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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>फ़िल्मेन्सी</td>
<td>फ़िल्मेन्सी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>when preceding</td>
<td>when preceding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>लू एम एल</td>
<td>लू एम एल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>की: सुंदरा ता</td>
<td>की: सुंदरा ता</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>इज़फ़ात</td>
<td>इज़फ़ात</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>कमांडे</td>
<td>कमांडे</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>साबर</td>
<td>साबर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>तानविन</td>
<td>तानविन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>मिना-ल्ला: हि इस्मुहु</td>
<td>मिना-ल्ला: हि इस्मुहु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>लाच्च</td>
<td>लाच्च</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unity in Diversity—this is the keynote of India as much as it is of Humanity. We, in India, are all conscious of our various provincial entities; but as a background of that consciousness, there is always present a sense of the Fundamental Unity of India. The diversity that is in Indian life is brought home to us most forcibly by the presence of the various provincial languages. I shall not mention religion, for however bigots and enthusiasts might attempt—and often attempt successfully—to disturb the peace of Indian life, the masses are on the whole sound, and, Hindu or Muhammadan or Christian, they share in a common Indianism or Indianness—in what may be called 'Bhāratīyatā' or 'Bhārata-dharma,' or 'Tahānnud'—that is, in a common Indian attitude, an Indian way of thinking and acting which forms the firm bed-rock below the surface upheavals. The diversity of speech in India has a unifying factor in Sanskrit, the great mother and feeder of the vernaculars, forming a link binding together the provincial languages—barring a few speeches of Muhammadan inspiration like the Urdu form of Hindustani, and Sindhi. In the case of these last, too, judging from the path taken by the great non-Arab Muhammadan languages outside India, viz., Turkish and Persian, which have started movements favouring the restriction (if not the entire elimination) of foreign elements in them (Arabic and Persian in the case of Turkish, and Arabic in the case of Persian), it will not be a wild dream to expect that Urdu and its peers will once again fall back upon the native Sanskrit for ordinary culture-words (retaining, of course, their special Arabic and Persian vocabulary in connexion with the Muhammadan religion), and thus fall in line with their other sister-speeches. But that is a matter for speculation, at present, and not directly connected with our present topic. We are trying to counteract this diversity of speech by other and conscious efforts—by setting up an All-India National Language in Hindustani (Hindusthani, or Hindi) which we are striving to establish both as a current Lingua Franca among our people (which it already is to a large extent) and as a language of political and public life and of high culture among
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our intelligentsia in the place of English. It is doubtful whether Hindustani (Hindi) will ever be able to supplant English entirely, as English is now not a mere national language—it has become international, the unique vehicle of World-culture. But it is quite true that our Indian national unity finds an appropriate symbol in Hindustani (Hindi) which alone has the greatest right to be the National Language of the future Federation of the United States of India, a right which is merely the reiteration of what is largely a fact and which has received almost universal recognition everywhere. Our mind set at rest about the National Language (with only the question of Arabic or Sanskrit in the matter of culture words in it being still undecided—the Indian National Congress has shirked this crux of the question, but to my mind there is not the least doubt that Sanskrit and not Arabic will be the most natural feeder of the National Language of India), the question of a National Script is exercising some of us.

This question of script involves not only the National Language, Hindustani (Hindi), but also our provincial languages; as what we decide for the National Language cannot but have a tremendous bearing on the provincial languages as well.

We have three well-defined types of writing in use in India:

[i] the native Indian system, represented by some dozen provincial scripts all closely related to each other, e.g., Devanāgarī, Bengali, Gujarāti, Kāthi, Gurumukhī, Oriyā, Telugu and Kannāḍa, Tamil, Mālayālam, and Maithili and a few less known, besides Sinhalese, Burmese and Tibetan; of these, the Devanāgarī is the most important, and has a prestige and a prevalence far transcending that of any of the rest, particularly because during the last century it has become the recognised All-India Script for Sanskrit;

[ii] the Perso-Arabic system, comprising Urdu and Sindhi; and

[iii] the Roman, in which among Indian languages the Konkani of Goa is regularly written, besides a number of aboriginal dialects, and to an extremely limited extent Hindustani (Urdu) as used in the Indian Army and among some Hindustani-using North Indian Christians.

Of these, the second can at once be dismissed from consideration, as from the nature of the alphabet it is one of the most imperfect scripts when applied to non-Arab languages; usually it ignores the vowels, and the shapes of many of the consonants are very similar, the divergence among them often consisting only in a number of dots. Besides, it has remained
at the best a subsidiary script, Hindustani being more widely written (albeit in its Hindi form) in the Devanāgarī script than in the Perso-Arabic; and Sindhi, too, has an alternative script, the one used by merchants and others, derived from the Śāradā alphabet of the North-west, a cousin of Devanāgarī.

Of the native Indian scripts enumerated under [i], Devanāgarī alone has the right to be regarded as the national script for India. Of course, the importance of Devanāgarī is of recent origin: previous to the 19th century, the provincial scripts were employed in their respective areas for writing Sanskrit. Devanāgarī, however, had a wider area than the other scripts, as it was the script native to what are now the United Provinces, Central India Agency, Rajputana and Gujarath, and part of the Central Provinces, and had spread to South Bihar, the Panjab, Maharashtra and the sub-Himalayan tracts, for writing Sanskrit. Devanāgarī is the representative in modern times of the Brāhmī, the finished Indian alphabet of two thousand years ago and more, and has remained faithful to the spirit and the method which characterised Brāhmī, the oldest native Indian script associated with the Aryan speech in India.

The Indian system of writing has certain advantages over all other systems in vogue in the world, and its most noteworthy superiority consists in the scientific order followed in the arrangement of the letters. Those who built up the ancient Indian system of writing and arranged the letters of the alphabet were among the most advanced phoneticians of all time; and it was probably done early in the first millennium B.C. while reducing to writing the Indo-Aryan dialects. It is, however, not unlikely that, even prior to that, this alphabet (which can in this primitive stage be described as 'Proto-Brāhmī') was a finished instrument, and had evolved among the civilised non-Aryans of India, and that the Aryan speakers merely adapted it for the Aryan dialects—Vedic, the Prakrits, and Classical Sanskrit. But of course, its perfection, at any rate its formulation, was the work of the grammarians describing the Aryan Vedic.

About Devanāgarī (and other Indian scripts generally), three points may be mentioned in which the script is capable of improvement—and as these three points are vital in any system of writing, they rather counterbalance the superiority which the Indian system has in the scientific arrangement of its letters. They are—

[1]. Comparative Intricacy or Complexity of the Letters, as compared, e.g., with those of the Roman Alphabet.

[2]. Syllabic and not purely alphabetical character of the writing.
[3]. Use of Conjunct Characters, involving the necessity of additional abbreviated forms of a great many of the letters, and in some cases the development of entirely new additional letters.

To consider these points briefly one by one:

[1]. The scientific order of the Indian system is admitted, but the ungainly shapes of the letters remain. The original Indian writing, the Brāhmī of the 3rd century B.C., is much simpler than any of the dozen Indian alphabets of the present day which are its descendants. Thus Brāhmī + = [k] is simplicity itself when placed beside its modern representatives like Devanāgarī क, Bengali ফ, etc.; so is ग = [kh] much simpler than ख and ग, ज = [j] than ज and ञ, ओ = [th] than ठ and ठ, ध = [d] than ध and ध, न = [n] than न and न, द = [b] than भ and भ, and so forth. Of course, the Brāhmī script has a sculptural or monumental quality about it, resembling Greek and Roman capital letters, which would disqualify it for a running hand, but it looks quite admirable in print. Devanāgarī has retained much of this sculptural or monumental quality, although in a different way; and a cursive Devanāgarī has given rise to Kaithī or Mahājanī and Gujarāṭī, which are more commodious in writing if less ornamental to look at. Compared with the Devanāgarī letters, it must be admitted, when we look at the question without prejudice, that the Roman letters also are, generally, much simpler. The unnecessary top-line is absent, and the letters require fewer strokes; thus [k] = क, [n] = न, [s] = स, [h] = घ, etc. The Roman letters are less tiring to the eye, and they are easier to remember; and this last point of view is one which is not to be lightly brushed aside, because habituated as we are to the Devanāgarī (or some other Indian system) from our childhood we may not find it irksome now; but we should take into consideration the difficulty we feel in learning another Indian alphabet which is not our own provincial or vernacular one and which cannot be described as being more complicated than Devanāgarī, although the principle of formation is familiar to us.

[2]. A purely alphabetic system of writing should represent clearly and unambiguously all the sounds, vocal and consonantal, that go to make a word. In a word like मनु = [manu], धर्म = [dharma], or इंद्र = [indra], we get the sounds as follows: म + न + उ = [m+a+n+u], ध + च + र + न + छ = [dh+a+r+m+a], ध + च + र + च + छ = [i+n+d+r+a]; or in a word like ब्रह्मचय = [brahmaçya], the sounds are व + ड + द + ध + च + छ + च + त + त = [b+r+a+h+m+a+n+y+a]. In the Roman system, the symbols are merely placed one after the other, in the order in which
their sounds occur in speech; the vowels and consonants are both indicated fully, each item standing on its own merits, and on its own dignity, as it were. But in the Indian system of akṣaras or syllable-representing letters, the independent items are made subservient to groups—as, e.g., क—म् = [ma—nu], ध—म् = [dha—rma], र—द्र = [i—ndra] ; and in each group the various elements are clipped and curtailed, both the vowels and consonants. In Roman, a word like [karotpala] or [atyukti] is quite plain sailing; but in the Indian system, करो—त्पल = [ka—rno—tpa—la], अतुक्ति = [a—tyu—kti], or, to follow something like the Indian habit—[ka—no—tpa—la] or [a—ty—kti], with the letters in fragments. To speak in the language of Chemistry, in the Roman system, we have the atom as a unit in writing, while in the Indian system, we have a molecule, with the component atoms mutilated in the process of combination, as it were. The Indian system often obscures the normal or natural sequence of sounds. Thus in a word like [dharma], [dhar] is the root, and [ma] is the termination; but in the Indian system of writing, धम्म, we get a sub-division into [dha] and [rma]. Probably contemporary habits of pronunciation, while the Brāhmi alphabet as applied to Sanskrit was being evolved, were at the basis of this sort of subdivision—habits of pronunciation which preferred open syllables like [dha] and [bra] rather than [dhar] and [brāh], as in क्र—म्म भ—म्म [bra—hma—nya]. The Indian system would easily turn what is Shakespeare into शक्श—पीया = [Shaks—pi—ya—ra], and Herbert into हर्बर्ट = [Hrbar—ta]. This in itself is not a grave sin, but it means the absence of the true alphabetical principle, which brings in its train a number of practical difficulties of varying importance.

In the first instance, what may be called the “root-sense,” which is always present in the mind of the speaker when a word is uttered, particularly an inflected word—this root-sense is unduly sacrificed in the Indian system of writing. Thus सह्या is really [sah—ya], root [sah] + suffix [-ya], but the orthography makes it [sa—hya]; हु—ति is really [han—ti], root [han] + inflexion [-ti], but in writing it becomes [ha—nti]. In the vernaculars, this untoward thing is also in evidence: witness, for example, the Bengali words করেছে, পারেছে (= করছে, পারছে) ‘He is doing, I shall be able,’ which are really [kor—che], [pār—bo], the roots being [kar] or [kor], and [pār]; but a common tendency would be (which tendency was given fullest scope to by the late Dwijendralal Ray in the orthography of his dramas and other works) to write such words as করেছে, পারেছে (= করে or পারে).
This kind of awkwardness is not found in Hindi to the same extent as in Bengali, in the spelling of genuine Hindi (Prakritic or tadbhava) words, as Hindi spelling is much more well-ordered than Bengali spelling and Hindi prefers single consonants to conjuncts (e.g., [karnā] 'to do' would be written in Hindi as करना, that is, [ka-ra-na] and not कर [ka-rānā]); and for the same reason Marathi and Gujarati are better placed than Bengali.

The syllabic nature of the Indian system makes analysis of words difficult or awkward. The analysis of a written word which stands for the spoken one can be from two standpoints—(i) from the standpoint of sounds, and (ii) from the standpoint of function. Thus, Bengali राखिलाम (राखिलाम) = [rākhilām] 'I placed, I kept', is, from the first point of view र + आ + ह + इ + त + अ + म (र + आ + ह + इ + त + अ + म), and from the second point of view is root राख + past-indicating affix इ + person-indicating inflexion अम (राख + इ + अम). It is at once evident how the syllabic character of the Indian script makes the work of analysis clumsy. But in a purely alphabetic script like the Roman, either kind of analysis can be visualised by means of a plus or a hyphen most easily and naturally—e.g., [r+k+i+l+a+m] and [r+k+i+l+a+m]: or simply, [rākhilām] = (i) rā-kh-i-l-ā-m, (ii) rā-kh-il-ā-m. So Hindi हूँ 'to me' = (i) सू-उ-न-ए, (ii) सू-उ-न-ए, (iii) सू-उ-न-ए (base सू + case-termination ए), but in the Roman, [mu-jh-e] = (i) m-u-jh-e, (ii) mujh-e. चलामा 'to cause to walk' = (i) c-a-l-a-n-a, (ii) c-a-l-a-n-a. It is at once evident how the syllabic character of the Indian script makes the work of analysis clumsy. But in a purely alphabetic script like the Roman, either kind of analysis can be visualised by means of a plus or a hyphen most easily and naturally—e.g., [r+k+i+l+a+m] and [r+k+i+l+a+m]: or simply, [rākhilām] = (i) rā-kh-i-l-ā-m, (ii) rā-kh-il-ā-m. So Hindi हूँ 'to me' = (i) सू-उ-न-ए, (ii) सू-उ-न-ए, (iii) सू-उ-न-ए (base सू + case-termination ए), but in the Roman, [mu-jh-e] = (i) m-u-jh-e, (ii) mujh-e. चलामा 'to cause to walk' = (i) c-a-l-a-n-a, (ii) c-a-l-a-n-a.

It has to be borne in mind that when the Roman letters are definitely used for an Indian language, we have to abandon their English names, but give them the Indian names, or, better, simply pronounce their sounds: [c] would thus be named, not सी (st) as in English, but ज or च; [r], not राक (रक), but र or र; [kh], not काक ('kay-aitch'), but ख or ख (of this, more later). So, Marathi चल 'having done' and चल 'he remained, he lived,' are much better analysed visually with the Roman letters as [kärūn] = (i) k-a-r-ū-n, (ii) kärūn] and [rāhīlā] = (i) r-a-h-i-l-ā, (ii) rāh-il-ā] than with the Bālabodh or Devanāgarī letters as [kärūn] = (i) क-आ-र-ू-न and (ii) क-आ-र-ू-न] and [rāhīlā] = (i) र-आ-ह-ि-ल-आ and (ii) र-आ-ह-ि-ल-आ. Breaking up the Indian syllables into their components for purposes of analysis would thus mean the very negation of the Indian syllabic principle. To write an English word like strength in the Devanāgarī script as स्वर, as they do in Parsi Gujarati (स्वर - स्व-र-म-ण-मा), instead of स्वर (स्व-र-म-ण-मा), is entirely against the spirit of the Indian system.
The syllabic character of Indian writing is at the root of the subordination of the vowel to the consonant element in the syllable. It is responsible for the subsidiary or post-consonantal forms of the letters for the vowel sounds. Thus श [a] has two forms—श (initial), and झ (post-consonantal); so व [u] has the initial form व, and the post-consonantal forms म, and ज, which are subscribed below the consonants—e.g., उ = [ku], ध = [ru]. In practice, it means that the script has two sets of letters for the vowels—quite a needless complication, which adds its quota in rendering the script difficult for learners.

Use of conjunct consonants is a further complication of the Indian system, and is a logical consequence of the syllabic system. The post-consonantal or subsidiary forms of the vowels are an inheritance from the Brahmī, and this inheritance is undoubtedly very old. In the Brahmī, the formation of conjunct consonants was very simple and easy, as they were made up simply by putting one consonant above another. In quick writing in a cursive script, these simple and easily made-out combinations were contracted and altered, so that at the present stage we have quite a multiplicity of symbols found only in the conjunct consonants, in some of which the shapes of the components are entirely obscured. Thus व = [k] + ज = [g] give the letter व = [kṣ], and ज = [j] + र = [r] give र = [jū], which has acquired in Hindi the new value of [gy], in Marathi of [dny]. In most of these conjuncts, however, the components are clear enough, although they are abridged or abbreviated; but some of them have assumed the complicated shapes of Chinese characters, which are difficult of acquirement for young learners and are frightening in their appearance (e.g., औ = [rtsna], व = [sua], य = [hya], व = [kṣva], etc.).

