

TWO PHILOLOGICAL STUDIES
ON THE
MAWANGDUI LAOZI MANUSCRIPTS

by

DEREK DANE HERFORTH

A.B., The University of California, 1971

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Asian Studies)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May 1980

© Derek Dane Herforth, 1980

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Asian Studies

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date 25 March, 1980

Abstract

This thesis focusses on some of the philological problems encountered in the study of two Chinese manuscripts of the Laozi dating from the late third century B.C. The MSS. were recovered in late 1973 from an early Western Han tomb unearthed at Mawangdui in the suburbs of Changsha, Hunan. The Introduction summarizes the details of the excavation of the tomb and discovery of the MS. documents. The main features of the MSS. themselves are then described with attention given to the graphic style, methods of dating and the arrangement of the text. The Introduction concludes with a discussion in the light of the new MS. evidence of some of the problems of the authorship and textual history of the Laozi.

Part One treats substitution variation between the two MSS. as well as between the MSS. and the transmitted versions of the text. A typology of this sort of variation is proposed in which all substitution variants can be classified as one of the following: taboo graph, semantic variant, miswriting, simplified graph or loan character. The first four types are briefly discussed with examples. The remainder of Part One is devoted to a detailed examination of the phenomenon of loan characters and the analysis of some twenty problematic variants of this type from the two MSS.

Part Two is a collation of the acknowledged quotations from the Laozi found in the Hanfeizi with the two Mawangdui MSS. and

the transmitted versions of Laozi as recorded in a modern variorum. Because of the large number of variables involved, due especially to our lack of knowledge about the transmission of the Hanfeizi, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions on the basis of this collation. The evidence seems to suggest, however, the existence in pre-Han times of discrete textual traditions of the Laozi and that some of the variation in the extant transmitted texts may derive from these separate pre-Han traditions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....ii

Table of Contents.....iv

Abbreviations Used.....v

Note on Principal Sources and Bibliographic Conventions.....vii

Introduction.....1

 Notes to Introduction.....31

Part One.....39

 Notes to Part One.....87

Part Two.....91

 Notes to Part Two.....137

Bibliography.....139

Abbreviations Used

- AL the Laozi portion of Mawangdui MS. A (甲本)
- AM the miscellaneous texts following
the Laozi on MS. A
- BL the Laozi portion of Mawangdui MS. B (乙本)
- BM the miscellaneous texts preceding
the Laozi on MS. B
- BMFEA Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern
Antiquities
- BS Mawangdui Hanmu boshu (yi) (Mawangdui Hanmu
boshu zhengli xiaozu 1974)
- FY Fu Yi (傅奕)
- FYY Fan Yingyun (范应元)
- GRS Grammata Serica Recensa (Karlgren 1957)
- HF Han Fei (韓非)
- HFZ Hanfeizi (Chen 1958)
- HL hapax legomenon
- HSG Heshanggong (河上公)
- JL 'Jielao' (解老), Chapter 20 of Hanfeizi
- KS Roshi kosei (Shima 1973)
- LC loan character (假借字)
- LZ Mawangdui Hanmu boshu Laozi (Mawangdui Hanmu
boshu zhengli xiaozu 1976)
- MC Middle Chinese, the language of the Guangyun
- MWD Mawangdui (馬王堆)

OC Old Chinese, the language of the latter half
of the Zhou dynasty

SSJZS Shisanjing zhushu (十三經注疏)

ST Mawangdui boshu Laozi shitan (Yan 1976)

TT transmitted text

WB Wang Bi (王弼)

XE Xiang'er (想爾)

XS xiesheng (諧聲)

YL 'Yulao' (喻老), Chapter 21 of the Hanfeizi

YZ Yan Zun (嚴遵)

ZD Zhongwen dacidian (中文大辭典)

A Note on Principal Sources and Bibliographic Conventions

In preparing this essay on the Mawangdui (MWD) MSS. of Laozi I have made use of two transliterations¹ of the text published by teams of Chinese scholars with direct access to the documents.

- 1) Mawangdui Hanmu boshu (yi) 馬王堆漢墓帛書 (壹), hereafter BS
(Mawangdui Hanmu boshu zhengli xiaozu 1974).
- 2) Mawangdui Hanmu boshu Laozi 馬王堆漢墓帛書老子, hereafter LZ
(Mawangdui hanmu boshu zhengli xiaozu 1976).

