronunciation.

As, besides the extensive use of official terms of Persian and Arabic origin, the latter is the language of the authorities of Mohammadan law, it has of course been necessary to comprehend it as well as Persian in a vocabulary of the judicial and fiscal nomenclature of India, as far as it owes its origin to them. A full and authentic description of the principal authorities on Mohammadan law, accessible in India by Mohammadans and Europeans, is to be found in the Introduction to Morley's Analytical Digest.

Although the Sanskrit has not supplied the administration of India with technicalities to the same extent as Arabic, yet, being the language of the laws of the Hindus, it furnishes, in its unadulterated form, a copious vocabulary of words relating to caste, to contracts, to inheritance, to marriage, and to a variety of the incidents of Hindu life; and it still more abundantly pervades the different Indian dialects, supplying them with the ordinary designations of trades and occupations, the terms of agriculture, the names of plants and animals, the affinities of relationship, and an infinity of words connected with the social circumstances of the people in all parts of India which come within the scope of the present compilation. Combined with Arabic, therefore, it forms the great groundwork of the official language of law, of revenue, and of manners and customs throughout British India. The absence of a competent knowledge of it is painfully displayed in most of the official documents, although the works of Colebrooke, Ellis, Sutherland, and Macnaghten, besides sufficient elementary works, render a conversancy with its technology at least of comparatively easy attainment. A like copious and learned account of Sanskrit authorities on Hindu law as that of the authorities of Mohammadan law is given in the same valuable work.

As the most direct offset from Sanskrit, we may begin, amongst the vernacular tongues, with the Hindí, although the term is rather indefinite, being scarcely applicable to any single modification of the language spoken by the thirty millions of the Hindus of Hindustan. Each province may be said to have its own form of Hindí; and in Bahar, Bhojpur, Benares, Bindraban, Delhi, various shades of it are known under the appellations of Mágadhí, the dialect of Magadha or South Behar; Maithilí, that of North Bahar or Purnea and Tirhut; Bhojpurí, that of Bhojpur; Púrbi, Eastern, Braj Bhákhá, or the speech of Braj, and others.

There is, however, a sufficient concordance to render any one form of comparatively easy acquirement to one who, in addition to a competent knowledge of Hindustání, possesses a stock of Sanskrit vocables; for the grammar of Hindí is, in the main, the same as that of Hindustání, whilst nine-tenths of its words are Sanskrit. There is, however, a great want of the necessary helps to its acquirement. The peculiarities of the Hindí dialects have never been investigated, and we have a grammar of only one of them, the Braj, which is somewhat meagre. There is nothing that deserves the name of a Dictionary. The books usually read, the Baítál Pachísí and Sinhâsan Battísí, are little else than Hindustání disguised in Nágari letters; and the Premsâgar is the only work that is an authority of any value. There is, however, a Hindí Literature of some extent, from which serviceable extracts might be made, particularly from the Rámáyana of Tulsi Dás, and the Mahábhârata of Gokulnáth, both of which have been printed, although little known in Europe. From these and other available sources, and from personal investigation, it would be very possible to analyse the specialties of each provincial dialect of Hindí, and thus render an important service to the philology of Gangetic India.

The next immediate offset from the Sanskrit is the language of those provinces of the Bengal Presidency in which Bengálí is current. The Presidency, as already observed, includes districts to which that language

is foreign, and in those in which it prevails, there are, no doubt, important local modifications. The Bengálí of Midnapur is probably somewhat different from that of Chittagong; I say probably, for, if possible, we know less of the dialects of Bengálí than of Hindí. Little was known of the language when the College of Fort William was founded. According to my late friend, Ram Komol Sen, in the Introduction to his English and Bengálí Dictionary, there were no adequate means of knowing much about it from the almost total absence of any literature. With the College came into existence the books at present in use: they were necessarily the work of Pandits, and they were consequently little else than Sanskrit compositions with a Bengálí grammatical structure. Of late years, elementary as well as other works have rapidly multiplied; and a list compiled by the Rev. Mr. Long shews a series of fifteen hundred publications in Bengálí from the presses of Calcutta alone. It is doubtful, however, if sufficient use is made of this opportunity of selection, and the publications in question are liable, for the most part, to the original defect: they are not the language of the people. This character applies, especially to the best dictionaries yet published, those of Dr. Carey and Professor Haughton, both learned and laborious works, but works in which one may look in vain for a large proportion, perhaps the largest, of the spoken Bengálí. Here, again, is an ample field for investigation, the successful exploring of which would be not only of philological but administrative benefit. A real knowledge of the speech of another thirty millions of people should not be an object of indifference to their rulers; nor should the materials for its acquirement be suffered to remain imperfect, even if no loftier aim were entertained than that proficiency in Bengálí, which is required as a condition of public employment from the junior civilian.

