

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
The Victoria Institute,  
OR  
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

---

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY,  
CAPTAIN FRANCIS W. H. PETRIE, F.G.S., &c.

---

VOL. XXIII.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute).

INDIA: W. THACKER & Co. UNITED STATES: G. T. PUTNAM'S SONS, N.Y.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND: G. ROBERTSON & Co., LIM.

CANADA: DAWSON BROS., *Montreal*.

S. AFRICA: JUTA & Co., *Cape Town*.

PARIS: GALIGNANI.

1890.

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

## ORDINARY MEETING.\*

THE PRESIDENT, SIR GEORGE G. STOKES, Bart., M.P., P.R.S.,  
in the Chair.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following elections were announced :—

MEMBERS :—Rev. John Z. Armstrong, Ph.D., United States ; J. Brown, Esq., C.E., Spain.

ASSOCIATES :—Captain J. du Boulay, D.L., J.P., Salisbury ; H. L. Reynolds, Esq., Entomological Bureau, United States.

The following Paper was then read by the Author :—

NOTES ON THE ETHNOLOGY AND ANCIENT  
CHRONOLOGY OF CHINA. By Surgeon-General  
C. A. GORDON, M.D., C.B., Honorary Physician to Her  
Majesty the Queen ; in France, Officier de la Légion  
d'Honneur, &c., &c., &c.

## ETHNOLOGY.

WHENCE came the word *China* to designate the vast empire to which, together with its people, the following remarks are intended to refer ? The Chinese themselves have no such name for their Fatherland. The most ancient name applied in their nomenclature is *Tien Hia*,—that is, “ Beneath the Sky ” ; also *Tien-sha*, signifying “ under, or inferior only to heaven.” At a later period, that of *Chung Kwoh*, or “ Middle Kingdom,” was given to the country, namely, by CHING-WANG, second monarch of the Chow dynasty, about B.C. 1150. The Buddhists of India called the land *Chin-tan*, or “ The Dawn.” But the dynasty now reigning distinguishes the country by the name of *Ta Tsing Kwoh*,—that is, “ Great Pure Kingdom.” † Whether the SINIM ‡ of the prophet Isaiah,

\* April 15, 1889.

‡ Chap. xlix. 12.

† Williams, vol. i., p. 2, et seq.

who wrote about B.C. 800, should be interpreted of the Chinese appears not to be susceptible of decision, but the context appears to indicate a people of the extreme east or south.

According to the *Laws of Menu* and to the Aryan epic poem the *Mahabharata*, the name *China* was applied to a country with which the Hindoos held intercourse B.C. 1200. The more generally received account assigns the name to about B.C. 250, and as derived from the family of *Tsin*, whose chief about that period obtained sway over the feudal principalities or petty kingdoms into which the country had previously been divided. But the patronymic of the founder of that dynasty had existed during several centuries prior to that event. There is reason to believe that the name *China* was introduced into Europe by Malay and Arabian traders so recently as about A.D. 1500.\* The Persian name *Cathay*, and its Russian equivalent *Kitai*, are of modern application,—modern in the sense of being not long prior to the thirteenth century, A.D.

The particular portion of China to which, in the first century of our era, the term *Sericum* (Silk) was applied, appears to have been that which now constitutes the province of Sechuen. The inhabitants, named “*Seres*,” were described as being “a mixture of Scythians and Indians”; as being just and gentle in character, loving tranquillity and comfort; as being isolated from the world, though addicted to commerce, and avoiding intercourse with strangers. In carrying on their commercial transactions “they inscribed the prices of their goods upon the bales in which they were packed, and deposited them in a solitary building called the Stone Tower. The Scythian merchants then approached, and having deposited what they deemed a just price for the goods, retired. After their departure the *Seres* examined the sum deposited; if they thought it sufficient they took it away and left the goods; but if not enough, they removed the goods and left the money.” In these particulars we recognise some characteristics and customs of the modern Chinese.

*Arrian* (A.D. 140) speaks of the *Sinae* or *Thinae* as a people “in the remotest parts of Asia,” by whom were exported raw and manufactured silks by way of Bactria,—that is, Bokhara, westwards. At the same date *Ptolemy* (Claudius) described the *Seres* as “a nation between the Ganges and the modern Tibet”; the silk exported by them as material for gar-

---

\* *Thsing*, pure, the title assumed by the Manchow conquerors. The word is believed to have been by the Malays turned into *Tchina* and from them, through the Portuguese traders, into *China*.

ments for Roman ladies of that period, having been looked upon as "collected from the leaves of trees."

Whence came the people by whom the country so named is now inhabited; and who are they? The few particulars relating to this question which are about to follow may, perhaps, throw some light or, at least, afford materials wherewith those interested in the subject may further prosecute their investigations in regard to it.

According to the authority\* whom I desire to follow on the present occasion, the tawny-coloured, olive, and yellow families of mankind, which include the Manchus of Central Asia, the Chinese, Japanese, and Hyperboreans, as the Laplanders, Samoides, and Esquimaux, are referred to the parent stock of SHEM, the Scythians and Tartars to that of JAPHETH.† The various peoples so enumerated have acquired distinctive characteristics in the course of their migrations, circumstances of locality, and general surroundings; their modes of life and national distinctions being also largely due to the same influences. Nor are the variations in type thus alluded to confined to man; changes of an allied nature are observable in respect to the zoology and botany of geographical regions, even, also, the physical aspect of territories undergoes continued change. And there are modifying circumstances of another nature, the influence exerted by which is not to be overlooked, namely:—

Chinese history supplies examples of the influence of wars and invasions as leading to migrations of particular septa or clans. One such instance must here suffice. In the second century before our era the tract of country which comprises the north-western portion of Kansuh, Kokonor, and a part of the south of Gobi was inhabited by a people called YUECHI, or YUETI; ‡ they had towns in their possession, and were ruled over

\* White's *Universal History*.

† Perhaps, therefore, if, as we may reasonably believe they did, the descendants of Shem, Ham, and Japheth commenced to colonise shortly after they began to form families, three centuries would not be too long a time for some of them to settle in China, offsetting presumably from Elam, Asshur, and other descendants of Shem in Persia.\* It is true that in sacred genealogy the origin of great peoples in Eastern nations cannot be traced with similar clearness as Moses adopted in regard to the western divisions of the human family, more especially the Arabian and the Phœnician branches. The fact, however, that Moses adapted his record in this respect, while it leaves the subject open to investigation and conjecture, makes more clear the intention with which that portion of this record was so written.

‡ The original seat of the tribe so-called is believed to have been Ghuznee. Under the name of *Scythians*, they have been known since about B.C. 800.

by a king of their own race. In the year B.C. 165 they were attacked by the HIONGNOU TARTARS, who were to be known in subsequent centuries as the HUNS; they were by the latter defeated, and compelled to seek elsewhere their independence. In their migration they retreated along the Tian Shan range to the countries of Trans-Oxiana; and having established themselves in Central Asia, there, some years afterwards, they came into conflict with the Parthians,\* whom, after a continuous struggle of several years' duration, they overthrew. Other bands of Yuchi Scythians, or, more correctly, *Scoloti*, attacked and destroyed the Greek kingdom of Bactria (Balkh), one of the last relics of Alexander's Asiatic conquests. Between the years B.C. 126 and 120 various migrations of the same people took place into India, culminating in the establishment of the empire of Kanishka about B.C. 50-30.† The name *Chinapati*, given to a place about ten miles to the west of the Beas‡ river, indicates a town to which Chinese hostages were taken as recently as A.D. 629-645.§ It is believed that the Jats|| of the present day are related by descent to the Yuchi of whom we have just spoken. History records numerous other instances in which migrations of tribes have taken place on a large scale, sometimes westward, at others eastward; and even in our own day migration-streams are flowing more or less copiously towards various destinations. As with the present, so in past time similar currents were set in movement by similar causes, and regions became occupied by foreigners; the so-called aborigines,—because history gives no clue to their actual origin,—being more or less completely replaced by immigrants. Thus, in relation to China, although the people now known by the name of “the Chinese” claim our first attention, there are others throughout that great empire who merit our notice, including the Miaotze, Li-mou, Kakyens, and other aborigines in the southern provinces; the Manchus, Mongols, and various Tartar tribes in the north, and the “wild” tribes in the island of Formosa.

*The Li-min, or Chinese, properly so-called.*—Twenty-two centuries before our era a band of immigrants advanced in an easterly direction through Central Asia, along the valley of

\* The Parthians inhabited what is now the Persian province of Khorassan.

† The name of Kanishka, a Turk or Tartar King of India, has been found in inscriptions at Muttra, Manikiala, and Bhawalpore.

‡ Beas river—the ancient *Hyphasis*.

§ Boulger's *China*, vol. i.

|| See Note 1.

the Tarim, or Ergu river,\* and across the desert to Kansuh, which province they are believed to have entered at a point near lat. 408° N., long. 108° E., from whence in due time they spread themselves amidst the forests of Shansi that skirt the left bank of the Hoangho, where the great bend of that river occurs, through the provinces of Kansu, Shensi, and Shansi. Having arrived in that region, they had to fight their way against the aboriginal inhabitants much as some eight centuries later (B.C. 1451) the Jews fought their way into Canaan. Partly by driving the aborigines into the secluded mountain ranges, partly by intermingling with and colonising among them, communities arose, out of which, in the course of generations, the descendants of those immigrants became possessors of the great empire whose name they now bear.

Several migrations, similar in character to the above, have taken place into China since the early date first mentioned. Of those more especially noticed in history one occurred in the ninth century of our era (860-873), and with regard to it we learn that the descendants of the early immigrants had by that time forgotten all trace of their original country; they looked upon themselves as aborigines, upon the new invaders as belonging to a different race, and as being therefore their natural enemies.

We endeavour still further to trace up to its earlier source the people whose immigrations are here related, and what do we gather with regard to them? In the first place, that they represented the "Scythians," a portion of whom struggled into Media, the geographical position of which is southward of the Caspian Sea, and to the eastward of ancient Elam and Susiana; that is, the modern Khurdistan, a portion of the ancient Persian empire.

