CROSS-BOWS.—Cross-bows which could shoot arrows 300 paces [步] are mentioned in the T'ang annals [伏遠弩]. The Sung armies marched in five columns, the three first being armed with swords and spears, the two rear with bows and cross-bows, supported by 'artillery' [虎蹲弩 and 床子弩]. The 論衡 [Mayers, 795] also mentions a 十石弩.

PHRASEOLOGY OF MOURNING.—The almost stereotyped expressions used on the death of prominent statesmen are 900 years old. On the death of 畢士安 the Emperor said, in A.D. 1,005, 遽此淪沒深可悼惜. Students with tolerable memories will also remember an impassioned memorial presented by 吳可讀 against the infamous 成祿, in which he said that either his own or Ch'ênglu's head must go. [As Ch'englu's head remained, Wu K'o-tuh subsequently committed suicide]. These exact words were used by 張詠 against 丁謂 in the year 1,015, to wit:—乞斬謂頭置國門以謝天下然後斬詠頭置丁氏之門以謝謂. Chinese history in fact affords both precedents and words for all possible combinations of circumstances. *Toujours perdrix*, variously dressed.

PHONETIC CHANGES.—The fact that the General 李榮 called himself 筠 in order to avoid using the Emperor's name 榮 seems to shew that in the 10th century A.D. the modern sounds *yün* and *yüng* (*yung*) were identical in Ho Nan as they are in some parts of central China now.

THE T'UNG-KIEN-KANG-MUH ANNALS.—As the current Chinese History 通鑑綱目 speaks of General Chao K'wang-yin as 我太祖皇帝, the said History must have been written during the Sung dynasty. Or, rather, Chu Hi re-edited [脩] it, and in doing this, he only imitated the precedent set by Confucius, who, in his History, made an exception in not naming his contemporaneous Duke.

AN IMPERIAL ICONOCLAST.—Another of the few really excellent Emperors China has ever had was 柴榮 or 郭榮, the 世宗 of the After Chou dynasty. Besides being an able captain and a dashing soldier, he was a long-headed statesman and a humane autocrat. One of his most sensible acts was to call in (in exchange for payment) all copper images of Buddha, in order to furnish an adequate currency. He said: 'By all means let the people worship Buddha if they choose, as he was, I understand, a humanitarian; but images of Buddha, are not Buddha; and even if they were, Buddha I believe, gave up his own body, or part of it, for mankind, so I am sure he won't grudge his image.'

NOTATION.—Hunter says:—'A regular system of notation had been worked out before the age of Panini (350 B.C.?), and the seven notes were designated by their initial letters.' Possibly these are the same as the Chinese 七始, especially as the Concordance says: 'The First Emperor changed the 周舞 to the 五行, and the Han Emperor Kao Tsu changed the 詔舞 to the 七始, in order not to have any clashing [相襲].' It is difficult, moreover, to account for the meaning of the Chinese musical notes 角羽商徵宮 (with the two half-notes) except on some such similar supposition as that above mentioned.

COREAN MARRIAGES.—With regard to the defective account of Corean marriages given by Dallet, Ross, and others, the following is a translation of the true customs as written down by the Prefect of 仁川 near Chemulpo:—'It is a compromise for the bride to visit her husband's parents and ancestors' shrine [廟], and then return to her own family. In great families it is not so. The bridegroom goes to the bride's

house, performs his duties to her parents [醮拜], and then returns with her to his own family, and presents her to his parents, where she remains: and the marriage lights are set out [設花燭] at the bridegroom's house too. It is in small families without means, that a return to the wife's house takes place, and this is only a popular custom [俗禮].' The same prefect writes, with reference to 殉:—'We have not the 殉' [burying or killing live persons with the dead] 'custom, nor has it existed even in China since the 秦 dynasty.' As regards the charge of despising women, the prefect writes:—'Other men taking a superficial view of us may well think it is so, for we are very poor, and cannot carry out the rites to the full; but it is not that we despise women. It [i.e. the absenting of himself by the bridegroom from the bride] does not take place in great families. The superiority of men over women is a 'popular custom' in Corea, like the superior and inferior relation of Heaven and Earth.'

Cotton in China.—Hunter says:—'The Malabar coast has always enjoyed a direct commerce with Arabia;' and:—'Philology proves that the precious cargoes of Solomon's merchant ships came from the ancient coast of Malabar.' Cotton would seem, however, to have been first imported into China from Turkestan [高昌], in the chapter on which State the 南史 says:—'They have a shrub like cocoon silk, out of which they make fine threads called 白疊, used for cloth-weaving, and very soft and white.' K'ang-hi says it is the 古貝草 [mentioned in *Contributions to Topography*], and that the course is called 貝 and the fine 氎. Perhaps the last word represents the Hindoo *tát*. But possibly the Bactrian *t'ah* (Cantonese *t'át*) 氎 may represent the Hindoo *tát*, mentioned by Hunter.

Irenicon.—In the interests of truth, I lose no time in offering the best explanation I can to Mr. Satow's justifiable protest. Mr. Satow, Mr. Aston, and Mr. Chamberlain, the honoured triumvirate of Niponology, have all directly traced *what there is* of the mysterious 'characters of the gods,' or *Jindaiji*, to the Corean alphabet; and, as I had, when I wrote the passage quoted by Mr. Satow, an incomplete theory connecting the *katakana* with both, I appear to have inadvertently made Mr. Satow and others responsible for more than I ought to have done; and for this I tender my humblest apologies. About the same date I sent a paper to the *China Review* proving, according to my lights, the derivation, almost direct from Sanskrit, of each letter in the Corean alphabet. As I put it, (I think), I said 'the Corean alphabet is a Sanskrit inspiration borne on Chinese wings.' Why this paper has never appeared, the Editor of the *China Review* only knows.

As to Mr. Satow's other point, my explanation is still more unsatisfactory. Mr. Aston, then in Corea, lent me certain papers to read, but made me return them; nor do I remember—for, after all, what's in a name?—what papers they were; I have a (perhaps vicious) habit of lazily trusting to memory; and, if my memory does not fail me, in one of those papers Mr. Satow said, (or some one said Mr. Satow had said), 'the *accent* [evidently meaning 'tone'], however, has entirely disappeared from the Chinese words adopted into Corean.' If Mr. Satow *did* say what I charged upon him, he was right, and therefore he cannot be aggrieved; for I have proved conclusively that there *is* no tone in Corean, but that words having in China a certain tone, take a long or a short vowel in Corean.

I send a copy of this direct to Mr. Satow, from whose works I have derived great instruction.

In reply to Mr. Playfair, I beg to say that I will try to be good in the matter of translating Chinese characters; but, (with all due difference) what the deuce is the Editor there for? The *ula* question I have since driven to earth, and the whole mystery