TO THE HON'BLE C. H. CAMERON,

President of the Council of Education.

HON'BLE SIR,

The criticisms which have appeared in the Newspapers on the first Number of the Encyclopaedia Bengalensis, present a few questions for consideration, on which I beg leave to solicit your advice and direction. It is your known interest in the cause which the Encyclopaedia is intended to subserve that emboldens me thus to presume upon your kindness and trespass upon your time. I need not here repeat how anxious I feel to conduct the Encyclopaedia as efficiently as circumstances will possibly allow; and I am the more solicitous for the favour of your opinion inasmuch as it must, on the one hand, rectify whatever may have been amiss in the execution of my plan, and be calculated to remove, on the other hand, whatever misapprehensions may have existed in any quarter.

The questions that have arisen are first, with reference to the general plan of the undertaking; second, with reference to the mode of conducting it.

1st.—In order to produce a series of works adapted to the present state of the Hindu mind, and with the special object of drawing the attention of the Native community to the history and science of Europe, my proposal has been, as you are aware, to draw as largely and as freely, as may appear requisite, from all sources that may be deemed suitable,—only consistently with the acknowledged rules of literary courtesy, and with justice to the authors whose works may be handled. I set out with the History of Rome, partly because it was the history of a nation from whom
the materials of European civilization were more immediately derived, partly because this history was entirely unknown to vernacular readers. I adopted Eutropius as my text, because it was a good compendium of this history, as authentic as any school-book now in use, and capable of being dilated or contracted at pleasure without injustice to the author, who has not inserted in his narrative anything that might be called characteristic of himself. If I introduced additional matter from other sources, it was to render the history the more interesting; and by proclaiming this act in the title page, I thought I guarded sufficiently against any mistake on the part of the reader, who might easily conclude from thence that my object was to represent the history and not the historian. To represent the historian, i.e. to exhibit the mode in which a writer constructs his narrative, might be premature so far as Bengali readers are concerned. Where the history is already known, the reader may dwell with great interest on the peculiar modes in which certain master minds have delivered it; but where the history itself is unknown, such philosophical discrimination could hardly be expected. When a new story is related to us, we desire first of all to make ourselves masters of the narrative itself;—we begin afterwards to discriminate between the different ways in which different persons relate it. In the infancy of a literature, a digest of various testimonies may answer a great object by giving a general view of certain historical facts. The facts being once understood, the reader may be enabled afterwards to consider the strength or weakness of the several witnesses supporting them. It was under impressions of this kind that I got up the first number. If my views were wrong, I would thankfully receive correction.
2nd. —My Encyclopædia is, as you are aware, intended especially for Bengali readers, and therefore my attention is first and principally directed to the Bengali. However important the object which the English is intended to subserve may be, it is subordinate to the Bengali. The Diglot edition is indeed designed to promote the study of both, English and Bengali, —to accelerate the progress of the Native mind in the two careers (as you called them in your address to students) now open to Indian scholars in the province of Bengal. Still the Bengali is in my work the more important of the two. (a)

My effort has been and shall continue to be, to present the history and science of Europe in as attractive and simple a dress as the subjects and the state of the Bengali language will allow. With this view it has been my practice to hear portions of my MSS, read by Pundits and other Vernacular scholars, —to note the passages where they might happen to stumble in the course of an un-premeditated reading, —to introduce improvements where the passages required to be amended, —to ask the opinion of learned scholars where difficulties presented themselves, and in these ways to render the work as elegant and perspicuous as circumstances would allow. The introductory essay on the study of history, (b) and the History of Rome, in the

(a) I must here apologize for a few erroneous expressions in English which crept into the text; and I have to thank the editor of the Harkar for the mistake pointed out. The mistake did not however occur in the Bengali text.