Conterminous with Bengálí on the south-west is the province of Cuttak, in which the Uriya language, or that of Orisa, is current. It is framed from the Sanskrit stem, and of near affinity to Bengálí; but it has its own alphabet, grammar, and vocabulary. We have a useful grammar and dictionary of Uriya by Mr. Sutton, but the latter is scarcely sufficiently comprehensive. Of the languages of the barbarous tribes inhabiting the hills and forests of the western portion of the district, the Khonds and Gonds, very little is yet known: the population of the province is estimated at four millions and a half.

Of the direct descendants of Sanskrit, which are current in Central and Western India, Bundelkhand, Malwa, and the Rajput States, nothing is known beyond their general connection with the Hindí family: no attempt has ever been made, except in the Serampur translations of the Scriptures, to obtain any conversancy with them, or convey a knowledge of them to others; yet it is evident, from the quotations made by the late Colonel Tod from the great record of Rájputána, the Prithí Raí Raisa, that the dialects have national peculiarities, which must be acquired before a free intercourse can be maintained with the people. The same may be said of Panjábí, of which, at present, little or nothing is known, except as to its being one of the great Sanskrit family. Since, however, the province has been "annexed," we may hope to become acquainted with its speech, and elementary works are beginning to make their appearance, although on a limited and inadequate scale. A well-digested and comprehensive dictionary should be set about without delay, especially as in the Sikh books there are copious materials for such a compilation, not forgetting, however, as has been too often the case, the spoken language of the people,

Proceeding westward and to the south, we come to two important languages, which are those of the Courts and Collectorates of the Presidency of Bombay—Guzaráthí and Maráthí, both members of the Sanskrit stock. Little has yet been done for the first of these, and for many years we had nothing to apply to but the very elementary work of Drummond, the Rudiments of Guzeráthí and Maráthí, published in 1808. In 1829 a more copious grammar, by Mr. Forbes, of the Civil Service, was lithographed at Bombay, and a second edition was printed in 1845: since then other useful grammars have been published. We have also a dictionary by Mirza Mohammad Kasim, which, although of limited extent, is very serviceable as far as it goes. The population of the country is somewhat uncertain, but it is estimated at about three millions. The Zila Courts in which the language is chiefly required are those of Ahmadabad, Baroch, and Surat.

The language of the Maráthas is still more important, as spoken by a still more numerous body of people, and more diligently cultivated both by natives and Europeans. It has a copious literature of its own, and this has been enriched by translations from English works of literature and science, as Duff's History and De Morgan's Algebra. The Missionaries have also published a great number of tracts and translations. We have several useful grammars and the very best dictionaries of any native tongue in Molesworth's Maráthí and English Dictionary, an improved edition of which is in progress, and Molesworth

and Candy's Dictionary, English and Maráthí. In these works we have what is so much missed in other similar compilations—the language of the people as well as the language of the books. Still, however, something has to be effected, particularly with respect to the dialects of the Maráthí. That spoken in the Konkan, for instance, differs so much from that which is current on the east of the Ghats, that the Serampur Missionaries translated the New Testament into it as if it had been a distinct form of speech, which brought upon them the scarcely deserved severity of the late Colonel Vans Kennedy's criticism. Very possibly there are other modifications of which a knowledge would be of service. The population by whom, in one or other form, Maráthí is spoken, is rated at about eight millions. The Zila Courts in which it is principally current are Ahmadnagar, Ratnágiri, Khandesh, Puna, Konkan, and Sholapur. At Dharwar it is mixed with Karnáta. Formerly, a knowledge of either Maráthí or Guzeráthí was required as a condition of public service by the Bombay Government, but either was made secondary to proficiency in Hindustání; and as it was the practice to attach the young civilian to the Court of a Judge or Collector before his proficiency had been tested, it commonly happened that no test was ever applied, especially with regard to a second language, and the latter was left to independent and voluntary exertion: of course the acquirement was rare. Very recently, however, more stringent measures have been announced, and the Bombay civilian is expected to qualify, in either Maráthí or Guzeráthí, in nine months at furthest, under penalty of removal from the service: the term allowed is something of the shortest.

