薛仁貴 [Mayers No. 582], one of the conquerors of Corea, still exists in 咸鏡 Province, Corea. Lately the noise of cavalry has been heard there in the dead of the night, whence the Coreans augur an early conquest of their land; so says a Chinaman in the *Shén Pao*, probably with a view to sharing the spoils.

E. H. Parker.

## REPLIES.

Ula.—With reference to J. M.'s notes, *China Review*, Vol. XV, pp. 244, et seq. I hasten to admit that in the matter of 打牲烏拉 I have been guilty of a serious mistake, confounding, I suppose, 打牲 'hunters' with 三姓 the town. I am far from my books of reference and can only make a conjecture. I still have the impression that 烏拉 is used officially for 'Kirin,' even though the example I quoted was not apposite.

On the other points discussed by J. M. I wish only to say that I made my suggestions honestly as such, indicating what I considered possibilities, not making dogmatic assertions of absolute fact. Where queries are made, any one is, I presume, at liberty to attempt to assist the querist with the best suggestions that occur to him; and while admitting my critic's full right to criticise, I cannot but regret that, being so well supplied with information on the subject of titles of nobility and of river-gods, J. M. did not do his duty by the querist and the *China Review*, by answering the questions himself, instead of lying in wait for me with his polyglot bludgeon.

G. M. H. Playfair.

London, May 3, 1887.

In this volume p. 300, J. M., under the heading of *More about ula*, criticizes my note on ula grass. In his note, on the whole not very lucid, he unfortunately employs expressions not usual in scientific disputes; I therefore restrict my reply to such of his remarks, as are free from offences against the *bon ton*.

In my note, after correcting some mistranslations of J. M., I proposed to explain *ula* as Mongol. To this J. M. hesitatingly assents. He says 'it is not altogether without some foundation, frankly,' he adds, 'I think it better than my own explanation.' I take it then, that my explanation is admitted as correct, until a better one is advanced.

With regard to the other part of my short note, J. M. accuses me of 'ascribing a wrong meaning to almost every Manchu word quoted in my note.' This is serious. That I have committed so many 'blunders,' J. M. thinks is due to the deficiency of the native dictionaries, although on the following column he accuses me of making more frequent use of European works and of seldom consulting the native ones. Without laying stress on this want of logic, I can only repeat what I said in my first note: why use the native works at all, since all of them have been condensed etc. in Sacharoff's lexicon? I admit then that I chiefly depend on the European works. There are only two such works, which J. M. can mean, viz. Gabelentz' Manchu-German dictionary and Sacharoff's lexicon, Amixt being entirely out of question. The first one is a useful and conscientious work. Sacharoff is admirable. Gabelentz has made use of some, Sacharoff of all native dictionaries and we must advance strong reasons, when we dissent from the explanations given by either of them.

The Manchu words that occur in my previous note are: *foyo*, *orho*, *gôlha*, *olo*, *fodo*, *ula*, *buthai*, *adun*. As J. M. agrees with me as to the rendering of *orho*, as he does not dispute that of *olo* and advances no proofs against my translation of *ula*, only five words remain, the translation of which I have to defend.

1. *foyo*, I said, does not mean carpet, but a grass. If I correctly understand J. M.'s note on *foyo*, he has since given up 'the carpet' and taken the word to mean a bunch or knot, formed by entangled horse-

hair. Gabelentz gives something similar. *Foyo*, however, clearly is some grass, which may grow in bunches. As such it enters into composition with other words denoting plants—*gôlha* f., *olo* f., *shadu* f., *sika* f. The similarity of a fettered horse tail to this grass may have led to its use in *foyonoho* i.e. *foyo-n-oho* or *foyo* and a participle of the verb *ombi* with intercalated n, a thing which has become (like) *foyo*. There is in Manchu no such thing as a 'verbal suffix no-m(e)-bi,' as J. M. asserts, although L. Adam in his grammar may say so.

With regard to *foyodon*, *fayodombi*, *foyo faitambi*, which all deal with magic, witchcraft and fortune-telling, they are not connected with our *foyo*, but are derived from another, though similar stem, which I find in Mongol *büge*, Turk. *bögü*, Hung. *bü*, Jak. *ab* (Boller, Böhtlingk).*

2. *Gôlha* I have translated by 'boots, shoes, *gôlha foyo* boots grass.' The latter translation shows that I lay stress on 'boots' as the ordinary translation of the word. That *gôlha* sometimes stands for shoes is shown by Ch'ing-wen-chien 卷 24 fol. 19, b, where *hôwaitame gôlha* stands for Chinese 靴子鞋. Sacharoff has only boots, Gabelentz boots and shoes. The Manchu does not well distinguish as the modern Chinese 靴 and 鞋, thus *gôlha* stands for boots and shoes, *sabü* for shoes, slippers and sandals. See Liki, I. fol. 16, a, where 屨 is translated by *sabu*.

3. *Fodo* stands in my note instead of *fodoho*. Both words mean willow, the latter being the more common of the two. For the comparison I merely required the stem and therefore chose the shorter word. Sacharoff and Gabelentz agree with me.

4. *Butha* I have translated by hunting. J. M. says it means game. The Ch'ing-wen-chien 卷 22 fol. 18 a, has 漁獵; it is a participle of *butambi's* 打牲. That *butha* originally is the thing hunted and *aba* the action of hunting, is clear. Still *butha* often stands for the latter, as the word *buthai niyalma*, huntsman, referred to by J. M., itself proves. Sacharoff and Gabelentz agree with me.

J. M. considers *buhai ula* synonymous with *buthasi* huntsmen, but he brings no proofs for this assertion. In his first note he ascribes to *ula* the meaning of escort, station and even guard or garrison!

5. *Adun*, says J. M., 'is a herd of horses or oxen, also a flock of sheep, when for enclosure or preserve the Manchus have *horigan* and for stable *heren*.' Yes, Sacharoff and Gabelentz say so too, as also the Great Mirror. As I use Sacharoff, when I want a word unknown to me, I could only find this meaning. The comparative note given by me shows that the stem *ad*— has the meaning of herd (*feniyen*). I however advisedly translated *adun* by enclosure, preserve, stud, in answer to Mr. Parker's question, as this is what the *aduns* in the Imperial mews actually are. The word enters also into the titles of the officials in charge of the mews: *adun i amban* and *adun i hiya*.

By thus maintaining throughout my former position, I do not intend to prove my infallibility in Manchu. Far from it. I accept corrections, wherever they may come from. But in the present case, in spite of repeated revision of my note, I find no reason for changing any of my former conclusions.

P. G. von Möllendorff.

* I am sorry that J. M. calls comparisons as the above 'an ostentatious display.' Others, I hope, will not think so. It is only by comparison with cognate languages that the true meaning of the stems is found. Dr. Edkins, who was the first in China to apply the comparative method to the languages of Eastern Asia, has in this respect produced excellent results, which I hope he will further increase. We were once at variance on this point, but only because he commenced with comparisons between two languages belonging to different families of languages, when the relationship between the single members within each of these families had not yet been placed on a scientific basis.

---

Tribute Fruit.—In the Number for Nov. and Dec. 1886 p. 183, Mr. Parker writes: 'with reference to the tribute fruit 哈達果丹 sent from Miasutai, it may be noted that in the 金史 it is stated that 哈丹