(b) This essay I had delivered, before it was printed, as a discourse, at a meeting of intelligent and respectable Hindu gentlemen. The following speech by the president has been forwarded to me as an authenticated extract from the records of their Society:


"Baboo Kissory Chand Mittra then rose and said that he was sure he expressed the sentiments of the whole meeting when he declared that the
first number I had tested in these several ways, and may perhaps state, without the guilt of presumption, that the experiments proved all very favorable.

paper just read by his Revd. and respected friend was a very interesting and valuable one; the subject was handled very ably, and the principles of historic evidence analysed in a manner that could not fail to come home to "the business and bosoms" of those who, he hoped and trusted, were soon to receive, through the liberality of Government, a sound and useful education through the medium of their vernacular language. He could not but admire the Bengali of the paper. It was not only chaste and devoid of oriental flourish, but as elegant and classical as the language under the present circumstances could be rendered. He (Baboo Keswory Chand) looked forward to the publication of such essays (as the one just read) as a new era in the history of the Bengali language, the improvement and cultivation of which was intimately connected with the regeneration of his fatherland. That the language was imperfect, was no reason why it should not be cultivated and improved. True, that it was destitute of a healthy literature. True, that it was inadequate to the expression of subtle metaphysical distinctions. True, that it wanted a scientific nomenclature. But its deficiencies ought to operate as so many fresh arguments for its improvement with those who are interested in the well-being of their country, as the vernacularization of European literature and science was a consecration devoutly to be wished. He would therefore conclude by saying that his Revd friend, by his exertions in furtherance of this good work, has entitled himself not only to the thanks of the society but to the gratitude of his countrymen."

Cossinwri Dutt,
Stee H. E. S.

The same essay was submitted for perusal to a gentleman of the civil service, J. Mur Esq., of Azimgur, whose experience as an oriental scholar and established reputation for Sanscrit authorship render his opinion of no common value. He says:

"I have very much the substance, and strain of your introductory remarks on the use and criteria of History, and think the whole is the very sort of thing calculated to be extensively useful in the present state of the native mind."

A portion of the History of Rome was shown to Capt. Marshall of the College of Fort William. His opinion is contained in the following letter:

"My Dear Sir,

July 11th, 1845.

I have the pleasure to return the specimen of your Translation of the History of Rome. I have suggested a few alterations which are not of much importance. I am of opinion, that the style is simple and pleasing, and well adapted for the perusal of young people. The matter is also I think well selected, and as amusing as so compendious a narrative could possibly be made. Your little work would in my opinion answer admirably for a School Class book for junior Students.

"I remain, My dear Sir

Yours very truly,

G. MARSHALL.

"P.S. I have made a note at the end of your MSS."

"
My plan in historical narratives is to adopt as simple a style as possible. Where words are required that are not in common use, I draw from the Sanscrit, if that can be readily done, without having recourse to far-fetched inventions. Where an idea can be easily expressed by a Persian or Hindoostani word, already current, I make no scruple to adopt it, in case no Sanscrit or Bengali word can be found equally apt for the purpose. Where Persian or Hindoostani words have been almost naturalized in Bengali, I do not fastidiously reject them, even though there may be corresponding Bengali words with the same meaning. In such cases I use the Bengali and the Hindoostani indifferently, only taking care not to shock my readers.

I also requested Mr Lodge, the Inspector of Government Colleges and Schools, to send the work or sheets to the Schools in the Muttra for any suggestions the pupils might have to offer. The following letter from the head master of the Madrasa School to the address of Mr. Lodge reports the result of this test:

"With much pleasure I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd instant accompanied by a few pages of the Encyclopaedia Bengali, as I have read the Bengali translation of it, and made our Pandit and the vernacular school teacher do the same; and to ascertain whether they clearly understood it, required them to explain almost every sentence, which they did very well, there is only one word (zhōri) to which they were at a loss to attach the correct idea, and it must be acknowledged that it is seldom used to convey the meaning it is intended to represent, that of garbing, and without an circumlocution there is no word in the Bengali language that can express the idea. With the exception of this single observation, which is scarcely worth mentioning, there is nothing else to be remarked on. The Pandits here speak highly of its language and consider it purely idiomatic.

