clusively that *officially* it means part of Kirin. The Superintendent of Pearl Fisheries at Ta-hsing is called the 烏拉總管. So *ula* grass may very well mean a grass from that part of the country and have nothing to do with rivers, frozen or otherwise.

G. M. H. PLAYFAIR.

GILES' REMAINS OF LAO TSZ.—I leave to abler pens than mine the task of laying bare the emptiness of the mare's-nest recently discovered by Mr. H. A. Giles; and can afford to pass by the polished criticisms he is pleased to indite upon my version of the *Tao Tê Ching* according to Lü Tsû. But when I am coarsely accused of 'stealing,' because I happen to employ a word in a passage where it has been used by one of my predecessors (page 43), and held up to ridicule for committing a gross blunder which I not only avoided, but to my avoidance of which I drew special attention in a note, I think all fair-minded readers will consider that the insolence goes too far.

In the 43rd chapter there occurs the following phrase, as quoted by Mr. Giles,—無有入無間; on which he remarks, 'Mr. Balfour alters 入 into 人, and translates * * * "There are no men who persevere uninterruptedly [in the culture of Tao]." But if Mr. Balfour will turn to page 84 of his own work, he will find that he himself had there rendered what is practically the same phrase (!) in a totally different way; viz., by "Issuing from nothingness it returns to nowhere."'

I have never met with a more cynical instance of misrepresentation than this. On page 85—not 84—of my "Taoist Texts" there is the translation of a passage attributed by Huai-nan Tzŭ to Lao-tzŭ, which, having been made independently of any commentary whatever upon the *Tao Tê Ching*, runs, 'Issuing from nothingness it returns to nowhere;' the Chinese text being 出於無有入於無間. To this I appended the following note: 'This quotation does not appear in this form in any edition of the *Tao Tê Ching* I possess. The words here used [as above] are quite different from those employed in the 43rd chapter according to Lü Tsû, where the first, second, and sixth characters are omitted, and 人 is used instead of 入. See page 27. In another copy the 入 is used, but the other three characters still do not appear. Huai-nan Tszu's Commentator says he is referring to water. But how does Dr. Chalmers reconcile his translation of this sentence with his evident allusion to it, Introduction, p. xv, lines 4 and 5 from bottom?'

This last question has never been answered, to my knowledge. But its elucidation is not likely to be furthered by Mr. Giles' attempt to lay the inconsistency of another translator upon my shoulders, and to suppress the fact, not only that my two translations were based on two widely different texts, but that I had gone out of my way to draw special attention to the point.

FREDERIC H. BALFOUR.

Water Hall, S. Aldate's,
Oxford, September 27th 1886.

THE CHARACTER 梁.—About twenty years ago, some person, thinking to improve the font of small types made in Hongkong and now in daily use all over China, must have changed the original steel punch for the above character, and substituted a new one without the little mark on the right. In the first two volumes of Dr. Legge's Classics it is found complete, but in the third volume (1865) and all after it is defective by that one little stroke. Only with Shanghai fonts is it now printed correctly. The Tientsin *Times* and the Hongkong daily papers alike have it defective. So also has Dr. Eitel's Dictionary. This is not the only character in the font that needs correction, but it is one which has been unfairly treated in other ways beyond most. It ought to have had a place in Callery's list of Phonetics, republished by Doolittle and by Williams; but it does not