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

will be shortly cleared up by the Japan Branch of the Asiatic Society.

I now turn to Dr. Chalmers. The exhaustive comparison which he demands is already published. The Japan Branch, which is much more accommodating to my whims than its cumbrous and snail-like *confrère* of Shanghai, has secured the morsel, and I am already spoiling for the fights which are to come from the Japan quarter of the globe.

Corean next demands my attention; and Mr. James Scott, the ablest of Corean scholars, is already moving uneasily about in Söul wondering what will be my *dictum* on his coming work, the proofs of which he jealously 'surrepts' from my gaze. I may inform Corean scholars, however, that Mr. Scott's work will be a very honourable monument of patient study, and patriotic Scotchmen should unloose their usually tight purse-strings and put in their subscriptions without loss of time.

E. H. PARKER.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Journal Ch. Br. R. A. S. for the year 1884 (sic). New Series, Vol. XIX, Part II. Shanghai, 1886.

The contents of this number of the Northern Royal Asiatic Society's Journal are made up of an essay by Mr. C. Imbault-Huart on the life and works of Yüan Tseu-ts'ai and by an essay on the Serica of Ptolemy from the pen of Mr. T. W. Kingsmill.

Mr. Imbault-Huart's paper, written in French, goes virtually over the same ground which is covered by the work of the same author published under the same title in the course of last year. It is, however, a valuable addition; as the published volume could not give the Chinese characters here partially supplied. We venture, nevertheless, to express our regret that this valuable article has not been published in the Society's Journal in an English dress If it was worth reading before the Society and worth publishing in its Journal, it surely was also worth translating.

As to Mr. Kingsmill's article, it is interesting reading and deals with an interesting subject. It is also enriched with a sketch map of Central Asia, shewing the localities which Ptolemy is supposed to have assigned to Serica and Scythia. Mr. Kingsmill complains at the outset that 'we still find Chinese students writing of the Hiung-nu as Huns, of the Yueh-ti as Getae or Massagetae, of the Tahia as Dahae etc.' We confess we belong in a certain sense ourselves to this class of benighted scholars, but the reason, why we have not yet been able to see things in Mr. Kingsmill's light, is not far to seek. The fact is we are not satisfied as to the reliability of his quotations and translations, let alone his arguments and conclusions. A single illustration will suffice to indicate what we mean. After bringing forward this complaint and stating that it is not sufficient to consult Chinese writings only, but that it is necessary also to consult Greek and Latin and other writers, Mr. Kingsmill proceeds to quote Ptolemy, but does it as follows. 'His 6th Book, in the 15th and 16th chapters, treats of Scythia without the Imaus and of Sêrica. *I shall give a literal translation of what he has to say* (the Italics are ours).