The presence of the conjuncts in the Indian system is responsible for three things: (i) Adversely affecting the eye-sight of learners: the complicated forms are bad for the eyes—this is a matter which we do not usually appreciate, but we ought to look at it from the point of view of tender children who are first learning their alphabet; (ii) they prevent small or fine type-fonts from being made and put into use. Usually a Devanāgarī book is printed in pica type, and type smaller than the small pica is not found or employed in printing Devanāgarī. This means that there is bound to be waste in space and in paper. Here, of course, we find an unconscious adjustment with the inherent defect in the system of writing—small fonts are bound to tire the eyes much more, the shapes of the letters being so complicated; and besides, very fine fonts of complicated conjunct and other letters are economically unsuitable, they are apt to get blurred,
broken and so become useless in a short time. (iii) What is very important as a practical proposition—the conjunct consonants increase the cost and the time and labour required in printing; and they form an extremely cumbersome business. In the Roman type-cases as used in printing English, there are in all 152 chambers for types plus numerals, brackets and punctuation marks and all accessories in the shape of spaces, leaders, etc. (The capital letters in English mean a duplication of 28 type chambers, included within the 152). Contrasted with this, we see that in the Bengali type-cases there are 455 chambers, and this is not enough for all the types used in Bengali printing, many of the chambers having from 2 to 3 types apiece; in printing Bengali, no less than 474 different letters, 49 signs, numerals, spaces, etc., and 40 ‘kerned’ types with special marks above and below—in total, 563 separate type-items are required. In the Calcutta-face Devanāgarī, there are 700 different letter-types (simple, conjunct and kerned), 3 spaces, and 3 quads—in all 706 separate type-items. The old style Bombay face has 455 chambers holding 626 different type-items; and the new style Bombay face has reduced the number to 450 different items (simple, conjunct, kerned and fragmentary types plus accessories). But this number in the new Bombay face has been arrived at after considerable sacrifice of elegance and beauty, broken or fragmentary forms of letters being used in framing conjunct consonants; which in the far more elegant Calcutta face or in the magnificent Oxford face of the Devanāgarī types (the Oxford type has been used in Max Müller’s edition of the Rigveda Samhita) are represented by single types (thus, the Calcutta (and Oxford) face has ओ = [tā], ङ = [tva], ः = [bdha], ः = [nta], ः = [tsa], ः = [sya], all single types, but the Bombay face has औ ओ ़ औ ़ औ which are composites, with fragmentary components, which add to the detriment of the beauty of the face, and has some bad effect on the eyes also, as the fine spaces which appear like breaks or blurs in the type interfere with the free movement of the eyes). 450 types vs. 152 types: if we eliminate the capitales, the small capitales, and some special or superfluous letters of Roman, the number 152 might be still further reduced—we might manage with considerably less than one hundred Roman types. Surely, in learning to read and write, and in printing, the advantages of the Roman are obvious: particularly, if without adding any new type to the number of 26 found in the current Roman we could employ it for our Indian languages, making provision for adequate representation in this Indian Roman or Indo-Roman script of all the letters (and sounds) in our Indian alphabets.

As contrasted with the above three great drawbacks of the Indian alphabets (the Devanāgarī, etc.), the advantages of the Roman can be seen
with a little unbiased study of the problem. The Roman letters are on the whole exceedingly simple; they are thus more easily learnt. They are easier to write, both in the printing type (block letters, capital or small), and in cursive or script form. The Roman letters will take a little more space than the Devanāgarī letters of the same size to write a word, true; any page of a work like Whitney’s Sanskrit Grammar, which gives the Sanskrit words in both Devanāgarī and Roman, will show this. But the legibility of the Roman and its simplicity would far outweigh this. The length of the Roman transliteration is due to the fact that the vowels are written in their full, as distinct letters, and particularly the vowel [a] (short), which is not specially indicated in the Devanāgarī, being regarded as inherent in the consonant letter: thus चारित  = [caritra], अनवरत  = [anavarata], भविष्यांसन्  = [bhavistyaastam], etc. But the gain would be considerably more than any loss of space.

These are some of the advantages of the Roman script. Being simpler to learn, they should appeal to any one who wants to spread literacy among the masses. Printing in the Roman character being easier and cheaper, the use of the Roman script will mean cheaper books and journals: the ‘Indo-Roman’ as proposed below will make printing cheaper still. Besides, the greater portion of the civilised world uses the Roman script, and in the present age, when our culture is becoming more and more international, the advantages of falling in line with the rest of the world are obvious. The Roman letters are familiar to an ever-increasing number of English literates in India, and many who are not familiar with the English language at least know the Roman numerals (the so-called ‘Arabic’ numerals—1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) and the Roman letters. It does not look likely that the Devanāgarī will be able to supplant the other scripts of the country, even with the spread of Hindi. There is no lack of provincial patriotism for the local scripts. The Devanāgarī as a second or additional script for the different vernaculars would not appeal to the people. With a strong central government, a single script could be imposed on the vernaculars. But it is not likely that the British government in India will give a lead in this matter. Scripts are unfortunately connected with religion, both among Hindus and Muhammadans; and many Muhammadans will not agree to give up the Perso-Arabic script in favour of the Devanāgarī, although the latter is the script employed by the largest group of people in India.

The problem of the Babel of scripts in India presents itself to me as being capable of a final solution only through an Indo-Roman script. I have been observing the situation. There are signs that the apathy or hostility
towards the employment of the Roman script for the vernaculars, which we notice to-day among the average run of our educated people, will not continue for long; opinion among the educated, as time and often a few minutes' talk has shown, can be induced towards the Roman script easily enough. But nevertheless, it cannot as yet be said that the problem is one which can be described as being of primary importance. At the best, it is still a matter of academic interest only. At an All Parties' Conference held in Calcutta in 1927 in connexion with the Indian National Congress, a representative from Sindh, supported by one from Bengal, brought in a proposal that the national language, Hindustani, should be written in the Roman script, instead of Devanāgarī (or optionally Perso-Arabic), and this proposal was poohpoohed by most of the members. But early in 1934, I was told by some South Indian (Telugu) Congress-men, enthusiasts for Hindi, that in the course of an extended tour in Northern India, they found many people, both Hindus and Muhammadans, favouring the Roman script. At the All-Bengal University and College Teachers' Conference held at Faridpur in April 1934, a proposal was brought recommending the use of the Roman alphabet for Bengali and other vernaculars, but it was lost by seven votes, 25 voting for and 32 against. These isolated and sporadic proposals from members of the intelligentsia are not much in their sum total, but they are symptomatic,—we see in them the genesis of a new idea.

Sporadic and not too well-directed attempts were made to introduce the Roman script for Indian languages ever since the Roman alphabet was brought to India by the Roman Catholic missionaries under Portuguese auspices, from the beginning of the 16th century, and these attempts were successful only in imposing the Roman script on the Konkani dialect of Goa, where it is used by a large population of converts to Roman Catholicism. Orientalistic studies with reference to Indian languages began with the foundation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta in 1784. J. B. Gilchrist began as an orientalist from the eighties of the 18th century, and he and his colleagues at that other centre of oriental learning at Calcutta, the College of Fort William, devised and employed a system of Roman script for Hindustani and other Indian languages from the end of the 18th century. The Roman alphabet was used for Sanskrit and other Indian languages for scientific purposes—in grammars meant in the first instance for Europeans, and in philological works. In the thirties, European Pali scholars decided for the Roman script in printing Pali books, since a common Pali alphabet was lacking—
the language being written in Sinhalese characters in Ceylon, in Burmese (Môn) characters in Burma, and in Siamese (Cambodian) characters in Siam (and Cambodia). Some German and other continental scholars sought to do the same for Sanskrit, as until the middle of the 19th century Sanskrit did not possess an All-India script. Each province employed its local character for Sanskrit—Bengali was used in Bengal, Maithili in North Bihar, Oriya in Orissa, Šāradā in Kashmir, Telugu in the Andhra country, Kannada in the Kannada tract, Grantha in the Tamil-land, and Mālavašām in Malabar. The most erudite Sanskrit scholar from Conjeeveram or Navadwip, Sringeri or Darbhanga, Puri or Śrīnagar ordinarily would not be able to read, much less write the Devanāgarī character, which was confined to what is now the United Provinces, South Bihar, the Panjab, Rajputana, Gujarāt and Mahārāshtra. Of course, as the script of North India, the homeland of ancient Indo-Aryan history and culture, and as that of Benares as the centre of Hindu culture, and as the script of Rajputana as the great bloc of warlike Hindu states, Devanāgarī had a certain prestige,—and that was all. When Max Müller published the first volume of his Rīgveda Samhitā with Śāyana’s Commentary in 1849, it was after some hesitation that he decided to adopt the Devanāgarī; and in this way he gave a very great impetus to this particular form of the Indian script in establishing it as the All-India Script for Sanskrit. The Indian Universities followed suit and printed Sanskrit text-books in Devanāgarī only. Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar did a great deal for the spread of Devanāgarī in Bengal. Now in 1934 the position of Devanāgarī is so important in the field of Sanskrit in India that it is hard for us to realise its comparative insignificance a hundred years ago. The establishment of Devanāgarī in tracts outside its home districts has been accomplished during the last eighty years, and it is only a reflex of the spirit of centralisation brought in by the British Imperial Government in India.

European influences were thus to some extent at work in setting up Devanāgarī for Sanskrit, but Roman Sanskrit is still maintaining a vigorous existence—in scientific works on Sanskrit Culture and Philology, written by both European and Hindu Indologists. Occasionally, serious attempts were made by both propaganda and publication of books in the Roman character, to employ the Roman script for the vernaculars—notably by Sir Monier Williams, T. W. H. Tolbort, the Rev. S. Knowles, in the second half of the 19th and the first two decades of the 20th century, but nothing tangible came out of these attempts. A standard
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system of transliteration, employing a Roman alphabet supplemented by some additional letters with diacritical marks, generally with the principle of “vowels as in Italian, consonants as in English,” has grown up, and this so far has been in possession of the field—most Roman printing for Indian languages being done in this alphabet, excepting in the more careful works which follow the Geneva system in transliterating Sanskrit into Roman. A translation of the New Testament, and of some books of the Old Testament are available in Roman-Urdu, besides a number of Christian religious tracts; and a Roman-Urdu weekly used to be published from Lucknow—the Kaukab-i-Hind. Some of the Christian Gospels, and one or two secular books are also obtainable in the Roman character in Urdu, Panjabi, Hindi, Bengali, Tamil, etc. Roman-Hindustani is taught in the Indian Army to the Indian soldiers.

Recently an Indian Government official of high scholarship and position, Mr. A. Latifi, C.I.E., I.C.S., LL.D. (Dublin), M.A., I.L.M. (Cantab.), Bar.-at-Law, has come forward with a proposal to adopt the Roman script in an enlarged form for Indian languages. His “All-India Alphabet” he has formulated in a pamphlet, and it has been received favourably by H. H. the Maharaja Gaekwad of Baroda, at least to the extent of being reproduced and circulated for opinion among the officials of the state under his order. (A note on this script, which its originator has also called the “Latifi Alphabet”—a name which we shall follow as it is shorter and leaves no room for ambiguity—is given as an appendix at the end of this paper.)

Three questions now arise:

[1]. Should we take up seriously the question of Romanisation of the Indian languages now?

[2]. If so, what should be our method of doing it—how could we do it best, without any hardship and without any loss of national prestige?

[3]. What should be the simplest and best form of Roman script to adopt as a uniform script for all Indian languages?

These may be taken up one by one.

[1]. In the face of the Indian systems of writing like the Devanāgarī which are as complete alphabets as any, and which possess a universally admired scientific arrangement of the letters, besides being a truly national and characteristic product of Indian civilisation—a product which is the creation of the Ancient Indian ancestors of both the Hindus and the Muhammadans of present-day India,—the insistence on the Perso-Arabic script among the larger section of Urdu and Sindhi-using Indian
Musalmans for their mother-tongues would appear only to be the result of a false sense of values in their communal culture. The script has become the symbol of a religion and a culture which are thought to be antagonistic to Hinduism and everything connected with it. This is unfortunate, but the attitude of a powerful and a vociferous group of Indian Musalmans is like that. Musalman supporters of Devanāgarī for Urdu (which a prominent Hindi writer has not inaptly described as ‘Musalmani Hindi’) are known, but they do not count. Few intelligent Musalmans will be found to hold the brief for the Perso-Arabic script, but fewer still among them would advocate or support the use of Devanāgarī in writing Urdu, although this would create a rapprochement to close the split of the Hindustani speech into Hindi and Urdu.

The position of the Roman script is different. The example of Turkey in adopting it has set many of our Indian Musalmans thinking. There are signs that Persia may also adopt the Roman script. A Roman alphabet for Persian is already in use; and in the musical notation of Europe—staff and tonic sol-fa—the Roman alphabet has found a strong ally in Persia. It is said that proposals for abandoning the Arabic alphabet for the Roman were already before the Mejliss, the Persian Parliament. The Turkish states under the Soviet Union have also adopted the Roman script. The Malay speech, now current among 50 millions of Malay, Javanese and other peoples, mostly Musalmans, of S. E. Asia and Indonesia, is universally written in Roman, in both the English and the Dutch spellings,—the Arabic script for Malay being confined to the million or so of Malaya Peninsula Malays. Considering its international character, and its use in a number of Muslim lands outside India, Indian Muslman opinion will, it appears to me, be not opposed to the Roman script, although it will stiffen against the Devanāgarī: this attitude might be illogical and anti-national, but it has nevertheless to be understood even though it cannot be appreciated.

We may now consider the position of the Hindus. With them their alphabet—the Indian system—is a precious heritage, which has served them from time immemorial, and has served them well. It has been a very good thing for them, and to abandon it, they must be convinced of something really much better. The scientific arrangement of the Indian letters, and the completeness of the alphabet for all native sounds (except in the case of some recent phonetic developments in the vernaculars) have been rightly regarded as a tangible evidence of the scientific thought and acumen of their ancestors. It is an alphabet which will conduce to the self-respect of any people: and to try to substitute a script of foreign origin, which in
India is associated with the British, would appear to be something of a sacrilege—an anti-national and anti-cultural movement of a most objectionable type: particularly at the present moment when there is considerable political unrest in the country. The national temperament among the Hindus is particularly sensitive: in the face of political subjection, our cultural autonomy is a great refuge, and the national alphabet is a strong pillar of support for that refuge. Questions of international solidarity or conformity would be unmeaning to a people who are looked down upon as helots of the empire, and whose best energy and best discipline should be utilised in strengthening its nationality: when the attitude of the nationalist leaders is that of *Sinn Fein* and *Athanasius contra mundum*, an attitude which looks askance at the internationalism of Rabindranath Tagore and is enthusiastic with the nationalistic asceticism of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi.

A legitimate pride in the bases of one's national culture is pardonable in any individual or nation, and the Hindu, orthodox or unorthodox, has an instinctive sense of pride in his race and culture. If he is ultra-orthodox, he feels superior to all Mlecchas—all foreign barbarians; and he would scorn to borrow the writing of the Mlecchas of Europe. The script is looked upon as an important base. And here the base is solid enough. It may have imperfections; but what human institution is perfect? On the other hand, the Roman alphabet at first sight has obvious imperfections of a far more serious type. The letters are arranged pell-mell, without any order. Why adopt chaos in place of perfect order? Then, the orthography employing the Roman alphabet with which we are familiar, namely, the English orthography, has been described as a system which is "absolutely without a conscience." We can have grave objections to a system which permits six sounds to a single letter (e.g., *a* as in *cat*, *call*, *father*, *ago*, *fate*, *hare*), and uses digraphs like *sh*, *th*, *dg*, *ck* for a single sound *ad infinitum*, and has a number of silent letters (e.g., *calm*, *have*, *knight*, *thought*), and permits orthographical monstrosities like *enough*=[*inaf*], *gaol*=[*dʒeɪl*], *psychology*=[*saɪkəlɒdʒɪ*], *nation*=[*neɪʃn*], etc. Besides, it does not have letters for some of the fundamental sounds of our languages, and to represent them, as well as the various vowels, we shall have to take recourse to additional capped and dotted letters, which are ugly and tiresome for the eye and besides are not very easily procurable. Why jump into this forbidding tank, leaving the limpid stream of your national alphabet? As for the gains, namely that the Roman letters are simpler, and they make printing easier,—well, we do not feel the difficulty of our alphabets: it is an inheritance from our fathers, like our native speech; and as it may be allowed that there
are more beautiful languages, so there may be more attractive alphabets—but we need not change our alphabet, as much as we could not change our language.

