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

syllables of the Chinese vocabulary have grown up from this simple beginning. The letters pronounced with the hidden parts of the sound channel were not aided by gesture in the first period of language, and consequently all appeared later. By the time of the invention of writing, the syllabary had made very great progress. The hands have made the pronouns, the substantive verb, the causatives, the conjunctions, the negative and all those important elements in language which embrace affirmation and negation. The hands and feet were early named from the sound accompanying the acts of beating, stamping and the like. From these as roots the greater part of the verbs which concern human action are derived. I should be glad of help from the contributors to the *China Review* in the development of this theory.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

ON CERTAIN PHONETICS.—Real phonetics are those which belong to the Koo wen. The Han authors, when they altered the writing, changed many of the phonetics. For instance when Dr. Chalmers (p. 773) says that 丬 ch'wang, wound, the same as 傷 shang, is the real phonetic of 梁 liang, corn, millet, should he not rather say that it is the phonetic in the modern writing in the Li shu and in the Siau chwen? Since B.C. 220, chwang has been the phonetic of liang, because certain literati chose to make it so, by forming ch'wang from 刃 jen.

As to these literati, they do not tell us enough and they had little science. The Shwo wen derives ch'wang wound, from jen knife edge and one, and Sü of the tenth century states that this means that a wound is inflicted by one knife. We cannot build good philological conclusions on such a basis as this. May I suggest Dr. Chalmers would do well to go further back?

Liang means strong and is by change of initial the same word in fact with 彊 chiang five. But 忍 jen in the Tie chiu and Amoy dialects djim, means able to bear and m is the parent of ng as a final. It is thus related to 能 neng, able to bear.

In the two Koo wen forms given in Kang-hi for liang, the water radical is present, and the idea of a bridge was therefore prominent when these forms were in use. When 梁 was written, the idea of millet was prominent. The character 丬 ch'wang certainly gets form from 刃 nim edge of a knife, used ideographically. This is beyond question. I have looked over what I wrote in page 14 of Vol. xii, and find nothing deserving of the word 'shaky' being applied to it. The Shwo wen does in fact make 刃 the phonetic of 梁, and I added that Sü called it ch'wang. It is not much used except as a contraction for liang, 'tael,' on money bills. I recommend that chwang be regarded as a variation of 刃 and that this last be retained as the phonetic. This indeed is what the native scholars mean. The Kwang yun omits the extra stroke and writes 梁. It was perhaps only in the tenth century that the stroke on the right began to be insisted on. Yet as the literati like to have it, Dr. Chalmers is quite right to support them as a matter of writing. Sü's authority has given it currency in the Sung ti 宋体 since the invention of printing.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

TIBETAN TRIBES.—Mr. Playfair, a well-known sinologist of our days, appears making a few remarks on some of Mr. Parker's notes, *China Review*, Vol. XV. page. 131). With due respect for Mr. Playfair's scholarship, I beg to put forth a few critical remarks on some of his assertions or suggestions, the accuracy of which, I must own, remains for me a matter of doubt.

Shielded with the authority of Mr. Porter Smith, Mr. Playfair expressly asserts that the Tibetan tribe 𠂢了 ought to be properly called 𠂢丫, and that this name was wrongly written in the *Gazette*. I have to call this gentleman's attention to a *post*