BS contains photographs of the MSS., transliterations into traditional kaishu and as an appendix a parallel printing of both MSS. with the Fu Yi text from the Daozang (道藏傳奕本). The annotations to the transliterations are restricted to single character glosses.

LZ lacks MS. photographs but provides a revised and well-annotated transliteration in simplified kaishu. Also included are the three parallel texts, incorporating the revisions in the transliteration, and three interpretative articles reprinted from Xuexi yu pipan 74.10, Wenwu 74.11 (revised) and Lishi yanjiu 75.3.

Citations from BS are made by reference to MS. A (甲本) or B (乙本), text L (Laozi) or M (miscellaneous), page and line number of the transliteration. Cross-checking of the MS. photographs is facilitated by the printing of MS. line numbers in the transliteration. In cases where the transliteration in BS has been revised in LZ, the latter only is cited by page number.

In addition to BS and LZ, a photocopy of the MS. photographs and the transliteration in BS has been published in Taiwan. This includes a lengthy textual study by Yan Lingfeng which is cited by page number in the present study.

- 3) Mawangdui-boshu Laozi shitan 馬王堆帛書老子試探, hereafter ST
(Yan 1976).

The task of collating the MWD MSS. with the transmitted versions of the Laozi would have been much more onerous without the convenience of Shima Kunio's variorum, also cited here by page number.

- 4) Roshi kosei 老子校正, hereafter KS (Shima 1973).

References to pre-Han literature indexed in the Harvard-Yanijing series are to that text. In the case of the Shiji citations are by juan and page number to the Takigawa edition. References to the Hanshu follow the same convention and are to the Zhonghua shuju edition. Unless otherwise noted, reconstructions of Old Chinese are Karlgren's Archaic forms quoted from GSR.

Introduction

Since the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949 archaeologists have excavated a number of ancient tombs in the area of Changsha in the central Yangzi basin.² In 1972 work began on what has proved to be the most spectacular and significant of these excavations, a tomb complex dating from the early Western Han period. Located at MWD in the eastern suburbs of Changsha, the complex has been identified as the burial site of the family of Li Cang (利蒼), the first Marquis of Dai (戴侯).³ The complex is composed of three tombs of which the Marquis' own (Tomb No. 2) had undergone considerable despoliation at the hands of grave robbers. The other two tombs were found on excavation to be intact and to contain a large number of artefacts and written documents of surpassing historical interest.

The MS. material which is the subject of this essay was discovered in Tomb No. 3 which contained the corpse of a man in his thirties. A wooden slip recovered from the tomb gives the date of burial as 168 B.C., midway in the reign of Han Wendi, Liu Heng (劉恆). Chinese scholars have speculated that the man buried here was a son of Li Cang, although he cannot have been the successor to the Marquisate, Li Xi (利豨) who is known to have died in 165 B.C. (Hanshu 16.618).⁴ The occupant of Tomb No. 1 has been identified as Li Cang's wife, thought to have died a few years after 168 B.C.

The MSS. themselves were found in the lower compartment of a rectangular lacquer box. They were written on silk which was then pleated to fit into the container, thus causing considerable damage to the creased portions. Among the many texts copied onto these lengths of silk are some which we today possess in transmitted versions and others which bear some resemblance to extant works such as the Zhanguoce or the Zuozhuan. Finally there are a number of entirely new documents, some broadly philosophical and others highly technical in nature.

Each of the first two lengths of silk MS. cataloged by the excavators contains a copy of the Laozi as well as other lost texts. MS. A opens with the Laozi, untitled, followed by four heretofore unknown essays, also without titles. Though the latter share some conceptual vocabulary with the Laozi, they are apparently not directly related to that work as it is traditionally understood. On MS. B the Laozi follows four new philosophical texts: 'Jingfa' (經法), 'Shidajing' (十大經), 'Cheng' (稱) and 'Daoyuan' (道原). The study of these texts has aroused great interest since it has been suggested by Chinese scholars that they may constitute the long-lost Four Classics of the Yellow Emperor (黃帝四經) listed in the bibliography of the Hanshu (30.1730).⁵ Furthermore, the coupling in MS. B of the Laozi with texts associated with Huangdi has suggested to many that here may be found the documentary antecedent of the term 'Huanglao' (黃老), a compound used repeatedly by Sima Qian in the Shiji to designate a school of thought current in late

Zhanguo, Qin and early Han.⁶ The study and interpretation of these lost texts is certain to shed light on other questions in early Chinese intellectual history as well, particularly the problematic relationship between early Daoism as represented by the Laozi and Legalism.