Another point to consider in connexion with the Hindu's predilection for his national alphabet is its relation to certain aspects of his religion and ritual. To an orthodox Hindu (and to this category belong most of the people, barring a few advanced intellectuals among the intelligentsia), the letters of the Indian alphabet are not mere letters—they have a mystic value, particularly in Yoga and Tantric philosophy and ritual. There is the mystic theory of the Bija-mantras, in which certain letters or combinations of letters are looked upon as forming the visible and audible symbols of certain aspects of the Divinity. Thus the syllable ॐ = [Om] represents the Absolute, ṣ = [Klīm] stands for the spirit of Generation or Manifestation in the Universe (Kāma-bija), ṣ = [Hrīm] represents Śakti or Energy (that is, Life-force), ॐ = [Aīm] represents the Guru or Spiritual Teacher, etc. In symbolising the Deity or certain aspects of it by means of Yantras or diagrams, for ceremonial worship or ritual, these Bija-mantras figure—they have to be written down inside these Yantras. The adoption of the Roman alphabet will cut off one aspect of our religious ritual from a living contact with our daily life, which is now actually present through the Indian system of writing—and many Hindus will not contemplate this with equanimity.

The above is roughly the situation among the Hindus, making the adoption of the Roman script at first sight both impossible and unnecessary, or at the best a most difficult matter. In the face of it all, should the Romanisation movement be pushed? Would it be worth while to have the Roman alphabet?

To my mind, it will be worth it, and, with a proper understanding of the implications of Romanisation, the thing could be brought about in such a way that the national sentiment and national self-respect will be not jeopardised. But it is a matter which is not to be rushed by lightning propaganda, or by official or Congress circular or fatwa. At present, the Romanisation question is not one of immediate practical politics; it is still in the academic stage, and that in an embryonic form too, despite the three hundred years that some Indian speeches came under the jurisdiction of the Roman script. Let us see if there is a possibility of effecting a conversion of the intransigent Indian attitude against the Roman script—whether the question can have an appeal on its own merits. If a rapprochement is possible ideally, its practical
application should be quite feasible,—specially when the ideal is to make it a matter of gradual evolution and not to bring in a violent revolution.

A close study of the question has convinced me that our attachment to our Indian system of writing is primarily a matter of habit and sentiment. Sentiment and the force of habit are strong things in life, and we can easily forego obvious advantages, when these loom large. Sentiment, like Bhakti or Faith, is often blind. Tempered with Knowledge, with Jñāna, with proper understanding of the problems, we can have the finest intellectual and spiritual harmony:—and this should be our goal in corporate life, in which speech and writing have a paramount place. The sentiment can be properly directed, and then the gain will be immense.

Whatever alphabet we adopt, whatever might be the underlying principle, syllabic or alphabetical, and whatever might be the shapes of the individual letters, in our future system of writing we must not under any circumstance abandon the scientific arrangement of the letters. The Indian, i.e. the Sanskrit arrangement will stand in our primers and grammars—the vowels first, and then the consonants—first, the stops, aspirates and nasals following the order of the places of articulation, then the liquids and semivowels, and finally the spirants (sibilants) and the aspiration; and these are to be followed by supplementary letters for sounds newly developed in our Indian languages, or imposed upon them from the outside. We cannot forego this order: it is a heritage too precious to lose.

This being understood, it is to be seen if the new wine of the Roman letters can be put into the old bottle of the Indian order. It would mean in practice merely a change in the shapes of the letters. The old scientific order will remain, and the old names will remain. There is no magic in the peculiar combination of strokes which gives us क or क, or the Grantha or Orijā or Telugu or Kannāda [ka]. Our current Indian alphabets are not more than a thousand years old, and consequently there is no question of an association with a hoary antiquity being sacrificed if we have [ka] and the rest of the alphabet in simpler and more convenient shapes than क or क, etc. If there were a virtue in antiquity, then we ought to go back to the 3rd century B.C. Brāhmī—which has the double advantage of being some thousand or twelve hundred years older than the Devanāgarī, and is much simpler in formation at the same time. If we were consistent in our desire to retain historical antiquity, we would then welcome a reversion to the Brāhmī + ṇ ḍ (ṇ) in the place of क ख ग etc.
A ROMAN ALPHABET FOR INDIA

What harm can accrue if we adopt [k], and call it, not k\text{ay} (\text{k}), but k\text{a} (\text{k})? If we write our ग as [g], and call this [g],—not जी (jee) as they do in English, or झे = \text{zhō} (zhō) as they do in French, or झ = \text{kho} (kho) as they do in Spanish, or झे = \text{yen} (yen) as they say in Swedish—but simply \text{ga} (\text{ga})? If we take [h] as a simpler symbol than our ह, and call this letter [h] just ह (\text{h}),—and not एच (aitch) as in English, or अच्छ (ačch) as in French, or एच (échō) as in Spanish, or ह (ho) as in Swedish? We would thus have the simpler Roman letters adopted for our purposes, and Indianised in both name and use. The Indianised Roman letters, simple, or, if necessary, enlarged with diacritical marks, will cease to have their English names when they are used for Indian languages, as equivalents of the Indian letters. We can even contemplate the future, when Indian children learning their English spelling, will use (at least in the earlier stages) the Indian names: they will not only not spell an Indian word or name like [Gopal] and [Faridpur] as जी-जो-पी-ए-एल (jee-o-pee-ay-el) and एफ-ए-एच-जाम-जी-पी-एल (eff-ay-ɚ-ai-dee-pee-yù-ăr), but as जी-जो-पी-ए-एल (ga-o-pa-ɚ-la) and फ-ए-एच-जाम (fa-a-ra-dirgha ɪ-da-pa-n-ra); but they will also spell an English word like neighbour as न-ए-ए-ए-ए-पी-ए-ए (na-e-i-ga-ha-o-u-ra), just as much as a French child learning English will spell it with French and not English names for the letters—as एन-ए-ए-ए-एच-जी-एच-जी-एच-जी-एच (en-e-i-tshō-ash-be-ə-ə-ə), and not as एन-ए-ए-ए-एच-जी-एच-जी-एच-जी-एच (en-e-i-tshō-ash-be-ə-ə). A Spanish boy similarly is accustomed to spell the English word as एन-ए-ए-ए-ए-एच-जी-एच-जी-एच-जी-एच (en-e-i-tshō-ash-be-ə-ə), and a Swedish boy as एन-ए-ए-ए-ए-ए-जी-ए-ए-ए (en-e-i-yē-hō-bē-o-u-ər).

Our sentiments, which are legitimately in favour of the Indian system, can be met in this way: the Indian order is retained, and the Indian names are retained—only we adopt new and simpler forms for the letters; and these forms are taken from the Roman script, as it is an old and tried script which has the widest employ in the world. That in itself need not vitiate the Roman letters in our eyes. The Roman letters, again, are not absolutely new to India. Experience has shown that these can be applied with perfect success to Pali and Sanskrit and other languages. Sentiment apart, the only drawback is that we are not familiar with the script as applied to an Indian language, we are not habituated to it. Unfamiliarity is a great stumbling block, but it is not an insurmountable obstacle.

In the form in which the Roman script is proposed to be adopted below, it will be possible, without the least ambiguity, to have all standard...
Indian sounds properly represented by means of the Roman letters plus a
diphthongal ligature or two, sked out by some of the current Roman letters
used upside down as new letters, and by modifying some of the current
letters by means of a few easily intelligible symbols (point or full stop,
minute mark or accent mark, and inverted comma) added to them. With
about 40 symbols of all sorts, original letters and modifiers, it will be
possible to do the work of the 48 simple Devanāgarī letters (together with
the whole host of conjunct letters, whose number is legion): and in
printing, these alone would suffice. A group of not more than 40 symbols
would be all that will be required in printing not only Sanskrit, but also
Hindustani (Hindi and Urdu), Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu,
Kannada and other vernaculars, and Persian and Arabic in addition: more
than ten times the number is needed now with the Devanāgarī. It must be
conceded that, at least as an academic proposition, it is well worth
a trial.

Everything is in a state of flux. Change is the law of life. If the
Brahmi could alter into the Devanāgarī, if a simple symbol like \(+\) could
become \(\text{[+]}\), then the use of \([k]\) in place of \([\text{\textbar{a}}]\) can have nothing inherently
wrong about it. Only, it must be admitted that in the case of \([+\]
becoming transformed into \([\text{\textbar{a}}]\), the change has been gradual—has been
evolutionary; the abandoning of \([\text{\textbar{a}}]\) for \([k]\) will be abrupt. But this
is an age of abrupt changes, and an abrupt change is permissible in the
best interests of the society,—only when such a change is assimilable.
And, as I suggest, thirty to fifty years of what I call bi-literalism or
di-alphabetism will not make the change appear so abrupt.

Taking into view the advantages of an Indianised Roman alphabet,
and noting also the way along which the world is moving,—with English,
a Roman-using language, becoming more and more widespread as a vehicle
of World-culture, I think it will be a good thing to recommend the Roman
alphabet to our country-men. Convinced that it will be a good thing, for
some years our Indianised Roman might be placed before our people to
enable them to make up their mind. The Roman will be kept as a side-
show, as a second script beside the vernacular ones, for a number of
decades, before the people finally can adopt it, attracted by its utility and
its other great qualities.

For the orthodox Hindus who see some mystic force in the shapes of
the Indian letters in Tantric ritual and worship, and would consider the very
idea of using the Roman script in that connexion sacrilegious, the Devanāgarī and other provincial alphabets will continue to be a matter of study and acquirement for this highly specialised purpose. The native system—preferably in the Devanāgarī—will continue to have a place in decoration and in ritualism.

As I have said before, the question of Romanisation is not one of urgent moment now. But we might start familiarising our intelligentsia with it, as both internal disharmonies—communal and provincial—and foreign influences might hasten issues; and as a great cultural problem, our educated men should be prepared as to how to receive it.

This is all that can be said about the first of the three questions broached previously. The simple and easily written Roman letters, enlarged as necessary by easily understood modifications, and arranged according to the scheme of the Indian alphabet, will give the most perfect of alphabets, as far as alphabets go in the world. The sounds of the letters (with the supporting vowel [a] in case of consonants) will be their names, as another tribute to the Indian system. Such an alphabet is worth bringing to our people.

[2] Remembering that the Romanisation idea will continue to be one of academic interest, for some time at least, we should not rush with it from the university or the club to the market-place, pressing it upon an unprepared people. We would not recommend its immediate acceptance, supplanting as quickly as possible the old scripts. We must first of all have a well-thought out scheme, which is to meet the criticism of competent people, trained in phonetics and familiar with all the problems relating to the languages and their scripts. Dilettantism, with merely a burning zeal to lead our people to the Land of Promise, will worsen matters. A scheme like Mr. Biss's 'Typewriter Bengali' will defeat its own purpose (Mr. Biss, an Education Department Officer in Bengal, sponsored some years ago the Romanisation of Bengali through the typewriter, and he suggested spellings like [swiikaar] for বীকার—which in their cumbrousness recall orthographies like [yuuzhual] for usual which was actually proposed by an English Spelling Reform Society). When the consensus of competent opinion has decided for a particular system (and mine is offered below for consideration), some representative and responsible body should take it up and lend its support to it by propaganda.
I would not for anything start Romanisation with children beginning to learn their alphabet, particularly when the grown-ups are innocent or apathetic about it, or actually or in a latent way hostile to it. The idea must filter down from the educated groups to the masses: the parents and the grown-ups must first be literate in both Roman and the Indian script before it can be taught to their charges. The method to be followed in this connexion should be something like this:

(i) Propaganda: special literature, special journals, books and periodicals in Indian-Roman; advocacy through the press, persuading the vernacular daily press to print some columns, at least one column, in the Indian-Roman script by way of propaganda and support.

(ii) Assistance from the universities: making a knowledge of Indian-Roman at first voluntary and then obligatory for all college students—a paper or half a paper in the mother-tongue written in the Indian-Roman script being made compulsory at some period in the college stage.

(iii) Making Indian-Roman as used for the mother-tongue first an optional and then a compulsory subject in the high school stage.

The fixing up of an Indian-Roman or Indo-Roman alphabet can be taken in hand immediately; then, as enthusiasts and active workers gather, propaganda can be taken in hand. The universities and schools can be handled only when a considerable body of public opinion is in its favour, or at least is not actively hostile: that will be the index of the situation.

Sir Daniel Hamilton, a large-hearted Scotsman who made his fortune in India and Bengal, conceived of the idea of teaching the village children in his estate at Gosaba in the Sundarbans in South Bengal the Roman alphabet, and had a simple Roman-Bengali on a strictly phonetic basis devised by a committee of which the present writer was a member. This was some 12 years ago. One or two books were printed in it, and it was taught to village children in a primary school. The results were exceedingly satisfactory—the boys and girls were able to read their mother-tongue in this Roman-Bengali much quicker than the ordinary children learning it through the Bengali alphabet. Nevertheless, this was only an experimentation at the expense of the children. Outside the school-room, and the few Bengali-Roman books available, their acquirement of this alphabet remained absolutely ineffectual, and they had to learn the Bengali alphabet over again. It will be wrong in principle and practice to make a beginning with the child.
Several decades of di-alphabetism, spread of the new script among grown-up literates, and existence of some printed literature in the new script (including a number of standard books and classics in the language)—these must precede any serious attempt to begin the children’s instruction in their mother-tongue with the Roman script.

I would not, again, support the use of the Roman script exclusively among a minority community living in the heart of a surrounding major community which does not use the Roman; and I would do so in the interests of the minor community itself. Take the case of the Santals in Bengal. An important non-Aryan people, they live surrounded by Bengalis, and they are everywhere bilingual. They cannot get on at all without the knowledge of Bengali, and if they can read and write Bengali they are equipped with a strong equipment in life. The Santali language is written in both Bengali and Roman. Roman-Santali will isolate the Santal from his Bengali neighbours. Bengali-Santali will automatically make him literate in Bengali, as he already speaks the language. The Santal has to live and work in a humble capacity—generally as an agricultural labourer, frequently as an independent farmer in a small way. He receives all his rent and tax receipts from his Bengali landlord in Bengali; all government and municipal notices that reach him are in Bengali. We can understand the value of a knowledge of the Bengali alphabet in his everyday transactions. I would postpone Romanisation of Santali so far as the Santal villager in Bengal is concerned to the day that Bengali is Romanised. Of course, Roman-Santali will continue to be used, as it is now, for scientific purposes; advanced Santals will, of course, be at liberty to pick up Roman-Santali at a later stage in life, to read the splendid series of Santali texts edited by the Rev. P. Boddiug in the Roman script, with English translation, and published from the Institute of Comparative Ethnology at Oslo in Norway.

If we proceeded in this way, taking time, there will be very little hardship. There ought to be a reasonably long period of transition in any important matter in the life-history of a people. And there will be no loss of national prestige, as the final adoption of an Indianised Roman script will be voluntary among the people, after a sufficiently long period of transition. Our sentiments will be trained in that direction, and in the combination of the scientific Indian order of the letters with the simpler shapes and purely alphabetical employ of the Roman letters, the proposed Indo-Roman alphabet will be a powerful instrument in the spread of literacy; and the
dissemination of a knowledge of phonetics and linguistics will be made much easier than it is now. Alphabets and languages are distinct things. A change of alphabet does not mean change of the language. There are plentiful instances of the same language being written in more than one script all over the world.