Recent investigations in Mesopotamia,—that is, the country between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris,—have discovered sculptures representing a people the type of whose features was distinctly Mongolian; and, moreover, we learn that the primeval men, who spoke an *archaic* or monosyllabic language, are by tradition referred to the valley of the Euphrates as their original seat. "We must,"—so writes Baron Bunsen,— "we must picture to ourselves this primitive archaic people, few in number, their wants few, their tongue limited, leading their wandering life. At length, a branch separating from the archaic stock departed to the eastward, and arrived at last in a smiling country, well watered with rivers, and

---

\* The river Tarim flows into the Lob-Nor.

flowing with verdure. Here they settled themselves, and called the land *Sin*, which we have called China.”\*

There are authors who see in the similarity of some of the customs of the Chinese and of the ancient Egyptians sufficient reason for the belief that a connexion anciently existed between those two peoples. With each, agriculture was held in high repute; astronomical science early cultivated; respect for parents inculcated; the dead worshipped; hieroglyphic and symbolic writing practised. In the opinion of an eminent Sinologist of the present day:—“In all probability the outbreak in Susiana of some political disturbance in about B.C. 2283 drove the Chinese from the land of their adoption, whence they wandered eastward until they finally settled in China and the countries south of the region so named.”†

That theory is supported by various arguments and circumstances. For example, the migrations of the three primitive‡ historical races are for the most part acknowledged to have begun about B.C. 2614, namely, at a period antecedent by more than five centuries (541 years) to the Noachian deluge. Nor are there wanting writers who accept the view that in still earlier times migrations took place of tribes which can only be referred to as “non-historical.” Such migrations of the “historical” races as are above alluded to continued during the period mentioned down to the twenty-second century B.C.; in their course colonies and distant communities may be considered to have been established, and various forms of society and of government instituted, those of China among others.§

“It would be a hopeless task to attempt to explain, on any certain grounds,”—so wrote an eminent historian,||—“the

\* *Lectures on the Origin and Migrations of the Human Race.* London, 1865. See Note 2, p. 193.

† Douglas.

‡ The theory of Isaac de la Pierère, A.D. 1655, adverts to *Pre-Adamites* with whom Cain intermarried, and produced a black progeny.—Hales, vol. i., 365. See also *Nouvelle Biographie Universelle* for further details in regard to that theory.

§ As the Phœnicians, Arabians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Libyans southwards; the Persians, Indians, and Chinese eastwards; the Scythians, Celts, and Tartars, northwards; the Greeks and Latins, even as far as the Peruvians, and Mexicans of South America, and the Indian tribes of North America, westwards.—Hales's *Chronology*, vol. ii., p. 50.

|| Sir John Davis, *The Chinese*, p. 122.

NOTE.—Adverting to the allusion made above to the migration of non-historic races, *Lawrence* wrote to this effect:—“Cain, after slaying his brother, was married, although no daughters of Eve are mentioned before this time.—Cain went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden (Genesis iv. 17), where he married a wife and by her had a son, Enoch, though no daughters of Eve were mentioned before this time.”—*Lectures on Man*, p. 168.



mode in which China first became peopled. The only thing like testimony that we possess out of China relating to this subject occurs in the *Institutes of Menu*. It is there written that 'many families of the military class, having gradually abandoned the ordinances of the Veda and company of the Brahmins, lived in a state of degradation as the *Chinas* and some other nations.' Evidently with reference to the later immigrants, and to a period B.C. 1200, a native historian observes that 'the Chinese nation was small and feeble; the Eastern foreigners, namely, the people between them and the east coast, numerous and strong; and the former gradually obtained a settlement in the middle of the country. This, so far as it goes, might be construed into a proof that China was originally peopled from India.'

Considerable discrepancy, amounting to, absolutely, contradiction exists between the accounts given by writers in respect to the actual condition of those immigrants. According to one class of historians, they consisted of a "small horde of wanderers, destitute of houses, of clothing, ignorant of the knowledge of fire, and consequently of the art of cooking food; skins of animals slain by them formed their only covering, the raw flesh of those animals, insects and roots their only food. On the other hand, it is asserted of the early immigrants that they brought with them the resources of Western Asian culture, a knowledge of writing, and astronomy, as well as of the arts which primarily minister to the wants and comforts of mankind."\*

What say native historians on the subject? MUNG TZE, otherwise MENCIOUS, who wrote in the fourth century prior to our era (B.C. 375-368) mentioned governors of provinces by the designation of "pastors" and "herdsmen," and princes as being "pastors of men." In Chinese history there occur other expressions, and also written characters which point to the belief that the earliest Chinese immigrants were pastoral.†

*The Miaotze*.—The people so called have been mentioned in

\* Douglas.

† Thus, their descendants at the present day continue to call themselves *li min*, a designation by which they have been known since the commencement of the Chow dynasty (B.C. 1121). Sinologists observe that the written characters for *plough* and for the Chinese people are nearly alike; also that as at the period mentioned, so it is still the duty of every man, from the chief downward, "to hold the plough"—in other words to engage in the work of agriculture. The Chinese themselves explain that the term *li min* means "the black-haired people," which may have come to be its secondary meaning, as distinguishing them from the nomadic tribes of a lighter complexion. In Northern Asia, and in the neighbourhood of the Himalayas, there occur races having light hair and relatively light complexion.

Chinese history during 4,000 years. As the early immigrants spread in China they found that country already occupied by tribes of aborigines, a description of whom as originally given remains to the present day. In the regions southward of Shansi they were pictured as "fiery dogs," those in the east as "great bowmen," on the south as "ungovernable vermin," and on the west as "mounted warriors." The language of those tribes differed from that of the "black-haired" invaders. Step by step the MIAOTZE were driven to the mountains, where their descendants still continue to maintain their independence, having on various occasions defeated the Chinese forces that have been sent against them.

The mountain ranges of Yunnan, Kiangsi, and Kweichow are their principal strongholds at the present day, several tribes inhabiting different portions of the 360 geographical miles from east to west, over which these ranges stretch. Allied in physical aspect, on the one hand, to the Shans and Karens of Upper Burmah, on the other to the Mishmis of north-eastern Bengal, their language has strong affinities with that of Siam and Annam. Their complexion fair for Asiatics, their features softened Mongolian in type, even approaching the Aryan; yet they are contemptuously called by the Chinese "I-jin," or black barbarians, "Yaou-jin," or dog-men, and "Lâng-jin," or wolf men.\*

They are described as in disposition bold and warlike, naturally averse to agricultural pursuits, and to the restraints of settled life. Certain of them have fixed dwellings; their houses consist of two stories, the lower being occupied by their cattle, while the upper is set apart for the family.

Towards the frontiers of Burmah, in Yunnan, and having various characteristics of the inhabitants of the Irawaddy Valley, are the *Lolos*, a branch of the *Miaotze*. Their history dates back to no earlier a period than A.D. 250, when a *Shan* nation came under Chinese influence. In the interior of the island of Hainan are to be found the *Li-Mu*, another off-shoot from this same aborigines. The inhabitants of that island comprise two other classes, namely, Chinese proper, and a cross between those and the "Black Li," or aborigines.

The *Mongols* and *Manchus* belong to the same family, but during centuries of separation, under different circumstances, have altered much. The *Mongols* are essentially nomadic; the *Manchus* are agricultural or a hunting people, according to locality. The *Manchus* seem to partake of both the *Mongol* and of the *Chinese* characters in about an equal degree, and

---

\* See Note 3, p. 194.

when, during the Kin dynasty (A.D. 1123-1260) they ruled the Northern provinces, they amalgamated with the inhabitants of those regions. It is, moreover, said of the Mongols that the "skill with which they have governed the Chinese Empire, and readiness with which they have adopted a civilisation higher than their own, give promise of still further advances when they become familiar with the civilisation of Christian lands." \*

Under the term Mongols a great many tribes occupying the steppes of Central Asia are comprised under the general name of Tartars—a word unknown among the people themselves. †

Bordering on China, and owing fealty to that empire, is Tibet, the people of which country partake of the characteristics of the Mongols and Hindoos. Of the Tibetians it is said that "they are mild in disposition, have a stronger religious feeling than the Chinese," and never have left their own highlands for emigration or conquest. ‡

The *Manchu Tartars* are scarcely distinguishable from the Chinese by external appearances. The Chinese are rather taller and of more slender and delicate frame than the Tartars, who are in general short, thick, and robust. The small eye, elliptical at the inner extremity, is a predominating feature in the cast of both the Chinese and Tartar countenance. They both have the same high cheek-bones and pointed chins; in complexion also they are alike, of a yellowish brunette.

The *Ortous* comprise a tribe whose region extends between the Hoangho and Great Wall to a distance of 100 leagues from east to west, and seventy from north to south. The tribe so called has been alternately subject to the Tartars and to the Chinese. About A.D. 1696 the Manchus were described by the Emperor Kanghi as "a very civilised nation who have lost nothing of the old manners of the true Mongols." "Their princes live in perfect union among themselves. No one ever heard of a thief among them, although they take not the slightest precaution for guarding their camels and horses."

In the 9th century, A.D., three nations appeared roaming about the northern side of China and Corea; in the west or modern Mongolia the Mong-u, who in the sequel were called Monk-kos and Mongoles; farther to the east the Kitanes; and beyond Corea, as far as the Eastern Ocean, the Niudsches, or Kin, who are, generally speaking, the same people with the Tunguses and the Manchus, the present sovereigns of China.

\* Williams, vol. i., p. 44.

† Klaproth confines the appellation TARTARS to the Mongols, Kalmucks, Kalkas, Eleuths, and Buriats, while the Kirghis, Usbecks, Cossacks, and Turks are of Kurdish and *Turkoman* origin.

‡ The remark does not refer to immediately recent times.

In the 10th century A.D. the Kitanes first subdued the two other nations just named, and then the northern provinces of China. The Niudsches soon rose in rebellion against the Kitanes, and then, being called by the Chinese to their assistance, they obtained the upper hand of both Kitanes and the Chinese. Upon this a part of the Kitanes retreated westward, and took possession of Upper Bokhara; where they have since borne the name of Karakitans or Karaktayans. In the meantime, the Niudsches ruled over the north of China, and Mongolia as far as the Eastern Ocean. The Mongolians, however, were divided into several classes, each with its own Khan, notwithstanding the supremacy of the Niudsches; and it was one of those petty princes, TEMUDCHIN, who, under the name of GENGHIS KHAN, became in A.D. 1176, the founder of the new monarchy of China.