"The work appears to be written in a very plain and simple language, intelligible almost to every native who pretends to the least knowledge of its literature, and although not a close translation, it conveys the sense of the English very faithfully.

"I think the work ought with much benefit to the Zillah Schools be introduced in them. It will give the boys a great deal of useful information and prepare them for subjects they will afterwards learn in English; and as there is no translation in Bengali of the History of Rome that I know of, except a part of it in the Encyclopaedia of Ancient History by Mr. Pearson, which has not afforded satisfaction on account of its idiomatic defects, the present work will be a desirable addition to the existing Bengali literature, especially if the forthcoming parts be written in as plain and simple a style as the specimen you have kindly sent me, and which I therewith return."
by disregarding their taste in this respect. The word thousand, for instance, I have sometimes translated by hazar, sometimes by sahasra. It is, I think, an advantage where foreign words may be introduced into a language, such as the Bengali now is, consistently with perspicuity and without shocking the national feelings of the people. This is, I think, the legitimate way of enriching the vocabulary of such a language. Where a Sanscrit word, though expressing originally the idea I intend to convey, has by the lapse of ages obtained a different signification, I do not hesitate to use some popular term having the same meaning, though it may be of foreign derivation. I have for instance generally translated ship by jahaj, though this is neither Sanscrit nor Bengali; because the Sanscrit nauka, though exactly corresponding to the Latin maris, is now used in Bengali to express a boat rather than a ship.

Scientific terms I borrow from the English when the Sanscrit fails to produce any, either ready-made, or capable of being easily invented. In Geometry and Algebra, however, I have scarcely experienced any difficulty in procuring terms, since the Sanscrit vocabulary here is very full. The Lilavati, the Vijnana, the Goladhyaya have supplied me almost with everything I wanted. The Rekha Ganita, or Euclid in Sanscrit, and Colebrooke’s Algebra have been of great use to me in this number on Geometry. A number of terms proposed by the accomplished Bapu Dera of the Sanscrit College, Benares, and obligingly sent to me by the late principal of that institution, has also been of great service. Still however I have been obliged to transfer one or two European expressions to the Bengali. The word Rhombus, for instance, is rendered in the Sanscrit Euclid by such a cumbrous term that I thought it would
be better to adopt the European expression itself, and explain it in the definition, than introduce a long unclassical Sanscrit term. (c) If ρομβος or ρεμβω conveyed any meaning that would render the idea of an equilateral parallelogram obvious, I would think of inventing a word which might have the same radical signification.

The favourable reception which the first number has obtained from the native community, may, I presume, be considered an auspicious commencement. Upwards of two hundred copies have already been disposed of, chiefly among native purchasers: and if the demand from this quarter continue as great as it has hitherto been, the first number will be out of print before the second makes its appearance. The native press has likewise pronounced a very favourable verdict. I have not seen the criticisms of the native editors in the original, but agreeably to the accounts which the English papers have given they are encouraging to the undertaking. (d)

Under these circumstances I beg leave to solicit the favor of your advice on the subjects adverted to. The sanction of your opinion, as far as you may approve of what has

(c) The word for rhombus in the Sanscrit Euclid is Vishama-Konasama-chaturbhujam, literally, unequal-angled-equilateral.

(d) "Encyclopedia Bengalensis. —Some of our native contemporaries have reviewed the first volume, containing Roman History, and are decidedly of opinion that the publication of the work will form an era in the history of vernacular literature. They find fault with the criticisms of the English papers, and are disposed to believe that instead of doing any good, they are calculated to discourage the Revd. editor in the prosecution of his laudable undertaking. They speak very highly of the Bengali of Krishna Mohun, and say that it is as eloquent and classical as the language in its present imperfect state could be rendered." —Beng. Hurkuru, Feb. 23, 1846.

