

in some other known language, or we may "render letter for letter without any particular care to preserve the pronunciation." This latter is the principle suggested by Sir WILLIAM JONES at the commencement of the first volume of the "Asiatic Researches," 1788. Such accurate transliteration is decidedly the more scientific method; and in most languages, including those of India, it possesses in addition the important advantage of allowing one at the same time to give the pronunciation, by a few modifications of the European alphabet.

This rule, however, does not hold good with respect to the languages of savage nations, which are not provided with alphabets; and though not impossible of application, it is at least impracticable for general use in those instances also where the pronunciation materially differs from the spelling, as is the case with Tibetan.

With reference to Hindostáni, the method of Dr. GILCHRIST,¹ which was published soon after Sir WILLIAM JONES's system had been adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society, consisted in an "attempt to render all letters in the Arabic and Persian alphabet by "one or more letters of the English alphabet according to their prevailing sound." The chief objection to this method was that the English vowel system destroyed all alphabetical identity by the substitution of double letters *ee*, *oo*, for *ī*, *ū*, or the separation of *ă* (= *u*) from *ā*; also a certain want of precision in distinguishing the consonants was soon carried so far, that a serious deformation of the words was the result.

Recently, in 1854, some German and English Oriental scholars in connection with the missionary societies of England and America, held several conferences in London under the auspices of the now deceased BARON BUNSEN. Although in discussions so unlimited with reference to the objects over which they are extended, conflicting opinions remained necessarily unsettled, yet it was surprising to see in many other respects, how nearly the principle of "analogy in spelling" can be reconciled with that of "pronunciation."

In writing languages, however, such as Tibetan, or even many of our European idioms (*e. g.* German dialects), it will always remain indispensable to distinguish between "transcription of the sound" and "transliteration," or analogy of spelling.

¹ Grammar of the Hindostanee Language. Calcutta, 1796.