fix them along the eaves of the roof as a gutter. To this they apply the name of 隔勒. Some say 蛤蜊 and explain that the reason for this name is the resemblance of the gutter's concavity to that of a shell of this clam, Anyhow, it is by similarity to the bamboo gutter that the thing used in funeral processions is also called *ko-li*. It is an half piece of a big bamboo of about six feet long, deprived of all its knots and painted white, having a small white tablet hung from its top, on which are written with black letters the phrases 一品夫人 or 一品大夫, according to the sex of the deceased person.—粉棍 which, I believe, is misprinted 粉頭 in Mr. Parker's note, is a rod of about the same length, painted white with black rings all along.—龍頭 is a red-painted rod terminating with a gilded dragon's head.

In the same note Mr. Parker writes: 'One of the deceased Imperial Princes has had his funeral procession swollen by yellow orioles, greyhounds, camels and mares—in pairs. It is questionable whether these were in the flesh or in effigy, and it behoves inquiring people at Peking to elucidate the history of the custom.' I beg to say a few words about it, but merely as a suggestion. No question is to be put forth as to the animals being in flesh or in effigy, for they are really living creatures led by men in the procession, the camels carrying on their back a wooden cage covered with a red cloth. I do not know whether this custom has any history (probably not), but it seems to be of Manchu origin, for generally these animals are only carried in the funeral procession of high Manchu personages. It might have simply originated from the idea of simulating that the deceased is going on a hunting expedition, the orioles and greyhounds being used to pursue the chase, and the camels and mares to carry the game: and this to the effect of avoiding the disagreeable idea of death, for which the Chinese have so many euphemistical expressions. It might be, otherwise, that, because of the Manchus being in life very fond of hunting, the family of the deceased, to show their tenderness for him, prepares all the necessaries for this sport, believing or feigning to believe that the deceased would be gratified by having the necessaries to procure for himself this kind of amusement in the next world, in the same way as the Chinese prepare food, paper-houses, trunks, horses, silvershoes &c. for sacrificing to the manes of their relatives, as if they were to use all these things.

J. M.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS
AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, being an account by the Chinese Monk Fâ-hien of his travels in India and Ceylon (A.D. 399—424) in search of the Buddhist books of discipline. Translated and annotated, with a Corean recension of the Chinese text. By James Legge, M.A., LL.D. Professor of the Chinese language and literature. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1886.

The record of personal observations gathered by the Chinese priest Fah-hien during the travels he made at the beginning of the fifth century in Central Asia, the Punjab, India, Ceylon, and thence back by sea to China, were repeatedly published, apparently under different titles, in the course of the fifth and following centuries and when the Buddhist canon was authoritatively fixed by the Sung dynasty, this record was included in the Tripitaka with the sanction of the Sung and subsequently the King dynasties. Both the Corean and Japanese editions of the Buddhist Tripitaka also

include Fah-hien's Record among the canonical writings of Northern Buddhism. The text suffered, in the course of time, slight corruptions, but the differences existing between the secular editions, as contained in various Confucian cyclopædias, and the canonical editions of the Buddhist churches of China, Corea and Japan, are very small. Dr. Legge is, so far as we know, the first translator of this work who took pains to collate the principal existing recensions of the Chinese text, and he has now produced, on the basis of the Corean edition, a text which may be considered as critically established. The value of Dr. Legge's work is materially enhanced therefore by his publishing both the authentic Chinese text and an English translation.