Other tribes, or septs, there also are, but on this occasion the following only can be alluded to:—

The island of Formosa is divided longitudinally by a ridge of high mountains. The western portion, colonised by the Chinese early in the seventeenth century, is now held by them as a portion of the opposite province of Hai Fokien. The region eastward of the mountain range continues to be inhabited by the aborigines, a savage race, bearing some resemblance to the Malays, and to the inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific, since they blacken their teeth like the former, and tattoo their skins as a distinctive mark of rank, after the manner of the latter.\*

The *Amois*, or *Amis*. A tribe of those "savages" are scattered over the eastern portion of the island. Tradition assigns their origin to a shipwrecked crew, who subsequently formed connexions with the islanders, with the understanding that the descendants of such unions were for ever to be in a position of slaves to the chief tribe of the island. The *Amis* of the present day are described as a quiet and gentle people, who chiefly live by agriculture and fishing; who seldom hunt, and have little desire for field sports.

On the other hand, the *Paiwans*, who live in close proximity to the *Amis*, are a turbulent and warlike people; fond of the chase, and of out-door amusements. In disposition, they are proud and independent; in their habits, cleanly and neat. Their language approaches the Malay, and like their congeners of Borneo, they are noted head-hunters. They appear, moreover,

---

\* As do also the *Chins* of Upper Burmah.

to have more affinity to the people of Luzon, and thence southward, than to the Chinese.

The *Tanka*, or *Boat population*, constitutes in a sense a class apart. They exist on rivers near the chief cities, more particularly Canton, where they inhabit "the flower boats," at one time so well known there. Two hundred years B.C. Loo Tsun, a general in the Chinese army of that day, and chief of a clan, raised the standard of rebellion, succeeded in capturing Canton, which city he held for thirty years and until his death. His descendants were persecuted by the Chinese, and forced to seek safety away from land; during many centuries succeeding generations of their countrymen continued similarly to act towards them, nor was it until A.D. 1730 that their lot was ameliorated, the Emperor YUNG CHING having then issued a proclamation in their favour. Of late years their numbers have diminished, but they are still looked upon as a *pariah* class. In physique and in general appearance, however, more particularly of their women, they are much superior to the dwellers on land.

In concluding this section, here is the picture presented to us of domestic and social life among the early immigrants, whose descendants were to become the people to whom we now apply the term Chinese:—

"The people principally applied themselves to the education of their children, and to agriculture. They were laborious to excess. The judges and governors of provinces were grave and sober, and by equity of their decisions gained the love and respect of the people. The Emperor placed his highest felicity in rendering his subjects happy, and did not so much consider himself the sovereign of a great empire as the father of a numerous family."

---

#### CHRONOLOGY.

Students of Chinese chronology divide the history of that people into periods, arbitrary in themselves, but convenient for purposes of investigation.\* The following enumeration of those periods will best suit our present purpose, viz.:—

1. The mythological,—its date uncertain and vague.
2. The traditional,—connecting the preceding with:—
3. The period of ancient history beginning with the institution of the *Hea* dynasty B.C. 2356, and ending with the *Han* dynasty, A.D. 265.
4. The middle ages, from the commencement of the *Tsin* dynasty, A.D. 265, to the end of the *Yuen* dynasty, A.D. 1367.

---

\* By Gutzlaff into 4; by Medhurst into 3.

5. Modern history, from the commencement of the *Ming* dynasty, A.D. 1368, to the present time.

To the *first* of these periods are assigned six different eras,\* the duration of the whole extending over many thousands of years,—sufficiently long to satisfy the most ardent believer in “the antiquity of man.” In the first, PWANKOO was “produced,” after the first division of heaven and earth, and the settlement of chaos. In the second, *Teen Hwang-she*, “Imperial Heaven,” settled the years. In the third, *Te Hwang-she*, “Royal Earth,” fixed the months. In the fourth, *Jin Hwang-she*, “Sovereign Man,” divided the land. In the fifth year, *Chaou-she* invented dwellings. In the sixth. *Suy-jin-she* “invented” fire.

The period thus indicated is considered to extend backward in time till lost in remotest antiquity, and down to a date variously assigned to B.C. 3369; 3254, and still later when the next era is said to open, namely:—

The *second*, or traditional period, called also the period of the “Five Kings,” is considered to include that which extends from the dates above given to about B.C. 2204, namely, the date of accession to power of the Emperor YU; but in respect to the several rulers to be named as belonging to it, the actual times in which they respectively lived are undefined, if, indeed, the names to be mentioned represent real and not mythological personages. With regard to each, a brief notice only can here be given, namely:—

FUHE† was “assisted” by a female principal called WA. To him is assigned the credit of introducing the elements of civilisation among the Chinese. He taught hunting and fishing; he invented music; instituted a distinctive dress for men and for women; established marriages, and in relation thereto laid down a list of prohibited degrees.

SHINNONG taught the arts of husbandry and medicine, was, like Cain, “a tiller of the ground” ‡ (Gen. iv. 2). He introduced markets and established commerce.

HWANGTI, or “The Yellow Emperor,” is credited with the invention of the “Chinese cycle” of sixty years; with

\* Somewhat similar to the four ages or *Yugas* of the Hindoos; the fourth of which corresponding to the present age or *Kali Yuga*, is held to date from B.C. 3101.—According to Menu, *Noah* (corresponding to *Fohi* of the Chinese) lived in the third or beginning of the fourth *yuga*, when the life of man, previously 1,000 years, had been shortened to 100.

† The date assigned to Fuhe is B.C. 2953. According to usually accepted chronology, Noah died B.C. 1998, aged 950 years; the Noachian deluge happened B.C. 2348.

‡ To Shinnong is attributed the discovery of the properties of the tea plant.

the discovery of written characters; the manufacture of silk; the invention of boats with oars; of wheeled carriages, and the training of horses to draw them; also with having designed various implements, and as having wrought in metals. Under him the nation emerged into the light of a sound social organisation. He erected an astronomical observatory; rectified the calendar; introduced coined money, and established a system of weights and measures. He built cities for his people, divided his country into principalities, the population into families, and organised communities. He appointed physicians to examine and prescribe for the sick, for it is recorded by Chinese historians that even in his day people suffered from without by the rigour of the seasons, and within from the passions which disturbed the mind; they died before their time.

CHUN HU is credited with having "joined the priesthood to the State," in other words instituted an "Established Church," albeit he reserved to himself the right of making "Sacrifices to Heaven." He was versed in the science of Astronomy, and directed that the new year should be considered thenceforward to coincide "with the passage of the sun through the 15th degree of Aquarius." According to the Chinese record, "about this time divine and human personages mixed together and produced confusion."\*

TE KWUH enjoys the reputation of having been a musician and a polygamist; his only recorded public act, the appointment of "masters to teach his people virtue." The brief record, as it stands, indicates the social condition which, even in those far distant times, prevailed among them.

Two more names of primeval monarchs need here be given,—those of YAO and SHUN, the last of these so-called "Five Sovereigns and Three Emperors." To YAO is assigned the conjectural date B.C. 2356; his reign extending to 102 years; a period less than that given to some of the Patriarchs, but far exceeding the limits recorded in authentic history. He it was who divided the early Chinese Kingdom into twelve provinces, presided over by as many "pastors." He instituted law courts and principles of procedure, such as continue in force at the present day; and he began a plan for the systematic improvement of his country and people.

To SHUN† is assigned the credit of having instituted the great agricultural festival which continues down to the present

---

\* The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair—  
Genesis vi. 2.

† Began to reign B.C. 2254; died B.C. 2207.

day, to be celebrated as originally ordered by this emperor at the commencement of the Chinese new year. The ceremonies attending that festival bear some resemblance to the procession of the bull Apis in ancient Egypt, which in like manner was connected with the labours of agriculture and hopes of an abundant harvest. Astronomical observations were taken, and instruments for the purpose made. From the days of SHUN his successors on the throne have continued, like him, literally to put their hands to the plough, and to "sow the five kinds of grain"\* as he did, thus intimating the honour they accord to manual labour, and especially to that connected with the tillage of the land. In the reign of SHUN also the first mention occurs of religious worship in the shape of "sacrifices to SHANGTE; † to hills and rivers, and to the hosts of spirits."

In those early days, also, tradition informs us that Governors of Provinces were under special obligation to show kindness to strangers and travellers, and see to their suitable accommodation and general care while passing through the districts under their charge and administration.

The particulars now given illustrate the kind of materials from which is woven the web of so-called History throughout the periods, indefinite in duration, which preceded the discovery of symbols and other written characters, by means of which it became possible to record actual events in their order and manner of occurrence. With reference, however, to the "sovereigns and emperors" whose names have been given, there are capable writers who look upon them simply as Chinese travesties of antediluvian patriarchs, an opinion the more plausible if we accept the theory already expressed, that the people we are dealing with had their birthplace in or near the territories adjoining the Euphrates.

Neither is the circumstance to be ignored that the history of China, like that of other nations, mythical or fabulous in its earliest stages, is not therefore necessarily altogether devoid of truth as some critics assert it to be, the truth being more frequently in respect to manners and customs of the people than to actual events.

The third PERIOD enumerated is held to date from the accession of YU THE GREAT, founder of the first, or Hea dynasty (B.C. 2204); that is, the year assigned to the institution by *Nimrod* of the first Assyrian empire; and to extend to A.D. 264, corresponding to the time in which lived ignobly GALLIENUS the Roman emperor; when Zenobia reigned in

\* Namely, maize, pulse, millet, sesamum, and sorghum.

† *Shangte*, = Jehovah of the ancient Jews. See Note 4, p. 194.



Palmyra; and only a few years subsequent to the martyrdom of St. Cyprian of Carthage.