The Presidency of Madras embraces a greater variety of distinct divisions and of languages than that of Bombay; and here we also lose that direct descent of the native languages from the Sanskrit which is so unmistakably evident in the Hindu languages of Central and Northern India. Modern philology traces those of the South of India to the Ugrian, Tatar, or Mongolian stock, difficult as it is to comprehend how or when the population of the Dakhin immigrated from the steppes of Central Asia. Whatever the origin, however, of these languages, they are dependent upon Sanskrit, in a greater or less degree, for their literature, and for the language of their religion, their institutions, and their government. Although they are all nearly connected, yet there are obviously two main divisions, one comprehending Telugu and Karnáta, the other Tamil and Malayálam; and we shall proceed to offer a few notices of them in that order, derived especially from the remarks of the late Mr. Ellis, the most accomplished oriental scholar that has done credit to the civil service of Madras.

The Telugu, as stated in Mr. Ellis's memoir, forming part of the Introduction to Campbell's Telugu Grammar; is the vernacular language of the Hindus on the coast of Coromandel, extending from the Dutch settlement of Palicat on the south, just above Madras, northwards through the Northern Sarkárs to Chikakol, and spreading westwards from the coast to the frontiers of Maisur on the south, and on the north through part of Berar and the territories of the Nizam; meeting on the north with Uriya, on the west with Maráthí and Karnáta, and on the south with Tamil. It is consequently the language of the Zila Courts and Collectorates of Belari, Gantur, Nellur, Rajamahendrí, Chikakol, Kadapa and Masulipatam, as well as the non-regulation districts of Ganjam and Vizagapatam, and is current, according to estimate, amongst nine millions of people. There are good practical grammars of the language by Messrs. Campbell and Brown, of the Madras Civil Service; and to the former we owe a dictionary, Telugu and English, of which the only defect is its want of comprehensiveness. Reversed dictionaries of English and Telugu have been published by Messrs. Morris and Brown, and the same gentlemen have supplied very useful selections for study: There is a considerable body of literature in Telugu, principally consisting of translations from Sanskrit, which enters extensively into the body of the language. A knowledge of Telugu is required of the civil servant of Madras before he is capable of public employment.

The Karnáta, or, less accurately, the Canarese language, has an alphabet scarcely differing from that in which Telugu is written, and the radicals of the two languages are essentially the same: a large proportion of the words are also the same, whether indigenous or Sanskrit, modified by slight variations of inflexion and peculiarities of pronunciation. There is a literature partly original, but, in a still greater degree, translated from Sanskrit; but no Karnáta works had been printed until lately, when encouragement has been given to the publication of lithographed copies of some popular compositions. We have, however, long had a serviceable grammar and dictionary of Karnáta, the former by Mr. M'Kerrell, a Madras civilian, published in 1820, and the latter, both Karnáta and English, and English and Karnáta, in four volumes quarto, by Mr. Reeves, of the London Missionary Society. The former follows Captain Wilks in his description of the



limits through which the language is in use—from Bedar, north-west of Haidarabad, passing by Adoni and through Nandidrug to the Eastern Ghats, the course of which it follows until it passes by Koimbatour, and, running to the north-west, ascends to the sources of the Krishna, whence it returns to Bedar. It is used also, but with other dialects, on the sea coast in the interval between the Principality of Kurg and the Portuguese territory of Goa, to which tract the designation of Canara is, with questionable propriety, restricted. The Zila Courts where it is chiefly employed are those of Honawar, Mangalur, and Dhárwár; but it is in use generally throughout Maisur. The population of whom it is the vernacular are estimated at about two millions. Encouragement is held out, in the shape of pecuniary rewards to the junior civilians of the Madras Presidency, to acquire some knowledge of Karnáta in addition to those languages which are indispensable, or Tamil and Telugu.

