PREFACE.

To persons conversant in Eastern literature, and sensible of the great improvements made by the Company's servants therein since the former Editions of this Book, it will seem extraordinary, that it should have extended to a Seventh. Besides the frequent applications that have been made for it, since it has been out of print, a more satisfactory apology can be pleaded for its re-appearance, by a reference to the opinion of the ever-to-be lamented Sir William Jones, who the author, on his return from India, was introduced to him, and presented him with the First Edition. "This book is a small change of immediate use; mine, bank notes, with which in his pocket one may starve, and not be able to get what one wants. Where one buys mine, you will tell a hundred." A juster and more compendious estimation, so opposite to the intention of the author, could not have been given in so few words.
words. Yet so much has it been mistaken, that a comparison has been made between the two books, though the latter is a defultory grammar of a different language, with the examples in abstruse, intricate, and sublime Arabic and Persian poetry. We hope to anticipate the asperity of critical reprobation, and all unfair comparisons, by a previous intimation, that the reader is not to expect a work of science in this publication, nor any attempt towards etymology or radical research, except when absolutely necessary to explain the true sense of some particular word. Materials were not wanting to have made this a less superficial work, and to have entered into such disquisitions. But this would have been an intrusion on a more learned work of a more learned author—have deviated from our original plan, and entirely have changed the complexion of this book. Having premised thus much to shew what it is not, we will now describe what it is.

It is (without the least pretension to erudition) an immediate, temporary, local assistant to such persons as have not either inclination, abilities, or time, to enter into a more intense, accurate, and laborious disquisition on the Eastern languages, that they may on their arrival communicate their wants in the common occurrences of
of life, avoid the inconvenience and imposition arising from a doubtful or perverted interpretation, to the detriment of their concerns; and be enabled to facilitate their intercourse with the natives, without waiting till they have acquired by long habit, what continual occasion requires they should put into immediate practice.

To enter into an investigation on the languages spoken in the Company's territory, would exceed the restricted limits prescribed to this work; but to obviate the confused uncertainty which may bewilder the emigrant on his arrival, who may wish to discriminate between the various dialects he will hear, we shall make a short observation, tending to elucidate the same. Hindostan comprehends the territories of the Shauh of Dehly (better known to us by the title of the Great Mogul). They were formerly Centoos, or Idolaters, till the Mohammedan conquest. In commemoration of which a native, when asked concerning his cast (religious tribe), makes the distinction by saying, he is either a Hindoo or a Mussulman, (Mohammedan, true believer,) though both natives of Hindostan (the country of the Hindoos). The pure Hindooee is a distinct language, not derived, as many think, from the Persian,
Persian, though there are such a multitude of words adopted therefrom, that it is an error very natural to fall into. The Persian, and consequently the Arabic, bears the same influence in the Eastern, as French does in the Western world, and pervades every dialect of every language, in a greater or less degree. But this does not prove that the Hindoos is derived from the Arabic or Persian, any more than that English is derived from the French. Probably when the northern Tartars invaded Hindostan, they introduced some of their dialect into the conquered country. Thus the present Hindostanee (the language spoken by the Hindoos) is a jargon of Arabic, Persian, Tartars, and Hindoos. And the dialect here treated of is a corruption of that jargon, peculiar to Bombay and Bengal, (but the Bengalee is again a different dialect) two degrees below the original pure unadulterated tongue; of the utility of which no person can be a judge, till he has been in those parts totally unacquainted with the language there in use. Why the Hindoos has been called Moors, and the people Moormen, is not so easy to decide, unless from the association of that idea with every black person that we see; but
they have been so miscalled from the earliest intercourse with the East.

Corrupt as this dialect is, it will not be totally useless to such as may wish to acquire a knowledge of the Persian. For, as few of the Munthees (language masters) understand English, they are in the predicament of Hill, who went to teach English in Holland, but found he had overlooked the circumstance of his own ignorance in Dutch: consequently the master and scholar were unintelligible to each other. He must therefore rely on the wretched abilities of a servant to interpret, who speaks English like a parrot; too ignorant to convey the true sense of a translation;—too indolent to exert himself if he knows it;—and too abject to correct a mistake in his master, if capable of doing it. This, therefore, will open the door of communication, through the medium of the interpreter, with the Munthee, the scholar being apprised that, though he will find a vast variety of Persian words, even in this dialect, many of them pure, but more mutilated, he will get no grammatical assistance either in the syntax or inflection of the conjugations, declensions, &c. To shew how totally they differ, we shall here subjoin some tenses of a verb in both.

