syllables of the Chinese vocabulary have grown up from this simple beginning. The letters pronounced with the hidden parts of the sound channel were not aided by gesture in the first period of language, and consequently all appeared later. By the time of the invention of writing, the syllabary had made very great progress. The hands have made the pronouns, the substantive verb, the causatives, the conjunctions, the negative and all those important elements in language which embrace affirmation and negation. The hands and feet were early named from the sound accompanying the acts of beating, stamping and the like. From these as roots the greater part of the verbs which concern human action are derived. I should be glad of help from the contributors to the *China Review* in the development of this theory.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

ON CERTAIN PHONETICS.—Real phonetics are those which belong to the Koo wen. The Han authors, when they altered the writing, changed many of the phonetics. For instance when Dr. Chalmers (p. 773) says that 丬 ch'wang, wound, the same as 傷 *shang*, is the real phonetic of 梁 liang, corn, millet, should he not rather say that it is the phonetic in the modern writing in the Li shu and in the Siau chwen? Since B.C. 220, chwang has been the phonetic of liang, because certain literati chose to make it so, by forming ch'wang from 刃 jen.

As to these literati, they do not tell us enough and they had little science. The Shwo wen derives ch'wang wound, from jen knife edge and one, and Sü of the tenth century states that this means that a wound is inflicted by one knife. We cannot build good philological conclusions on such a basis as this. May I suggest Dr. Chalmers would do well to go further back?

Liang means strong and is by change of initial the same word in fact with 彊 chiang five. But 忍 jen in the Tie chiu and Amoy dialects djim, means able to bear and *m is the parent of ng as a final*. It is thus related to 能 neng, able to bear.

In the two Koo wen forms given in Kanghi for liang, the water radical is present, and the idea of a bridge was therefore prominent when these forms were in use. When 梁 was written, the idea of millet was prominent. *The character* 丬 c'hwang certainly gets form from 刃 nim edge of a knife, used ideographically. This is beyond question. I have looked over what I wrote in page 14 of Vol. xii, and find nothing deserving of the word 'shaky' being applied to it. The Shwo wen does in fact make 丬 *the* phonetic of 梁, and I added that Sü called it ch'wang. It is not much used except as a contraction for liang, 'tael,' on money bills. I recommend that chwang be regarded as a variation of 刃 and that this last be retained as the phonetic. This indeed is what the native scholars mean. The Kwang yun omits the extra stroke and writes 梁. It was perhaps only in the tenth century that the stroke on the right began to be insisted on. Yet as the literati like to have it, Dr. Chalmers is quite right to support them as a matter of writing. Sü's authority has given it currency in the Sung ti 宋体 since the invention of printing.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

TIBETAN TRIBES.—Mr. Playfair, a well-known sinologist of our days, appears making a few remarks on some of Mr. Parker's notes, *China Review*, Vol. XV. page. 131). *With due respect for* Mr. Playfair's scholarship, I beg to put forth a few critical remarks on some of his assertions or suggestions, the accuracy of which, I must own, remains for me a matter of doubt.

Shielded with the authority of Mr. Porter Smith, *Mr. Playfair expressly asserts that* the Tibetan tribe 乍了 ought to be properly called 乍丫, and that this name was wrongly written in the *Gazette*. I have to call this gentleman's attention to a *post*

scriptum memorial of Mr. Selengge (色楞額) and others, published in the *Peking Gazette* of the 13th November last, which surely is not the number that furnished Mr. Parker with the matter for his note, because it is of a date posterior to the publication of the note. The *Gazette* referred to by Mr. Parker must be, undoubtedly, that of the 4th May, 1886, in which I see the word in question repeated many times, and in every instance written 乍了. Having found again the same word mentioned in Mr. Selengge's memorial, I suspected that such a mistake, as Mr. Playfair believes, could not possibly be reproduced so many times. A Chinese book, however, which accidentally I was reading within the last few days, happened very opportunely to solve my doubts, and to convince me that the tribe, notwithstanding Mr. Playfair's authoritative assertion, is really and correctly called 乍了. In describing an itinerary through Tibet, the author says, 'at eighty *lis* from 阿足 one arrives at 洛加宗, and thence following a ravine, till coming out of it, by a circuitous and uneven way of about ninety *lis*, opening through hills, one arrives at the post of Cha-liao (至乍了汛).' Here in a brief note, interpolated in the text after the Chinese fashion, the author gives some short desultory notices of the place. 'For choultry or halting place, he says, there is the stone-house of the military officer (宿站有營官碉房); the inhabitants are very numerous (人民頗多); there is a large temple which is the one mentioned in the *Plates to the Collected Institutes* as the *Cha-ya* temple (有大寺院卽會典圖註之札雅廟也); *Ula* may be changed there (可換烏拉);* the natives are stubborn in their character and addicted to robbery' (夷人性頑不純慣於搶劫). I surmise, upon this passage, that perhaps Mr. Porter Smith had confounded the name of the temple with that of the place, and thus he caused Mr. Playfair to fall into a mistake.

The Cha-liao are described as being the largest and strongest tribe beyond the river (Kin-sha-kiang?) lying between Kiang-ka (江卡) on the east and Tsiamdo (察木多) on the west, and forming with these tribes, together with Bathang (巴塘), Derkoth (德爾格忒) and others, an extensive circuit. Their territory embraces twelve postal stations, and borders with that of the savages commonly known by the name of San-yen (三岩). About 180 years ago, the Cha-liao supplied the Manchu sovereign with more than 14,000 men, equipped and provisioned at their own expenses, to war against the Nepaulese (廓爾喀) and the Chan-tui (瞻對).

J. M.

* This occasional remark of the author constitutes a pretty good proof of what I ventured to suggest in a previous note, *i.e.*, that the men of a post are called *ula*. It is in this sense that the word *garrison*, which I used, ought to be understood.

NOBILITY TITLES.—In endeavouring to reply to a query of Mr. Parker's concerning the expression 護羌都尉, Mr. Playfair says that, from analogy with other similar terms, 都尉 would seem to be a title and 護羌 a descriptive affix, common in the case of *Baturus*. I venture to remark that Mr. Playfair has daringly advanced something not easy to be proved. The titles of 輕車都尉, 騎都尉, 雲騎尉 and 恩騎尉, as well as the higher ones of 子 and 男, are never preceded by any laudatory appellation (嘉名=to Mr. Playfair's 'descriptive affix'), similar to those conferred on *Baturus*; and I would invite Mr. Playfair to produce, as a mere foundation to his surmise, a single example of such a 'descriptive affix' joined to the above title. The laudatory appellation may be prefixed only, according to established rule, to the three higher classes (公, 侯 and 伯); and these, as well as the following three (子, 男 and 輕車都尉),