

which it might be led. By training and education, by habit and association, men became either virtuous or evil. (5) A fifth group, whose views came to be represented long afterward by Han Yu, the Duke of Literature, taught that some men were by nature good and some by nature bad.

Though these schools differed thus widely in their views as to the moral nature of man, yet all alike sought as their final object a development upon or in that nature of principles of humanitarianism and righteousness; the Taoist seeking perfection by obedience to the "way of heaven" (the enwrapping in heavenly virtue), the other four by conformity to the "way of man" (the performance of human duty).

There were, however, among other minor schools, three in particular, whose principles were at variance not only with those of the groups just mentioned, but with each other. Thus (6) Hsu Hing, an itinerant philosopher of the time of Mencius, traveled with his disciples from place to place, clad in rough clothes and carrying instruments of husbandry, and taught that as the highest social happiness was, according to him, to be found in field labor, the sovereign, the magistrates, and the leaders of thought should be actual agriculturalists. Again (7) Yang Chu, in date somewhat anterior to Mencius, laid down one short rule for life, namely, "each for himself," and held to ridicule any effort but that of self-gratification. As with the Emperor Shun and with the sage Confucius, so, said he, was it with the tyrant Chow and the bandit Ch'ih, all alike died the same death, and all alike became but clods of earth. The lives of the former were laborious and bitter to the death; their fame such as no one who knew what was real would choose. The courses of the latter were brilliant and luxurious to the end, and the enjoyment which they had was such as no posthumous fame could give. Each man then should live only for his present pleasure, for neither the past nor the future was his. (8) In striking opposition to *Yang Chu* was *Mih Teih*, a teacher of the early part of the same fourth century B. C. Of the former, Mencius said, "If by plucking out one hair he could have benefited another man, he would not have done so;" and of the latter, "if by flaying himself alive he could have done good to his neighbor, he would not have hesitated so to do." *Mih Teih's* leading principle was that every man ought to love and serve all others. The cause of all disorder, so he taught, was to be found in the absence of mutual love. If a son was unfilial, it was because he loved himself best. So it was with a thief, and so also with contending princes and "warring states." Let mutual love only have sway, and all evil would disappear.

These instances of the teaching of schools, several of which were but short-lived, are cited simply to show how men at the most convulsive period of Chinese history were seeking after rest for the soul; how almost entirely (with the exception of the school of Chwang-tsze) they had lost faith in aid from above; and how far they had gone in taking their second downward step.