The dating of the Laozi MSS.

Obviously none of these texts can date later than 168 B.C. when Tomb No. 3 was sealed after the burial of Li Cang's son. In the case of the two Laozi MSS., a difference in calligraphic style helps to establish their relative chronology. AL was copied in a style transitional between the small-seal and clerical scripts (帶有隸書筆法的小篆. LZ 110); that is to say, the construction of the graphs retains many features of the small-seal style while the individual strokes have begun to lose the roundness of the earlier script for the angular quality of the clerical style.⁷

<u>Small-seal</u>	<u>MWD-AL</u>	<u>Clerical</u> ⁸	<u>MWD-BL</u>
物	物	物	物
胃	胃	胃	胃
弗	弗	弗	弗
而	而	而	而

As these examples suggest, the graphic style of BL is closer to the clerical script than is AL. This is one piece of evidence which allows us to date BL somewhat later than AL.

Another method of dating the two MS. copies of Laozi, this

time in terms of absolute chronology, is provided by the avoidance of a taboo character in BL. In every case where the graph 邦 is found in AL, it is replaced by 國 in BL. A taboo against the use of the character 邦 went into effect on the accession of Han Gaozu, Liu Bang, in 206 B.C.; thus, AL must have been copied before that date.⁹ Gaozu's successor to the Han throne was Huidi, Liu Ying (盈). Since this graph is not tabooed in BL, it seems reasonable to assume that BL was copied sometime between the accession of Gaozu and the accession of Huidi in 194 B.C.¹⁰

The arrangement of the MSS.

The earliest bibliographic information of any kind we have for the Laozi is contained in Laozi's biography in the Shiji where Sima Qian states that the sage composed a text of over five thousand words in two sections (上下篇) on the meaning of dao and de (63.6). Both the MWD MSS. preserve the division into two sections; however, the order of the sections is reversed from that found in all transmitted versions. In the MSS., the section generally referred to as the 'Dejing' (i.e. Chapters 38-81 of the TTS) precedes the 'Daojing' (Chapters 1-37). This has led Gao Heng and Chi Xichao to posit the existence in Warring States' times of two versions of the text: one similar to the TTS and property of the Daoists for whom the metaphysics of the Dao was paramount and the other in the arrangement of the MSS. and associated with the Legalists who were more concerned with the political philosophy of the 'Dejing' (LZ 112). The only

surviving evidence on this point comes from Han Fei's commentaries on the Laozi, the 'Jielao' and 'Yulao' chapters of the HFZ. The first quotation from the Laozi discussed in the 'Jielao' is taken from the opening of the 'Dejing' section (i.e. Chapter 38). This has been treated as evidence that in the version of the Laozi known to Han Fei the 'Dejing' preceded the 'Daojing', as in the MWD MSS. As we might expect of a proponent of Legalism, Han Fei strongly favors the 'Dejing' as a source of quotations; however, the sequence of his citations does not preserve the order of passages in the MSS., nor does it respect even the boundaries between the two sections of the Laozi.¹¹ Thus, it is quite possibly coincidental that we find the opening of the 'Dejing' cited first in the 'Jielao'. One might just as reasonably hypothesize that Han Fei begins his commentary with this passage simply because it is the most general statement in the Laozi of the nature of de, a concept of great importance in the metaphysical underpinnings of Han Fei's Legalism.

The MWD MSS. lack the clear-cut division into 81 chapters that characterizes all the TTS. Gao and Chi believe that the undivided state of the MSS. represents the original form of the Laozi and proceed to point out, as others have before them, that the chapter division in the transmitted versions often fails to respect the contextual units of the original (LZ 117). The statement that the MWD texts lack chapter divisions is disputed by Henricks who has noted the divisions marked by prominent dots placed in the center of the MSS. columns (1979:49-51). Curiously, these dots are confined almost exclusively to

the 'Dejing' of AL. Henricks' analysis of this part of the MS. has shown that the sections marked by these dots do, in fact, correspond to thematic units and in some cases represent a more reasonable division of the text than that found in the transmitted versions.