The Tamil language is one of those of which a knowledge is highly essential in the provinces subject to the Presidency of Madras, and it is accordingly one of the two of which the study is now imperative on the Madras civilian. It is the language of the country termed, in Sanskrit, Drávida, comprising the provinces of the Coromandel coast, from a short distance north of Madras to Cape Komorin, and extending inland to the limits of the Karnáta language. • It comprises, therefore, the Presidency Courts, and those of Arcot, Salem, Koimbatour, Kumbhakonam, Trichinapallí, Madura, Tinivelli, and is spoken, it has been estimated, by five millions of people. There are two dialects, or, perhaps, rather styles of it—Shen and Kodun, or high and low Tamil—in both of which there is a copious literature, Tamil having been highly cultivated at as early a date as the ninth century, when a college, established at Madura for its especial encouragement, was in a flourishing condition. Ample means for the acquirement of its structure exists, as the Missionaries of both the Roman and Protestant Churches have long ago contributed ably to its illustration. Beschi's grammar of the common dialect was published in 1728, and that of the higher Tamil has been translated by Mr. Babington. A grammar of the current language, by Ziegenbalg, was printed in 1716. The originals of these were in Latin, but more recently an excellent grammar has been published by Rhenius, in English. We have also an English Grammar by Mr. Anderson. We are indebted to the Missionaries also for Tamil dictionaries, but the first published is printed in an uncouth type and on bad paper, and is now scarce. A much more comprehensive dictionary, Tamil and English, was undertaken by the late Dr. Rottler, and has been printed in four parts. Unfortunately it was left by the compiler unfinished, and it has been printed in a defective state, long lists of Tamil words being inserted without any English interpretation. The portions which are translated form much the larger share, and the manner in which what has been done is effected enhances the regret that some competent scholars should not have been employed to render the work entire. The language is difficult of acquirement, but with these helps it is to be mastered. It is no doubt, in its origin, independent of Sanskrit, but, to judge from the dictionary, admits of Sanskrit insertions, as freely as any other of the southern dialects. It is also peculiar in its dealings with Sanskrit words, so that, without a previous knowledge of the latter, it is scarcely possible to recognise them in their Tamil form. It has, as shewn above, a scanty alphabet. It has no aspirates, and abhors compounds; and therefore substitutes unaspirated letters for the former, and resolves the latter into syllables; *Bhárata*, therefore, becomes *Páradá*, and *Gráman*, *Kiránam*; for *Siva-prakása* we have *Siven-pirikasan*, and for *Taitwam*, *Tattuvan*. It is evident that Tamil scholars who are not Sanskrit scholars also must be continually embarrassed by these equivocal expressions.

Radically related to Tamil, but employing a different alphabet modelled on the Devanágari, and differing very frequently in its grammatical structure, is the Malayálam or Malayálma language, which is spoken along the southern portion of the Malabar coast from Quilon to Cape Kumari. North of Quilon, as far as to Goa, the Tuluva, which is a distinct dialect, although of the same derivation as the Malayálam, is the provincial form of speech, though much intermixed with other dialects, especially Karnáta; and, according to Mr. Ellis, the Koduga or Kurg language is a modification of Tuluva. The Kurg Raja, however, when in England, wrote in the Karnáta character, and declared that to be his native tongue. Besides the relation of the order of the alphabet, the Malayálam abounds, more perhaps than either of the other dialects of the south, in Sanskrit derivations, in a proportion exceeding a half, equal perhaps to three-fifths of the whole under the two heads which Mr. Ellis specifies as common to the dialects of Southern India, *Tat-samam*, pure Sanskrit words, or *Tad-bhavam*, derived from Sanskrit. The *Desya*, or native words of the country, may also be divided into Tamil *Tatsamam*, or pure Tamil, and Tamil *Tadbhavam*, derivatives from Tamil.

There are several serviceable grammars of the language. One was published by Mr. Drummond, of the Bombay Medical Service, soon after the province was subject to British authority, or in 1799;—but this is now superseded by the grammars of Mr. Spring, of the Madras Civil Service, and the Rev. Mr. Peet, of the Church Mission Society. There are also good dictionaries, Malayálam and English, and English and Malayálam, by the Rev. Mr. Bailey, of the same Society. There is a dearth of printed books, but something has been lately done to provide students with the means of study. Malayálam is the language of the Zila Court of Kalikat, or Calicut, and it mixes with Karnáta in the Courts of Honawar and Mangalur. It is spoken by about two millions and a half of people, inclusive of North and South Canara.

