critics that I shall cheerfully correct and acknowledge emendations however unfriendly be the spirit in which they were offered. It is, however, a different affair when my translations are judged from *à priori* conclusions by writers who have never even looked into the originals, nor have ever had by education or opportunity the ability to form a judgment. Ethnology, Geography and Comparative Philology, I may assure them, do not come by intuition but need careful and discriminating study.

THOS. W. KINGSMILL.

ANSWER TO MR. BALFOUR.—無有入無間, 'The non-existent enters where there is no crevice.' *Tau-têh-king*, XLIII. Mr. Balfour wants to know how I reconcile this translation of the Chinese with my 'evident allusion to it,' in my Introduction, p. XV, lines 4 and 5 from bottom. My answer is that there is no allusion to that passage in the Introduction. The Introduction speaks of water, and the allusion is evidently to Chapter VI:—'The Spirit (like the perennial spring) of the valley never dies,' &c. The non-existent, 無有, is not water.

J. CHALMERS.

PROTEST.—I beg to protest against Mr. Parker's denunciation of the *China Branch of the Asiatic Society*, and his invidious comparison of its 'accommodating' character with that of the sister Branch in Japan. (See *ante*, p. 190.)

HERBERT A. GILES.

THE MEANING OF 神器.—After an interval of some months, Mr. Parker condescends to say that he believes the term 神器 was first applied to the 'Throne' in reference to Kao Tsu, founder of the Han dynasty. Mr. Parker goes on to say that the Empire is there (?) compared to a stag, and the fight for empire etc., etc. (See p. 185 in reply to Vol. XIV., p. 355).

The query is answered with Mr. Parker's characteristic slovenliness and inaccuracy. It does not matter what Mr. Parker believes or does not believe. But if it is a fact that 神器 was first applied to the Throne at so late a date as that of Kao Tsu of the Han dynasty, how can Mr. Parker 'struggle' to show that I ought to have translated 神器 by 'Throne' in a saying uttered by Lao Tzŭ several centuries before? Unless, indeed, this saying belongs, not as I had imagined to the genuine fraction, but to the bogus bulk, of the *Tao Tê Ching*.'

My copy of the 幼學 takes the following view: 天子賞罰之柄曰神器.

HERBERT A. GILES.

ERRATA.—*China Review*, Vol. XV., p. 194, 2nd column, 3rd line from the bottom, for 'side by side with the Romanized sounds,' read 'side by side with the Romanized Swatow sounds and numbers indicating the Romanized sounds' etc.