appear there, nor in Edkins' work on the Study of Characters, though he has supplemented the list. The consequence of this serious omission and constant misprinting is that Dr. Edkins, whose views of the formation of characters are very shaky, has devoted a page of the *China Review* to the phonetic connection of 忍 *jen* and 梁 *liang* (Vol. xiv, p. 214), in which, though he refers to the *Shwo-wen*, he ignores the existence of the real phonetic of the latter character, namely 刅 *ch'wang*, wound; and supposes it to be 刃 *jen*, sword. This affords an opportunity of inflicting upon the readers of the *China Review* a dissertation on the original identity of sounds which have no resemblance to each other.

J. CHALMERS.

FINAL CONSONANTS IN CHINESE.—If any confirmation of the antiquity of the Cantonese final consonants be wanted it is abundantly supplied by the Japanese. It was pointed out some time ago in the *China Review*, vol. XIV., p. 181, by Mr. Parker, that the Japanese has final consonants corresponding to those found in Cantonese and Hakka in certain words; and, in order to make sure that the cases quoted were not exceptional, I obtained from a friend in Japan the Japanese pronunciation of the common characters given in the three following lists. I have placed the Mandarin of Williams' *Syllabic Dictionary*, which may be supposed to represent the language of Central China at the present day, between the Cantonese and the Japanese. Japan we cannot suppose had any direct intercourse with Canton, but must have derived its pronunciation of Chinese from further north, in fact from those parts of China where the final consonants *k*, *p*, and *t* do not exist now. It is evident therefore that they did exist then, though an indefinite *h* has taken the place of all the three in Central China now, and even that indefinite *h* is unknown in Peking as a distinctive mark of what are called *ju shăng* words. In the process of disintegration Pekingese has lost these consonants and not a trace of them is left behind. The final *h* in Wade's system does not serve at all to distinguish this class of words.

In the second of the following lists *f* appears in Japanese for the *p* in Cantonese and Hakka. The reason of this probably is that the Japanese had no *p* in their own language; and the *f* existed only as an initial, therefore *kap* became *kafu*, just as 'have' becomes 'hap' or 'hafi' in pidgin English.

An exhaustive comparison of Japanese and different dialects of Chinese would no doubt bring to light many other interesting facts.

J. CHALMERS.

FINAL K.

	Cantonese.	*Mandarin.*	*Japanese.*
直	chīk$_2$	chih$_4$	jiki
束	ch'uk$_4$	shuh$_4$	soku
福	fuk$_4$	fuh$_4$	fuku
革	kāk$_4$	koh$_4$	kaku
局	kuk$_2$	küh$_4$	kiyoku
力	lik$_2$	lih$_4$	riki, ryoku
樂	lok$_2$	loh$_4$	raku
六	luk$_2$	luh$_4$	roku
目	muk$_2$	muh$_4$	moku
木	muk$_2$	muh$_4$	moku
嶽	ngok$_2$	yoh$_4$	goku
白	pāk	poh$_4$	haku
得	tāk$_4$	teh$_4$	toku
的	tik$_4$	tih$_4$	teki
式	shik$_4$	shih$_4$	shiki
石	shek$_2$	shih$_2$	seki
則	tsak$_4$	tseh$_4$	soku
席	tsik$_2$	sih$_2$	seki
夕	tsik$_2$	sih$_2$	seki
嶽	yuk$_2$	yuh$_4$	goku
玉	yuk$_2$	yuh$_4$	giyoku
肉	yuk$_2$	juh$_4$	niku

FINAL P.

	Cantonese.	*Mandarin.*	*Japanese.*
刷	ch'āp$_1$	ch'ah$_4$	sofu,* sō
執	chăp$_2$	chih$_2$	shifu, shiu
乏	fāt$_3$ (fāp$_3$)	fah$_2$	bofu, bō
法	fāt$_3$ (fāp$_3$)	fah$_2$	hofu, hō
劫	hip$_3$	hieh$_2$	kefu, kiyo
洽	hip$_3$	hieh$_2$	kifu, kiu
合	hop$_3$	hoh$_2$	kofu, gō
急	kăp$_2$	kih$_2$	kifu, kiu
甲	kāp$_1$	kiah$_3$	kafu, kō
匣	kāp$_1$, hāp$_3$	kiah$_2$	kafu, kō
夾	kāp$_1$	kiah$_2$	kefu, kiyo
劍	k'āp$_3$	k'iah$_3$	kofu, kō
卅	sāp$_1$	sah$_4$	safu, sō
剳	tāp$_3$	tah$_2$	tafu, tō
搭	tāp$_3$	tah$_2$	tafu, tō
荅	tāp$_3$	tah$_2$	tafu, tō
葉	tip	tieh$_2$	rafu, rō

* The Japanese at the present day do not pronounce this *f*. They spell as in the first column and pronounce as in the second.

	Cantonese.	*Mandarin.*	*Japanese.*
揖	tsăp$_1$	tsih$_2$	shifu, shiu
入	yăp$_3$	juh$_4$	nefu, niu
葉	yip$_3$	yeh$_4$	yefu, yō
業	yip$_3$	yeh$_4$	kefu, giyo

FINAL T.

發	fāt$_1$	fah$_1$	hatsu
罰	fāt$_3$	fah$_2$	batsu
吉	kat$_1$	kih$_2$	kichi
結	kit$_1$	kieh$_2$	kitsu
律	lut$_3$	lüh$_4$	hitsu
物	măt$_3$	wuh$_4$	motsu
必	pit$_1$	pih$_2$	shitsu
失	shăt$_1$	shih$_2$	shitsu
殺	shāt$_1$	shah$_2$	setsu
舌	shit$_3$	sheh$_2$	zetsu
朮	shut$_3$	shuh$_4$	jutsu
達	tāt$_3$	tah$_2$	tatsu
七	ts'āt$_1$	ts'ih$_1$	shichi
月	üt$_3$	yüeh$_4$	getsu
日	yat$_3$	jeh$_4$	jitsu

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

La Poésie Chinoise du XIV*ème au* XIX*ème siècle.* Extraits des poètes Chinois, traduits pour la première fois, accompagnés de notes littéraires, philologiques, historiques et de notices biographiques. Par C. Imbault-Huart, Vice-Consul de France etc. etc. Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1886.

Mr. Imbault-Huart, who some years ago contributed to the North-China Branch R. A. S. Journal, an essay on the life and works of the principal Chinese poet of the 18th century, Yuan Tseu-ts'ai, presents now to the general reader a brief anthology of modern Chinese poetry. The author remarks, at the outset, on what he assumes to be an established fact, viz. that in all countries of the world poetry preceded prose. In proof of this statement, which is, as we take it, by no means identical with Voltaire's *bon mot* "verses have always been the first offspring of genius," Mr. Imbault-Huart points to Orpheus, Linus, Musaeus, Hesiod, Homer, and finally to the Shi King, of which latter compilation he says that "it shows us the Chinese language at its birth, rather unformed and diffuse in its cradle, an embryo from which came forth later on, under the chisels of Confucius and his disciples, the models of true prose." The whole argument reads much more plausibly in French than we can briefly put it in English,