Since it was not the practice of early bibliographers to record the subdivision of a work into units smaller than pian (篇), it is difficult to ascertain when the current division of the Laozi into 81 (37+44) chapters was made. A quotation, of questionable authenticity, from the Qilue (七略, c. 6 B.C.) of Liu Xin, cited in a Song work preserved in the Daozang is relevant to this question (KS 6a). The quotation describes an edition of the Laozi in two sections and 81 (37+44) chapters prepared by Liu Xin from an assortment of older texts totalling five sections and 142 chapters. If this quotation is accepted as authentic, we then know not only that the present division of the text into 81 chapters originated with Liu Xin, but also that copies of the Laozi with various numbers of chapters were in circulation by the end of the first century B.C. Other traditions have been preserved describing early division of the text into 72 or 81 (36+45) chapters to tally with Daoist numerology (Chan 1963:75). The colophon of one of the Dunhuang MSS. of the Laozi (Stein #6453) records the latter division, though the MS. itself is in a fragmented state (KS 12a). Lu Deming's sound glosses on the Laozi (老子音義) make no mention of chapter divisions indicating that an undivided version of the text may have been current as late as the early seventh

century. From comments in the early Southern Song bibliography Junzhai dushuzhi (郡齋讀書志), however, we can infer that by the middle of the twelfth century the division of the Laozi into 81 (37+44) chapters had become standard.¹² If we impose this pattern of division on the MWD material, we find some discrepancies in the sequence of passages.

	<u>'Dejing'</u>	<u>'Daojing'</u>
Chapter units	38 - 39	1 - 21
	41	24
	40	22 - 23
	42 - 66	25 - 37
	80 - 81	
	67 - 79	

Gao Heng and Chi Xichao have argued that, in at least one case, the sequence of passages in the MSS. preserves a greater sense of continuity than the chapter arrangement of the TTS. They point out that Chapter 41 interrupts the continuity between the end of Chapter 40 and the beginning of Chapter 42 where the common theme is the generation of the phenomenal world (萬物) (LZ 121-122). As for Chapter 41 itself, it seems to be an arbitrary lumping together of two very disparate passages, the first a description of the Dao's reception among knights (士) of differing capacities and the second an evocation of concepts like shangde (上德), dafang (大方), etc. through paradoxical similes and seemingly contradictory assertions. The suggestion that the sequence of these passages in the MWD texts better preserves the author's original progression of thought is

certainly plausible. On the other hand, it would be very difficult to argue convincingly for the superiority of the sequence of the MS. texts over that of the TTS in any other instance in which they diverge. It would seem that modern standards of continuity and logical progression are of limited applicability in the discussion of the arrangement of a text as laconic as the Laozi.

The derivation of the two Laozi MSS.

As we have seen, the two MWD texts differ in style of script and date of copying. Yet they share the same sequence of passages and, to a large extent, the same wording.¹³ Do they belong to the same textual tradition? This is a very difficult question to answer at the present stage of our knowledge of the early Laozi. Gao and Chi believe that BL was not copied from AL and this much seems fairly certain. (The case is less clear, however, if we consider the possibility that BL may have been transcribed from a dictation of AL.) They also assert that the two MSS. derive from different sources (LZ 119). This opinion is offered without supporting evidence or discussion and so seems little more than an impressionistic comment. My own view is quite the opposite, namely that AL and BL do share enough features to derive from a common archetype. One possible way of uncovering evidence either to corroborate or refute these impressions would be to examine the two MWD MSS. for what textual critics refer to as 'separative variants', i.e. disparate readings which reveal that BL was not copied from