I feel it right to state that a writer has once appeared in one of the native papers enumerating the universal negative that "not a single letter in the Bengali of the work is intelligible," and then, entering into personal reflections against the author and against those who have ventured to pronounce a favourable opinion on the publication.
been done, and the benefit of your correction, where you may consider it open to censure, must be of the greatest advantage to the undertaking.

I have already, Hon'ble Sir, trespassed too long upon your time; but I cannot conclude a statement like this without appending a few remarks on the present number of the series. The perspicuity of the following Bengali version of the first three books of Euclid was, agreeably to my usual practice, tested by being submitted to the perusal of pundits, who had not studied the subject through the medium of the English. The elements of Euclid could scarcely be expected in any language to be wholly intelligible to a beginner from an unpremeditated off-hand reading; but the pundits to whom I handed over these sheets went through them so well, and followed the demonstrations so closely, step by step, that I think I can safely say the result of the test proved much more satisfactory than I could possibly have expected. The case of one of these pundits was in particular so very striking that I cannot refrain from stating it more minutely. In the correction of the proof-sheets, I had the happiness to secure the assistance of one of the passed students of the Government Sanscrit College at Calcutta, who is now attached as Bengali tutor to one of the metropolitan institutions, under the superintendence of the Council of Education. This accomplished scholar, with no other preparation than the perusal of the 1st Prop. in the Rekha Ganitu, mastered the demonstrations, as he went over the proof-sheets, with a quickness that was as surprising as the evidences of his really understanding them were satisfactory. Literal errors sometimes occurred in the proof-sheets, which occasioned a discrepancy between the demonstrations and the diagrams to which they referred. These errors, though fit
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF EDUCATION

TO

THE REV. K. M. BANERJEA.

Calcutta, April, 1843.

SIR,—I have received your letter of February 26, in which you solicit my advice and direction as to the future conduct of your work with reference to the criticisms which have appeared in the Newspapers.

I understand you to speak of such criticisms as have some foundation, or at least an appearance of foundation in reason. These appear to me to be reducible to three heads: viz. criticisms upon your English style, upon your mode of translating Eutropius, upon your selection of that writer's work.

They who find fault with your English style do not perhaps advert to the fact that the English in your book is quite subordinate to the Bengali. Whether it is actually a translation of the Bengali, or not, it is for the present purpose to be considered as a translation.

It cannot be fairly criticised, if it is regarded as an original and independent English work. In writing the Bengali Introductory Remarks on the study of History, which is an original and independent work, you had to consider, not in the spirit of a servile flatterer, but in the spirit of an indulgent Instructor, what might be agreeable to the taste of those whom you were addressing. In writing the English you had nothing to aim at but such a correct representation of what you had already said in Bengali, as would enable the Council of Education and such part of the British nation as take an interest in the matter, to judge of your work.
Peculiarities of expression, that is to say what would be peculiarities in an original English Book, are not therefore in my opinion blemishes in your composition. When you submitted your MS. to me for criticism, I never thought of effacing those peculiarities. If I had done so, the English would no longer have been an accurate reflection of the Bengali.

The Council of Education want to know exactly what you are saying to your countrymen. The portion of the English Public here and at home who are interested in the improvement of Bengali literature, will no doubt be desirous of learning what style of reasoning, what illustrations, what turns of thought, are considered by a Bengali scholar likely to captivate the attention and stimulate the mental activity of his race.

If you had undertaken to write an original English Book, you would, I doubt not, have endeavoured to think and to express yourself like an Englishman. But such an endeavour would have been out of place in your Encyclopaedia.

It is quite true, however, that some careless expressions have escaped you in composing, and me in reading your composition.

Perhaps in the circumstances amidst which we are placed, some errors of this kind are inevitable. We must do our best to prevent them, and certainly can have no complaint to make against those who point out our failures.

The criticisms upon your plan of translating Eutropius freely and interspersing additional matter from various sources appear to me unfounded.

To translate freely and to intersperse foreign matter, while you are professing to adhere closely to your original, would be morally wrong, because it would mislead.—But to do this, as
you have done, with distinct proclamation of your intention; can only be improper, if at all, in a literary point of view.