Six different dynasties\* and 120 monarchs had during this long interval occupied the throne of China; the empire was much enlarged and consolidated; manners, customs, and trains of thought of the people,—all according to models differing absolutely from those of Western nations,—had become fixed and stereotyped in many respects, though not in all. Waves of conflicting opinions regarding political and religious affairs have since then successively passed over the people; in other respects, however, no change has occurred throughout the many generations that have meantime played their parts in the drama of Chinese life. Reverence to parents,† and submission to constituted authority, have ever been held as established tenets among them, the few exceptions to the rule which history records having been marked by general disapproval and execration.

With reference to the dynasties here alluded to, no more than a few scanty particulars may now be given, viz. :—

The *Hea*, founded by YU, as already alluded to, about B.C. 2204, had a duration of 439 years; it included 17 sovereigns, and passed away B.C. 1765, the period thus included corresponding to times in which took place the call of Abraham (B.C. 2093); the flight of Jacob to Mesopotamia (B.C. 1916); and Joseph's elevation in Egypt (B.C. 1885).

The great event connected with the monarchy of YU, and already alluded to, had its commencement in that of the second preceding monarch, namely YAO; it has been variously described by different writers on Chinese history, but the following account is that selected for our present purpose :—

During the reign of YAO (B.C. 2293)‡ a tremendous deluge occurred, from the overflow of the rivers in the north of China, more especially of the Hoangho, called even then, as ever since, "China's sorrow." According to tradition, YAO inquired: "Is there a capable man to whom I can assign the correction of this calamity?" His advisers presented KWAN as a proper man, but he laboured without success for nine years to drain off the waters. YAO was then advised to employ SHUN, who called in YU, a son of KWAN, to his aid, and the floods were assuaged by deepening the beds of the rivers, and opening new channels.§ According to the records,

\* Or eight according to other writers.

† See Fifth Commandment.

‡ Era of Noachian deluge. B.C. 3155.

§ Williams, vol. ii. p. 147.

as YU had assisted SHUN in his government during his lifetime, he was unanimously called to the vacant dignity, and so became founder of the *Hea dynasty*.

A record of the inundation referred to has been stated to exist in the form of an inscription traced in "tadpole characters" on the rocks of *Kau lan shan*, one of the peaks of Mount Hang, in the province of Hunan.\*

According therefore to the records quoted, large tracts of country having thus been reclaimed, they were rendered habitable. Communities had to be formed, and a system of government elaborated, for which purpose history states that YU sought for his ministers "servants of God, the supreme Ruler." He divided his territory among his chiefs or nobles, and so instituted a feudal system, while he himself retained the regal power and drew the Imperial revenues from the entire empire. The system so established in China thus anticipating by upwards of a thousand years the introduction of feudalism into our own country.

Even at this early period certain of the arts had made considerable progress. "The black-haired race," as the Chinese were even then called, were acquainted with the growth of the mulberry tree, and with the culture and manufacture of silk. If also we are to credit early history, the art of shipbuilding,—that is, of vessels to be propelled by means of sails,—dates from the same period. History relates that during this reign the manufacture of wine, or, more probably, ardent spirits, was discovered; that no sooner did the monarch taste it than he exclaimed, "This liquor will cause the greatest trouble in the empire." He forthwith banished its discoverer.†

But, according to the records of the time, the high qualities of YU did not descend to his immediate successors. Thus we learn that his son, who came to the throne B.C. 2188, neglected his public duties, abandoned himself to "pleasure," music, wine,† and hunting, with the not unnatural result, even in those early times, that he was detested by his people, and by them dethroned, although not until he had reigned twenty-nine years.

A somewhat romantic episode of the ancient period we are now concerned with may be here recounted:—About the year B.C. 2146, TE SEANG, contemporary with the date of ABRAHAM, occupied the throne of China. A weak prince and ruler, he fell completely into the hands of a clever and designing minister, named HANTSU, who ultimately usurped the regal

\* Williams, vol. ii. p. 149.

† It thus appears that this particular vice was not suppressed by the banishment of E TEKH, the discoverer of wine.

power, and killed SEANG in battle. The empress MIN, widow of the deceased emperor, fled to a distant city where she gave birth to a son, whom she named SHAU KANG. As that son grew to boyhood he was employed to tend flocks, in view thus to conceal his royal origin; but reports of the existence of the boy reached the usurper, HANTSU, and orders were issued by the latter that the lawful heir to the throne he occupied should be brought to him dead or alive. The better to avoid the search thus instituted for him SHAU KANG was placed in the capacity of under-cook in the house of a neighbouring governor, and there soon distinguished himself by a spirit and temper so superior to the humble station he appeared to occupy that suspicions with regard to his birth and name were aroused, and led in time to the discovery of both. The governor, his employer, kept the secret for thirty years, and meanwhile gave to SHAU KANG a small government in a secluded situation, where he conducted his administrative duties satisfactorily, alike to the people under him and to his patron. At the end of that time he was in a position to declare himself. Having gathered round him a powerful body of adherents, he proceeded against the usurper, whom he defeated; then with his mother he entered the capital, where he ascended his rightful throne and, it is said, reigned 61 years.

But there came a time when the dynasty to which YU and KANG belonged had run its course, and it may be interesting even now to trace the causes of its downfall. History records what they were, and briefly enumerates them as "dissipation, neglect of public duties, and tyranny." KEÂ KWÊI, the last of the dynasty, ascended the Imperial throne B.C. 1818. His cruelty, exactions, and prodigality led to a combination of the "Barons" against him. He was by them deposed, and being deserted even by his profligate favourites, he died in exile B.C. 1766.

In that year the second, or SHANG, dynasty was established by the most powerful of these "Barons," named CHING-TANG. The dynasty so named continued to rule during the succeeding 644 years, and down to B.C. 1122. It comprised 28 sovereigns, some of whom appear to have left a special mark in history. In the reign of the founder of this dynasty a severe drought occurred in China, contemporaneous, and believed to have been directly connected with that of Egypt in Joseph's time.\* Other important events, the dates of

\* Genesis xli. 54. The use of written characters by the Chinese is assigned to the Shang dynasty, consisting at first of little more than rude representations of common objects. Prior to about B.C. 1600 the records of government were said to have consisted merely of knotted cords.

which come within the period of this dynasty, were the birth of Moses (B.C. 1571); the exodus of the Israelites (B.C. 1491); their settlement in Palestine (B.C. 1451); the siege of Troy (B.C. 1184); the death of Samuel (B.C. 1122).

A very serious political mistake is attributed by Chinese writers to the founder of the Chinese dynasty in question, namely, that he divided the empire into a number of petty states, thus destroying the "ancient pure monarchy," and leaving himself only a small portion of territory and of power. In fact, he broke up the unity of the empire as up to his day it had existed. The result, as we shall presently see, was the conquest of China by a foreign Power.

As an example of the rules of conduct laid down in those early times, the following may here be quoted:—"Order your affairs by righteousness; order your heart by propriety, so shall you transmit a grand example to posterity. He who finds instructors for himself comes to the supreme dominion; he who says that others are not equal to himself becomes small. He who likes to ask becomes enlarged; he who uses only himself becomes small. To revere and honour the way of Heaven is the way to preserve the favouring regard of Heaven."

And yet, excellent as were the precepts laid down by the sages of that time, the rulers belonging to the SHANG dynasty ignored, or acted in disregard of them. In addition to famines, earthquakes, and other calamities due to natural causes, the six centuries during which the dynasty existed were characterised by successive wars, by impiety, cruelty, and licentiousness on the part of the rulers. The stories of profligacy and cruelty of the period, as related in history, are in their details atrocious. Alienation of the people was the natural consequence. As happened at the end of the previous dynasty, so now, a confederation of Barons, on this occasion (B.C. 1134) led by WU WANG, defeated and threatened the dethronement of CHAU SIN, the last emperor of the dynasty. That monarch, "feeling the contempt he was held in, fled to his palace, where he voluntarily perished in the conflagration which at the same time destroyed his treasures,—like another Sardanapalus, though his immolation preceded that of the Assyrian by five centuries."

The third, or *Chow* dynasty, set up by WU WANG, "the martial king," the leader of the conspiracy alluded to, B.C. 1122, had a duration of 873 years, the longest period related in history of any dynasty,—that is, down to B.C. 249,—and

---

\* From the *Shoo King*.

included thirty-five sovereigns. Civil wars and commotions continued throughout a great part of that long period. In the course of those wars some of the vassal princes sought and obtained the aid of the Tartars against others, and thus introduced into the heart of the empire a Power which was destined to undermine each in turn, and at a later period to conquer the Chinese Empire for itself.

Contemporaneous with that dynasty there happened the accession of Saul (B.C. 1110); of David (B.C. 1070); the revolt of the Ten Tribes (B.C. 975); the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (B.C. 586); the accession of Cyrus (B.C. 551); the battle of Marathon (B.C. 490); and the accession of Alexander the Great (B.C. 336).

History records with regard to the early monarchs of the *Chow* dynasty that they were "impersonations of everything wise and noble"; also that certain maxims laid down by the founder of the dynasty continue at the present day to command obedience in China; including such as relate to duties of ministers to their sovereigns; of children to parents; brother to brother; and friend to friend.\*

During that long-continued dynasty oscillations took place in respect to the deference to ethical subjects paid alike by the *classes* and by the *masses*. In the eighth century B.C. religion and morality had been relegated to neglect. Then came a time, extending over several centuries, when sages and philosophers who, for "conscience sake," had previously to flee to mountains and deserts, were recalled, and their counsel sought by those in high places. The public mind having been thus prepared to receive new systems of philosophy, doctrines severally enunciated by two sages who lived contemporaneously during the sixth century B.C. were readily accepted, although the principles so taught differed among themselves, namely, LAO TSE, the founder of *Taoist* philosophy, and KUNGTSE, the author of Confucianism. The doctrine of the former was said to be dominated by *Tao*, otherwise "Reason"; its principles to ignore everything that interferes with selfish tranquillity, including the pursuit of business, the desire of honours or riches, affection towards those united by blood, friendships, and all other earthly ties. No wonder that such principles led their disciples to indulge in such pursuits as those of alchemy, mesmerism, spiritualism, *et cetera*; and subsequently to doctrines of which the following, expressed by a *Taoist* philosopher about the year

---

\* During the *Chow* dynasty the use of surnames by the Chinese was introduced.

