Chindwin and the Irrawaddy. The Kachins have not as yet settled down, and are still pushing southwards. The Kachins and the Kuki-Chins gradually and finally merge into Burmese, the language of the ancient kingdom of Burma.

It is impossible to bring the relationship existing between all these various groups under one single formula. The dialects spoken in the Himalayas and in Assam can be described as a double chain connecting Tibetan with Burmese, which are the two principal languages of the family. In the first place the Kachin group runs from the easternmost Tibetan dialects in Sze-ch'uen down to the Burmese of Upper Burma. The second chain has a double beginning in the north. We can trace one line through the North Assam group, the Nāgā, Bodo and Kuki- Chin groups. Another line can be followed from Tibetan through the Himalayan and Bodo groups into Kuki-Chin. The latter dialects finally merge into Burmese.

The original home of the Tibeto-Burman race seems to have been on the Upper Hwangho and the Upper Yangtszc-kiang in the Chinese provinces of Sze-ch'ucn and Yiinnan. The oldest invaders followed the Tsangpo into Tibet and became the Tibe­tans of the present day. Other hordes crossed the Brahmaputra and settled in the hills on the southern slopes of the Himalaya range. From the headwaters of the Irrawaddy and the Chindwin successive waves entered Assam and Further India. Some fol­lowed the course of the Brahmaputra and settled in the hills to the south and east of the great bend of the river. Others entered the Nãgã hills, while numerous tribes must have followed the Chindwin into Manipur and the hills to the south. The in­habitants of Burma have probably come down along the Chindwin and the Irrawaddy, and the latest immigrants, the Kachins, have only in modern times begun their wanderings southwards through the hills. The tribes settled in the hills north of the Assam valley appear to possess a mixed character. Their home can be considered as a kind of backwater which has been over­flowed by the waves of successive invasions.

In their original home the Tibeto-Burmans were the neighbours of Chinese and Tai tribes. Their languages are also closely related to Chinese and Tai, more closely to the former than to the latter. The agreement is apparent in the phonetical system, in vocabulary and in grammar. The principal point in which they differ is the order of words. The Tibeto-Burman family arranges the words of a sentence in the order of subject, object, verb, while the order in Chinese and Tai is subject, verb, object. Together all these languages form one great family, which is usually called Indo-Chinese.

The Indo-Chinese family is usually considered as a typical instance of the so-called isolating languages. The single words do not consist of more than one syllable. They are incapable of inflexion because there are no form-words, which merely denote relation in time and space. Grammatical relations are therefore not indicated by inflexion, but simply by putting together, according to fixed rules, words of which each retains its independence. Thus a sentence such as “ the father struck the boy ” would be translated “ father agent son striking completion.” This state of affairs, which is the prevailing condition in Chinese, is not, however, the original one. While the bases of the words are monosyllabic, *i.e.* each word consists of one syllable, comparative philology shows that these bases were often preceded by prefixes, short additions, the meaning of which cannot always be ascer­tained, but which modified the meaning of the base in the same way as the terminations of other languages. Such prefixes were not accented, and in the course of time they were commonly reduced and often dropped altogether, so that each word (*i.e*. the prefix plus base) itself came to be monosyllabic. Such words were then pronounced in a higher tone, and this gave rise to the development of a complicated system of tones in Chinese, Tai and some Tibeto- Burman languages. The existence of old prefixes can therefore still be inferred from the tones.

This development can still be followed in the Tibeto-Burman languages. They have, to some extent, retained the old prefixes. This is, for example, the case in Old Tibetan and some modern Tibetan dialects, while the prefixes have been dropped in the modern dialect of Central Tibet. Compare Old Tibetan *b-dun,* Balti *ab-dun,* but Central Tibetan *dün,* seven. The connexion between the drop­ping of prefixes and the development of tones can be seen from the fact that Balti, which has, to some extent, preserved the prefixes, is devoid of tones, while Central Tibetan has developed a system of tones corresponding to that prevailing in Chinese. The same is the case with Kachin and some Nãgã dialects, while the re­maining Tibeto-Burman languages apparently agree with such Tibetan dialects as are devoid of tones. The development of tones in many dialects was probably counteracted by the influence of the speech of the former inhabitants whom the Tibeto-Burman found in possession of the country when they invaded their present habitat. Remnants of such old inhabitants are still found in the Khasi hills of Assam, in the midst of the Tibeto-Burman territory. Traces of the speech of an old, non-Tibeto-Burman population, can also be found in some dialects belonging to the Himalayan group.

Through the dropping of old prefixes several different words coincided in form. The same result was effected by another tendency, which is apparent in all Indo-Chinese languages, viz. to harden soft consonants. Thus Tibetan *ba,* cow, is often pro­nounced *bha* and *pa.* The confusion which might arise from this double tendency is counteracted by the system of tones and the fixed rules for the order of words.

The vocabulary is richly varied. Thus the different varieties of some animal are often denoted by separate words. On the other hand, ,there are few general terms or such as denote abstract ideas.

All these features of Tibeto-Burman speech tend to make the difference between the dialects considerable, and the changes within one and the same dialect bewildering. Instances arc said to be on record where one small tribe has changed its language in the course of a couple of generations so as to be unrecognizable. This fact, if fact it be, can however be accounted for by assuming that the male individuals in question have robbed their wives from some other tribe. At all events, the changes are not so important in cases where we are able to compare the existing vocabulary of a tribe with words noted down, say, a century ago.

The different classes of words are not clearly distinguished, and many instances occur in which a word can be used at will as a noun, as an adjective or as a verb. The verb can, on the whole, be de­scribed as a noun of action, and we find phrases such as "my going is” instead of.“ I go.” Inflexion is often effected by isolation. Thus gender is commonly denoted by adding words meaning "male,” “female,” respectively; number is indicated by means of numerals and words meaning “many,” “heap”; and there is no relative pronoun and no clear distinction between the various verbal tenses. Many of the words added in order to indicate relation in time, space, &c., have, however, ceased to be used as separate words, and have become what can for all practical pur­poses be called case and tense affixes. The inflexion is therefore at the present date, to a great extent, effected by agglutination, *i.e.* by adding modifying particles to the base, which itself remains un­changed. Such particles are only put once if there are more than one word put together in the same relation. Thus an adjective and a qualified noun only takes one “ case-suffix.” Several dialects have in this way developed a complicated system of grammatical forms, partly perhaps under the influence of non-Tibeto-Burman languages.
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**TIBIA,** a pipe played by means of a reed mouthpiece, exten­sively used in classic Rome. The tibia, often mistranslated “ flute,” was identical with the aulos of the Greeks, and accord­ing as it was made with a cylindrical or with a conical bore, it may be regarded as the prototype of our clarinet or oboe. The tibia was used at musical contests, in the theatre, in the arena,