If you, or any one who may aspire to emulate you as an Instructor of the people of Bengal, were, in introducing Thucydides to your countrymen, to deal with him as you have dealt with Eutropius, you would be justly obnoxious to censure. But why? Because the work is a model of historical composition, and because the writer is a most trustworthy narrator of the events of his own age and country.

If you ever do publish a Bengali Thucydides, I am quite sure that you will endeavour to show him to your countrymen exactly as he is. You will never dream of altering his text. If you have any remark of your own to make upon the Peloponnesian war, or wish to draw attention to what other writers have said, you will add notes to your edition.

You would have too much reverence for so grand a work of art to think of adding a sentence to it. Such an interpolation would be as offensive as if a sculptor or painter of the present day were to add a figure to a group of Phidias or Raphael.

Neither would you think of inserting a story out of Plutarch in the midst of the testimony which the great witness of the Peloponnesian war has delivered to posterity.

So also with regard to such an author as Livy. Though he relates facts remote from his own time, and aims rather at the glorification of Roman warriors and statesmen than at truth, still if you were to translate his beautiful narrative, you would no doubt remember that the main object of your translation would be, not to exhibit the History of Rome, but the work of Livy.

But can any one think that Eutropius has any claim to this kind of consideration? A writer with no other pretension than that of having made for the use of the Emperor Valens, in a
degenerate age, a careful Epitome of Roman History from the foundation of the city?

Eutropius' book is no model which it would be a sort of sacrilege to touch. Eutropius is no authority for the facts he relates. You did not want to show the people of Bengal how he tells a story, you did not mean to call him as a witness to facts which happened hundreds of years before he was born.

What you wanted was an epitome of Roman History, and finding it done to your hand by Eutropius, you very wisely translated and added to him, instead of epitomizing Roman History yourself.

No one can be deceived as to the real nature of your work, because you have distinctly pointed it out. Whether what you have added to Eutropius was fit to be added for the instruction of your countrymen, is another question. I believe nobody has said it was not.

There yet remains a further and more important question, viz. whether the epitome of Roman History which you have published, ought to have had the first place or any place at all in your Encyclopædia.

Assuming that the epitome ought to have a place, I should say that the question whether, with reference to its intrinsic qualities, it ought to have the first place, is scarcely worth considering. My advice would have been "of those things which you intend to insert, begin with that which you can soonest get ready."

I am far too glad to see a beginning made in this new Bengali literature to care whether, in a work intended to be miscellaneous, the first article can be proved to have irresistible intrinsic claims to the particular position which it occupies.
But ought such an epitome of Roman History to have any place at all in your Encyclopaedia?

I think that it ought: I believe that the History of Rome is a most important study for your countrymen, for the reason which you have assigned in the letter you have addressed to me, and also for another reason of more special application to British India, on which want of time and space prevents me from entering at present. I believe that those who are beginning the study of any history (whether nations or individuals) should not be at once introduced to elaborate, detailed, and critical works, and I believe also that only in works of that kind can an account of the labours of such critics as the great Niebuhr, by which men's faith in much of Roman History has been shaken, be properly introduced.

Upon this subject I can refer you to something much more satisfactory and conclusive than any reasoning of my own; I mean the opinion, and the grounds on which it rests, of the late Dr. Arnold, himself a profound historian, a devoted admirer and follower of Niebuhr, and one of the most successful instructors of youth:—