B.C. 330, are examples:—"Crime is due simply to the measures taken for its repression; immorality is an invention of moralists; if all laws were abrogated crime must necessarily cease; if weights and measures were abolished the people could not cheat each other in the exchange of commodities." Is it subject of wonder that the advocates of such doctrines were in those days described as charlatans! As opposed to the doctrines of so-called "Reason" thus presented, those taught by CONFUCIUS inculcated reverence to the gods (authorities of the land); the discharge of duty to all mankind, and to relations in particular. He taught men "to treat others according to the treatment they would themselves desire at their hands"; also to guard their secret thoughts as the sources and origin of action: all of which maxims are, in theory at least, observed by millions of Chinese at the present day, nearly 2,500 years after the time when they were first enunciated.

Ultimately conditions arose under which the great dynasty of CHOW came to an end. During several reigns prior to that in which the final catastrophe occurred, timidity and inaction were observed in administration; then followed the imposition on the people of taxes and other burthens which they were unable to bear; maladministration which led to the withdrawal of allegiance by tributary princes, and, finally, to intestinal war and general tumult.

In vain did MENCIOUS (MUNG TZE, B.C. 371-288), successor of CONFUCIUS, follow up the endeavours of the former to check the prevailing vice and immorality of the time. It is interesting to observe that in early youth this sage was by no means an ardent student, a circumstance which led his anxious mother to address him thus:—"Without diligence and effort," such were her words of advice, at the same time that, as to give her expressions due emphasis, she rent asunder the material she was weaving at the time,—“without diligence and effort,” attendance at school “would be as useless to progress in learning as her beginning a web and destroying it when half done would be” for the purposes of clothing. The principal maxims expressed by MENCIOUS himself in subsequent years had reference to the prevailing spirit of avarice at the time in which he lived. “From avarice,” so he spoke, “mutual strife and anarchy must result. Benevolence is all in all. The hearts of the people are the only legitimate foundations of empire, or of permanent rule. He who subdues men by force is a tyrant; he who subdues them by philanthropy is a king.” “There are employments,” MENCIOUS further added, “proper to men of superior station, as well as to those of inferior conditions. Some labour with their minds; some

with their bodies. Those who labour with their minds *rule*; those who labour with their bodies are *ruled*." About A.D.1730, that is, one-and-twenty centuries subsequently to the time when MENCIUS thus expressed himself, Pope wrote:—"And those who think still govern the world."

For a short time "the seven rival States"\* into which China had been during the dynasty of *Chow*, and was then, divided, remained at war among themselves. The States of *T'sin* on the north-west, *Ts'oo* on the south, and *Tsi* on the north, having vanquished the other States, they engaged against each other, with the result that victory rested with the State of *T'sin*, and in B.C. 255 CHAO-SEANG WANG became the acknowledged ruler over the "black-haired" people.† To him succeeded CHWANG SEANG WANG, who, in the year B.C. 246 was followed by CHE WHANG-TE, founder of the *Tsin* or fourth dynasty of China, a dynasty in which it is usual to include the "*After Tsins*,"‡ and which, so extended, was to end B.C. 206, thus having a duration of no more than forty years,§ a period during which wars in the far East were to be no less destructive to human life than were those in Europe, as between Carthagenians, and Romans; the Syrians, Greeks, and Egyptians.

CHE WANG-TE, otherwise "the First Emperor," or the first absolute sovereign of the dynasty of *Tsin*, as he claimed to be considered, having brought under his sway the different States above alluded to, and thus re-united the empire, his first public measure was the abolition of feudalism, which prior to his day had been established as a system in China; his next to make a tour through the thirty-six provinces of which, under him, that empire consisted. His most important military feat was a successful campaign against the *Hioung nu* or *Huns*, whose country, situated to the west of the modern province of Shensi, extended beyond the Oxus and Jaxartes (Amoo Darya and Syr Darya). He ordered the erection of many public buildings; he caused roads and canals to be opened up. In the year B.C. 214 he began the work of uniting the portions of wall that, prior to his day, had been erected at intervals along the frontier, his object thereby

\* See Note 5, p. 196.

† The Chinese Empire at that period extended from lat. 33° N. to 38° N., and long. 106° E. to 119° E. It included the southern portions of the province of Chih-li, Shan-se, and Shen-se, the northern portions of Ho-nan and Keang-soo, and the western half of Shan-tung. The capital was fixed at Chang-yan Heen, in Shen-se.

‡ Sometimes described as the 5th Dynasty.

§ Douglas.—It is to be observed, however, that different accounts of the chronology of this period occur in the works consulted.

being to avert future incursions by his Tartar neighbours. The gigantic work thus begun was not finished in B.C. 209, when "the First Emperor" died; it was subsequently completed, and at the present day has stood for more than 2,000 years, its extent 1,500 miles, from the Eastern Ocean to Western Tartary.

This brief reign is remarkable as having witnessed the destruction of literary works even more extensive than that which was to happen in subsequent years at Alexandria.\* The First Emperor "desired that all records of the past should be destroyed, and history commence with and from himself. With this object he ordered the destruction of all existing literature, excepting only such works as referred to medicine, agriculture, and civilisation." To the credit of the *literati* of that period, great numbers refused to give up their precious volumes, notwithstanding that six hundred of them suffered death for refusing to comply with the Imperial edict. Many books, however, escaped the sentence against them through the zeal of those who cultivated learning; and from the records so preserved Chinese history came in subsequent years to be reconstructed. The death of HWANGTI (B.C. 209) was the signal of an outbreak among the deposed feudal princes. EUL-SHE, his son, only enjoyed sovereign power three years. Dissolute and immoral himself, his government fell into the hands of a worthless favourite, who imposed heavy taxes upon, and subjected the people to oppressive regulations in other respects. Under such conditions rebellion occurred, a private soldier named LIEU PANG, otherwise CAOU TSOU, who was destined soon to make his way to Imperial power, having early become a leader of the disaffected, a spirit of revolt spread to the army, dissensions occurred within the palace, and EUL-SHE fell, among other victims. For a few months a successor who had been chosen to the throne ineffectually held his position. At the end of that time, his influence having completely gone, the rebel leader LIEU PANG ascended the throne as First Emperor of the fifth dynasty, or that of Han.† That dynasty, dated from B.C. 206; it continued till A.D. 220, when it came to an end with HIEN-TE, the twenty-fifth Emperor of the line, having meanwhile occupied a period the most famous in China's history, and in that of the world. In its later years

\* B.C. 47, when the library of the Bruchion, which contained 400,000 volumes, was destroyed during Cæsar's hostilities against Alexandria, or the burning of the Alexandrian library by the Caliph Omar, A.D. 641.

† According to the order of succession usually adopted.—See Du Hulse vol. i.



the Han family degenerated with each successive representative, and, finally, the last of their race gave himself up so completely to indolence and pleasure that he was forced to abdicate in favour of the son of one of his own ministers.

As a result of conditions existing in "the Middle Kingdom," however, considerable difficulty arises in presenting a picture in which the order of events may be strictly followed. Thus, we learn that towards the end of the Han dynasty China proper consisted of three separate States,\* the transactions relating to which are still a favourite subject of historical plays and romances in that country. The States referred to were named respectively *Wei*, *Wu*, and *Shuh*. The first, under the son of TSAO TSAO, at Loh-yang, whence he ruled the northern country. The second, under SIUN KIEN, occupied the northern provinces from Shantung to the Yellow River down to the mountains of Fuhkien; that Prince holding his court at Nankin. The third, under LIU PI, was regarded as the legitimate dynasty, from his affinity with the Han; he held his court at Chingtu, in Sechuen. Under the latter the fortunes of the dynasty revived as the After Han dynasty, by some writers reckoned as the 8th.

It was about the middle period of the Han dynasty that events occurred in Judea the importance of which is transcendent in the spiritual history of the human race,—those events the birth and death of Jesus Christ. When the birth of our Saviour took place in Bethlehem the throne of China was occupied by PING TI, otherwise "The Prince of Peace," eleventh† emperor of the dynasty,—the coincidence of title furnishing subject of comment to subsequent writers.

As a result of the divided condition of the empire already noticed as existing at the period alluded to, we again find that difficulty occurs in following events in their proper sequence. But according to the authority‡ now followed, the reigning monarch at the date of the Crucifixion was KWANG WOO, fourteenth of the same dynasty. In his reign a remarkable solar eclipse was recorded, the precise date of its occurrence "the last day of the seventh moon, in the twenty-eighth of the fortieth cycle," and Du Halde has left it to astronomers to decide from the data so given whether that event coincided with the darkness which happened at the death of Christ.

\* Known as "the period of *Sankwo*, or Three States."

† The Empress LIUCHI,—who, from B.C. 186 to 178, although nominally Regent, was virtual ruler,—is not reckoned in this enumeration.

Sir John Davis.

It is related in reference to MINGTI, seventeenth emperor of the same dynasty that:—Remembering the words of *Confucius* that “The Holy One is in the West,” he sent ambassadors in that direction in search of the true religion. When they had reached India they found that the followers of BUDDHA were being persecuted by the Brahmins, and ready to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded them of proceeding to a new field. They accordingly declared that they were priests of the new doctrine which the ambassadors sought; a body of their class accordingly accompanied the messengers on their return journey. Thus was introduced among the millions of China (A.D. 64–68), a *philosophy* which teaches that “from nothing all things proceed; into nothing they will return”; whereas the *religion* they sought was that of Christianity.

Under MINGTI, and his successor CHANGTI, the Chinese extended their conquests westward, to the Caspian Sea, overcoming in their progress various tribes on the confines of the Desert, and at the foot of the Tianshan mountains. In those distant conquests the Chinese came for the first time in contact with the Romans, whose merchants then traded with India and Persia.

From that time to the present, dynasty has succeeded dynasty, but the political tradition has remained unchanged; though Mongols and Manchous have at different times wrested the throne from its legitimate heirs, they have ultimately been engulfed in the homogeneous mass inhabiting the empire, and, instead of impressing their seal on the country, have become but the reflection of the vanquished.\* Judging from the past, are we not justified in expressing the belief that a great future is in store for China, and that the teeming multitudes of that vast country are destined to play a very important part among nations, as heretofore they have done in Eastern Asia?