[3]. I now formulate my scheme of an Indo-Roman alphabet. It is always easy to devise elaborate letters, but elaborate letters have no practical value, as when a thing is in an experimental stage we cannot persuade press-owners to spend money in getting them done, or even in buying them when they are available in the market— which is not always the case. My scheme of Indo-Roman does not go in for any capped or dotted letter: modifications are indicated by placing some special marks (which are always available in the ordinary English or Roman type cases) immediately after the letter. The main principle adopted is this: the diacritical marks are separate and detachable symbols added after the original letter, and not fixed below or above it, making new letters or types necessary. This makes printing easy. Writing is also easy, with convenient cursive forms of these symbols.

The following 27 Roman letters—

a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s, t, u, v, w, x, y, z, æ
together with the following inverted letters treated as new or distinct letters—

o, ø, j, ñ, ñ, w, w, æ (=inverted c, e, f, h, j, k, m, v)

and the following Italic forms—

d, n, r, s, t, z,

modified in some cases by the following ‘indicators’ (sucaka-cihna न्यक्क-विछ, ‘alāmat अलामत) placed after (and in two cases before) them—

will suffice for the sounds of all the important languages of India, and will adequately transliterate all the letters of the Indian and the Perso-Arabic scripts. (For representing the pronunciation of Arabic as made by native Arabic speakers, it will be necessary to add the following two letters of Greek to the above list— namely, [Beth] and [Beth].)

In framing the above alphabet, the principles and the methods of the International Phonetic Association have largely been drawn upon, and, as far as practicable, the signs employed in the I. P. A. alphabet have been
adopted. Thus for the sound of \( \text{\=z} \), the letter \( [j] \) (inverted [f] treated as a separate letter) has been used, as if it were a sort of barred [i] with superfluous dot taken away; the Roman letter \( [j] \), which has the \( \text{\=z} \) value only in English and is pronounced either as [y] or as [zh] in the other European languages, is reserved for other purposes. There will be no ambiguity about the value of [j].

The 'indicators' (रज्ञान-रज्ञ, ऋ) have in the main the following values (these indicators do away with the necessity of dotted and capped letters and capital letters, and dotted and capped types mean additional types)—

1. the colon : used after a vowel, it indicates its length. A thicker style of this length-indicating sign, or some other more suitable sign, may be employed in place of the colon now suggested. It is also used after [r] when it is treated as a long vowel.

2. a full stop, printed upwards, is used after consonants: after [r], it indicates that the [r] is vocalised, i.e., it becomes [\( \text{\=r} \)]; after other consonants, excepting [h*], it indicates the quality known to the Arab phoneticians as itfiaq, which characterises some of the Arabic consonant sounds.

3. an accent or minute mark, stands for palatalisation of the preceding consonant.

4. stands for cerebralisation, or retroflex pronunciation, of the preceding consonant.

5. when preceding a vowel, indicates its nasalisation. This symbol (candra-bindu) is adopted from the Indian script, as it will be easily available in India: the proper nasalisation symbol for the Roman alphabet—the symbol [\( \tilde{\text{n}} \)] (called the til or tilde), although preferable—will not always be available in Indian presses.

6. before a word will show that it is a proper name, as capital letters are omitted entirely from the proposed Indo-Roman script as being unnecessary.

Experience has shown that these indicators being at a level with the tops of the letters are easier to write than diacritical marks above and below the letters; and they are also less tiring to the eyes. Besides, dotted and capped letters demand greater attention in reading; and the dots and caps in the types are prone to get broken or become blurred quickly.
The letters of the Indo-Roman Script (Bharatiya-Romaka Lipi, Ḫurūf-i Tahajji-i Romānt-i Hindi) can be arranged thus in a tabular form, taking into note their points of articulation:

**INDO-ROMAN CONSONANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Interdental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Retroflex or Cacunal (Cerebral)</th>
<th>Palato-velopharyngeal or Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Uvular</th>
<th>Pharyngal</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>p b</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>t' d'</td>
<td>k' g'</td>
<td>k g</td>
<td>[q]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops Aspirated</td>
<td>ph bh</td>
<td>th dh</td>
<td>th' dh'</td>
<td>k'h g'h</td>
<td>kh gh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td>ts dz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates Aspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ch jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>r, r'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>f v</td>
<td>[θ θ']</td>
<td>s z</td>
<td>s' z'</td>
<td>s' z'</td>
<td>x q</td>
<td>[h' u']</td>
<td></td>
<td>h' h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semivowels</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above consonant letters may now be identified with their Devanāgarī and Perso-Arabic equivalents.

[p, b] = त, व = ब, भ; [t, d] = त, द = ध, त्र; [t, d] are alveolar (danta-mūliya) sounds, like the English t, d, which are heard in Assamese and some forms of Gujarati, as a substitute for both the dental and cerebral t, d; [t', d'] = त्र, श = त्र, द्र; [k, g] = क, ग = व, ज; [q] = ज of the Arabic; [?] = the alif hamza of Arabic, a sound which is found in many Indo-Aryan languages, as a substitute for [h] = ह, ह, as in Rajasthani, Gujarati, East Bengali.

[ph, bh] = घ, भ = घ, भ; [th, dh] = ध, ढ = ह, ह; [th, dh] = Assamese ध, ढ and ह, ह; [t'h, d'h] = त्र, श = त्र, द्र; [k'h, g'h] are dialectal Gujarati sounds; [kh, gh] = ख, ग = ह, ह. It is to be noted that for these aspirates, as well as for ह, ह = ह, ह below, the stop + [h] is employed: this is in accordance with the ancient Indian analysis of these sounds as 'māhā-prāṇa' sounds, i.e., compoundings with 'prāṇa' or breath. By using digraphs for these compound sounds we at once do away with the necessity of having single-letter equivalents for the eleven Devanāgarī letters—अ, 顶, ः, इ, ऊ, ऋ, ऌ, ऎ, ए, ऒ, ओ—in our Indoroman script—following in this matter both ancient Indian analysis and the habit of the Perso-Arabic and the Roman.

[ts, dz] occur in Marathi, Rajasthani, Nepali, Oriya, East Bengali, Telugu, etc.

[c, ğ] = ज, ढ = ज, ढ; [ch, jh] = झ, झ = ज, ढ.

[m] = म = म; [n] = न = न; [n'] = Tamil 'palatal n'; [m'] = म = म; [n'] = न = न; ([m'] = anusvāra, and '[: nasalisation, not in the table); [l] = ल = ल; [l'] = ल; [r] = र = र; [r] = Tamil 'palatal r'; [r'] = र = र.

[f, v] = Indian / (ँ, ं) and v (ँ, ं), bilabial spirant sounds; [θ, ð] are Greek letters, standing for the original Arabic values of the letters ϑ and θ, = respectively English th in thin and th in then (these two sounds are rare for Indian languages, but are given in our Indoroman alphabet for the sake of completeness by including Arabic, which is a classical and sacred language for Indian Musalmans);

[ʃ] = श = श; [z] = झ = झ; [z'] = the Tamil l, or ळ, a cerebral or retroflex s sound, the voiced (श्वम्भ) form of श = [s']; [s'] = झ = झ; [z'] = झ = the French j'; [x, ी] = ख, ख = ख, ख; [h', ण] = श, श of Arabic; [h] = ह = ह; [h'] = (visarga; an unvoiced [h], in Sanskrit); [w, y] = semi-vowel (not spirant) व, य = व, य;
In addition, the 'lidded' (muṣbaq) letters of Arabic, viz., ١، ٢، ٣، ٤، ٥ are to be transliterated respectively as [s, d, t, ṭ, ð] when the native Arab pronunciation is intended to be conveyed, say in an Arabic quotation; when the Persian and Indian pronunciation is in mind, the above letters can be transliterated in the Indo-Roman script as [s, z, t, z'] ; and [θ, ð] = ٧, ٨ of Arabic can similarly be rendered as [s, z]. Italic letters, when their-Persian and Indian pronunciation is to be indicated.

**INDO-ROMAN VOWELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilabial (Rounded)</th>
<th>Front (Unrounded)</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back : Rounded, Unrounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the above vowels can be lengthened by putting the 'indicator' of length [:] after them, e.g., [i]=short, [i:] = long; [u]=short, [u:] = long; and they can be nasalised, with the 'candra-bindi' (or 'hilul') symbol put before them, e.g., [i], [u], [u:] [A], [a] = १, २, ३, ४, ५ respectively.

The symbols for the vowels as in the above table are explained and identified below:

- [i] = १, [i:] = २, [u, u:] = ३, ४; [u] = the final [u] of Tamil; [e] = ५, [e, e:] = short and long [e] of Dialectal Hindi, Tamil, etc.; so [o, o:] = short and long [o]; [a] = Bengali ० in । in ।।, the sound of a in South English man; [a] = unaccented, very short ० of Hindustani, as in the second syllable of रतन = [रतन] = the English sound of a as in ago, China; [ɔ] = Bengali ६, short and long, [o, o:] = the English sound as in law; [A] = Hindustani ७ = English u as in sun or o as in son; this may be considered as the All-India value of the short [३] = ७; [a] = Hindustani ८.

The above letters comprise practically all the symbols required for most of the sounds and the letters of all the important Indian languages, Aryan and non-Aryan. In the case of one or two languages, some special symbols may be necessary; they are noted in their proper place.

I now give the Indo-Roman script—the 'Bharatiya-Romaka Lipi' as applied to individual languages.
The Devanāgarī letters give not merely the sound-equivalents, but also the proposed names of the Indo-Roman letters. In case of the aspirates, a little more elaborate naming, as suggested below, will be necessary.

### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indo-Roman Letters</th>
<th>Devanāgarī Equivalents and Names in Devanāgarī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>अ (अस्तान्त)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>आ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ई</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i;</td>
<td>ई (शोधन)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>उ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u:</td>
<td>उ (शोधन)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r'</td>
<td>र'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r;</td>
<td>र (शोधन)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l'</td>
<td>ल'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ए</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_l</td>
<td>ए (पांचपांच)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>ओ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o:</td>
<td>ओ (पांचपांच)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_u</td>
<td>ओ (पांचपांच)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am'</td>
<td>ओ (पांचपांच)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A</td>
<td>ओ (पांचपांच)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah'</td>
<td>ओ (पांचपांच)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indo-Roman Letters</th>
<th>Devanāgarī Equivalents and Names</th>
<th>Indo-Roman Letters</th>
<th>Devanāgarī Equivalents and Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>क, कृ, कृ (क्रृत-क्रृत)</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>क्ष, क्ष (क्रृत-क्रृत)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ग, ग्न (ग्न्न-ग्न्न)</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>ग्न, ग्न (ग्न्न-ग्न्न)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n'</td>
<td>न (न्न-न्न)</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>च (च्च-च्च)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>च, च्च (च्च-च्च)</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>ज्ह (ज्ह-ज्ह)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A dot before a vowel indicates the nasalisation.*
**CONSONANTS—continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indo-Roman Letters</th>
<th>Devanagari Equivalents and Names</th>
<th>Indo-Roman Letters</th>
<th>Devanagari Equivalents and Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n' =</td>
<td>न (वाल्य न, पारित्यात न)</td>
<td>t' =</td>
<td>ट (चोट्टाला ट), t' hi =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(चोट्टाले) ट-पर-ट,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ट-के-साथ-ट (वा प्राण) ट;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d' =</td>
<td>ड (चोट्टाला ड), d' h =</td>
<td></td>
<td>(चोट्टाले) ड-पर-ड,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ड-के-साथ-ड (वा प्राण) ड;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n' =</td>
<td>न (सुरंग न, चोट्टाला न)</td>
<td>t =</td>
<td>त, th = त-पर-त, त-के-साथ-त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(वा प्राण) त;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d =</td>
<td>ड, dh = ड-पर-ड, ड-के-साथ-ड</td>
<td></td>
<td>(वा प्राण) ड;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>न (सच्च न);</td>
<td>p =</td>
<td>फ, ph = प-पर-फ, प-के-साथ-फ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(वा प्राण) फ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b =</td>
<td>ब, bh = ब-पर-ब, ब-के-साथ-ब</td>
<td></td>
<td>(वा प्राण) ब;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m =</td>
<td>र; y = य</td>
<td>l =</td>
<td>ल;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r =</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>v, w =</td>
<td>व ( [व] before [i, e, y]; [w] before [a, u, a, o], and after consonants; or simply [v] could be used);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s' =</td>
<td>श (ताल्या श, 's' = श (सुरंग श, चोट्टाला श), पारित्या श);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s =</td>
<td>श (दक्ष्य श);</td>
<td>h =</td>
<td>ह;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r' =</td>
<td>र (चोट्टाला र), r' h =</td>
<td></td>
<td>र (चोट्टाला र-पर-र,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>चोट्टाले र-के-साथ-र वा प्राण ह).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, for foreign sounds as introduced by Urdu, the following letters would be required:

- f = फ = फ; z = झ = झ;  z' = झ = झ;
- x = ख = ख; g = ग = ग; q = क = क;
- [v] = व = व; [w] = व = व; भगु ती का प्राण = त.

A special note on the symbol [A] = अ is necessary.
In Indian writing, अ is grammatically the short vowel, and आ is its long form. This was so when अ was as much an open (विष्णु) sound as आ. But at least from the time of Panini, short अ changed its quality, it became a close (कुंकुम) sound, and thus it was no longer the short of आ—in practice though not in theory. For this अ, which is equivalent to the u in English but, the International Phonetic Association has been using the symbol [A]. This can be adopted for the Indian अ, and this will release [a] for आ, without making it necessary to have the length indicator [:] after the [a], which would have been unavoidable if simple [a] were used for अ. A good deal of inconvenience in having the length-indicator always after the [a] for अ is thus avoided.

For the anusvara, the symbol [m'] is put after the vowel, from the nature of the sound itself. Optionally, it could be rendered in Hindi by a simple [n], for which see below. The anunāsika, or nasalising value is denoted by putting the symbol before the vowel—[n']—as a sort of warning beforehand that the vowel following is nasalised.

The Indo-Roman alphabet for Hindi stands thus, with the names for the letters being as in Hindi:

A a i i: u u: r r: l e i o A u A m!: Ah::

k k h g gh n'
c ch j jh n'
t' t' h d' d'h n'
t th d dh n
p ph b bh m
y r l v, w
s' s' s h r' r'h
f z z' x χ q q'

Where the final अ is absent in pronunciation, its equivalent in the Indo-Roman script, [A], is to be omitted from writing.

Before their corresponding class nasals, [n' n' n'] may be written simply as [n], so that the letter [n] may be allowed to behave like the anusvara in Devanāgarī writing, e.g., नन्द = नन्द ['pan'kaj, or pankaj], पन्नन्द = पन्नन्द ['pan'cām or pāncām], तन्दन्न = तन्दन्न ['tan'd'aw, tand'aw']. As anusvara=[m'] has the sound of [n] in Hindi, and is often written as अ, e.g., वनस्प = वनस्प, the letter [n] consequently could be employed for [m'] in Hindi, e.g., वा, बा = [hans, banś'] rather than [hams'ā, wams'ā].
जानिए, एक बार चल कर हम धर्म धर्म का लगे उस पुरानी देवी की देवी को देखे' तो साधक, जो नाती के किनारे, भाषा के चने बागों के बीच में बसा हुआ है। जिस देवी में घर-घर में चंदन के तह चिर दरवाज़ों में चंदन के किवाले लगे हैं। जहाँ सब लोग सोचे के बालों में भोजन करते हैं, सोचे के वर्तनियों में पानी पीते हैं। जहाँ घर-घर में चित्रकला है। जहाँ की सब खिचड़ी चित्र-कला में नियुक्त हैं, भीर सब पुरुष चित्रों की सुनकरता पर सुधार होने का छत्र रखते हैं। जहाँ चर्च और महरणे के पेंड़ों की काया जहाँ राजाओं को शोध भीर सुखद बनाने रखते हैं। जहाँ प्रवेश केंद्र से गाम निकलता है। जहाँ की चीपाली में राजनीति के जटिल प्रश्न एक एक वाक्य में सुखमयी जाते हैं। जहाँ समुद्र मात्र के जीवन का निर्देश लक्ष्य भीर निर्दिष्ट प्रश्न है।

jao, ek bar oal kar ham apne us purane des' kq dekh'e to sahi: , jo nai' o ke kinare, am ke ghane barq'o ke bi:o m'e bāsa hua hāi. jis des' m'e ghar ghar m'e candan ke vr'ks' aur darwaz o m'e candan ke kiwar' e lage h'āi. jah'a sab log sone ke thal' o m'e bhōjan karte h'āi, sone ke bārant' o m'e pāni; pāte h'āi. jah'a ghar ghar m'e citras'alā h'āi. jah'a ki; striy' a citrakāla m'e nippun' h'āi, aur sab purus' citr' o ki:sundāvata par mugdha hone ka h're day rakhte h'āi. jah'a ghar' oke pichwār' e ghani; b' aśwār' i; hāi. am aur mahāwe ke p' er' o ki; chaya jah'a rast'o ko s'i; tal aur sukhad bānaye rakhti; h'āi. jah'a pratyek kan't'h se gan nikalta hāi. jah'a ki; caupal' o m'e raj-niti ke jat'il pras'n ek ek wakyā se sulhaye jate h'āi. jah'a manus'ya matri ke pī.wan ka nirdis't' laks'ya aur nis'cīt pāth hāi.