"Now it is not so much our object," he says, "to give boys useful information, as to facilitate their gaining it hereafter for themselves, and to enable them to turn it to account when gained. The first is to be effected by supplying them on any subject with a skeleton which they may fill up hereafter. For instance, a real knowledge of history in after life is highly desirable, let us see how education can best facilitate the gaining of it. It should begin by impressing on a boy's mind the names of the greatest men of different periods, and by giving him a notion of their order in point of time and the part of the earth on which they lived. This is best done by a set of pictures bound up together in a volume, such, for
instance as those which illustrated Mrs. Trimmer's little histories, and to which the author of this article is glad to acknowledge his own early obligations. Nor could better service be rendered to the cause of historical instruction than by publishing a volume of prints of universal history, accompanied by a very short description of each. Correctness of costume in such prints, or good taste in the drawing, however desirable, if they can be easily obtained, are of very subordinate importance; the great matter is that the print should be striking, and full enough to excite and to gratify curiosity. By these means, a lasting association is obtained with the greatest names of history, and the most remarkable actions of their lives, while their chronological arrangement is learnt at the same time from the order of the pictures; a boy's memory being very apt to recollect the place which a favorite print holds in a volume, whether it comes towards the beginning, middle, or end, what picture comes before it, and what follows it. Such pictures should contain as much as possible the poetry of history; the most striking characters, and most heroic actions, whether of doing or of suffering; but they should not embarrass themselves with its philosophy, with the causes of revolutions, the progress of society, or the merits of great political questions. Their use is of another kind; to make some great name, and great action of every period familiar to the mind; that so in taking up any more detailed history or biography, (and education should never forget the importance of preparing a boy to derive benefit from his accidental reading) he may have some association with the subject of it, and may not feel himself to be on ground wholly unknown to him."

Now the Epitome of Eutropius contains just such short descriptions as would be fit to accompany the historical
prints which Dr. Arnold recommends. The descriptions with the prints would be the best thing. But you have not got the prints; and the descriptions without them are the next best thing. We have very good evidence I think that this was Dr. Arnold's own view of the matter; for the passage I have been quoting is to be found in an article which he contributed to the Quarterly Journal of Education; that article begins with an account of Rugby School, over which he presided with so much credit and success; and if you look in that account for the method in which Roman History was studied by Dr. Arnold’s Pupils at Rugby, you will find that he made them begin, as you are making your countrymen begin, with Eutropius.

I dare say nobody ever thought of blaming Dr. Arnold for this. But your enterprise, on account of its novelty, its boldness, and its magnitude, naturally and not unreasonably invites criticism. And therefore it has been objected to you that the early part of what you have given as Roman history, though handed down to us by antiquity, has been proved untrustworthy by modern researches and modern criticisms.

But I think you were right nevertheless to exhibit in the first instance to the nation you have undertaken to instruct, (as Dr. Arnold, we have seen, exhibited to his scholars) the History of Rome as it was transmitted to posterity by the Romans themselves.

For such researches and criticisms as those of Niebuhr would be wholly out of place in a work intended for the purposes described in the above extract from Arnold, much more out of place even than "the philosophy," "the causes of revolutions, the progress of society," "and the merits of great political questions," with which he justly says such a work ought not to be embarrassed.
Those narratives which the Roman people received and transmitted to us as the history of their ancestors, cannot now be cast aside as so much useless trash. They are not to be treated as mere fraudulent inventions.

A fabricated story of the sinking of the French man-of-war *Vengeur* found its way not long ago into history, and kept its place there for some years. Very lately the true story came to light. I have not the means of referring to Mr. Carlyle's account of the way in which the truth was discovered; but, if I recollect rightly, the French Government most readily and courteously afforded access to its official records; and if I am not mistaken in this, it may be worth your while to look for the account, and to give this part of it as a striking proof of the sincere desire for historic truth which animates the Governments of Europe, and which is a characteristic mark of high civilization. No honest and intelligent man would now think of repeating the fabricated story, or if he did repeat it for some special purpose, would take care to point out the fraud to his readers.

But the early History of Rome ought not to be classed with such a fabrication as this. The fact that during long ages it was received by the people of Rome as the genuine history of their progenitors, that it was no tissue of falsehoods woven by deceitful men with a view to impose upon the credulous, ought to secure it from such an association. I do not think we are less called upon to read it now than before Niebuhr wrote. Niebuhr himself never intended that it should be blotted out, nor that it should be held up to scorn as a mere fraudulent invention. I could prove this by numerous passages in his great work; I will quote one, which sufficiently evinces what he thought of those ancient accounts and which will at the same time demonstrate how vain an attempt it would be to give his opinion a place in your Epitome.
After relating the first part of the story of Romulus and Remus, the great historical critic thus muses upon his subject.