---

\* Douglas.

## NOTES.

THE limits within which such a paper as the present must of necessity be restricted render it impracticable to do more than briefly glance at certain points of the general subject in hand, which, from their very nature, could only be satisfactorily dealt with at greater length than is thus possible. Even with the aid of the following *notes*, no more than a very partial view can be conveyed of conditions pertaining to the ancient periods referred to; but it is hoped that the additional information now to be added may be deemed sufficiently important to justify the insertion of it in this form, namely:—

1. *Jats*. Several clans of the tribe so called inhabit the North-western provinces of India, including Delhi, the Upper Doab, and the Punjab. The origin of the name is by some authors referred to *Xanthii*, thus assigning to them a Mongolian ethnology. Other authors, however, consider that in race they are purely Aryan; and refer their birth-place to a small district situated to the south-east of the Caspian Sea, and westward of ancient Sogdiana and Bactriana.

2. *The Chinese, properly so called*, page 172.—Adverting to the text, and adopting the theory that the original home of the Chinese people was in the West, that their line of migration eastward was by direct route over the passes over the Hindoo Kush, and through Tibet, we may reasonably assume that a separation took place among them as they reached the Kwan-lun Mountains; that thus the Huns or Turks became separated from southern families by that mountain-range and the Gobi desert, till both divisions met again long afterwards about the northern bend of the Hoangho; whereas the Siamese, Burmese, Assamese, and the northern and southern Chinese would be one people till they separated with the five great rivers that take their rise in the table-land of Tibet, namely, the Brahmaputra, Irawaddy, Mukong, Yangtzekiang, and Hoangho. Of the tribes who descended by the two last-named rivers, those who chose the course of the Yangtze became “the ungovernable vermin” of the south. By the spread of a knowledge of writing from the tribes on the Hoangho, north and

south, by intermarriages, and other causes, the several tribes or families became in time one people,—the Chinese,—who now occupy the region which extends from the Great Wall to Canton, and from Tibet to the Pacific Ocean.

The 35th parallel of north latitude from the borders of Tibet to Shan-tung marks very nearly the course of the earliest Chinese civilisation. And a parallelogram extending two degrees north and south of this line, and from the western border of Shensi to within fifty miles of the coast of Shan-tung, thus measuring north and south about 250 miles, and east and west about 600, will include all that part of China where we have reason to believe that letters were cultivated early in the Chow dynasty, and about B.C. 1000. The area thus indicated is not much greater than that of the British Isles, and scarcely equal to three of the eighteen provinces, or one-sixth part of China proper.

3. *The Miaotze*, page 176.—The civilised people of “The Middle Kingdom” alluded to in the preceding *note* were, at the early period described, hemmed in on all sides by hostile barbarians. On the east *the great-bow men* held possession of the promontory of Shan-tung, and the whole coast-line to the mouth of the Hwae river, where, turning south-westward, they occupied a great portion of the modern provinces of Kiang-su and Ngan-hwai. On the south all along the Yangtze were the “Mān,” *ungovernable vermin*, also called *Mé, Bé*, or Bleaters. On the west were the *mounted warriors*, of whom came the Ts’inities, those named “Jung,” though translated “western barbarians,” meant also “weapons.” On the north, within and without the northern bend of the Hwang-ho were the “Tih,” *fiery dogs, tykes*, distinguished also as *red tykes* and *white tykes*, as if in reference to their complexion as contrasted with the *Ti-min*, or Chinese proper.

The Ts’inities must have occupied the borders of Tibet before they displaced the Chowites from Shen-si. The States of Ts’oo and Woo embraced the whole of Central China, watered by the Yang-tze and the Han rivers. Woo does not appear in history till B.C. 584. It embraced the modern Nan-king and Shanghai. Farther south still was Yueh, where, according to tradition, the Great Yu investigated the principles of government on the top of a mountain (as if he were a counterpart of Moses on Mount Sinai), and where afterwards he died and was buried.

4. *Religious Worship, &c.*, page 182.—Not only in relation to the manner and object of their worship, but in various other

respects a connexion has been traced between the customs of the Chinese and those of more westerly nations.\*

*Shangti and Tien of the Chinese.*—The ancient Persians worshipped “the whole circle of Heaven”; they took from the Phœnicians the worship of “the Most High, the God of Heaven,” the *Shangti* of the Chinese, with whom also *Ti* and *Tien* (Heaven) must be correlatives, Heaven in the largest sense, infinitude; *Ti*, the God of Heaven.

*Sabeism.*—The worship of the sun, moon, and stars seems to have been objects of earliest worship from Egypt to China.

*Practical Dualism.*—The antithesis of “Father Heaven” and “Mother Earth,” or more generally *yang* and *yin*, originally *light* and *shadow*, made use of in early Chinese writings, is nothing more than a repetition of what has been found in ancient India, Persia, and Greece.

*The Worship of Ancestors and Sacrifices to the Dead.*—These were introduced into China by the race of Shang, from the west about B.C. 1600, and have continued to prevail. In the Sama-Veda, Indra is invoked “with invitations, as we would the *manes* of a father.” In the Vedas the sacrifice of a hundred horses is supposed to be sufficient to gain heaven. The Chinese have, from very early times, sought to propitiate Shangti by the shedding of blood of bulls and goats.

*Suttee.*—A practice similar to that of India, happily unknown in China before and since, was introduced by the Tsinites about B.C. 620; that is, nearly 400 years before that race attained imperial power.

*Burnt Offerings.*—These were made by the Chinese as by the Jews, entire animals being consumed in a pile of fire, the fire being obtained for the purpose by means of boring wood, as is still practised in Burmah and also in New Holland.

*Soma Spirit.*—Prepared from the *Sarcostemma brevistigma*, N. O. Asclepiadaceæ. “The drink of Indra” and of “the gods” of Vedic India, “the liquor of immortality” in ancient China.

*Fasting and Bathing.*—These observances are mentioned by Mencius (B.C. 450) “as a proper preparation for sacrificing to God,” which also is according to Jewish law.

---

\* This subject has been well discussed by Mr. John Chalmers in his brochure on “The Origin of the Chinese,” published at Hong-kong, 1866, to which work I am indebted for much that is given in these notes.

*Casting Lots.*—The land of Canaan was divided among the children of Israel by casting lots. In China, more especially in the northern provinces of that empire, very many of the ordinary transactions of every-day life are similarly decided.

*Lucky and unlucky Days.*—These are observed by the Chinese at the present time. They were so by the ancient Indians and Romans, and our own almanacs two centuries ago. The idea of the horoscope is substantially the same in China and in Burmah now, as “once upon a time” it was in England.

5. “*The Seven Rival States*,” page 189.—Considerable difficulty has been experienced in the arrangement of details connected with the condition of China at the period referred to in the text; it is, therefore, deemed advisable to add in this form the following particulars obtained from the work of Père Du Halde:—

About B.C. 478 cruel wars between tributary princes began again, and lasted nearly 300 years. The kingdom of Tsin had been divided among four princes, one of whom overcame the others, and so got the whole kingdom into his own hands. His son, TEHI SONG, quarrelled with the kings of Han, Guot, and Chao, but they, having united their forces, defeated the army of TEHI SONG, whose kingdom was accordingly taken possession of by the king of Chao. The kings of Lou and Tsi were also at war with each other, but after a time an amicable arrangement or peace between them was brought about. During the reign of HIEN WANG, 32nd emperor of the Chou dynasty, B.C. 367–319, the tributary princes strove severally to usurp the Imperial authority. In the reign of CHUN TSIN WANG, 33rd emperor of the same dynasty, B.C. 319–313, the king of *Tsin* defeated the combined armies of the kings of *Tsou*, *Tchao*, *Han*, *Guei*, and *Yen*. He sent his forces to aid a prince, in the western part of Sechuen, who was at war with a neighbouring chief; and subsequently cleared his own way to empire by fomenting discord among the various tributary princes named, so that they might destroy each other. Thus the kingdom of *Song*, which had existed 380 years, was destroyed by the kings of *Tsi* and *Tsou*; the principality of *Lou* was destroyed by the king of *Tsou*, who also made tributary to him the king of *Guei*. After those events CHAO SEANG no longer concealed his own designs upon the Imperial throne. He defeated the king of *Tsi*, the only prince who was powerful enough to stand in his way. Shortly afterwards he defeated the reigning emperor NANG WANG, 34th of his dynasty, permitting him, however, to retain the nominal power.

Meantime the king of *Han* gave his formal allegiance to *Chao Seang*. Several princes in the south of China, however, elected to the title of emperor TCHOW KIUN, a prince descended from KAO WANG, 28th emperor. On being so elected, CHOW KIUN appealed for aid to the kings of *Tsi*, *Tsou*, and *Gusi*. But these princes declined to give the assistance sought for, and, accordingly, the titular "emperor" abdicated, thus leaving the succession, and the establishment of a new dynasty, namely that of *Tsin*, to the successful usurper CHAO SEANG WANG.

THE PRESIDENT (Sir George Gabriel Stokes, Bart.).—I am sure we ought all to render our thanks to the author of this paper. There is one matter I might mention which is referred to on p. 191 as being coincident with the darkness that happened at the death of Christ. The Passover, I think, was held at the full moon, and a solar eclipse could only occur at the time of the new moon. If so, that would settle the point in question.