As to Dr. Legge's translation, it was of course materially facilitated, not only by his life's labours as a translator of the Confucian Classics and by his proximity and access to the best Sanskrit Scholars at Oxford as well as to the treasures of the Bodleian Library and the Indian Institute, but especially also by the fact that several English translations had previously been published and called forth the most searching criticisms. Apart from Rémusat's French translation (1836), Dr. Legge had before him Beal's English translation of 1869, Giles' translation of 1877 accompanied by critical notes, Watters' articles of 1879 and 1880 reviewing those two translations, and finally Beal's revision of his translation, published in 1884. There is hardly a single passage of more than ordinary difficulty in the text which has not been the battle ground of adverse critics. Dr. Legge took advantage of the positive results of this sinologic warfare, but, whilst freely acknowledging the help he derived from various sources and most especially the accuracy of Chinese scholarship and the extensive knowledge of Buddhism which distinguished the articles of Mr. Watters, Dr. Legge eschewed all polemical matters and rarely makes remarks of a critical nature in defence of his own translation. At the foot of the translation, Dr. Legge gives copious notes which will be found of great use both from a Chinese and from a Buddhist point of view.

Among the illustrations by which the work is enlivened, there is a small sketch map of Eastern Asia on which the various countries and cities through which Fah-hien passed are marked, as at present identified. So far as India is concerned, Fah-hien's progress has been followed, almost step by step, by Cunningham and other Indian archæologists, whose excavations have often proved in the most unexpected manner the general correctness of Fah-hien's statements. The work is thus of importance, not merely to the student of Buddhism, but also to the students of ancient ethnography and topography. We hope to be able to publish in a future number a more extended notice or review of Dr Legge's work from the pen of some one of our contributors.

E. J. E.

Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Vol. XXI. New Series, Nos. 1 & 2, 1886.

A symposium on the advisability, or the reverse, of endeavouring to convey western knowledge to the Chinese through the medium of their own language, opens the present number of this Journal. Fourteen answers are given, more or less differing in their treatment of the question propounded, but the general sense of them appears to be, as Mr. Playfair succinctly put it, that the Chinese language, though adequate for the communication of the rudiments of Western science to the natives of China, would fail as a medium for the imparting of accurate scientific knowledge.

In continuation of subjects dealt with in the preceding number, Dr. Macgowan contributes some histrionic notes and Mr. Phillips gives the second part of his article on the seaports of India and Ceylon, also a

map, and a list of some 75 geographical terms now identified with more or less show of probability. Mr. Macintyre furnishes a pleasantly-written account of roadside religion in Manchuria, Mr. Playfair supplies an alphabetical arrangement of the list of dynastic and reign titles which is found, in chronological form, in Mayers' well-known Manual. Two contradictory contributions on the interminable term-question of Ta-ts'in, by Mr. Allen and Dr. Hirth, conclude the series of articles, which is followed by a miscellaneous series of rather valuable notes and queries, and literary notes. The latter principally consist of adverse critical notes, by Mr. Giles, on some translations of Mr. Parker, and a review, by Mr. Kingsmill, of Mr Giles' article on the Remains of Lao Tsze, published in the *China Review*, Vol. xiv, p. 231-281.

E. J. E.

The Cantonese-Made-Easy Vocabulary: a small dictionary in English and Cantonese, containing only words and phrases used in the spoken language, with the classifiers indicated for each noun, and definitions of the different shades of meaning, as well as notes on the different uses of some of the words where ambiguity might otherwise arise. By J. Dyer Ball, M.R.A.S., etc., of Her Majesty's Civil Service, Hongkong; Author of 'Easy Sentences in the Hakka Dialect with a Vocabulary,' 'Cantonese Made Easy,' etc. etc. Hongkong, 1886. [All rights reserved.]