"This is the old tale, such as it was written by Fabius, and sung in ancient sacred lays down to the time of Dionysius. It certainly belongs to anything rather than history; its essence is the marvellous; we may strip this of its peculiarities, and pare away and alter, until it is reduced to a possible every day incident; but we ought to be firmly convinced, that the caput mortuum which will remain, will be anything but a historical fact. Mythological tales of this sort are misty shapes, often no more than a fiata morgana, the prototype of which is invisible, the law of its refraction unknown; and even were it not so, still it would surpass any powers of reflexion, to proceed so subtly and skilfully, as to divine the unknown prototype from these strangely blended forms. But such magical shapes are different from mere dreams, and are not without a hidden foundation of real truth. The name of dreams belongs only to the fictions imagined by the later Greeks, after the tradition had become extinct, and when individuals were indulging a wanton license in altering the old legends; not considering that their diversity and multiplicity had been the work of the whole people, and was not a matter for individual caprice to meddle with." Niebuhr's History of Rome. Translation of Hare and Thirlwall. I, 219.

This extract, I say, from Niebuhr's stupendous work, not only serves to show the value he set upon early Roman history; but also proves decisively how utterly unfitted his speculations, or even their results, are, to be communicated to beginners in history.

*If it should be said that, although such a passage as this is unfitted for that purpose, an explanation of it might be
given instead of the passage itself; the answer is, that any explanation, which should make such a passage as this intelligible to an un instructed mind (be it the mind of a person or of a people) would be nothing less than a course of lectures on Mythical and Historical narration and their mutual relations.

Before I close this letter it will be proper to advert to the method which Dr. Arnold has pursued in his History of Rome in consequence of the labours of Niebuhr.

In the preface to that work he says —

"The form and style in which I have given the legends and stories of the first three centuries of Rome may require some explanation; I wished to give these legends at once with the best effect, and at the same time with a perpetual mark, not to be mistaken by the most careless reader, that they were legends and not history. There seemed a reason, therefore, for adopting a more antiquated style, which otherwise of course would be justly liable to the charge of affectation."—Arnold's History of Rome, Preface, 10.

It is obvious that this plan of distinguishing the early from the later and more authentic portions of history by differences of style, could not be adopted in an Epitome, because such a work affords no room for exhibition of style; and it could not be attempted in a Bengali work, because the existing literature of that language does not supply the various models of which such an attempt pre-supposes the existence.

I think, then, you may rest in the assurance that you have done wisely in translating into Bengali the common story of the early ages of Rome, without attempting for the present to explain what relation this story bears to an authentic narration of real facts.
The time will come, I hope, but we must not expect it to come very quickly, when you, or those who tread in your footsteps, may show Niebuhr himself to Bengali eyes capable of looking at him not with blank astonishment, but with intelligent admiration.

I am, Sir,

With much esteem,

Your obedient Servant,

C. H. Cameron.
* * * Though the ancient Hindus had, to a great extent, cultivated the sciences of Algebra and Geometry, and though the elements of Euclid themselves were translated into Sanscrit in the days of Rajah Jayasingha, the subjects may now be said to be entirely new to the natives of Bengal, except where they have studied them in English. The following extract from Lord Brougham’s essay on the objects, advantages, and pleasures of science may therefore be an appropriate introduction to a branch of knowledge of which the Bengalee reader has no conception. The explanation of the signs of Algebraic notation, taken from the introductory part of Whewell’s Mechanical Euclid, is intended to enable the reader to understand the summary given at the end of each proposition in Algebraic characters. The summary it is thought will help to impress the truths demonstrated the more strongly upon the learner’s mind, and to show the relation between Algebra and Geometry.