PROFESSOR S. BEAL, B.A., D.C.L. (Professor of Chinese at University College).—Not being a member of the Institute, I feel some reluctance in offering any comments, but I am sure I, in common with all who have heard the paper that has been delivered to-night, must agree that it is a most valuable one. It has brought together a number of facts, each of which would require separate study. Perhaps you will allow me, as a Buddhist student, to make a few remarks upon my special study. In the first place (I will begin at the end of the lecture), I do not think it is a proper description of Buddhism to say that Buddha advocated the origin of everything from nothing, to which it is to return. I do not know upon what ground that assertion is raised. I believe he taught the eternal succession of causes, the beginning of which he could not, of course, define, but he laid it down to ignorance. He was ignorant of the first cause, but that first cause was an existing cause, and certainly not "nothing"; and as to advocating the idea that we return to nothing, I think, on the contrary, he thought we should return to a primitive state of excellency,—a primitive state of happiness and bliss,—but he could not define what it was. One of his maxims was, as every scientific scholar will allow, that the beginning or supreme cause was un-

definable, and Bishop Lightfoot, in his excellent treatise on St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, considers that the remark of St. Paul, "and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing," was derived from the Brahmins during the reign of Augustus; and I will go further, if you will allow me to do so, not as claiming the scholarship of Bishop Lightfoot, but I think it has reference to the unknown God mentioned in Acts xvii. 23, and Professor Plumtree appears to advocate the same principle. Perhaps you will allow me to say in regard to the Yuechi people mentioned on the third page of the paper, that I think, from their name, they are by no means an aboriginal race belonging to Central Asia on the borders of China, and I think it is allowed by most scholars that these Yuechi were really Scythians, and the word "Scythian" is a very comprehensive one. Karl Blind, in a late number of the *Asiatic Review*, says that the Goths were Scythians. These Yuechi he believes, had invaded that part of Central Asia, and were a blue-eyed and fair-haired race, and were driven back by the Hiongnou race or the Huns. I do not know whether I am right in saying the Huns, but it is said they were driven back to their original country, and that when on the borders of the Caspian Sea there they met with the Parthians, and finally helped to overthrow the Greeco-Bactrian kingdom. As Dr. Gordon says, these people were called *Scoloti* as well, and they are spoken of as having golden cups round their necks, and there have been several discoveries of these *Scythians* or *Scoloti*. They were accustomed to make their drinking-cups out of skulls when denuded of the skin. I would say as to *Chin-tan* being "The Dawn" that in Hiouen Thsang the word *Chin-tan* constantly occurs for China, and by it is understood nothing but *Thina*. Dr. Gordon spoke of *China-pati* as bearing on a period as recent as A.D. 629—645. From the records of Fa Hian and Hiouen Thsang, whose travels I have had the honour of translating, it would appear that a temple was erected there, near the Beas river as early as A.D. 150. Then, again, Dr. Gordon referred to hostages being taken there at so late a date as A.D. 600 or 700, the empire of Kanishka being established about B.C. 50; but I venture to say that it was not B.C. 40 or 50, but A.D. 500 or 600, and I think that is shown by the inscriptions at Muttra, Manikiala, and Bhawulpore, thus bringing a time claimed to be B.C. 50 or 60 down to about A.D. 500 or 600. As a stranger here, I should be sorry to take up further time, but there are one or two points I should like to refer to as to the Scythians.



I cannot suppose for a moment, though Mongolian types were found in Mesopotamia, as were found the Hyksos in Egypt, that the Scythians were Mongols. I think there is every authority for believing that they were originally a mixed race, probably a pure Aryan race, but that they became intermixed with the Shemites, and the Mongolian race was produced, and that very probably they branched off into different tribes, some of which were savage and some civilised; but the Aryans, from whom they sprang, must, if Karl Blind is right, have had qualities which we do not find, as a rule, in the Mongolian races. There is one little remark about the *Seres* or *Sechuen*. I think we may trace the origin of that word to a simple derivation; we know that *Syr* means yellow, there is the river called the Syr river, and I think the Chinese are called *Seres* because they are a yellow race, from that simple word *Syr*. With these remarks I beg to conclude.

Mr. W. GRIFFITH remarked upon the great interest attaching to the questions taken up by the author of the paper.

Rev. F. A. WALKER, D.D., F.L.S.—I should like to ask the author if he attributes the similarity of customs between the Chinese and the Egyptians, page 174, to the fact that Mongolian rulers held sway, in a part of one dynasty, over Egypt. I remember when the Rev. H. G. Tomkins gave his interesting lecture on Egypt and Assyria, and the different races that have from time to time inhabited those countries, there was a very Mongolian look in one of the kings of Egypt shown. There is not a doubt with regard to all these customs that they did exist in ancient Egypt. Every one of those which Dr. Gordon has mentioned, I think, is abundantly illustrated in the peculiar monuments and sculptures, which have come down to our time, from Egypt. With regard to agriculture being held in repute by the Chinese and ancient Egyptians, you see many representations of them cutting the corn with the sickle; and in regard to hieroglyphic and symbolic writing, the signs of the zodiac are cut on the roof of the chapel of Denderah, only they substituted a Scarabæus for the Crab. You see Cyrus represented in a very uncomfortable position round three sides of a square, where the priests gave bread to the people on New Year's Day. You see over and over again these matters recorded on Egyptian monuments; but I should like to know through whose influence it was, whether it was through the influence of Mongolian rulers that the similarity of custom of those two great nations was brought about.

## ERRATUM.

Page 199, line 7 from end,  
for Cyrus read Sirius.

The Hon. Secretary, Captain F. PETRIE, F.G.S.—As regards the communications received from those unable to be present, the first is from Sir Thomas Wade, K.C.M.G., Professor of Chinese at Cambridge University: he expresses his regret at not being able to be present, and bears testimony to the value of the recent labours of Baron Richthofen and his work on China (in German), Dr. Bretschneider's *China*, and a new work on the Formosan aborigines.

Dr. LEITNER writes, regretting that illness "prevents his being present at the reading of so good a paper as Dr. Gordon's."

The AUTHOR.—In the first place, I thank those who have been so good as to comment on my paper for the spirit in which they have expressed themselves. The difference of opinion that strikes me as being apparent among Chinese students\* illustrates some of the difficulties I have had in preparing this paper, during which process I have consulted so many works that I am afraid to enumerate them; and in the course of the comments made on my remarks, I think you recognise the difficulty I had, out of the materials at my disposal, in weaving such a web as I have been able to produce. I tried, as far as possible, to give the authorities from whom I have quoted. Many of these are given in the footnotes, and others are given in the series of notes at the end of my paper, and I think that if my critics had consulted the notes which I give in the shape of an appendix, perhaps they would not have made some of the remarks they have. I may observe that the data from which I have taken my chronology included, as far as has struck me during the time their remarks have been made, such as are contained in works by Gutschlaff, Edkins, Du Halde, Williams, Boulger, Giles, Davis, Douglas, and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. All of these authorities give more or less different dates; so it will become apparent what great difficulty I have had in formulating the remarks I have made. In several instances I specially notice that the dates I give are approximate. I am afraid I shall not be able to answer all the comments made, but I will endeavour briefly to make such remarks as occur

---

\* The difficulties of Chinese students are increased by the Chinese characteristic disregard of accuracy. There is no accuracy in their system of statistics, and no uniformity in their standards of weights, measures, money, length, &c. A man becomes 80 years old after he stops being 70, their habit being to reckon by tens. Their whole system of thinking even has a basis different from that to which Europeans are accustomed.—*Ed.*

to me. One speaker, talking of what I said with regard to the doctrine of Buddhism, namely, that all things come from nothing and return to nothing, is well aware from his reading that the Indians, the Brahmins, the Chinese, and the Singalese all give different accounts of what the doctrines of Buddha were, and I observe that this speaker when remarking on those notes of mine did not actually say what the doctrine of Buddha was, so that one individual sets up one conjecture in the place of another, an observation which applies to those I have taken my remarks from. Then about the Yuechi. I look to my paper and see that I did not say anything about their having been aborigines; but in another part of my paper I see the word "aborigines" is mentioned, not as indicating a people so called, or as the actual original people of that place occupied by them, but as indicating that we have no history of any race preceding them. In a footnote I quote from Hale's *Chronology*, p. 174. I allude, rather vaguely, to a subject in itself so extensive that I really am afraid to make more than a passing allusion to it, namely, a division of the human race as handed down to us in history, sacred and profane, into historical and non-historical races. Many of the tribes I have mentioned in my paper belong, I believe, to the non-historical races. I invite your attention to the few notes relating to this point which I have inserted at the foot of page 174, and those who have done me the honour of being present on this occasion, and are interested in the subject to which I have so briefly alluded, will have an opportunity of investigating it for themselves. It is too long to be entered on here. In reference to the remark made with regard to my making use of the word "Chintan," and the question asked regarding it, my authority is Williams. With regard to Chinapati, the position of which, as I remarked, is close to the river Beas, as far as I am aware I make no allusion to the actual date when it was named. I merely mention the particular with regard to it having been named. Then, in regard to the empire of Kanishka, I have carefully examined the data on which I have based my remarks, and the period stated therein is quoted *verbatim* from the work consulted by me in the Royal Institution. I can only again refer, as perhaps offering some interpretation of these remarks, to the notes which I have inserted at page 174. I was asked on what authority I made the remark on the similarity of customs between China and Egypt. In the notes which I have given in the shape of an appendix to my paper various points are given, and quoted *verbatim*, that will probably further elucidate the subject,

and I may mention that they are abstracted from a very interesting work by the Rev. John Chalmers. The title of that work is "The Origin of the Chinese." It was published at Hong Kong in 1866, and to it I am indebted for much that is given in these notes. I mention these particulars so that those interested in the subject may know where to find the work alluded to. Another remark has been made about *Chin-tan*, or "the dawn," and different opinions have been expressed by different speakers as to whether the word means *dawn*. It is the common means of expressing Japan rather poetically as "the Land of the Rising-Sun"; so it may have been with China, and there is no reason why it should not.

The meeting was then adjourned.

---

## REMARKS BY THE REV. JAMES LEGGE

*(Professor of Chinese at Oxford University).*

I. As to the origin of the name *China*. There can be no doubt that this name originated in India, and came into general use through the employment of it by the Buddhist missionaries. Dr. Gordon says, on the first page, that the Buddhists of India called the land *Chin-tan*, or "The Dawn." In Nien Châng's *History of Buddhism*, he gives a conversation between Matangha, one, and probably the first, of the Buddhist missionaries, and the Emperor Ming, who first brought Buddhism to his country, as having taken place in A.D. 69. Their discourse having turned on a mysterious building in the capital, Matangha tells the Emperor that it was one of the nineteen places in the country of "China or Chin-tan" to which King As'oka had lent relics of Buddha. This is the earliest occurrence, so far as I know, of the name "China," and *Chin-tan*, the synonym of it, means nothing about "the dawn." It is merely a contracted form of the phonetisation "*China-sthana*," meaning "The Land of China." It will remind many of a common termination of Sanscrit names of countries, such as Beloochistan, Afghanistan.