In addition to the information conveyed by the foregoing title of the book under review, we may state that we have here a very neatly got up vocabulary of the most common terms which a beginner is likely to stand in need of. As the whole book, however, comprises only 27 pages, the author was naturally compelled, by the limited space at his disposal, to exclude many words which a beginner may occasionally wish to use, and which, we suppose, he would otherwise have inserted. The renderings of the terms selected appear to be given in good idiomatic colloquial style, such as is used among certain classes of the mixed population of Hongkong. The dialect of Cantonese which the author has taken for his standard is in harmony with the idiom referred to, for it is neither the dialect of Canton City nor that of Fatshan, hitherto taken as a standard by students of Cantonese. The following few examples will show this. The author pronounces 壺 wú, 管 kwún, 固 kwú, 要 yiú, 响 nöng 傳 ts'ün, etc. But such deviations from Canton City dialect are few and far between, and really of slight importance. As the author gives, for the English words selected by him, the corresponding Chinese characters together with their pronunciation and tones, the little book is sure to prove useful, especially if the tonal marks are revised throughout; but whether it has, as the title-page claims, succeeded in making such a difficult dialect as the Cantonese positively easy, is a question which we are not in a position to answer. A portion of the very limited space has been filled with digressions of a rather peculiar and doubtful nature. The following examples will indicate our meaning. Under the term 'Government,' which we would have rendered, in accordance with both diplomatic and colloquial usage, by 國 or 國家, Mr. Ball gives the following:—'皇家 ˏwong ˊká. On no account be induced to write 王家 ˏwong ˊká, nor allow any document, if you are in the Government service, to be addressed to you in such a style; for in such a case you give your sanction to the supposition that the Government, to which you belong, is merely a princely and not an imperial one.' Under the word 'this,' the author devotes more than half a page to an excursus on the stupidity of all previous 'dictionary makers.' We have not room to quote the whole of

this passage, but the following extracts will prove instructive. 'Do not be led into the mistake of supposing that 呢個 ,ni ko' is 'this;' it is nothing of the kind, although all the dictionaries say so . . . . . The probability is that the first dictionary maker, seeing that 個 was so frequently used as a classifier, and also not being able to exactly represent that word by an English word, either without thinking much about it, or not knowing the great mistake he was committing, put it down as meaning 'this' when used in combination with 尼; and all subsequent dictionary makers have followed, like sheep, their leader. . . . . It is no doubt this class of mistakes that helps amongst others to make Chinese so badly spoken by the majority of foreign residents.'

E. J. E.

The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal, Vol. XIII. Nos. 7-9, July to Sept. 1886.

The first of these three numbers opens with a short article by Dr. Edkins on certain obscure sects in North-China, whose Tauistic or Buddhistic shibboleths are explained. In the same number Mr. Ohlinger describes his visit to a Hakka tribe, popularly known as the 'dog-headed barbarians,' located near Foochow. He gives a comparative table of 24 words as pronounced by these people and by the Hakkas of Kwangtung. Seven of these words appear to differ more or less, but in these seven cases Mr. Ohlinger or the printer gave the Hakka equivalents wrongly. If they had been correctly given, the identity of dialect would have become even more plausible, although identity of selected words is no reliable proof in such cases. In this number and in the number next following, the Rev. G. W. Clarke gives an interesting account, taken from a popular pamphlet, of the introduction of Mahometanism into China (A.D. 629). It is to be regretted that the author did not take the trouble to compare the account here given with the statements on the same subject to be found in some standard history or in the T'ung-tien. The details given by Mr. Clarke with reference to the first Mahometan settlers in Canton are probably of historical value.

The Rev. G. Owen contributes, (in Nos. 8 and 9), an interesting essay on 'New Testament parallels in the Four Books,' but we fear that in most cases a parallel will be found to have been proved to exist simply by fastening upon a superficial similarity and disregarding the essential differences existing between Christianity and Confucianism, and by watering down the meanings of divine thoughts to the low level of naturalistic ethics. One instance will show what we mean. Believing, as we do, that the New Testament uniformly uses the term 'cross' as a means of bringing about the crucifixion and death of a condemned malefactor, and the term 'to take up one's cross' as referring to voluntary self-crucifixion and mortification of carnal and selfish desires, we cannot see any useful parallelism in comparing the words of Confucius, 'The scholar who is concerned about his personal comfort is not worthy to be deemed a scholar,' with the words of Christ, 'He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me.' What we mean is, that the drawing of such parallels only encourages the mischievous tendency, pre-existing among Chinese Christians, to empty the words of Christ of their meaning by bringing them down to the level of a superficial Confucian morality of outward observances.

