their fields.' The local name for these *wind pumps is 'Feng ché,'* 風車 *and I* was told the contrivance dates back to a remote antiquity. Chain water pumps are not, I believe, mentioned in the classics, nor do I know the exact date when the *pump* was introduced into China; but it may be safely asserted the chain pump was first invented and then the sails used to assist. Possibly some of your readers can throw light on these points, and the imperfect description given above may throw light on obscure passages in Chinese history or elsewhere.

E. L. Oxenham.

The First Commentator on Lau tsze.—The first editor of Lau tsze's Book on Reason and Virtue was 河上公 Ho Shang Kung according to the Shi chi of Si ma C'hien. This author was called Ho Shang Jen 丈人 and was thoroughly acquainted with Lau tsze's system. He resigned his position as a Tauist teacher to Kai Kung who was teacher to Ts'an ts'an, prime minister to the king of Ts'i 齊. Assuming that this account is correct—and it is given on the authority of Chau Kung wu 晁公武 —the first editor of Lau tsze was of the *Chan kwo period and Mencius would be liv*ing at much the same time.

But Ko Hung of the third century after Christ says of Ho Shang Kung that he was a person whose very name was unknown and that he was believed to have lived on the banks of the Yellow River in the time of Han Wen Ti. If so, he would belong to the second century before Christ, and he was probably a different personality altogether from the Tauist of whom Si ma C'hien speaks.* The reason for holding that there were two Tauists known as "teacher of the river bank," is that in the catalogue of books in the Sui history the Tau te king is mentioned as having been commented on by Ho Shang Kung in the time of the emperor Han Wen Ti. The same list adds that in the Liang dynasty there existed a comment on the Tau te ching by Ho Shang Chang Jen of the Chan kwo period, which was afterwards lost. On this the Chien lung critic* remarks that, as the Chan kwo comment on Lau tsz was already lost in the time of the Sui catalogue, that is at the beginning of the 7th century, what we now have is the comment of the second Ho Shang Kung B.C. 180.

But the Chien lung critic does not allow the matter to rest here. He proceeds to examine the claims of this comment to be viewed as genuine. When in the Ming dynasty Chu Tung kwang engraved an edition of the comment, he said in the preface that Kai, the Tauist of the Ts'in dynasty who was supposed to have received the comment and transmitted it, was a personage beyond the reach of research, but that it would seem that the emperor Wen Ti received the book on the occasion when he visited the banks of the Yellow River. In this case, says the 18th century critic, it is strange that Lieu Hiang does not mention the comment although he speaks of three. Neither Lieu Tsze yuen nor Lu Te ming in the 7th century seems to have trusted this comment. They preferred that of Wang Pi. As they were both great scholars, they must have had good reasons for this doubt about the genuineness of Ho Shang Kung's commentary. The style too, it is added, is not like that of the Han period. It is probably an invention of later authors of the Tauist school. Such is the decision.

We are driven therefore to fall back upon the authors who quote Lau tsze as the oldest witnesses to the genuineness of the Tau te ching and of other sayings attributed to the same philosopher. They are Lie tsze, Chwang tsze, Han Fei tsze, Si ma C'hien, Hwai nan tsze, all of whom lived before B. C. 100. But Lu Te ming, while he follows Wang Pi's edition of Lau tsze, regards the work itself as ancient and genuine enough

* 樂毅列傳 in 史記.

* 四庫全書總目.

for him to place it with Chwang tsze in the same class of books as the Confucian classics, and he gives critical explanations on these *two writers just as he does on those of* the orthodox school. This opinion of Lau tsze has been that of all competent native critics before and since so far as I know. Wang Pi holds the same position in reference to the Tau te ching that Chang Chan holds to Lie tsze, Kwo Siang to Chwang tsze, Tu Yu to Tso Chieu ming, Man chang to the Odes and Kwo p'u to the Er ya. We are not therefore required by what has been here said to displace Lau tsze from among the books coming down to us from the Confucian age.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

GILES' REMAINS OF LAO TZŬ. (See Vol. XV, p. 132).—With Mr. Balfour, I too am 'leaving to abler pens than his the task of laying bare the emptiness of the mare's nest recently discovered by myself.'

Meanwhile, as Mr. Balfour thinks I 'cynically misrepresented' him in a single passage, and tried to lay an 'inconsistency' of Mr. Chalmers' making on his shoulders,—without arguing the point, I withdraw the remarks he considers objectionable in that connection.

In order, however, to keep up the numerical strength of my battery, I take leave to substitute another gun, which I think it will puzzle Mr. Balfour, or even abler pens, to silence.

In chapter X of the *Tao Tê Ching* we read

生而不有爲而不恃長而不宰是謂玄德

Mr. Balfour tells us on p. 7 of his *Taoist Texts* that this means 'Producing, he does not claim the possession [of virtue]; acting, he does not presume upon [his ability]. Though he be a veteran among his fellows, he assumes no seignory over them. This may be called Sublime Virtue—[the highest development of Tao].'

Proceeding to chapter LI of the *Tao Tê Ching* we read 生而不有爲而不恃長而不宰是謂玄德.

This is translated by Mr. Balfour as follows:—

'[Tao] produces without claiming merit; it works without presuming; it causes increase without destroying. This is called Sublime Virtue.'

At the risk of being again thought cynical, I should vastly like to know how

長而不宰

can sometimes mean 'causes increase without destroying;' at another, 'though he be veteran among his fellows, he assumes no seignory over them.'

Mr. Chalmers also thinks these four characters require to be rendered in two different ways; for on p. 7 of his *Speculations* he translates them, 'To enlarge and cut not off' and on p. 40, 'To enlarge and not control.'

HERBERT A. GILES.

EVOLUTION OF THE CHINESE LANGUAGE.—An article on the evolution of the Chinese language will appear in the forthcoming number of the Peking Oriental Society's Journal. Something like the following is the view that will be presented. Melville Bell's representation of the sounds of language in his visible speech has the great advantage of being strictly physiological and exact. By means of his eighty-one consonants, twelve glides and thirty-six vowels and the explanations by which they are accompanied, it has become possible to approach the question of the evolution of Chinese sounds and words in a satisfactory manner. Man began with gesture and the imitation of natural sounds. The most important elements in the first words were the activity of the lips, hands and feet, combined with lip sounds. The sounds were *p*, *b*, *m*, and *a*, *o*, *i*, and these were the materials from which the first words were made. From this beginning all Chinese words were derived. All the eight hundred