These are the principal languages of British India, but there are others which are of growing importance, although not yet forming objects of official requisition. In the north, the Bhot dialects, which spread through the Himálaya districts, are of Tibetan origin, and terms from the latter find their way into the language of administration. The grammar and dictionary of Csoma Körösi are the only means of becoming conversant with the language; and no English scholar has yet trodden in his steps, although Petersburg and Paris can boast of cultivators of Tibetan. The Panjábí, of course, becomes of primary importance; and our intercourse with our neighbours, the Affghans, renders Pushtu a valuable acquisition; but nothing has yet been effected towards facilitating the acquirement of the latter beyond the very circumscribed grammar and vocabularies of Lieutenant Leech, or of the former, except the similar publications of the same intelligent officer, and a grammar, vocabulary, and dialogues, by Captain Sterling. On the west, a knowledge of the language of Sindh has become essential; and here, also, the means are yet limited, although they begin to be supplied in a grammar and short dictionary by Captain Stack. Of the dialects of the Hill tribes on the east, from Asam to Arakan, all that is yet known is from the comparative vocabularies of the Rev. Mr. Brown and of Mr. Hodgson, the object of which is rather comparative than practical. When we get to Arakan we come upon the Burma language, a knowledge of which, since the annexation of the provinces along the coast from Arakan to Tenaserim, is indispensable to the government of an extensive tract of country and a numerous population. There are grammars of the language, sufficient to enable the European to acquire it, by the late Missionaries Judson and Hough, and by Captain Latter. There is also a good English and Burma dictionary, by Mr. Lane; but a comprehensive Burma and English dictionary is still a desideratum. There is a want, also, of printed books, which might easily be multiplied from the copious stores of Burma literature, both historical and Buddhist.

To give liberal encouragement to the preparation and publication of these and similar works in all the languages current in the wide provinces and among the many millions of people subject to its authority is the positive duty and the obvious interest of the Government of British India. Much has, no doubt, been accomplished; but it may be questioned if the encouragement that has been given has been always judiciously bestowed. The efforts of individuals must always be desultory, and will often be ineffective. There wants a systematic course of proceeding, and the selection of competent agents; and it might be worth while to adopt official arrangements for ascertaining what has been done, and what remains to be done, towards providing the civil and military servants of the Company with ample and adequate means of acquiring a command of all the languages through which they may have to minister to the necessities and claims of the different races amongst whom the course of service may call them. In the meanwhile the following pages will, it is hoped, contribute to facilitate their acquirement of the qualifications which are indispensably necessary for the due performance of their important functions—knowledge of the languages, and knowledge of the people, of India.

H. H. WILSON.

LONDON, *January* 1855.

# ERRATA.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
2	1	80	For आवदद read आवदन.
8	1	31	.. Diwani, read Dīwānī.
9	1	17	.. كغز read كغذ.
..	..	..	.. Kāghaz, read Kāghaz.
10	2	7	.. प्रमायं read प्रमायं.
11	2	31	.. Agwasi, read Agwāsi.
13	1	5	.. Mahmud, read Mahmūd.
..	..	20	.. دقتر read دقتر.
..	..	30	.. Jaigir, read Jaigīr.
18	1	5	.. اسامي read اسامي.
15	1	7	.. واحد read واحد.
18	1	20	.. دد read دد.
20	2	42	.. گزار read گزار.
..	..	..	.. Guzār, read Guzār.
21	1	31	.. دقتر read دقتر.
..	..	45	.. دد read دد.
..	2	28	.. دد read دد.
22	1	3	.. Amaváludana, read Amuváludana.
..	..	15	.. Dáhale, read Dáhale.
..	2	11	.. दहले read दाहले.
..	..	6	.. Ambarakkadai, read Ambárakkadai.
23	2	38	.. Múmanín, read Múminín.
25	2	19	.. د read د.
26	2	36	.. دد read दद.
27	1	39	.. Dar, read Dār.
..	..	42	.. Kar read Kár.
29	2	33	.. आपिना read आपिना.
31	2	3	.. Árázi, read Arází.
..	..	..	.. ارض read ارض.
..	..	..	.. ارض read ارض.
33	1	37	.. Pála, read Pala.
36	2	31	.. Asoea, read Asoca.
37	1	1	.. Vāṇa, read Vāna.
..	1	24	.. Śinchana, read Sinchana.
..	..	..	.. शिचन read सिचन.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
37	1	28	For वाडि read वाडि.
..	..	32	.. अडि read अडि.
43	2	7	.. वा read वा.
..	..	34	.. possesson, read possession.
44	1	11	.. m̄aash, read m̄aāsh.
..	..	..	.. معاش read معاش.
46	1	30	.. चालाण read चालान.
50	1	24	.. वेक्या read वेक्या.
..	..	28	.. توجیه read توجیه.
..	..	..	.. Tauji, read Taujīh.
51	1	26	.. Baladasti, read Báládastí.
..	..	..	.. بالادستی read بالادستی.
56	2	10	.. घाटि read घाटि.
59	2	42	.. Banijaga, read Banijiga.
61	1	4	.. Bānsphor, read Bānsphor.
..	..	..	.. بیور read بیور.
..	..	10	.. वंठ, वांठ read वंठ वांठ.
..	..	12	.. वांठा read वांठा.
..	..	16	.. वंठक read वंठक.
..	..	18	.. वंठन, वांठन read वंठन, वांठन.
63	1	43	.. Árázi, read Arází.
..	..	..	.. اراضی read اراضی.
67	2	3	.. वट read वट.
..	..	17	.. वाट read वाट.
68	1	17	.. वाट्टा read वाट्टा.
63	2	15	.. Bhaulī, read Bhaoli.
69	2	5	.. Bāzi, read Bāzī.
..	..	..	.. بعضی read بعضی.
75	1	33	.. फोट read फोट.
84	1	39	.. डूट read डूट.
87	1	28	.. انعام read انعام.
..	..	..	.. Inám, read Inâám.
93	2	5	.. T, read Tam.
97	1	24	.. Árázi read Arází.
..	..	..	.. اراضی read اراضی.