In No. 9, Dr. Edkins supplies a brief article on the vexed question as to the meaning of the three terms 'I Hi Wei' occurring in the Tau Têh King. Dr. Edkins does not go so far as to say that Lao Tsze knew the name Jehovah or the Hebrew Scriptures, but he has no doubt that we have in these three words an indication that Lao Tsze had adopted opinions involving a belief in a trinity, both metaphysical and cosmogonical. Moreover, in harmony with

the latest fashion of referring the origin of everything singular, connected with Chinese antiquity, in the first instance to Babylonia, Dr. Edkins labours to show that these trinitarian and cosmogonic notions of Lao Tsze were derived from Babylonia. 'In his time,' says Dr. Edkins, 'Babylonian astronomy, astrology, cosmography and cosmogony were probably spread much more widely in India than in China. But they had not at that date assumed a decided Hindoo shape. They passed through India and beyond it in a form which was still Babylonian.'

In No. 8, Mr. Parker promulgates 'another small step in advance' which he appears to have made in his painstaking philological studies. The new step consists in the discovery of the following rule :—'All Chinese words adopted into Corean which, in Chinese, are in the departing tone, have long vowels ; and all Chinese words adopted into Corean which, in Chinese, are in the even tone, have short vowels.' Mr. Parker adds that this system runs through the whole imported Chinese language and that the fact is of the very utmost importance as a key which must sooner or later disclose many mysteries.

No. 9 contains a brief notice of Dr. Legge's *Li Ki* from the pen of Dr. Edkins, who considers Dr. Legge's translation to be carefully done and such as will bear examination.

E. J. E.

The Chinese Government.—A Manual of Chinese Titles categorically arranged and explained, with an appendix. By W. F. Mayers, Second Edition. With additions by G. M. H. Playfair. Kelly and Walsh (Shanghai, Hongkong and Yokohama), 1886.

We hail with pleasure this reprint of one of the most useful handbooks of the student of Chinese, especially as a competent hand has undertaken the task of supplementing the late Mr. Mayers' work with reference to points which, through administrative and other changes brought about by lapse of time since the original work appeared, required correction or additions. It would, of course, have served the interests of the general reader better if the additions and emendations thus necessitated could have been embodied in a thorough revision of the whole of Mayers' work. But, we suppose, vested interests stood in the way and, as a matter of fact, the present arrangement, which leaves the original work untouched and embodies the needful addenda et corrigenda in two separate articles, from the pen of Mr. Playfair, is, though cumbersome for purposes of reference, still of very great practical usefulness. As it is, the book opens with Mayers' original preface and table of contents. Next follows a reprint of an article published on the first appearance of Mayers' book, in the *China Review*, 1878, Vol. VI., p. 242, in which Mr. Playfair, while putting prominently forward the excellencies of Mayers' work, suggests a number of valuable additions and emendations. Next follows Mr. Playfair's introduction to the second edition, a long list of further addenda and corrigenda and an alphabetical Chinese index. Then comes Mayers' original work, reprinted without alteration from the edition of 1878, followed by the original index of Chinese characters.

E. J. E.

COLLECTANEA BIBLIOGRAPHICA.

Les Francais au Tonkin, 1787-1886. Avec six cartes. Par Hippolyte Gautier. Paris, 1886.

Journal Asiatique. Fevrier-Avril, 1886. Tchaosien-tché, mémoire sur la Corée, par un Coréen anonyme, traduit pour la première fois du chinois, avec un commentaire perpétuel. Scherzer.

Lehrbuch der Japanischen Sprache. Philipp Noack. Leipzig, 1886.

Quarterly Review. No. 325, July, 1886. China and the West.

The Tropical Agriculturist, April, 1886. China grass.

Times of India, 30 April, 1886. The mission to Tibet.—7 May, 1886. The opium question.—21 May, 1886. China and France.