( ii )

आज जल हुकी का एक नई टकसाल खुल गई है, भीर वह है—जीवन-संग्राम। जीवन-संग्राम! जिघर देखिए, वही भावावज सुनाई देती है। इस संग्राम में भाषा किसी से सहानुभूति की, चम्पा की, प्रोबाइशन को भाषा नहीं कर सकते। सभी धर्म-धर्म सब भीर देंत निकाली गिरावट की ताज़ में बैठे है। उनका धुधा प्रशांत-महासागर से भी गहरी है; किसी तरह गायत्री नहीं होती। आग! यह दिन चीवी खंsतों की जगह बढ़तालीस घंटों का होता!
अज कल दुःख कि: एक नई: त'अक्षाल खुल गाई: है, अर वह वह गाई—जिमन-संग्राम! जिमन-संग्राम! जिद्धर देखिये, यही: अवर सुनाई: डेट: है। इस संग्राम मे: अप कि: से सहानभूति कि:; क्स'अमा कि:; प्रोत्साहन कि: अस'अन्ह'ि: कार सक्ते। सब-हि: अपने-अपने नकल अर डांट निकले रिकार कि: ताक मे: बाइट'हें हृ'नि:। उन कि: क्सु'धा प्रसंसां-महासागर से भि: गाहरि: है; कि: संनाह संत नह्य'ि: होति:। कस्! यह डिन मूबुल संग्राम'ि: की: जा'ख अर'तल:ि: संग्राम'ि: का होता! इधर सुर्या निकला, अर उधार मासी:न उली:। पहिर वह दो बजे रात से पहले नहीं बंद कि: सकती—एक मिनट के लिये भि नहीं। नाग्ना खड़े-खड़े कोजिये, खाना ढीलू-ढीलू खाएँ, मिलों से मिलने का समय नहीं—फालतू बातें सुनने की पुर्यालत नहीं। सत्तलब की वात कहिए साहब, चटपट! समय का एक एक मिनट बालग्रही है, सोती है; उसे व्यर्थ नहीं कि: सकती। वह संग्राम की मनोविन्द्य पक्षम से ग्राह है, अर वह वें वें से भारत में फैल रही है।

अज कल दुःख कि: एक नई: त'अक्षाल खुल गाई: है, अर वह वह गाई—जिमन-संग्राम! जिमन-संग्राम! जिद्धर देखिये, यही: अवर सुनाई: डेट: है। इस संग्राम मे: अप कि: से सहानभूति कि:; क्स'अमा कि:; प्रोत्साहन कि: अस'अन्ह'ि: कार सक्ते। सब-हि: अपने-अपने नकल अर डांट निकले रिकार कि: ताक मे: बाइट'हें हृ'नि:। उन कि: क्सु'धा प्रसंसां-महासागर से भि: गाहरि: है; कि: संनाह संत नह्य'ि: होति:। कस्! यह डिन मूबुल संग्राम'ि: की: जा'ख अर'तल:ि: संग्राम'ि: का होता! इधर सुर्या निकला, अर उधार मासी:न उली:। पहिर वह दो बजे रात से पहले नहीं बंद कि: सकती—एक मिनट के लिये भि नहीं। नाग्ना खड़े-खड़े कोजिये, खाना ढीलू-ढीलू खाएँ, मिलों से मिलने का समय नहीं—फालतू बातें सुनने की पुर्यालत नहीं। सत्तलब की वात कहिए साहब, चटपट! समय का एक एक मिनट बालग्रही है, सोती है; उसे व्यर्थ नहीं कि: सकती। वह संग्राम की मनोविन्द्य पक्षम से ग्राह है, अर वह वें वें से भारत में फैल रही है।

निसि दिन बीनन विपुल से पियत रहे,
छाय रङ्गो नाद बोधुदरी की सुराम को;
तरसे-तनुवा-तौर बन कुंज वीरियन से
जहाँ तथा देखती है रूप छविधाम को।
कचि मतीराम होत दरिा ना डिए तै नेक
सुख प्रेम गात को परस विहिराम को;
जड़ौ तम कहत वियोग तज जोग करी,
जोग तब करै जो वियोग ही यम्ब गा को।

निसि दिन स्यानना पियु:स'अ सो पियाा रहाल,
चश्या रह्यो नाद ब 'असूरि: के सुराम्रामा को;
*तरानी-तनु-जाति: रा बना कुंपा बि: भीना म'अल
जाह' ताह' आ देखति: ह'अ रु: पा ओहिल-धमा को।
Sanskrit (as well as Pali and the Prakrits) can also be written in this Bhāratiya–Romako Līpi—only for ṣ and ṣa it may be thought advisable to write short [a] and long [ai] (and not [A] and [A]) as in the vernaculars). ṣa, ṣi may be properly indicated as long in Sanskrit—[e; o;], and long and short in Pali and the Prakrits [e, e;] and [o, o;]. ṣa, ṣi would consequently be [ai, au] (or better, [a:i, a:u]), and not [Ai, Au]. But to keep up an agreement with the vernaculars, it would perhaps be better, from the point of view of present-day Indians, to write Sanskrit in the vernacular way—a, ṣa=[A, a], ṣa, ṣi=[e, o], ṣa, ṣi=[Ai, Au].

If thought necessary, the visarga can be indicated as [h:], and the upadhmaṇiya and jihvamūliya forms of the visarga respectively as [f] and [x]. Special symbols will have to be employed for Vedic accent—a vertical bar, ['] justified, at the top of the syllable for the udātta, and the grave accent ['] similarly for the svārīta, the anudātta being left unmarked. For ṣa, only [v] is to be employed; or [w], if it is intended to indicate the semi-vowel sound of ṣa: both [v] and [w] which are equally permissible for the dhatu v in the modern vernaculars, need not be used for v in Sanskrit.
The Indo-Roman script for Hindi will also be suitable for Urdu. The order of the vowels as in Hindi can be retained. The consonants can be arranged as in the Urdu alphabet, as follows (the names of the letters in Urdu can for the present be applied to the Indo-Roman letters):

```
(f) = l; (p) = v; (h) = y; (t) = t; (r) = r; (d) = d;
```

The Indo-Roman script for Hindi will also be suitable for Urdu. The order of the vowels as in Hindi can be retained. The consonants can be arranged as in the Urdu alphabet, as follows (the names of the letters in Urdu can for the present be applied to the Indo-Roman letters):

```
(kh) = k; (gh) = g; (ch) = c; (th) = t; (d'h) = d;
```

**SPECIMENS**

(i)
درسنا ان کی نظری میں نہ پیش کر سکتا - انسداد تو اس بات کہ ہے کہ بعد از مصنفین - قدیم شاعرین کی تکریم بھی نہیں گی - ہر غزل گی دلدل میں ایسی پہنس گی کہ کسی حسرہ صنف شاعری نہ تک ان کی رسالی فشار ہو گئی - اور اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ حسین یہ زمانہ نکھ مہارہ پہلا طولانی اور مسلسل نظام نکل فیdan رہا - اور حسن یہ بعد جہب اس کا احکام ہی پیدا ہوا تو اسی شاعرین کی کمپی ہو گئی - حسین جی کی تکریم میں اعلیٰ سے اعلیٰ ادائی کارزام.

پیش کر سکتا

**qdil; m *urdu:** adab agaer zaban ki: qadamat ki: wajh se maquuda na sul o ke lie s'ayad kuch kam dileaspi: ka baqis ban sake, lekin ws ke mut'alaqa ke baqad is amr ka yaqi:n ho jata hai ki *urdu: zaban is qadir thi:maya nah i; hai jali ki qam t'aur par samjha jata hai. ni;z aq se ti:n sau baras pahile bhi: wu is ki: ahi thi: ki is m'e aqila darje ki: sa'qiri: ki: jati: thi: aur mus'kil-se-mus'kil aur peci: da-se-peci: da masaful sulhaye yate the. sa'qiri: ki: ko: s'inf aisi: nah i; jo is xizane m'e maqiu:d na ha ho. razm aur bazm, don o ki: tas:wi:ri e jis xu:bi: ke sath is zamane m'e dihkal: gati; baqad ke adi:b'o m'e siwae *mi:r ani; aurr h'asan ke ko: du:sa in ki: naz'ir m'e na pes' kar saka. afsos to is bat ka hai ki baqad ke mus'ani:f' o ne qadi;m s'aur' i: ki: taqi:l di: bhi: nah i; ki:. wu haxal ke daldal m'e aise ph'as gae ki kisi: duseri: s'inf'i:s'aur' i: tak un ki: rasai: dus'war ho gal; aur us' ka nat'i:jaha yah hu:a ki *h'ali: ke zamane tak hamare yah a t'ai:li aurr musalsal naz'm'o ka fuqdan raha, aurr *h'ali: ke baqad jab is ka ih'sas pada hu:a to aache s'aur' i: ki: kami: ho gal; jo *h'ali: ki: taqi:l di: m'e aqla-se-aqla adabi: karname pes' kar sakte.

(ii)
तूने की है फूर्त हीकियत का मोज़ खिज़
हृदय का फ़्रेक़ केरु़ हेलिका जेहाद तो
रहे द से गुल़ से गुहार तेज़ ईदुल शाहाबी
बिले है एब आँदा तर ने किजो नमाज तर
एहल नज़र की आँकेह मैन रहना दे किदाये
जो बिनोर हेज़ इन्स ने रेक़े साज साज तो
नाक आनंद दिन से तेज़ी ग्रो चेताविन लोग
मुद्दर जा एळू एको- झु है जार झु झु झु
जो है एळू एको ने तूलुम अमाज तो
एळू एळू ने का विद्यम अमाज तो
एळू एळू एळू एळू इसे से के जा दर्ने मिन गरे
ग्रो चेता है खप्सर की उम्र द्राज़ तो
उत्त का बहिद़ मल्क की धक्के मिन है जेहाद़
मुहम्मद जान आळ एळू एळू एळू एळू एळू एळू एळू

ay s'iqr, dil-fireb na ho tu; to rām nāh'i;
p̨ar tuḥ-pa h'alîf hāl, jo nā ho; dil-gudaz tu;
s'āṇqat pā ho firetā qalam āgar tāmam,
h'a, -sadaqī; se aīyo a[qnī: na baq tu;
jauhar hāi rāsti: ka āgar terī: ẓat ṃ e,
tah'si:n-i-roẓgār se hāi be-niyāz tu;
h'ūsn āpna āgar dikha nāh'i: saktā jāhan ko,
apē ko dekh, āur kā apne pā nāz tu;
tu: ne kiya hāi bahw'i-h'āqiqat ko maqż-xez;
dhoke kā qārq kār ke rāhāga, jāhāz, tu;
wuh din gae, ki jhu:t' tha i:man-i-s'aqiri:;
qibla ho xāb udhār, to na kī:jo namaz, tu;
ah-l-nazr' kī: akh-m e rahāna hāi āgar qazi:z,
jo be-bās'ar h'āl, un se nā rakh saz-baz bu;
nak u:parī: dawā se terī: āgar car'hā e log,
maqżū: pān un-ko, jo ho cara-saz tu;
cup-cap āpne saase kīye ja dī o m e ghar,
ūcē abhī: nā kar qalām-i-īmtiyāz tu;
S. K. CHATTERJII

As a classical language, Persian can equally be written with the Indo-Roman script as employed for Hindustani (Hindi and Urdu), following the Indian pronunciation of Persian, which is archaic for the language, being based on Persian pronunciation of five hundred years ago. In present-day Persia, a standardised Roman spelling does not appear to have been generally accepted, but it will be quite easy to write Persian in its modern pronunciation in the Roman character without it being necessary to use a single capped or dotted letter.

The short [a] of Modern Persian is pronounced very much like the South English a as in man, and hence this can be conveniently represented by [æ]; the long [a:] of Modern Persian has become like the South English au or aw as in caught, law (and a frank [u:] before nasals), and this pronunciation can be well indicated by the symbol [o], as employed in the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association: if [o] is thought too outlandish, [a] simply can be employed instead, differentiating it from the short [æ]. The short vowels of Modern Persian can thus be written [æ, e, o], thus β = [bae, be, bo] (in Indian pronunciation [ba, be, bu or bo]); and the long vowels of Modern Persian also can be written [a or a, i, u], thus پوئئی پئئی = [ba or bo, bi, bu] (in Indian pronunciation [ba:, bi: or be:, bu: or bo:]), and the diphthongs as [ei, ou], e.g., پوئئی = [bei, bou] (in Indian pronunciation [bai, bau]). The long i and o vowels of Modern Persian are always pronounced as ma'rūf, i.e., [i:] and [u:], the Indian (majhāl) values of [e:] and [o:] are unknown to Modern Persia; as both short [e] and short [o] will have to be used for representing the Indian pronunciation of Persian, long [e:] and [o:] will also be necessary in India. The isfārat and the conjunction ک are frequently pronounced as short [e] and [o] in India, and they may be written as such.

SPECIMENS

(1)

شگفت از انگلیسی در سفر دریا کردنی ر سفر دریا کردنی در
دریا که سفر دریا کردنی - گفت عجب همین بود که از دریا بکنارا سلامت رسیدم.
A ROMAN ALPHABET FOR INDIA

(Indian Pronunciation)

s'axs'e: az *aflat'un pursi:d ke, "salha-e bisyar dar jahaz bud;di: o safar-e-darya kardi; ; dar darya ce qa'jab di;di: ?"—guft, "qa'jab hamin bud ke az darya ba-kinara salamat rasi;dam."

Below are given two transcriptions of Persian, in Indian and in Modern Persian pronunciation—the first in Indo-Roman, and the second in what may be called Perso-Roman. It is to be noted that in India, final [n] after a long word becomes a mere nasalisation. [n] = nīm-fathah.
S. K. CHATTERJI

(Modern Persian Pronunciation: Perso-Roman)

kārima! bābāxs/a-e-bār h'al-e ma,
[kārimo! bābāxs/o-e-bār hōl-e mo]
ke hāstım āshr-i kāmānd-e hāva.
na darīmē yēl az to fāryādā ṭes!
to i yas'īyan ra xāt'a-bāxs'/ o bās.
negāhdārē mā ra ze rāh-i xāt'a,
[negāhdo re mo ro ze rō-i xāt'o]
xāt'a dār gozār u sēvābam noma....
cehel sah qomr-i qāzizat gozās't
mezaj-i to az h'al-e t'ēflī negās't.
hāmēh ba hāva u hāvās sāxēti,
demī ba mās'āleh' na pārdaxēti,
mā kon tākhe bār qomr-e na-pāedar
mā-bās' imān az hāzī-e rūzēgar.

In a simplified Perso-Roman, representing the actual pronunciation without any reference to the Perso-Arabic orthography [s, s'] = ū, ū, can be written simply [s] = same as ū; [t'] = b simply [t] = ū; [h'] = ē, simply as [h] = ə; [z, z', s'], that is, ū w b, as [z] = j; and [x] = ĕ and [q] = į being both pronounced as [x] = ē, one symbol can be written for both—perhaps [q] as the more common letter would be preferred; [q] = ē can be ignored, also [f] = ə; and in scanning, the indistinct vowel which is intruded can be written as [ə], as it has been done above. In the modern pronunciation, [v] is to be used rather than [w]; the vowels [ə e o] are always short; [a] = [o], as in English law, [i], and [u] are always long. If [ə] is thought too outlandish, simple [a] can be used for the short vowel = sahr or fathah, and [o] then can be used for the so-called long ā. See p. 39 for transcriptions.

