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),

are still divided into three grades (一二三等).

The reference made to 佩文韻府 is, in my opinion, entirely out of place; for nothing common exists between the present titles of Manchu nobility and the manifold combinations of 都尉 which are to be found in the *P'ei-wên-yün-fu*. These latter refer generally to some ancient officers with different duties, which were designated with the same appellation 都尉, and for this reason had to be distinguished by some individualizing prefixes. The present titles, however, of the Manchu hereditary nobility are an institution of the reigning dynasty at the beginning of its rise, created with the view of stimulating and maintaining the warlike character of the nation, by rewarding with such honorific titles those who succeeded in distinguishing themselves by some meritorious act of military gallantry. So that the nobles of our days are not to be compared with those of old feudal China, nor even with the European aristocratic titles, although the names by which some of them are designated, are identical with those of the old Chinese nobility. The present nobles of the Manchu-Chinese Empire might rather be fairly assimilated, were it not for their hereditary character, to the various degrees of some order of knighthood for reward of military merit, such as exist in some of the western countries.

The idea that I have of the names for the nine degrees of the present nobility, is that most of the Manchu titles were framed before, the actual Chinese names being much later adapted to them. It is on account of this circumstance that, notwithstanding the habit of the Manchus, as well as of the Chinese, of being generally literal translators of each other, these names in both languages do not offer any analogy whatever. It is not until the time of the Emperor K'ien-Lung, when this sovereign prepared for the press his voluminous work—the *Mirror of Manchu Literature*—published in the year 1771, that the Chinese names were introduced as the equivalent of the Manchu titles. Still in a preceding work with the same title, published in 1735, during the reign of the Emperor Yung-Chêng, the Chinese names were not yet in use, nor existed then the ninth degree (恩騎尉), which has been afterwards created to be bestowed on the grandson of a 雲騎尉 as an hereditary title *in perpetuum*; for, the 8th degree, until then the lowest one, being established by law to be transmissible only to a single generation, it had to become extinct by the death of the son of its former possessor, and so no trace of nobility could remain in the family.

Before the present Chinese names were adopted, the titles of nobility were then denoted by a meaningless combination of characters suitable to phonetical imitation of the Manchu words, with the exception of the three highest classes in which the Manchu is, on the contrary, the phonetic imitation of Chinese preexisting titles of the old nobility. Thus:

1.—*Gung* stands for the Chinese 公.

2.—*Heo* for 侯.

3.—*Be* for 伯.

4.—精奇尼哈番 stood formerly for the Manchu *djingkini hafan*, which means a *main* or *proper officer*, being, as it seems, the two next lower classes, in the same manner as in many of the official posts there is a 正 with two subordinates—a 左 and a 右. This imitative Chinese name was later on changed for 子, as it is now called.

5.—阿思漢尼哈番 for the Manchu *as-han i hafan*, a *side officer*, now named 男 in Chinese.

6.—阿達哈哈番 for the Manchu *adaha hafan*, an *accompanying* or *assistant officer*, now designated by 輕車都尉.

7.—拜他喇布勒哈番 for the Manchu *baitalabure hafan*, which means an *officer to be commissioned* or *employed*, now styled 騎都尉.

8.—拖沙喇哈番 for the Manchu

tuwashara hafan, a *supervising officer*, now indicated by the name of 雲騎尉.

9.—In Manchu *kesingge hafan*, an *officer by (imperial) favour*, recently created, as I stated above, with the Chinese corresponding name of 恩騎尉.

Now, it being expressly established by the *Collected Institutes of the Tai-Ch'ing Dynasty* that no laudatory appellation should be prefixed to any title inferior to the third degree, Mr. Playfair's supposition turns out to be not only completely devoid of foundation, but contrary to the very rules of the institution.

For my part, I openly own that I am not in a position to cut the Gordian knot, and to give Mr. Parker a satisfactory reply. I did never see the title 護羌都尉, and, frankly, I entertain some doubt about its real existence, as it would be an abnormal and very surprising case. I would rather be inclined to think it a misrepresentation of some other thing. Mr. Parker, however, who is an indefatigable student of Chinese matters, could have met it somewhere, and I would request this gentleman kindly to gratify my curiosity by stating in a more explicit manner where it is to be found.

J. M.

River duties.—Mr. Playfair would have enhanced the value of his remarks on the Yellow River Duties, if he had given the names of the four gods, instead of referring the reader to the *Peking Gazette* of 1874, which many a student might not be in a position to glance at. I confess that I was in the belief that 金龍四大王 was a general designation for the whole set of those divine beings, which I thought were individually named 栗大王, 黨將軍, 俞將軍 and 袁將軍. Mr. Playfair will certainly oblige by giving a more detailed account of those river-gods, and also by explaining to the readers of the *Review* the terms 陳九龍將軍 and 王將軍, which, if my memory does not fail, are in some way equally concerned in the miraculous appeasing of some river's fury.

J. M.

Ula grass.—After having dissected some of Mr. Parker's notes, Mr. Playfair falls *vi abrupto* upon an inoffensive note of mine, with reference to *ula* grass. Pronouncing his verdict on the matter, this gentleman writes the following lines. 'Whether 烏拉 means originally "river" or "garrison," a glance at the Red Book under the heading Shingking will show conclusively that *officially* it means part of Kirin. The Superintendent of Pearl Fisheries at Ta-hsing (*sic*) is called the 烏拉總管. So *ula* grass may very well mean a grass from that part of the country and have nothing to do with rivers, frozen or otherwise.'

This seems to be, *primâ facie*, a very *conclusive* piece of reasoning; but dialecticians, who are the most stiff-necked and unmanageable set of men below heaven, would surely refuse to accept it as an argument of any weight, and would accuse Mr. Playfair of being specious. But, justice be done, those poor fellows are not, after all, such intractable and bad men, as people generally think them; for their only fault consists in going always hunting after the truth amidst the many falsities and deceits of the world. Seeing that their way is the surest one in doubtful matters, I feel inclined to follow their process of truth-finding, and beg therefore to be allowed to throw into a syllogistic form Mr. Playfair's fallacious argument, which, I think, should stand thus:—*ula* is officially a part of Kirin; the Superintendent of Pearl Fishery is called *wu-la-tsung-kuan* (烏拉總管); *ergo ula* is a grass from that part of Kirin.

Now, under this dialectic form, no man of sound judgment will, certainly, give his assent to Mr. Playfair, notwithstanding the claim of conclusiveness that he puts forth in favour of his argument. Such an illogical conclusion would justify logicians in crying *contentâ voce* before Mr. Playfair's