tried to show that the use of the pronominal prefixes in those forms of speech is due to the common tendency observable in all Tibeto-Burman languages to avoid abstract terms. The verb, which is virtually a noun, is always put into relation to some other noun as its subject.

I still think that this explanation is the correct one. It is, however, possible that another factor has been at work as well. The Kuki-Chin prefixes are used in the same way as the Muṇḍā suffixes, which are added to the word immediately preceding the verb. Compare e.g. *Santālī kora-e ṇur-en-a*, 'boy-he fell, the boy fell,' where the suffix *e*, 'he,' shows that the subject of the verb *ṇur-en-a* is of the third person.

We do not know anything about the old history of the Kuki-Chin tribes. It is, however, possible that they were at some time influenced by Muṇḍā tribes, and the distinction of the person of the subject by means of pronominal prefixes may accordingly be due to a double reason.

Muṇḍā tribes must once have lived in many districts where they have now disappeared. The dialects spoken by several Tibeto-Burman tribes in the Himalayas show distinct traces of Muṇḍā influence, and there is nothing improbable in the supposition that some Muṇḍā tribe once lived in the neighbourhood of the Kuki-Chins.

STEN KONOW.

Christiania, Norway.

THE VERSE 18 OF THE HARṢACARITA.

In spite of being perhaps taxed with tediousness I venture to present another translation of this verse already examined by various scholars in this Journal (see above, pp. 155 sqq.). It seems to me that one of the ways of coming to a right understanding of a difficult passage is to take into consideration the context. Now Bāṇa, after having extolled the works of other poets, which brought them fame and splendour, hesitates to follow their example before the difficult task of finding terms adequate to the greatness of

his patron's deeds. A fine compliment indeed, and duly couched in the following terms:—

“My tongue held back, as it were, by Āḍhyarāja's achievements, engraved in my heart, refuses to chant, although I remember them well.”

J. KIRSTE.

CHALDEAN PRINCES ON THE THRONE OF BABYLON.

An interesting paper has been contributed to the *Churchman* of October and November last by the Rev. C. Boutflower, Vicar of Terling (Essex), entitled “Chaldean Princes on the Throne of Babylon.” Beginning with a statement of the views of various scholars upon the subject, and their opinions as to the origin of the Chaldeans and their name, he shows that the word first occurs in the inscriptions of Aššur-našir-āpli, father of Shalmaneser II, the king who, to all appearance, was the first to come into contact with the Jews. This text informs us that, in or about the year 879 B.C., the Chaldeans occupied the southern part of Babylonia, and were under the rule of Nabû-ābla-iddina, “who was probably a Chaldean himself.” All the occasions when the Chaldeans came into contact with the Assyrians, in the reigns of Shalmaneser II, Šamši-Rammanu (Šamši-Addu), Rammanu-nirari (Adad-nirari), and Tiglath-pileser III, are then recounted, with many interesting details. His arguments tend to show that many of the Babylonian dynasties in the canon of kings published in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, May 6th, 1884, were really Chaldean, so that “‘Ur of the Chaldees’ may well have been in the hands of that people at the time when Moses wrote the Pentateuch.” Whether the composition of the names of early Babylonian kings constitute real evidence or not, is a question which requires the test of time, but there is very great probability that the presence of Merodach, Bêl, and Nebo, as component parts of them, may be an indication of the Chaldean nationality of those who bore them. The dynasty to which