ERRATA.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
101	2	9	.. Chándla, read Chándlá.
102	1	15	.. Chánwál, read Chánwal.
110	1	37	.. Chhar, read Chhár.
110	2	15	.. हटार read हटार.
111	2	7	.. हित read हित.
..	..	20	.. होटा read होटा.
114	1	3	.. टिता read टिता.
120	2	44	.. Phareolus, read Phaseolus.
120	1	23	.. Kazzá, read Kazzí.
..	..	..	.. قضي read قضي.
..	2	35	.. Dáulu read Dáulu.
130	1	24	.. تشخیص read تشخیص.
131	1	23	.. Dehrí, read Dehrí.
135	1	11	.. Dhálbol, read Dhálbol.
136	2	15	.. Dharaṭ, read Dharat.
138	1	15	.. उपाध्याय read उपाध्याय.
154	2	44	.. فكار read فكار.
159	2	21	.. الآ read الآ.
168	2	33	.. مهال read مهال.
180	1	35	.. Goshtashthami, read Goshtsháshthamí.
197	2	37	.. همال read همال.
205	1	7	.. حاضر read حاضر.
..	2	6	.. Huzur, read Huzúr.
..	..	..	.. Guzár, read Guzár.
..	..	..	.. گزار read گزار.
207	1	29	.. هجرة read هجرة.
215	1	27	.. Ikráh, read Ikráh.
..	..	..	.. اقرار read اقرار.
218	2	12	.. Kánungo, read Kánungo.
..	..	..	.. قانونگو read قانونگو.
220	1	31	.. Ishhád, read Ishhád.
..	..	..	.. اشهاد read اشهاد.
..	2	4	.. Ishrák, read Ishrák.
..	..	..	.. اشراق read اشراق.
221	1	10	.. استحقاق read استحقاق.
..	..	27	.. استحقاق read استحقاق.
..	..	34	After lawful, insert استهلا.
..	..	..	.. Istihláh.
..	2	39	For گزاري read گزاري.
222	1	5	.. Istihshád read Istishhád.
..	..	..	.. استشهد read استشهد.
..	1	27	.. Itikáf, read Itikáf.
..	..	..	.. اعتكاف read اعتكاف.
..	..	29	.. Ramazán, read Ramzán.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
225	1	39	For تہانہ read تہانہ.
..	2	14	.. جھیم read جھیم.
227	1	39	.. کاغذ read کاغذ.
..	..	..	.. Kágghaz, read Kágghaz.
229	1	31	.. نحر read نحر.
..	2	22	.. Tashkhía, read Tashkhíyá.
..	..	..	.. تشخیص read تشخیص.
..	..	42	.. Sudr, read Šadr.
..	..	..	.. صدر read صدر.
230	1	44	.. فاسن read فاسن.
231	2	24	.. جانب read جانب.
232	1	1	.. "but," read "as it is."
..	2	31	.. यन्ती read यन्ती.
233	1	17	.. आरी read आरी.
..	2	16	.. کشیدن read کشیدن.
..	..	39	.. Kafífa, read Khafífa
..	..	..	.. خفیفہ read خفیفہ.
235	2	15	.. خانه read خانه.
236	1	18	.. کاغذ read کاغذ.
..	2	25	.. Jazar, read Jazar.
..	..	..	.. جذر read جذر.
240	1	37	.. حساب read حساب.
..	2	35	.. निरायमी read निरायमी.
245	2	4	.. "second," read "last."
249	2	33	Dele "probably the same word."
251	2	36	for भूमि read भूमि.
260	1	26	.. تعلقدار read تعلقدار.
..	2	6	.. کنص read کنص.
..	..	..	.. Kanz, read Kanz.
264	2	29	.. قرار read قرار.
..	..	..	.. Karár, read Karár.
267	2	34	.. Katá al íarík, read Kátá al íarík
..	..	..	.. قاطع الطريق read قاطع الطريق.
268	2	19	.. Katákina, read Katákina.
271	2	8	.. Kávál, read Kával.
273	1	25	.. Kessiriya, read Kessiriya.
274	1	28	.. बाबर read बाबर.
279	2	30	.. Sadr, read Šadr.
..	..	..	.. صدر read صدر.
..	..	36	.. Kad, read Bad.
280	1	12	.. گزار read گزار.
..	..	..	.. Guzár, read Guzár.
..	2	10	.. تعلق read تعلق.
285	1	26	.. Khaín, read Kháin.