A PERSO-ROMAN ALPHABET FOR MODERN PERSIAN

VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>æ (or a), e, o; ə</td>
<td>a (or õ), i, u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphtongs</td>
<td>ei, ou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A ROMAN ALPHABET FOR INDIA

CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gutturals</th>
<th>Palatals</th>
<th>Dentals</th>
<th>Labials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>k, g</td>
<td>(k', g')</td>
<td>t, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td>c, j</td>
<td>s', z', y</td>
<td>s, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirants</td>
<td>x, q (or η)</td>
<td>r, l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids</td>
<td>(n'=n)</td>
<td>(n'=n)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[k', g'] are subsidiary values of [k, g], and may be optionally employed. It is to be noted that initial and intervocal [k, k', t, p] of Modern Persian are strongly aspirated, as [kh, k'h, th, ph], but this aspiration need not be indicated in writing, as much as it is not done in English.

SPECIMEN OF MODERN PERSIAN

The same text in the alternative system, with [a] short å, and [o] long ó:

ruh-e bas'ar niz ruzi xohad amad ke az tams'a vo kar bordan-e in hame vasael taraqqi ke tamaddon-e jadid paluyas' mirizad xaste s'ode vo xod ra darmeyan anha mahbus dide. be atraf-e xod xohad nagerist, o vaqtike az modar-e xod yani az ruh-e azali vo jamali motlaq asari peida na-kard, an vaqt bana-e garie vo nale xohad gozas't o faryad xohad zad—modar! modar!

ruh-e bas'ar niz ruzi xohad amad k'e az tamos'o vo kor bordan-e in hame vasael taraqqi k'e tamaddon-e jadid paluyas' mirizad xaste s'ode vo xod ro darmedeyon onho mahbus dide. be otrof-e xod xohad nagerist, o vaqtike az modar-e xod yoni az ruh-e azali vo jamoli motlaq asari peida na-kard, an vaqt bana-e garie vo nale xohad gozas't o faryod xohad zad—modar! modar!
Like Persian, Arabic is a classical language of India, although foreign to the country. Arabic quotations may occur in Urdu, and it may be necessary to write them in Roman. The Indo-Roman script for Hindustani covers Arabic in its Indian pronunciation, but to transliterate Arabic in Arab pronunciation it would be found convenient to have two letters from the Greek—[θ] and [ð], for the Arabic sounds of ω and scheduler. (Failing these, an Italic [t] and an Italic [d] can be employed.) The vowels will be as follows: [a, a:, i, i:, u, u:] the diphthongs—[ay, aw]. For consonantal _scheduler_, we should use only [w]. The Roman equivalents for the Arabic letters (consonants) would then be—

![Roman Equivalents](image)

**SPECIMENS**

(i)
A ROMAN ALPHABET FOR INDIA

For Standard Bengali, the Indo-Roman alphabet as for Hindi can be employed, but as the Bengali pronunciation of $\alpha$ is not [A], but [o], this may be used in place of [A]; then [a] or [oi, ou] will then have to be written [oi, ou], or, better, [oi, ou]. But it would be better to follow the All-India system of transliteration, and equate Bengali $\alpha$ with [A], it being understood that in Bengali [A] has the value of a more rounded sound, of [o].

Colloquial Bengali $\alpha'$ (i.e. $\alpha$ followed by an $\hat{I}$, which is either lost or is weakly pronounced) and $\omega'$ (i.e. $\omega$ similarly treated) can be indicated by [A] and [a] followed by a symbol [?] which can be made from the note of interrogation [?], with the vertical line and the dot at the bottom broken off: [A?] and [a?]; of these, [A?] has the value of a frank [o], and [a?] of a fronted [a]. This symbol can be called in Bengali ইতেলেফ = [flek]. Failing this special symbol, the inverted comma could be employed as a vowel-modifier, হফল or subscribed [v] is denoted by [w]; and the doubling of consonants after superscribed [r] = reptha is omitted: e.g., পশ্চা, কর্তব্য are to be written as [dharma, kartabya], and not with [mm] and [tt].

The Indo-Roman Alphabet for Bengali is given below.

The Bengali equivalents are to be used as names of the Indo-Roman letters, and in some cases, descriptive names, given within brackets, will be useful for young beginners (as the current descriptive names in Bengali are).

$\alpha$ = $\alpha$ (the final $\alpha$, when not pronounced, is to be omitted in Indo-Roman spelling); $\alpha$ = $\alpha$; $i$ = $\hat{I}$; $i$ = $\hat{I}$; $u$ = $\hat{U}$; $u$ = $\hat{U}$; (where
in pure Bengali or vernacular words, [i] and [i:\] [u] and [u:\] are both allowed, for convenience [i, u] only may be used); r' = 's; r = 'dhr̄i; l = 't; l = 't; e = 'e; Ai = 'i; '0 = 'o; AU = 'a; A = 'e (চ্ছাবিক্রম); AM = 'g (অছুবার; since the Bengali pronunciation of the anuvāra in identical with that of 'u', this may also be denoted by [An' = 'u, 'u\); \h attending 'e- 's, a' = 's- 's; = 's- 'suggestion; 

1. c = 'c; ch = 'c = 's- 'c; j = 't; jh = 't- 't; n' = (কীৰ্তে-বাত্তি) 'e; t' = (টিক-মাথা) t; t'h = (টিক-মাথা) t- 't; d' = (টিক-মাথা) d; d'h = (টিক-মাথা) d- 't; n' = (টিক-মাথা) 

2. t = 't; th = 't- 't; d = 'd; dh = 'd- 'd; n = 'c 

3. p = 'p; ph = 'p- 'p; b = 'b; bh = 'b- 'b; m = 'm; y = 'y; j = 'y 

4. r = 'r; l = 'l; w = (অন্যান্য) 'w; r = 'r; 

5. s = (কীৰ্তে-বাত্তি) 's; s' = (টিক-মাথা) 's; s = 'c; h = 'h; 

6. r' = (টিক-মাথা) r; r'h = (টিক-মাথা) r- 't; ks = 'k- 'k-'k-'k; 'k' = (টিক-মাথা) 'k-'k-'k-'k (সিল্প) 

---can also be written 'k = [khy], or 'k = [kh] (in non-Sanskrit words); so jn' = 'k- 'k = 'k, can also be written as 'k [gy'] 

(For representing dialectal East Bengali pronunciation: [f] = ' of East Bengali; [gf, jf, d' f, df, bf] = 'f, 'f, 'f, 'f, 'f; [ts, dz] can be written for indicating the East Bengali values of 'f and 'f, and 's for that of 'c) 

**SPECIMENS.**

(i) 

বাঙালি নিন্দা তাহার বড়ই সাধের জিনিস ছিল। এক সাহেবের সঙ্গে খানসাম হইয়া তিনি পাখাড়ে গিয়াছিলেন, সেইখানেই এই সঙ্গে জিনিসটা জড়িয়ে করেন। ইহার গাত্রে হিজ-বিজি কাপো-কাপো অনেক সাখ ছিল। আশীর্বাদে করতেন, নালের সেহাঁলি আলাপ, তাই সে হিজ-বিজির বড়ই সোপার করিয়ে। বসতি সেহাঁলি অফার নামে, সেহাঁলি অফার-চীন ভাষায় অফার। তাহাতে লেখা ছিল,-"চীন দেশের সহায্যকারীর সাহায্য দিয়ে শহীর অপহরণের সো-পিং নামের কারিগরের দ্বারা এই নলটা একটা হইছে। নল-নির্দিষ্ট-কার্যে সো-পিং আঞ্চলিক কারিগর, অপহরণ হইলে তাহার স্থায়িত্ব। মূল্য চারি আলা। হারার নলের অবশ্য হইবে, তিনি তাহাই নিকট হইতে সেন কৃষ করেন, বাজে মেকারদের কাছে পিয়া বেন বৃথা সাথে নাই করেন। সো-পিং নল কৃষ করিয়া যদি কাহারও মনা নাই হয়, তাহাহইতে নল করিয়া দিলে সো-পিং তৎক্ষণ্ত মূল্য ফিরাইয়া দিলেন।" - বাংলা হইতে।
নাই রক্ষা। না হইলে, মৃত্যু এরকম কাহতে হইত। যুদ্ধের যে পথ দিয়া আসে গিয়াছিলেন, 
সেই তুষারময় হিসাবির অভিক্রিয় করিয়া, তিনি পরে পরক্ষণে উপাস্য পার হইল, তাহার 
সহম-কোষ মরভূমি চলিয়া, চীনের উত্তর সীমায় লিং-টিং শহরে আমীরকে কাহতে হইত, 
সেখানে যাইতে তবে সন্ধিপিপের সহিত সাক্ষাৎ হইত, সন্ধিপিপ সফট হরিয়া দিতেন। 
নাই বলি, ধরে রক্ষা করিয়া দে নলটি আমীরের মনোমত হইয়াছিল।

b's'er nalt'i t'ahar bar'a-i sadher jinis chila. ak saheber san'ge khan-
sama haliya tini pahar'e giyachilen, seikhanei ei sakker jinist'i kray kare.
ihar gaye hiji-biji kal-o-kalo anek dag chila. *ami:r mane kariten, naler 
seguli alan'kar, tai se hiji-biji-gulir bar'a-i gaurab kariten. bastoto seguli 
alan'kar nahe—seguli aks'ar, *ci:n bhas'ar aks'ar. tahate lekha chila—"*ci:n 
des'er mahapraci:rer sannikat' *lin'-'t'in' s'ahare" *mo-pin' namak karigar 
dwara ei nalt'i prastut haliyache. nal-nirman-karjye *mo-pin' adwiti:ya 
karigar, jagat jur'iya tahar sukhyati. mu:lya cari ana. j'ahar naler abas'ayak 
haibe, tini t'ahar-i nikat' haite jena kray karen, baje mekar-diger kaehe giya 
jena br'tha artha-nas't'a na karen. *mo-pin'er nal kray kaliya jadi 
kahar-o mononi:ta na hay, taha haile nal phiralya dile *mo-pin' tatks'an'at 
mu:lya phiralya diben." jaha hauk, *ami:r je nalt'i kiniyachilen, taha maner 
mat'a haimachila, tai rak'sa. na haile, mu:lya pherat lakte haita. *judhis't'hir 
je path diya swarge giyachilen, sei tus'ar-may *himagi:ri atikram kaliya, 
tibbater parbat-may upatyaaka par haliya, *tatarer sahasra kros' maru-bhu:-ni 
caliya, *ci:ner uttar si:may *lin'-'t'in' s'ahare *ami:r ke jaite haita, sekhane 
jaile tabe *mo-pin'er sahit saks'at haita, *mo-pin' sikit'i phiralya diten. tai 
bail, dharme rak'sa kariyache je nalt'i *ami:rer manomata haimachila.

( ii )

মাটির প্রাদীপ্তানি আছে মাটির ঘরের কোলে।
সন্ধ্যা তারা তাকার, তারি আলো দেখিবে বলে।
সেই আলোটি নিমেষ-স্তম্ভ ব্যাকুল চাওয়ার মত, 
সেই আলোটি মায়ের প্রাঙ্গণের ভবের মত দোলে।
সেই আলোটি নেবে অন্য কামাল ধরার জমদ-জলে, 
সেই আলোটি চণ্ড হাওয়ার বাঘার কাপে পলে পলে।
নামুল সন্ধ্যা তারার বাণী আকাশ হইতে আশীর্বাণী',
অব শিখা আকুল হল', মন্ত্র নিষিদ্ধ উঠতে বলে।

mat'ira pradi:pa-khani ache mat'ira ghara:ra kole; 
sandhya-tara takay tar-i alo dekhe ba'le.
S. K. CHATTERJI

sei aloṭ'i nimes'ā-hata priyāra byakul cawar māta;
sei aloṭ'i mayera pran'era bhayera māta dole.
sei aloṭ'i nebe jwāle s'ymala dhārara hr'daya-tāle;
sei aloṭ'i cāpala haway byalhāy k'ape pāle pāle.

namlo 'sandhya-tararx ban'ī:, akas' hā'te as'is' ani'—
amara s'ikha akula hā'lo—martyn s'ikhay ut'hite jwā'le.

(ii i)

সামনে এল' অসীম সমৃদ্ধ, সবের চেঁ-তোলা নীল সুনের মত। সেখানে রাজপুত্রী
লোকের উপর থেকে নেনে পাড়ি।

কিন্ত সেদুনি মাটিতে পা পড়, অন্যভিন এ কি হ'লা? এ কোন জাগকতের জাত?
এ তে শহর! টাম চলেছে। অপিস-সুকো গাড়ির ডিড়ে রাই হুর্ময়। তাল-পালার
বাল্যিভালা গলির দ্বারে রাজার উল্লাস চেলের লেভে দেখিয়ে রাধিতে দূর গিয়ে' চলেছে।

আর রাজপুত্রের এ কি বেশ? এ কি চল? গায়ে বেকাস-খোলা জোনা, গুড়িটা
বুঝ সাফ নায়, জুট-কোড়া জীব্র। পাড়িগীরের ছেলে, শহরে পড়ে, টিউশানি ক'রে
বাস-খোল চালায়।

রাজকুমাৰী কোথায়?

তাঁর বাসার পাশের বাড়িতেই। টাম সুলের মত রঙ নায়, হাসিতে তাঁর মানিক
খেলে না। আকাশের তারার সংকে তাঁর তুলনা হয় না; তাঁর তুলনা, নব বয়স্ব দাসের
আদালে বে নাম-হারা সুল ফোটে, তাঁরি সংকে।

samne elo asi'm samudra, swapner d'heu-tola ni:l ghumer māta.
sekhane raj-puttur ghor'ar upar theke neme pā'r'la.

kintu jenni mat'ite pa pā'r' a, amni e ki hā'la? e kon Jadukārer jadu?
e je s'ahar! t'ram oā'leche. apis-mukho gā'ir bhīr'e rasta durgām.
tal-patar b'as'iwala gālir dhare rastay ulan'gā cheleder lobh dekhiye b' asite
ph'u diye oā'leche.

ar raj-putturere e ki bes' e ki cal? gaye botam-khola jama, dhuitit'a
khub saph nay, juto-jor'a ji:rn'x. par'ag'ayer chele, s'ahare pā'e, t'ius'an'i
kā're basa-khārāc caile.

raj-kanya kothay?

tar basar pas'er bar'itei. c'apa phuler māta pā'n: nay, hasite tar
man'ik khase na. akas'er tarar san'ge tar tulana hay na; tar tulana, nāhā
bars'ar ghaser ar'ale je nam-hara phul phot'e, tari san'ge.
The Indo-Roman alphabet for Hindi will also serve for Gujarati, with the addition of \([l']\) = \(\ddot{\text{C}}\). For \(\text{r}, \text{v}\) alone is to be used. The recursive sounds of Gujarati, like \(\text{k\r}, \text{g\r}, \text{p\r}, \text{b\r}\) etc., which result from the change of \(\text{h}\) to the glottal stop \([\ddot{\text{C}}]\), can be written, if thought necessary, as \([\text{kh}, \text{gf}, \text{pf}, \text{bf}]\) etc.