How the Indians came to call the country "The Land of Chin" we do not know. It may have been from the feudal state of Tsin, in the North West, which in B.C. 221, attained to the sovereignty of the whole country. The initial *Ch* instead of *Ts'* is against this conclusion; but I need say no more on this point. There is the fact that the Buddhists called the Empire *China* in our first century, and this came gradually to be adopted by other countries generally, as Buddhism and its literature came to be known.

I have said more than was necessary on this point, because it is an instance of what I consider certain errors which I could point out as lessening the value of Dr. Gordon's paper; for example, the notion to which he alludes on p. 170, that the name was introduced into Europe, by Malay or Arabian traders, so recently as about A.D. 1500, from *Tá ts'ing* or *T'ai Ts'ing*, the name of the present dynasty. Again, I do not agree with the quotation from Baron Bunsen on pp. 173-4, that "the primitive

archaic Chinese settled themselves in the land, and called it *Sin*, which we have called *China*," the fact being that the Chinese do not yet call it *Sin* or *China*, except as they are learning to conform to foreign custom by doing so.

II. As to where the first Chinese settlers came from I will say very little, because I have got very little to say. All that Dr. Gordon has brought together on the point is necessarily speculation. I cannot call to mind a single hint about it in Chinese literature.

About 2,300 years B.C. the settlers occupied a small extent of territory on the east and north of the Ho or Yellow River, the more southern portion of the present province of Lhan-hsi. Thence they directed their course eastwards, southwards, and by-and-by westwards also, and we can hardly come to any other conclusion but that they had come into China from the north-west. From what western region, and by what route they came, we do not know. There is a wide field for speculation to choose from, but I have not yet read any theory that has to my mind the semblance of probability, or is supported by arguments grounded on ancient monuments or words in which a thoughtful inquirer can rest.

Nearly, one might rather say fully, 2,000 years elapsed before the rule of the Chinese race was extended to the limits of the present eighteen or nineteen provinces that form the present "China Proper."

III. As to how long ago the earliest Chinese settlers entered China there is more to say. I have said above that about 2,300 years B.C. we find a monarchy, which appears to have been elective, on the east and north of the Ho. I say this on the authority of the best historical documents which the literature of China supplies.

We have the twenty-four dynastic histories, the earliest of which is the "Historical Records of Sze-ma Ch-ien," who died in or near the year B.C. 85. He was grand historiographer to the dynasty of Han, the dynasty which dates from B.C. 206. His materials were all the classical literature before his time, and all the historical documents contained in the archives of the Empire. His work embraces the long period of time from the ancient Hwang Ti to rather more than 100 years of the dynasty of Han.

According to the best chronological Chinese tables, the first year of Hwang Ti's reign was B.C. 2697, so that Ch-ien's history would seem to cover a period of nearly 2,800 years. But let it not be

thought that he vouches for all the dates or eras in that long space. The first year to which he ventures to annex the cyclical expression of its chronological date is B.C. 842. I cannot go into the reasons which he had for doing so. They were abundantly sufficient; and his history from that year downwards will not, I think, be questioned by any one capable of forming a judgment on such a matter. From that year Ch-ien was left to push his way among the abundant materials in his possession. And he did so, carefully and skilfully, up, as I have said, to Hwang Ti. But the cyclical or chronological expression for his reigns and eras was not introduced into tables till the year 1077 A.D., when the arrangement of them was first completed by a Sháo Khang-chieh, one of the great scholars of the Sung dynasty.

The results for the earlier time given to us by those tables conduct us to the commencement of the dynasty of Chow, the third of the feudal dynasties of China in B.C. 1122; of the second dynasty, or that of Shang (called latterly Yin), in B.C. 1766, and that of first, or Hsiâ in B.C. 2205.

A somewhat shorter scheme is found in what are called the "Bamboo Books," discovered after the death of Ch-ien, and the genuineness of which has been much questioned, but the difference between the two is not very great. The dynasty of Hsiâ, according to these books, began in 1961. The founder of it was "the Great Yü," who cleared away the waters of the great flood of Yâo, a terrible inundation of the Ho and other rivers with which the documents of the Shû king commence, and which to many have seemed a Chinese version of the Flood of Noah. Yü also was the founder of the feudal monarchy which displaced the elective, and continued till B.C. 221, or fully 2,000 years.

To help him in his records from Yü to Yâo, Ch-ien had still the earliest books of the Shû King, though they are not so valuable as the documents posterior to Yü. Still, according to the tables made out from them, Yü's reign begins in B.C. 2205; that of Shun, who preceded him, begins in 2255; and that of Yâo in 2357.

We have now to plunge into the shadowy ages before Yâo, and see if we can find in them traces of what we can consider historical narrative. There must have been men,—subjects and rulers,—anterior to Yâo. I do not think, indeed, that Sze-ma Ch-ien had written documents with dates in them earlier than those of the Shû King; but he has prefixed a chapter to his account of Yâo professing to give an account of five Tis, generally, though erroneously, called

"Emperors," whose reigns begin in B.C. 2362, 2432, 2510, 2594, and at last Hwang Ti's in 2697. At this point we have done with Ch-ien, but the chronological tables, containing a good many other names, and among them especially Yen Ti, or Shān-nǎng, called by many "The Divine Husbandman," and Thai-háo or Fû-hsí, or Fo-hí, who used always to be called the Founder of the Chinese Empire. Where in chronology are we to place these two? I have often amused myself with putting together the figures supplied in various compendia of the most ancient history and have brought out for Shān-nǎng the date of B.C. 3072, and for Fo-hí 3322. My judgment is that if we put down the beginning of the Chinese kingdom at B.C. 3000 we are within, rather than beyond, the proper limit. I cannot in these desultory observations enter into a detail of my reasons for that judgment.

My principal one is connected—

IV. With the formation and nature of the Chinese written characters.

I consider Dr. Gordon has been led into error on this subject, but for which he would have come, I think, to a very different conclusion from that which his paper indicates about Chinese chronology. In a note on page 185, he says: "The use of written characters by the Chinese is assigned to the Shang dynasty, consisting at first of little more than rude representations of common objects. Prior to about B.C. 1600 the records of government were said to have consisted merely of knotted cords." The only classical witness about such cords that I have seen is in one of the appendices to the Yih King, where it is said that "in the highest antiquity," prior, that is, as we see from the context, to Fo-hí, Shān-nǎng, Hwang Ti, Yáo, Shun, and Yü, government was carried on by the use of knotted cords, and subsequently the sages substituted for these written characters and bonds. The Yih King does not say who the sages that substituted these written characters were. It is a pity, for the system of its written characters is, I think, the greatest thing that the Chinese race has done,—greater than the Great Wall of Shih Hwang Ti, greater than the Grand Canal of Kublai. The honour is ascribed to Fo-hí himself, or to a Tsang Chieh before him, or at latest a minister of Hwang Ti.

Dr. Gordon thinks they were the work of the Shang dynasty, because my friend, Dr. Chalmers, a very great Chinese scholar indeed, but liable to err, like all other men, has speculated to that effect.



But in the Shû King we have two short memorials "in writing" by the premier of the founder of the Shang dynasty to his son, probably in B.C. 1753. The written characters were not invented then; they were then in use. They were framed before the time of the Great Yü, for we find him using four of the cyclical characters, all of which are among the primitives, or the earliest formations. The written characters are a great fact, which have always stood in the way of my accepting many speculations as to where the original Chinese came from, and how long ago they found their way to what has been the home of their descendants so long. The state of society indicated by the primitive characters cannot have arisen in less than a thousand years from the time of the knotted cords.

Dr. Gordon has much to say about the earlier tribes whom the Chinese found in the country, and representatives of which still continue to subsist in parts of it, and in the regions west and north of it. The names of more than twenty of such tribes may be collected from the classical literature, as still subsisting under the Chow dynasty, but in B.C. 559, the chief of one of them, at hostilities with one of the great feudal states, addresses its commander in these words:—"Our food, our drink, and our clothes are all different from those of the Flowery States. We do not exchange silks or other articles of introduction with their courts: *their language and ours do not admit of intercourse between us and them.*"

So it is; until our own times the Chinese have dwelt as a race alone; and it has not been possible to trace satisfactorily the affinities between them and other races, in respect of their origin, duration, and language. I must with this conclude the remarks suggested by Dr. Gordon's paper. I have read it with the greatest pleasure, and thank him for it. I only wish I had been better prepared by recent studies to review it, and more truly to do justice to it. May I end what I have found to say with the following excellent critical canon of Confucius?—"Hear much. Put aside the points of which you stand in doubt, and speak cautiously of the others."

[Some remarks, sent in by another student of Chinese history, coincide to a certain extent with Professor Legge's. They were placed in Dr. Gordon's hands, but the author having asked for their return they cannot appear here.]

## THE AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I would express my thanks to so high an authority as Professor Legge for his remarks upon my paper. With respect to certain objections which he has brought forward, I would briefly observe as follows :—

I. Name of China, "*Chin-tan*, as signifying the Dawn." See Williams's *Middle Kingdom*. On a merely abstract question such as this opinions differ so greatly that it becomes equally difficult to assert positively which of them are erroneous, which correct.

II. "Quotation from Baron Bunsen." See authority quoted in foot-note, page 174. It does not appear to me that the circumstance that the modern Chinese do not call their land Sin necessarily implies that the immediate descendants of the early immigrants did not do so.

III. "The origin of the Chinese people." The authors quoted in my paper evidently bestowed much attention upon the work of formulating a theory from sources other than Chinese history, regarding their ethnology.

IV. "Origin of Chinese written characters." From the interesting and valuable comments made on this subject, the fact is made very evident that authorities who have studied the question are divided among themselves with regard to it. This is not to be wondered at considering its complexity and obscurity.

A careful comparison of views contained in the remarks of the several men who have done me the honour to comment upon my paper suffice to indicate the difficulties attending the task I set myself in the preparation of my paper.

---