ERRATA.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
285	1	26	For خين read خاين.
286	1	9	.. Khém, read Khéni.
289	2	33	Insert, H. (كرانا).
290	1	29	For قرأت read قرط.
297	1	13	.. Krushikudu, read Krushikuđu.
..	..	..	.. కృషికుడు read కృషికుడు.
..	..	..	.. Krushivaludu, read Krushivalađu.
..	..	..	.. కృషివలుడు read కృషివలుడు.
..	2	10	.. Kriya, and the same in the following com- pounds, read Kriyá.
299	2	43	.. قانون read قانون.
300	1	37	.. लेश्य read लेश्य.
303	1	32	.. అంధన read అంధనా.
..	..	..	.. Anchana, read Anchaná.
304	1	35	.. Kuri, read Kuri.
308	1	19	.. Miráj, read Miráj.
..	..	..	.. معراج read معراج.
..	2	4	.. Lakít, read Lakít.
..	..	..	.. لتقيت read لتقيت.
310	2	33	.. لاوارشي read لاوارشي.
312	1	44	.. లిషి read లిషి.
316	1	8	.. Vádu, read Váđu.
..	..	..	.. వాడు read వాడు.
320	1	39	.. مهارة read مهارة.
..	2	27	.. محملانہ read محملانہ.
323	1	13	.. Sadr, read Sadr.
..	..	..	.. صدر read صدر.
..	..	41	.. پیشکار read پیشکار.
..	2	9	.. واجب read واجب.
330	1	26	.. منصبذات read منصبذات.
..	..	..	.. Manṣabzát, read Manṣabzát.
332	1	18	.. مرحون read مرحون.
333	2	24	.. مشرق read مشرق.
335	2	11	.. مطول read مطول.
337	2	21	.. تعلق read تعلق.
..	..	24	.. مزور read مزور.
..	..	35	.. Mázúli, read Mázúli.
..	..	40	.. Mazún, read Mauzún.
..	..	..	.. مزورون read مزورون.
342	1	21	.. آتش read آتش.
..	..	28	.. میر read میر.
344	1	25	.. مزاج read مزاج.
346	1	9	.. محصل read محصل.
346	1	44	.. Mṛigaśirsha, read Mṛigaśirsha.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
349	2	29	For قانونكو read قانونكو.
354	2	5	.. Mulḡ, read Mulḡ.
..	..	..	.. ملك read ملك.
..	..	8	.. Mulḡi, and in the following, read Mulḡi, &c.
..	..	..	.. ملكي read ملكي.
356	2	37	.. ശ്രദ്ധ read ശ്രദ്ധ.
357	2	29	.. مشاع read مشاع.
..	..	..	.. Mushâá, read Mushâá.
358	2	44	.. تاريخ read تاريخ.
..	..	..	.. Tarikh, read Táríkh.
359	1	2	.. متفرق read متفرق.
361	1	36	.. دعوا read دعوا.
364	1	4	.. چیتھا read چیتھا.
..	..	13	.. مذکورات read مذکورات.
..	..	..	.. Mazkúrá, read Mazkúrá.
374	1	18	.. نذرانہ read نذرانہ.
378	1	36	.. Níránambam, read Nírárambam.
..	..	..	.. நீராமபాదம் read நீராமபాదம்.
386	..	..	.. 286, read 386.
408	2	9	.. పత్రుడు read పత్రుడు.
..	..	..	.. Patrudu, read Patruđu.
410	1	22	.. Paṭṭan, read Paṭṭan.
..	2	27	.. Pattaní, read Pattani.
411	1	9	.. ഹൈന്ദവ read ഹൈന്ദവ.
416	2	21	.. Pharnivasi, read Pharnivísi.
419	2	38	.. Pod, read Poä.
421	2	2	.. Porombadom, read Poromkadom.
423	1	8	.. Absolute, read absentee.
..	2	21	.. كاغذ read كاغذ.
429	2	17	.. پرسش read پرسش.
..	..	26	.. प्रश्न read प्रश्न.
430	1	12	.. پشتت read پشتت.
431	1	30	.. العرض read العرض.
432	1	8	.. رفوگر read رفوگر.
..	2	5	.. رهایی read رهایی.
439	2	42	.. نظارت read نظارت.
..	..	..	.. Nazárat, read Nazárat.
At bottom,	..	..	.. 339, read 439.
444	1	37	.. رشته read رشته.
445	2	6	.. Roja, read Roju.
446	1	18	.. روبرکاري read روبرکاري.
..	2	1	.. الشهادات read الشهادات.
446	2	37	.. السرقة read السرقة.