Infi-
The orthography here observed is regulated entirely by the pronunciation of the words, without any regard to a conformity between the Persian and our alphabets. For instance, the word for *stamp* or *type* is written with the Persian letter Cha and the b lenis, Ch,haupoh. But as this may occasion a difficulty to perceiue unacquainted with the Persian orthography, the b lenis, which is hardly observable in speaking, is omitted, and it is spelt thus, Chaupoh. The word Ommur, age, is spelt with the Persian letter Ain, but is pronounced Ommur, Ummur, or Oomur. Our letters have various sounds, as united with others, of which every one is not apprised, having never had occasion to consider the circumstance; as that a has three sounds, as in face,
face, farther, and fall; that *ei* is pronounced like *ee* in most words; that *c* before *e* and *i* is sounded like *s*; and before *a*, *o*, *u*, like *k*, &c. But what creates a greater uncertainty is, that the same letters, though preceding each other alike, will have different sounds. Thus *e* before *i* in the word *seize* is like *ee*. But in *heighten*, it sounds like *i* long. The letters *eh* in the word *choke* are blended, but in *choir* they are separately articulated, *e* taking the sound of *k* tho' *o* follows in both words: that *g* before *e* in the word *send* is short like *f*, but in *get* is open; as also before *i* in *suply*, and *i* in *give*, &c., &c., with a number of other dubious sounds.

We may likewise observe, that imperatives, in Hindustanic particularly, when not followed by another word, end in *o*. But besides that, this is little attended to in common; the want of a nice distinction may occasion a confusion between the simple and causal, or efficient verb, productive of the most ridiculous effects. For instance; if a gentleman came to visit me, attended by his servant, (as is the custom,) and I used the efficient for the simple verb, and said to him, *beiz*/*beboz*, instead of *beiz*/*bebo*, it would be desiring him to eat his
servant, and not himself. On the other hand, to bid my servants fight my rams, if I used the simple for the efficient verb, saying hurro instead of hurano, it would be ordering them to fight with one another. This termination, therefore, is omitted entirely; and the rather, as it is partly supplied by the creation of a short syllable insensibly expressed by the re-action of the tongue and throat in such Imperatives as kurr, do, and duch, see, &c., &c., which will not subject the novice to the above-mentioned mistake.

It has been customary to spell words having the sound of a. in face, case, place, with e, according to the French; but why are we to make a preposterous perversion of our own vowel to pay a compliment to their orthography, as unnecessary as it is liable to mistake, when our simple vowel a is perfectly competent to the sound required?

The Persian aulef is also often rendered by u (sometimes even when the meddle occurs to open the articulation); but these marks are frequently overlooked, and oftener misunderstood by scholars: hence we hear of bat, cat, hat, rat, instead of baut, kaut, haut, raut, &c. all obviated by au.
The guttural "t and "g are best expressed by placing the aspirate before the consonant in writing, as it is allowed that an aspirate precedes it in speech; it will be found impossible to articulate both without making them guttural. The first resembles the Scotch pronunciation of the words light, bright, &c.; the second corresponds with the Newcastle bur, as "p, bgay, for read, pray, &c. An explanation, which we humbly conceive more adapted to the sensible purpose of instruction, than some (admirably calculated to exhibit the profound erudition of the author), containing pedantic references to the Tuscan dialect, the German pronunciation, or an imaginary forced construction of our own.

Words, when the accent lies on a consonant are here given with a double letter, as kurringe, not kurunga, the first syllable of which might erroneously be spoken as our word cure; also the same final consonants, forsett, form, chur, raufs, a buckle, &c.

The operation of the Persian short vowel peaf, is rendered in one author by "o, with shorts, in another by "u, as gōōl and gōōa refer. We have chosen the latter as the least complex of the two; the mark few will attend us, and fewer understand.
Words ending with \(th\) lenis are given by one in \(u\); in another by \(ch\), as \(zada\) and \(zadeh\), a fon. The latter, being more consonant to the Persian orthography, is observed throughout.

To instruct with efficacy we should avoid ambiguity, and obviate, when we can, the possibility of mistake.

**MEMORANDUM.**

\(A\) to be pronounced as in face

\(Au\) 

\(Aw\) - - - - yawn.

\(C\) - - - - chest.

\(E\) - - - - met.

\(E\) at the ends of words mute core.

\(Ei\) to be pronounced as in heighten.

\(G\) - - - - gold.

\(Hk\) a guttural \(k\).

\(Hg\) a guttural \(g\).

\(P, b\) not as in pheasant, but separately.

\(S, h\) not as in short.

\(T, b\) not as in think.

**GRAMMATICAL**