

of all tone-marks. It is true that tones do vary considerably in different dialects, and are sometimes even affected by the position of a word in a sentence ; but all the same, half a loaf is a great deal better than no bread, and to refer the student to " his teacher or some authoritative work " is simply shifting the difficulty to other shoulders. A teacher may not always be handy ; and the student who finds that the use of Mr. Hemeling's dictionary necessarily involves the possession of another, will be tempted to economize by purchasing only the latter.

The author warns us to be on our guard against printing errors ; but the proofs have evidently been read with great care, and a fairly prolonged search has failed to reveal a single wrong character. The type employed is excellent, and the general arrangement of the page could hardly be bettered.

L. GILES.

INTRODUCTION TO PRAKRIT. By ALFRED C. WOOLNER, M.A.
 9½ × 6, 219 pp. Published by the University of the
 Panjab, Lahore. 1917.

One of the untoward results of the war was that Orientalists in England had few opportunities of knowing what was being done by their brethren in India, and that books printed in that country between 1914 and 1918 became little known here, and, even when known, were not easy to procure. The present volume is a case in point.

Beginners of the study of Prakrit in this country have hitherto had to depend chiefly on Professor Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen*, an excellent work, but possessing the double disadvantage of describing only one dialect—Mahārāṣṭrī—and being written in a foreign language. Pischel's great work is, of course, suited only for advanced students. Mr. Woolner has now provided an introduction to all the dialects of Prakrit which is written in English. He takes as

his base standard Śaurasēnī-Mahārāṣṭrī, the two dialects being throughout put side by side and treated together. In a separate chapter he deals with the special peculiarities of the other dialects, Pāli, Māgadhī, Apabhraṃśa, and so on.

The book is in two parts. The first (pp. 1–80) contains a brief but clear and complete introduction to the subject as a whole, an account of the three stages of Prakrit—Pāli, Middle Prakrit, and Late Apabhraṃśa—and a description of the chief literary forms and their general characteristics. Then follow chapters on phonetics, accident, the dialects, and Prakrit literature. The whole is lucidly written and carefully printed. It is exceptionally free from misprints, and the one or two that I have detected are merely types misplaced in the printing in such a manner that the necessary correction is at once suggested. The book is thus not only a convenient, but also a safe guide, a statement that, unfortunately, cannot be said of many learned books published in India.

The second part (pp. 81–194) consists of specimens of Prakrit, and forms an admirable reading book. Mr. Woolner rightly starts the student on Śaurasēnī—the dramatic Prakrit which is nearest to Sanskrit, and which is the grandparent of modern Hindī—and of this, he gives about twenty pages of extracts from the plays. The student is then led on to Mahārāṣṭrī (twenty pages), Jain Mahārāṣṭrī (about the same amount), and so to Ardha-Māgadhī, Māgadhī, and other dialects, concluding with ten pages devoted to Pāli and the older inscriptional Prakrits. All these specimens are supplied with abundant notes and with translations, and in addition there is a very full Index-Vocabulary. The work is completed by the addition of a Students' Bibliography, which should be found most useful by beginners.

We must congratulate Mr. Woolner on having thus successfully removed a reproach that has long hung heavily over English Orientalists. Many of us will wish that such a book had been available in our own student days, and even to older stagers it will be found a most convenient work of reference.

I can thus warmly commend it to the notice of every student of Indian languages.

G. A. GRIERSON.


CAMBERLEY.


13th May, 1921.

LA LANGUE ÉTRUSQUE DIALECTE DE L'ANCIEN ÉGYPTIEN.





By HILAIRE DE BARENTON. 11 × 7½, 62 pp. Paris : Geuthner, 1920.

It is a matter of some difficulty to treat this work seriously. The author's knowledge of the principles of comparative philology in general, and of the grammar and syntax of the Egyptian language in particular, hardly appears adequate for the task he has undertaken, and he allows himself to be betrayed into writing such nonsense as—

“‘ARIMI was, it is said, the name of the monkey among the Egyptians (Strabo, xiii, 46).’ The name of the monkey, in the Hieroglyphic-Coptic language, signified “the imitator”. It was pronounced  *anlou, ain, dini* in Egyptian; *en* in Coptic. Now *an* (*cini* in Coptic) meant “to imitate, write”. The monkey, then, was “the imitator”.

But in Hieroglyphic, , *arimà, arimi* means exactly “to imitate”, *ar* (*ari* in Coptic) “to act”; *mà* (*mai, mi*) “the like”, that is to say, “to imitate.” This word, then, well describes the monkey.

We have not found this word *arimi*, with the sense of monkey, in the Hieroglyphic-Coptic texts. It is none the less a word of the language and an exact synonym of *anlou*, which signifies monkey.”

On this we may remark (1) that the Egyptian for a monkey is ,  or , ³*c*_n, ⁱ*c*_n or ^c*c*_n, and that M. de Barenton's form is a rather rare form of the plural; (2) that the verb  ^c*n* is not “to