**SPECIMEN**

\[\text{अपल्लु कृप्या भाषामध्ये पुराणादेशी कथा चनि कल्याणादेशी हळळी हळळी वर्णों सा काव्य लखवायां हेतु, परंतु हमारे सूचीमध्ये केवल ऐतिहासिक वल्लुळक्ष काव्य जाणवानें स्वयं नयी। जुनामां जून एवं वीराध्वज ते काळकडे-प्रवंध हेतु। चा प्रवंधने प्रजानी जाणामां लाभावां मान प्राचीन-शीघ्र-रसिक प्रवाहात विहरूरः खः डाः भूरूनि घटे हेतु। जुना कस्तुः चंद्रनी शोधसां ऐंठो राज्यपुत्रांना तर्फ गाया हता, या घरां ना जैन भंडार तपस्तां तेमनी टटी चा प्रवंध उपर पडी। लुळुकाणा वांचामां वांचिंचं चनि सुरुवत दाळवामां सुवळी तातांमूळचीवाळा पटारामां सावळबं चा रजः कदरदान भावरी तो टटी एचत पडतां तेमणे तेन चाव चोख विषंत करो। पोती पणी नकल करावाणी खः नवरात्री लक्षीराम पंडत्या, जेने शातापत्ना तत्त्व हता चनि जेमना उपर गुजराती भाषामां बारा विधान तर्की पोतानी पवाचत हतो, तेमनी तर्फ मोकली दोषी। एकज प्रत उपरती संशोधन करवं घरं विकट घारी तेमणे लक्षिणी प्रत गरवाणे न भाय माते कडकी कडकी शातापत्नामां कापी।

apn'1: bhas'a-m' a puran'e-ni; katha xne kalpanao-ne hu; lavi hu; lavi; ne ghan' ae kavya lakkha y'a che, parantu atyar sudhi,-m'a keval' aitihasik vastuval'u kavya ja'n'ya-m'a avy' u nathi: ju:n'a-m'a ju:n' u ev' u vi:r-kavya te *kanhad' de-prabandh che. a prabandh-ne praja-ni: ja'n'-m'a lajava-n'u man praci:n-s'odh-Rasik prakhyat vidvad-var svarg-vasi: d'akt'ar *byu:lar-ne ghat'e che. ju:na sam sk'ret grantho-ni; s'odh-m'a eo rajpu:t-sthan taral gaya hata, ty a *tharad-na *jain bhun'd'ar tapast'a temni; dr's'ti a prabandh upar pad' ti. lugd'a-na ba'adh'an'-m'a ba'dhe'u, xne suraks' it dabd'a-m'a muki:ne tal'a-kun'ci:-val'a pat'ara-m'a saavel'u a rat'ra kadar-dan jhaveri:-ni; dr's't'ie pad't'a'-y temn'e ten'u ab jot klimmat kar'. pot' eni: nakal kara:vi:ne svarg-vasi: *navalram *lksm':i:ram *pan'd'ya, jeo *s'al'a-patra-na tantri: hata xne jemna upar *gujarati:
The Indo-Roman script for Gujarati will also do for Marathi. [A] = ɺ will of course have its Marathi value—that of an unrounded [o]. The [ts, dz] pronunciation of ɺ, ɺ need not be specially indicated, [c, j] alone being employed. We need not write ɺ as [dny] or [dn'] the Pan-Indian [jn'] should do; and, as in Gujarati, [v] alone is to be employed for ɺ. ɺ should be written [mh], rather than [hm].

**SPECIMEN**

श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतिवर चाणेश्वर महाराजानी जी टीका कैसी तिचे नाव "भावायंदोपिकात". तोंच "चाणेश्वरी" या नावातील ह्या सुप्रसिद्ध चाहिए. या यंगारावर माहिती लोकांच्या मोठी शहा चाहिए. संयोग चाहिए. परंतु माहिती खप्रशंस बसे चाची ती, महाराजाभाषा बोलव्या जेवें काहीत ला सावळी या यंगारावर शहा समावित. त्याविष्ट यसे नस्त्रांची कारण चाणेश्वरीनी भाषा दुर्बिंध चाहिए बसे बडूनेकांचे खप्रशंस चाहिए. परंतु हा दुर्बिंधपणा वेदुळा चाणेश्वरीचा चाहि बसे खप्रशंस येथे नाही. ज्या सूलबिंधावर खप्रशंस भविकतीवर ही टीका चाहिए, तोंच धंघं सुजी गूढ चाहिए. वेद, वेदांग, उपनिषद, शास्त्र, हिन्दूद-कालीं जे सनातन बार्यरमाचीं भादार, ला सावळी चा उल्लेख या संबंधत भाषा चाहिए. हा उल्लेख कारखाचा प्रयत्न जर साधारण पुढापासून भाषा चयन, तर तो ध्यायित्व कहावा तसा कर्त्तच भाषा नसता. परंतु श्रीमद्भगवदगीताचा याचा सुखातून ही महजभ्रोता निवासी, व ती केवळ सामान्य मतूनकाळ दिल्या, बसे नाही, तर निकृष्ठ भविकता घाता जो "भरुन लखा ती दिव्या चाहिए. याचा प्रसंग कोणता हे श्रीमद्भगवद्गीताचा पंख्या भावायंदोपिकाच्या सहज समजते ते.
A ROMAN ALPHABET FOR INDIA

asavi. tathapi as'e nasn'yac'e kar'an', *jn'anves/vari:ci; bhas'a durbodh ahe, as'e bahutek'ac'e mhan'n'a e ahe. parantu ha durbodh-pan'a keval' *jn'anves/vari:ca ahe, as'e mhan'ta yet nah'i: jya mu,l-grantha-var, mhan'je *bhagavad-gi:te-var hi: t'li:ka ahe, to-e granth mul"i: gu'd'h ahe. *ved, *vedan'g'e, *upanis'ad"e, s'ast're, ityadik'ati:l je sanatan aryadharma'e bhan'd'ar, tya sary'aca ullek'h ya granth'at jhala ahe. ha ullek'h karn'yaca prayatna ja sadhan'an' purus'a-pasu:n jhala asta, tar to yatha-yogy'a v'hav'a tasa kadh'lo jhala nasta. parantu *s'ri:kr's'na-paramatma y'acya mukh'atu:n hi: *bhagavad-gi:ta nighali, va ti: keval' samanya manus'yas dili; as'e nah'i:, tar nissi:m bhagavad-bhakt'a asa jo *arjun tyala ti: dili: ahe. yaca prasan'g kon'ta h'e *s'ri:mad-bhagvad-gi:te: ceyya pahliva adhyaaya-varu:n saha' samaj't'e.

[IX] SINDHI

The vowels as in Hindustani. The final and interior weak vowels may be fully written [A, i, u]. The special Sindhi recursives are to be indicated by [gf, d'f, jf, bf]. Other letters to be represented as in Urdu. The Perso-Arabic alphabet of Sindhi can be thus transliterated:

A, a; b; b'; bh; t; th; t' (t'r); t'h; s; p; ph; j; j'; n'; c; ch; h'; x; d; dh; d'f; d' (d'r); d'h (d'hr); z; r; r'; z'; s; s'; s*; z*; t'; u; y; f; q; k; kh; n'; g; gj; gh; l; m; n; n' w (v); h; y.

SPECIMEN

hikir'e man'hua-khe bfa put'a hua. tini-m'a nand'he piu-khe cayo, e baba, mala-m'a jeko bhan'o m'uh'i:je h'ise ace, so m'u:khe khan'i: d'fe. j'ah'i-te huna malu b'shihi-khe viraha-d'fino. thorani d'f'i:han-kh' a poi sandusi nand'ho put'u sabhuk: hathi kare hikir'e d'fur:rah'e d'heha d'fe uthi: hallo, sate p'ah' i-jo malu ajhalala-m'e vin'ay'a"i:. sabbh khapai'n'kh' a poi itiqa' a unhe d'heha-m'e d'fad'ho d'ukaru aci: pio, j'ah'i-kare ho parawasi thilan'a lag'o. pan'a-khe tan'gi h'ala-m'e di'si: unhe d'heha-je hikir'e rahandar' a-khe ji: a-ti:"a kare van'i: cambir'lo, j'ah'i p'ah'i-je b'jania-m'e suara caram'a-loi mokilusi. "ai i' e the-bhay a' i: ta jeke chil'u: suara tha-khaini, se jekara in'a khai; p'ah'i-jo pet'u bhary'a, para khesi k'ah' i bl ki:ki:na d'fino.

[X] ORIYA

The system for Bengali will suit Oriya exactly, with the addition of [l'] for the cerebral l. As in Bengali, [o] can be used for w, if required.
**ASSAMESE**

Assamese is rather unique in its phonetic development, although it agrees most with Bengali. The Indo-Roman system for Bengali will have to be employed in transliterating Assamese: only the values of the letters in Assamese pronunciation will have to be explained.

**Vowels**—practically the same as in Bengali.

**Consonants** present a wide aberration:

\[
[c, ch, \tilde{J}, \tilde{J}h] = [s, s, z, z] \text{ in Assamese pronunciation.}
\]

The cerebrals \([t', t'h, d', d'h]\) and the dentals \([t, th, d, dh]\) are both absent in Assamese, alveolar stops as in English, \(= [t\, th\, d\, dh]\), being pronounced.

There is a special letter 3 = \([w]\) which does not occur in Bengali.

**[XII] TAMIL**

The following is the Indo-Roman script for Tamil:

\[
\text{A ; a ; i ; i ; u ; u ; e ; e ; \tilde{A}i ; o ; o ; \tilde{A}u ; k, g ; n ; c, s', \tilde{J} ; n' ; t', d' ; n' ; t, d ; n, p, b ; m ; y ; r ; l ; v ; z' ; l' ; r ; n (nr ; rr ; tt).}
\]

Grantha letters in Tamil—\(s' ; s ; \tilde{J} ; h ; ks'\).

The \textit{aylam} of Shen Tamil (Old Tamil) = \([x]\).

In Shen Tamil, it would be preferable to use only the sounds \([k, c, t', t, p]\)—and no \([g, s'\text{ and } \tilde{J}, d', d, b]\).

For representing accurately the pronunciation of Modern Tamil, \([k, s, v]\) can be used respectively for \([g, d, b]\), and final \([u]\) can be indicated as \([w]\) = unrounded \([\tilde{u}]\).
A ROMAN ALPHABET FOR INDIA

SPECIMENS

(i)

oru manus'ánukku iran'd'u kumarar irundargal'. avargál'il il'aiyāvan
tagappanai no;kkī—"tagappane:, astiyil en'akkku varum pan'gái en'akkut tara-
ve:n'd'um,' einran. andappād'd'ī avan avargál'ukkut tān astiyip pan'git't'uk
e kōd'uttan. sīla nal'alikkup pinbu il'aiya magan ellavaṟṟaiyum s'eettuk
kon'd'u durā:de;śattukkup purappatt'up po;y an'ge; durmā:rekkām ay
ji;vanam pan'n'i tān astiyai az'ittup po;t't'an. ellavaṟṟaiyum āvan
s'elavaz'ittā pinbu ānda de;ś'attile; kod'īya pan'jam un'd'ayirru. appoz'udu
āvan kuṟaiyu pad'at tod'āngi ānda de;ś'attuk kud'igāl'il oruvan id'attil
po;y oṭ't'ik kon'd'an. āndak kud'īyāvan āvan kīt tān vāyālāgāl'il pān'igal'āi
me;yykkumbād'ī kā uppinan.

(ii) Old Tamil

i;tal A?Ain; ti;vbiAi vit't'-i;t't'A l porul'; en'n'anrum
katal iruvar karutt-urā vaiitt-atarayu
patt't'āte: inpam; paranāi ninaint-immumru
vit't't'āte: per-inpa-vit't'u.

[XIII] MALAYALAM

The Indo-Roman alphabet for Malayalam: [A, a, i, i̊, u, ů, r, r̊, e, e̊, o, o̊, ăi, ău, ām, āh; k̊, g̊, g̊h, n̊; c̊, j̊, j̊h, n̊; t̊, t̊h, d̊, d̊h, n̊; t̊h, d̊h, n̊; p̊, ph, b, bh, m; ẙ, l̊, v; s̊, s̊, s̊h; z̊, l̊, r̊].

SPECIMEN

oru manus'yānu ṁaṅ'd'u makkāl' un'd'ay-irunnu. adīl il'aiyāvan
appano;d'u—"appa, vastukkal'il enikkku vare;n'd'unna pan'gu tāre;n'ame;';
ennu paran'nu. āvanum mūdaline avarkku pāgudi-ceydū. ēre nal' kāzyiyum
mumbe il'aiya magan sakalavum svaru;pičcu-kon'd'u du;ra de;ś'attē;kku
yatras po;y ēvīd'ē durnadād'appayi ji;vioccu tān'e vastu nanavidham akkk-kal'ān'n'u.
ellem celavaz'īcchā s'e;ś'āma de;ś'attil kat'hina ks'amām un'd'a-
yit't'u āvanu mut't'u vannu tūd'ān'n'i. ēnna āvan po;yā de;ś'attile;
paurūmaril oruttanod'u pari-kkon'd'u ay-āvan ayane tān'e nīla'n'āl'il
pānīgal'e me;ypān ayaccu.

[XIV] KANNADA

Letters as for Hindi, only short and long [e, e̊, o, o̊]; the special
consonant sounds are [l̊], and [r̊] and [z̊] for Old Kannada.
S. K. CHATTERJI

SPECIMEN

\[\text{obba manus'yani} \text{ge ibba} \text{ru man} \text{kaka'iddaru. avari-alli cikka} \text{yanu} \text{tandege,}
\text{"tandege, astiyalli nanage bara-takka pali} \text{nu nanage kod'u," andaga badukannu avari} \text{ge palit'tanu. kelayu} \text{dina} \text{gal'a me;le cikka maganu ella}
\text{ku;du} \text{si} \text{kon'd'u du} \text{;ra} \text{;de;sa} \text{;kke horat'u alli du} \text{ndugaran-ag} \text{i baduki tanna}
\text{astiyannu hal'mad'ita} \text{bit'tanu. avanu ella veccol-mad'ida me;le a de;sa} \text{;adalli}
\text{ghoravada bara un} \text{;t'ag} \text{i avanu korate-pa} \text{d'al-arambhaisid} \text{anu. aga hogi a}
\text{de;sa} \text{;asthari} \text{;alli obban} \text{annu hondi-kon'd'anu. ivanu avanannu handi} \text{gal'a} \text{annu}
\text{me;yu} \text{svadakke tanna holagal'ige kal'u} \text{hisid} \text{anu.}
\]

**[XY] TELUGU**

Alphabet as for Hindi (without its letters for special Urdu sounds), plus [l'], and [r'] for Classical Telugu, with short and long [e, e:] and [o, o:]. [w] need not be used; and [c, j] are to do duty for both [c, j] and [ts, dz], as [ca ca co cu] are pronounced as [tsA, tsa, tso, tsu] and [ce ci] as [ce, ci]; and similarly [ja ja jo ju]=[dzA, dza, dzo, dzv] and [je ji]=[je, ji].

**SPECIMEN**

\[\text{voka manus'yuniki yiddaru kumarulu vun'd'iri. varilo; cinnava;d'u,}
\text{"o; tan'd'ri, astilo; naku va} \text{ce; palu yimm'"-ani tan'd'ri;to; ceppin-appud'u}
\text{avan vara} \text{ki tana astini pan'ci pet't'enu. konni dinamulania taruvata a}
\text{cinna kumarud'u samastamunnu ku;runkoni du} \text{;ra} \text{;de;sa} \text{;munaku praya;"n'amai}
\text{vel'i tana astini deriyaaramu-valla pad'u-ce;senu. adanta vrayamu-ce;} \text{;sina}
\text{taruvata a de;sa} \text{;amandu pedda karu} \text{vu kalgin-anduna atad'u yibbandi pad'\text{;a}sa} \text{;genu. appud'u atad'u vel'i a de;sa} \text{;asthulal; vokaniki lo;bad'ly-un'd'e} \text{;nu. atad'u pendulanu me;put'aku tana polamulalo;ki atani pampenu.}
\]

**[XVI] AUSTRO-ASIATIC (KOL)**

The Kol (Munda) speeches (of which Santali and Mundari are representa­tives) have the following vowels : [i, e, æ, a, o, u]. Vowel-length need not be indicated, as it depends on some special speech-habits of the languages. There is no [A] in Kol ; [æ, o] are for open or low æ and o. The neutral vowel of Santali, æ, also need not be indicated, as it is a modified form of [a] under the influence of other contiguous sounds. But if required, it could be rendered as [æ']. The consonants are : [k, g, n; c, j, n'; t', d', r';
\text{t, d, n;} p, b, m; y, r, l, w, s, h], plus the aspires [kh gh, ch jh, t'h d'h,
th dh, ph bh, r'h] as in Santali, and the “checked stops” [k' c' t' p'], (or [g' y' d' h'] for Mundari) wherever they occur. (The value of the indicator ['] after these consonants, [k e t p +']={k' c' t' p'] is not that of a
palataliser as in the cases of [s' n' z'], but in the Kol speeches it serves to indicate that the stops are not exploded.)

