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