ERRATA.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
447	2	19	For مانوس read مانوس.
451	1	44	.. قاتونگو read قاتونگو.
458	2	42	.. Samba, read Sambá.
462	1	1	.. کانتا read کانتا.
466	1	42	.. Sarufrázi, read Sarfarázi.
468	1	40	.. صغره read صغره.
..	..	..	.. Sughra, read Şughra.
475	2	43	.. دكككك read دكككك.
..	..	..	.. Şevakudu, read Şevakuđu.
481	1	31	.. كاخذ read كاخذ.
..	..	36	.. خانه read خانه.
482	2	30	.. Sîhasái, read Sîhasáhi.
491	2	38	.. Şúchaka, read Súchaka.
..	..	..	.. शुचक read सूचक.
492	2	5	.. शुचि read सूचि.
496	2	20	.. स्वमितं read स्वामितं,
497	1	1	.. Swaist, read Swastí.
..	..	20	.. इवेतामवर read इवेतावर.
..	..	31	.. उपाजित read उपाजित.
498	1	42	.. ضامني read ضامني.
501	1	33	.. تعينات read تعينات.
503	2	19	.. تقسيم read تقسيم.
509	1	31	.. نصف read نصف.
512	1	24	.. تراوي read تراوي.

PAGE	COL.	LINE	
513	1	10	For Taşadağ, read Taşadduğ.
..	..	..	.. تصدق read تصدق.
514	1	28	.. تعطيل read تعطيل.
515	1	30	.. توجع read توجع.
516	2	39	.. Tengalay, read Tengalai.
520	1	17	.. Selection, read Selections.
522	2	20	.. جمبندی read جمبندی.
524	2	4	.. टोनी read टोनी.
530	2	7	.. عذر read عذر.
538	1	34	.. मदि read मदि.
546	2	7	.. Vetkanam, read Vettukánam.
549	2	34	.. ضابطه read ضابطه.
553	1	24	.. گذاشته read گذاشته.
584	2	6	.. تقسيم read تقسيم.
557	1	11	Should be وسيل بالنكاح.
..	..	19	For واسطه read واسطه.
..	..	32	.. वतवधु read वतवधु.
561	2	31	.. ذابح zábîh read ذابح zúbîh.
569	1	14	.. زاده read زاده.
575	1	4	.. దొక్క read దొక్క.
582	2	39	.. قراري read قراري.
590	1	3	.. مؤذن read مؤذن.
592	1	1	.. پیری read پیری.