documents, but it is a punishable offence to call for stage horses on private business.

Chinese Bannermen, (according to a recent decree), must be prepared to reply in Manchu to the Emperor's questions.

Every New Year the Manchu and Mongol Princes at Peking have to give a Tatar feast [韃靼筵] to the Mongols visiting the capital. In 1887 over 300 of both sexes were thus entertained by Prince Suh, in groups of six, each person receiving in his lap a present of cakes and fruit.

The emperor's order that Prince 惠's funeral shall be 由官辦理 or 'a public funeral,' and that the *beitsz* 奕謨 must look after the arrangements [官中一切事務] seems a very special distinction. The word 官 kwan seems to have a very special meaning here. The expression 縣官 sometimes means 'the government,' as distinguished from 'private enterprise;' it has a history.

Chinese magistrates endeavour as much as possible to hear cases 'in chambers' [二堂] or 'in private' [三堂] with only their own secretaries and police as witnesses, endeavouring to evade 'open court' [大堂] hearings as far as possible, in order to escape the risk of public derision or adverse criticism. The 3rd, 13th, 23rd, 8th, 18th, and 28th are the usual days for receiving petitions [放告].

It seems that the formality of opening the seals of office [開印] after the New Year is done privately [暗開] or informally when the legal day for the ceremony falls on the anniversary [忌] of an Imperial death.

Duke Confucius.—Duke Confucius' peculiar position is indicated by the expressions 接准 and 咨稱 which the Governor of Shan Tung uses with reference to his Grace's communications. He alludes to him, however, as 該公, which re-asserts the superiority of office over hereditary rank. After all the ancient temples, with the imperial scrolls and presents, were not burnt in the late fire. The house just consumed was built by the Ming Emperor Kia-tsing, and repaired by the Manchu Emperor Tao-kwang. The Magistrate of K'üh-feu city has been ordered to rebuild it.

Greece.—It is a remarkable thing that the *Shên Pao* applies the name 烏遲 to Greece. Dr. Hirth is half inclined to identify | | 散 with Alexandria. With reference to the Western country 烏弋, Kanghi, or Yen Shih-ku's authority, tells us to pronounce it *Adja*. In another place he endeavours to explain that the sound imitated is *yanna*. Possibly the *Yaona* or rulers of the Greek kingdom of Bactria may be the same men as the *Yuji* or Greeks (Achaians). The *Shên Pao* says that *Wu-chi* is the western name for 希臘.

Gold diggings.—The *Shên Pao* says (quoting a French paper) there are 9,000 gold-diggers in Russian 黑龍江, of whom 6,000 Chinese and 150 Europeans are not Russian. A Jew was executed by the Russians the other day for swindling the miners.

Corean Marriage customs.—A curious Corean custom is mentioned in the *Shên Pao* which corresponds with Lubbock's and Morgan's stories. 'The bridegroom goes forth to bring the bride to his house, and, after remaining there a short time, they both return to the wife's parents' house, and lodge in the spare-room [館於貳室] for two nights [信宿], when they return [? both of them to his house 乃歸].' A story is then told of a betrothed youth who, being sick, forcibly slept one night at his betrothed's father's house. He died the same night, and law-suits resulted. The bride committed suicide. This story sounds like one of Dallet's. Dallet says the nobles only (that is the noble bridegroom) return home after sleeping three nights at the bride's, in order to shew that they are not in love.

A Corean Prophecy.—The Temple of

薛仁貴 [Mayers No. 582], one of the conquerors of Corea, still exists in 咸鏡 Province, Corea. Lately the noise of cavalry has been heard there in the dead of the night, whence the Coreans augur an early conquest of their land; so says a Chinaman in the *Shén Pao*, probably with a view to sharing the spoils.

E. H. Parker.

REPLIES.

Ula.—With reference to J. M.'s notes, *China Review*, Vol. XV, pp. 244, et seq. I hasten to admit that in the matter of 打牲烏拉 I have been guilty of a serious mistake, confounding, I suppose, 打牲 'hunters' with 三姓 the town. I am far from my books of reference and can only make a conjecture. I still have the impression that 烏拉 is used officially for 'Kirin,' even though the example I quoted was not apposite.

On the other points discussed by J. M. I wish only to say that I made my suggestions honestly as such, indicating what I considered possibilities, not making dogmatic assertions of absolute fact. Where queries are made, any one is, I presume, at liberty to attempt to assist the querist with the best suggestions that occur to him; and while admitting my critic's full right to criticise, I cannot but regret that, being so well supplied with information on the subject of titles of nobility and of river-gods, J. M. did not do his duty by the querist and the *China Review*, by answering the questions himself, instead of lying in wait for me with his polyglot bludgeon.

G. M. H. Playfair.

London, May 3, 1887.

In this volume p. 300, J. M., under the heading of *More about ula*, criticizes my note on ula grass. In his note, on the whole not very lucid, he unfortunately employs expressions not usual in scientific disputes; I therefore restrict my reply to such of his remarks, as are free from offences against the *bon ton*.

In my note, after correcting some mistranslations of J. M., I proposed to explain *ula* as Mongol. To this J. M. hesitatingly assents. He says 'it is not altogether without some foundation, frankly,' he adds, 'I think it better than my own explanation.' I take it then, that my explanation is admitted as correct, until a better one is advanced.

With regard to the other part of my short note, J. M. accuses me of 'ascribing a wrong meaning to almost every Manchu word quoted in my note.' This is serious. That I have committed so many 'blunders,' J. M. thinks is due to the deficiency of the native dictionaries, although on the following column he accuses me of making more frequent use of European works and of seldom consulting the native ones. Without laying stress on this want of logic, I can only repeat what I said in my first note: why use the native works at all, since all of them have been condensed etc. in Sacharoff's lexicon? I admit then that I chiefly depend on the European works. There are only two such works, which J. M. can mean, viz. Gabelentz' Manchu-German dictionary and Sacharoff's lexicon, Amixt being entirely out of question. The first one is a useful and conscientious work. Sacharoff is admirable. Gabelentz has made use of some, Sacharoff of all native dictionaries and we must advance strong reasons, when we dissent from the explanations given by either of them.

The Manchu words that occur in my previous note are: *foyo*, *orho*, *gôlha*, *olo*, *fodo*, *ula*, *buthai*, *adun*. As J. M. agrees with me as to the rendering of *orho*, as he does not dispute that of *olo* and advances no proofs against my translation of *ula*, only five words remain, the translation of which I have to defend.

1. *foyo*, I said, does not mean carpet, but a grass. If I correctly understand J. M.'s note on *foyo*, he has since given up 'the carpet' and taken the word to mean a bunch or knot, formed by entangled horse-