**SPECIMEN: SANTALI**


**NOTE I.**

For tone-languages like Tibetan, Burmese, and other Tibeto-Chinese speeches, special tone-marks will have to be devised. The [''] accent-mark being already used as an 'indicator' to denote a sound-quality, it may be omitted from the list of tone-marks. A thick line, slanting, like [\[\] or [\[]], and a curved line like [\[\] or [\[\]], and similar other lines, placed before the syllables, might be employed for the purpose.

**NOTE II.**

The Indo-Roman script, as proposed above, may be forthwith employed for scientific purposes, in transcribing Sanskrit and other Indian languages, as well as Persian and Arabic, in Indological and other oriental publications. The systems of transliteration in vogue now, the standard or official Geneva system included, require a number of dotted and capped letters which only a limited number of presses in India possess. The result has been that the printing of an article with Sanskrit or other words and passages in Roman transcription, or of a book in Roman Sanskrit or Roman Hindustani, remains an expensive thing. With Indo-Roman, any press will be able to print these efficiently and cheaply. Will not orientalists and learned societies take note of this, and support Indo-Roman or something on its lines? That will be a very helpful step for the dissemination of the Roman script in India.
APPENDIX

THE LATIFI ALPHABET.

Mr. A. Latifi in his "All-India Alphabet" has presented a system of Romanisation before the Indian public. Here is a reproduction of what he offers,—the symbols he suggests, and his own notes on them:

The Alphabet is as follows for Urdu:

\[ A b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z \]
\[ 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 \]
\[ \alpha \omicron \upsilon \eta \]

More symbols will be added if required for other languages, but the following additional ones for Gujarati, Bengali, and Punjabi have already been devised:

\[ \alpha \omicron \upsilon \eta \]

Of these letters \( \alpha \), \( \epsilon \), \( \iota \), and \( \upsilon \), are used for the short vowel sounds of the English words \( \text{but, men, } \)\( \text{pin, put } \) respectively. \( \alpha \), \( \epsilon \), \( \iota \), and \( \upsilon \), are used for the corresponding long vowels as in } \( \text{father, mane, peel, and fool } \) respectively. \( \omega \) is always long.

\( \eta \), \( \alpha \), \( \epsilon \) represent the vowel sounds in } \( \text{molest (short o sound), bad, and ball } \) respectively. These are for Bengali.

\( \acute{c} \), \( \nu \), and \( \chi \) are only used in English and foreign words not naturalized in the Indian language concerned. Such words should be spelt as in the original language and not phonetically.

\( \beta \), \( \gamma \), \( \delta \) (as in } \( \text{gun} \), \( \beta \), \( \iota \), \( \kappa \), \( \lambda \), \( \mu \), \( \nu \), \( \pi \), \( \rho \), \( \sigma \) (as in } \( \text{soft} \), \( \omega \), \( \upsilon \), and \( \zeta \) (as in } \( \text{zone} \) represent the same sounds as in English. \( \delta \) and \( \tau \) represent the corresponding softer sounds in the Indian languages, e.g., in } \( \text{darwdzd, tamashd} \).

\( \eta \) and \( \iota \) represent the Gujarati } \( \psi \) and } \( \upsilon \).

The following table explains the use of the remaining consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Devanagari</th>
<th>Urdu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>स</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Latifi’s alphabet can be criticised on the following points:

(i) It does not appear to be based on a proper analysis of the phonetics of the Indian languages. Mr. Latifi quite unnecessarily follows the native Indian system in having distinct letters for the aspirates, instead of the simpler device of using the combination—unaspirated consonant + [h] (although some of his new letters, e.g., those for ः, ः and ॐ, are really ligatures of [t+h], [d+h] and [the symbol for ः+h]); thus he has found it necessary to provide for 11 additional characters.

(ii) It has a number of quite new and unfamiliar letters which make a page printed in it look like being in quite a different system of writing (e.g., the symbols for ः, ः, ः, ः, ः, ः, ः). The use of the numerals for speech sounds (e.g., 2 = ऐ, ऐ, kh; 3 = ज, zh, z; 4 = व, व, c; 5 = र, र, sh, s; 6 = ल, ल, bh; 7 = ध, ध, jh; 8 = श, श, ch; 9 = , ), will lead
to very great confusion: e.g., Latifi system, \([4a2na]=\text{चक्ना, जैफ़}=\text{[cakhna]}\) in Indo-Roman; \([506a]=\text{शोभा, जैफ़}=\text{[s'obha]}\); \([7a2mar]=\text{शहियाद}=\text{[jhaykhar]}\); \([1540\, \text{m}]=\text{5हर5हर हुर}=\text{[5har5har hue]}\). etc.

(iii) The distinction between some of the letters representing quite different sounds is very minute indeed, and some clear diacritical or indicating sign, with a fixed or clearly established function, would be preferable: e.g., the symbols for \(\text{र} \) and \(\text{र्न} \), \(\text{व} \) and \(\text{व्} \), \(\text{ण} \) and \(\text{ण्व} \). Compare also the script forms for \(\text{र} \) and \(\text{र्न} \), which are very similar.

(iv) Foreign words not naturalised may be indicated in their original Roman spelling, but then such words must always be written or printed within inverted commas. There is no point in keeping both \([\text{c}]\) and \([\text{k}]\) for the \([\text{k}]\) sound, and \([\text{x}]\) for the compound consonant sounds of \([\text{ks}, \text{gz}]\). English and other naturalised foreign words should be written in their Indianised forms. (Calcutta is an Indian word, and in Urdu it should be \([\text{कलक्ता}]=\text{[kalkatta]}\); English \text{January, February, ticket etc.} should be written in their Hindustani forms, as \([\text{जैनवर, फरवर, टिकेट}]\).

(v) The use of a symbol like the \(\text{tas'did}\) ( tas'did) of the Perso-Arabic script on the top of a consonant to represent the lengthening or doubling may be recommended as conducing to economy of time and space in writing, but it is to be objected to for two reasons: it is against the alphabetical principle of the Roman script, and it will necessitate the use of a number of capped letters in printing. If economy of space and time were required, the length mark \([:\text{]}\), used after vowels, can be used after consonants also, as the so-called “double consonant” is really a long consonant.

(vi) It will not be a practical proposition for the simple reason that at an experimental stage the printing presses will not (unless compelled to do so) provide themselves with unfamiliar types not necessary for printing English and other known languages. The lay public, already averse or apathetic to the much more familiar Roman letters, will be actively hostile to the dozen and more unfamiliar and ungainly letters devised by Mr. Latifi, and to the use of the symbols for the numerals for speech-sounds: and the scientific public will have its objections to the arbitrary creation and employment of letters and numerals in it.

The Latifi alphabet follows a good principle in eschewing the capital letters. It would be better, however, to follow the International Phonetic Association in employing \([:\text{]}\) for the long quality of sounds, rather than for
nasalisation, which the Latifi alphabet proposes for nasalisation, the universally employed tilde [~], or failing that, the Indian candra-bindu ["] would be a better symbol, and it should be used before the vowel letter, to warn the reader beforehand that a nasal vowel follows.

The specimens of Urdu, Hindi and Gujarati given by Mr. Latifi in his alphabet are quoted below, first in the original alphabet, then in the Latifi alphabet, and finally in Indo-Roman (in the *bharati*ya-romanaka lipl, or h'uruf-i tahanji:-i *romani:-i *hindi:) as suggested by me. The differences in principle and in practice will be apparent from a comparison of the two systems.

---

**URDU TEXT**

مین سنہ 1885میں ہیں، سیاہہ تھا - ار، هر شہر، سنہیؤیں کے بعد سے 60 جغرافیہ سنة 1882 تک اپنی لزمان کی عمر گھر تھے کام لئے کونہ میں بسے
کی - 1 فجریہ سنة 1882 کو میری ایک ہم عمر دوسرے پر مشہور هندستانی
یہ سیر کیتے ہر آمادہ کیا - لیکن جو ہونا یہ کام رپیدے بھی نہ کیا تھا ار
یہ سفرات میں رلی کی بھی مرضی سے تھا - اس لئے میں نے اپنے دوریاں سینگھ
داس ملے اپنے بھالے مالاب کے تھے کیا - مہا کھٹا کہ جن میں گو دیکھی
کے لئے کھھا رہنے لگا - جب میں رپیدہ مل کر توہم سے اس غرف سے کہ
میرے رہنے کا داڑھا کو میرے سفر کا صمیمی راستہ نئے معاون ہیں لیکن
ہے چے چہ مگر میں ہو شاہری چیڑھے مکھا نو آئیں ہے؟ جبر کے کسی نے
سونات کی درخواست کہ ار کسی کہ چھا چھا بھی نہیں مکھا

بہ ہر حال میں ہر کی رات کوچی کی کھیر ہے زران ہو ہور کھیر خور آباد پہنچتی -
اے رخت تک رہن درختی اتھا سے ہے آس پار میں - ار پھیر کی نہیں بھی ہن
تھی - مین سوال کیتے گے ار کسی شہر کا نام نہیں جاننا ہے - استیش کا
ہچھی کر جب بابو ہے کہ جب ادا تر اس نے کہا کہ کل کھا کہ چھا چھا ہے?
دم یہ پیش نہیں مل سکتا.
The same in the Latifi Alphabet

HINDI TEXT

S. K. CHATTERJI

In Indo-Roman
यक कर भारी नींद में प्रचतिसौ रहा है। तब उसने पुकार के सब संख्याओं से कहा, “ैरे भारती! देखो! वह सिंह सीता है; इससे मैं ऐसा मारता गा कि वह दुखदार लाखलुहान ही जावेगा।” यह बहु, बड़ी शुरुता कर सिंह की पृंजि पै चढ़ डंक मार उड़ गया, और ऐसा चमंड करने लगा जैसे उसने बड़ी शुरुता का कार्य किया। पर सुज़के जो रेखा तो सिंह हिला भी न था, तब उसके मरने का अवसर करने और संख्याओं से कहा, “जो सिंह मर गया ही तो मैंने बन को दुख चौर भय में कुंज़ा दिया। चरि सिंहो! रेख लो! तंदवा जिसे डरता है, वह बीर डंक ने गिर गया; चय हम शुरुता करके सब अपने दौरीयों को मारके हटा देंदेंगें।” ऐसी ऐसी लंबी-चौदी हो कर रहे थे चौर विज्ञातके मनोरोध लग रहे थे कि इसतने में वह प्रचतिसौ नींद में जाग पड़ा और अन्य शाखां दौंता चला गया।

The same in the Latifi Alphabet

मादारो: का एक तुऱ उर्ता हुआ अपने मार्ग में 4ाला जाता है। उन मेंके मादारो ने देखा कि एक शिव आज़े करते करते दावर्ते दावर्ते बहुत हक्कर हो निंद में: 43ैट सो रहा है। तब उसने पुकारके सब मादारो: से कहा, “एर गायो! देहो! वह शिव सो रहा है। उसके आस पर नीड: 4ार दातं तो सुरता कर।” यह कह, बतान सुरता कर, शिव कि पूर्व पै एक मर उत गया, अर असा गवमाक दातन लागा जारे उसने बतान सुरता का करता किया। यह मूत्को को देखा तो हिला है। तब उसे मारने का अम्मन करके अर मादारो: से कहा, “जो शिव मर गया हो तो मे: ने हान ने दुश अर गय से 8ुटा दिया। अर मिटो! देहो। तीन चौके यजसे दातर है वह में दातक से गिर गया; अर हम सुरता करके अरपे बातियों को मारने हादा देवते।” इसी इसी लामबि 4ारु महं कर ताहे हे अर के विजेत के मानोराज में: लाग रहे हे के इने में: वह एक स्त्री निंद से जाग पड़ा अर पाना: अर एक उर्ता 4ाला गया।

In Indo-Roman

मादारो: का एक जिहु दर उर्ता हुआ अपने मार्ग में 4ला या जाता था। उन में के से एक मादारे ने देखा कि एक सिंह अकेष्ठ करते-करते दाउर्ते-दाउर्ते बहुत थक कर भरी: नि: द में ने तो रहा है। तब उसें पुकारके सब मादारो: से कहा, “एर बहलियो! देखो, वह मिह सो रहा है; इस का मैं असा मार: उगा कि वह दुखदार लाखलुहान हो जावेगा।” यह कह, बतान ने पुकारके सब से कहा, “एर गायो! देहो! वह शिव सो रहा है। उसके आस पर नीड: 4ार दातं तो सुरता कर।” यह मूत्को को देखा तो हिला है। तब उसे मारने का अम्मन करके अर मादारो: से कहा, “जो शिव मर गया हो तो मे: ने हान ने दुश अर गय से 8ुटा दिया। अर मिटो! देहो। तीन चौके यजसे दातर है वह में दातक से गिर गया; अर हम सुरता करके अरपे बातियों को मारने हादा देवते।” इसी इसी लामबि 4ारु महं कर ताहे हे अर के विजेत के मानोराज में: लाग रहे हे के इने में: वह एक स्त्री निंद से जाग पड़ा अर पाना: अर एक उर्ता 4ाला गया।
S. K. CHATTERJI

jo dekha to sim'h tila bhi; na tha, tab uske marne ka anuman kar ke luh macchar se kaha—"jo sim'h mar gaya ho to m'ni ne ban ko duh'kh luh bhay se chur'a diya. are mitro! dekh lo, t'eduwa jis se d'arta hai wuh mere d'an'k se gir gaya; ab ham s'urta kar ke sab apne baari' y' o ko marke hat'a deh'ego."

aisi: aisii; lambi-caur'i; hi; kar rahe the luh bijay (bijay) ke manorath m'la lag rahe the ki itne m'e wuh acet sim'h n'i; d se jag par'a luh apna akhet' d'h'ur'hta caha gaya.

GUJARATI TEXT

सारी पवन जीवन पहले चम्पे बोलनेवाले बेटमाथी निकटावा. पण बागधरे चलतां तीफान लागवा मांझे. केलोक दहाडलगो तो चमांचे बजांचं उक्तांतं रहं। कःकेट पवन नरम पडो, चम्पे दरियाने जरा घोसी घो, परंतू वही केटे चम्पे एक महके वडकं खाने दोतो। दूरबीनाथी जोयं तो केलोक मासह सारा वाप दोटो, चम्पे हुँकने नोशानो पाटवी चटावतं हीय एवं जचागयं। तेंदू चम्पे चमांचे बजांचं तेंदू तरफ लढ गया। पण दरियाने सारे कोजीने लीखो खा पहुंचीने ती महकाभींडि लीखीने चमांचे जागरू हेता धानो चार लागी। ते पर पांच मासह हच्चा। तेंदू माल एक चन्दनेनी बोलवानी सुची हच्ची।

The same in the Latifi Alphabet

SARO PAVAN JINE PACHI: AME BORNEO BEC MA: HAI

Nikalya, pan agal 4alta: tofan lagwa madiyu.

Ketlak dahada lagi to amaru: wahan usaltuj rahyu.

Bewle pawan natam padyo, ane daryo jara

31ao hayo, etle bahu 8ece ame ek madwo dabka:

2ato dho. durbin ma: hi joyu: to ketlak manas

Mara bape ditoa: ane duzin nigani no wawlo

4lahawa: hoy ewa: janaya: teht ame amaru:

Wahan tent taraq leh gaya, pan daryant bate

Solone lathe tyu: daholjane te madwa mahena

Lokne amara 7apat leta: gani war lagi. tepar

Paiz manas hatai, tema: mat ri ek jah nej bolwani

5udan hati.

In Indo-Roman

Saro pawan jine pachi: Ame *borneo bet’mathi: nikli’ya. Pan’ agal’

Calt’a tofan lagv’a m’adiy’u. Ket’lak dahad’a lagi: to amar’u wahan’

Uchal’t’u rahy’u. Cheva’te pawan napam pad’yo, anedari: yo jara dhi: mo

Thayo, et’le bahu chet’a ame ek machvo d’abk’a khata di: t’ha: du: rbi: n

M’mahi. joy’u to ketlak man’as mara: bape di: t’ha, ame duh’khni: nis’ani: no

Vayt’o cxt’hav’i: hoy ev’n’jan’ay’u. Tethi: Ame amar’u wahan’ teni: tarafl

Lai gaya. Pan’ daari: Yan: bhaare cholo ne bhi t’ya p’an oon ne te machva

M’taha lokone amara jis’ar par let’u ghan’ti: var lagi: tepar p’aoc man’as

Hat’a. Tem’a mat ri ek jan’nej bolwani: s’uddhi: hati.;