AL. If only 'conjunctive variation' is found, we can assume a common archetype for both MSS. (The distinction between these two types of variation will be discussed and exemplified in Part Two below.) Another method of delineating the relationship between the two MWD MSS. would be to collate them with quotations from the Laozi preserved in early texts like the HFZ whose relative freedom from corruption can be demonstrated by comparison with the TTS. If the collation revealed that one of the MSS. differed significantly from the other in its rate of agreement with the HFZ witnesses, we would then be justified in inferring that AL and BL belong to different traditions. These results would suggest that the MS. which agreed in a significantly greater number of instances with the HFZ shares a common ancestor with the version of the Laozi known to Han Fei, while the other MS. is independent of that tradition. If, on the other hand, both MSS. differed but in contrasting ways from the quotations in the 'Jielao' and 'Yulao', we could then posit three independent traditions of transmission. Reference to a third 'control' text would in this way facilitate a more accurate judgement of the derivation of the two MWD MSS.

In the preceding paragraphs I have attempted to describe the significant extra-linguistic features of the two Laozi MSS. recovered at MWD. Some of the many variations between these MSS. and the TTS at the level of word and phrase will be taken up in detail in the body of this study. It now remains to

discuss briefly some of the problems of the authorship and transmission of the Laozi. This is a vast subject which has been treated by generations of prominent Chinese, Japanese and Western Sinologists. A comprehensive review of the secondary literature alone would constitute a considerable scholarly undertaking. I propose instead to summarize critically three accounts of the origin of the Laozi each of which embodies a different approach to the problem of authorship. Laozi is one of those figures like Homer whose historicity is so uncertain that one suspects them of having been invented by Tradition. The gradual re-evaluation of the sources and methods appropriate to the discussion of authorship in early China has fostered the sort of radical skepticism implied by the last statement. Each of the following three hypotheses on the origins of the Laozi illustrates a different degree of skepticism vis-à-vis the received traditions.

The first approach may be called 'traditionalist' because it adheres closely to the account of the composition of the Laozi found in Shiji 63. Sima Qian attributes a work in two sections and some five thousand words on the meaning of dao and de to one Lao Dan (明), a contemporary of Confucius (551-479 B.C.). The Shiji biography also includes an account of a meeting between Lao Dan and Confucius. Now the fact that this meeting is described several times in the Zhuangzi has been interpreted by the traditionalists as conclusive evidence that Lao Dan lived before Zhuang Zhou (middle of the fourth to early third c. B.C.). Even if the encounter with Confucius never took place,

they maintain, Lao Dan's book, the Laozi, must have been in circulation by the time of Zhuang Zhou. As D.C. Lau has pointed out (1963:149), this conclusion rests on the assumption that Zhuang Zhou is the sole author of the Zhuangzi. Authorship in early China is rarely so easily determined. It can safely be stated that no extant work of pre-Han philosophy is entirely free of either corruption or interpolation. This is particularly true of the Zhuangzi, whole sections of which are now recognized as dating much later than Zhuang Zhou himself. Thus, if one is going to date Laozi and his book solely on the basis that they are mentioned in the Zhuangzi, the dates of the relevant parts of the Zhuangzi will have to be established first. The traditionalist view can likewise be faulted for its assumption that Lao Dan composed the Laozi. This obviously is open to serious question, since cases of forgery and misattribution are not at all uncommon in Chinese literary history. Suffice it to say, the traditionalist view of the origin of this text has been superseded by a more sophisticated awareness of the difficulties of dating pre-Han literary material. Long before the discovery of the MWD MSS., most Sinologists had become dissatisfied with the traditional attribution of the Laozi and were pursuing a more critical examination of the evidence.

One approach which reflects this increased distrust of traditional sources has been taken by Qian Mu in his study of the chronology of the pre-Han philosophers, Xiangin zhuzi xinian (Qian 1956:202-226). Qian's concern is to 'demythologize' the

figure 'Laozi'. To this end he performs a meticulous analysis of the traditions associated with the supposed author of the Laozi. He points out, no doubt correctly, that 'Laozi' is not, in fact, a name at all, but merely an epithet which could in principle be applied to any venerable man of learning. The several legends which by the time of the Shiji had grown up around a figure referred to as 'Laozi' can be separated into three strands, each traceable to a distinct historical individual, according to Qian. Thus, Lao Laizi (萊子) is the figure mentioned briefly in Lunyu 38.18.7 who later became known as Hexiaozhangren (荷篠丈人). Lao Tan (詹), keeper of the archives of Zhou, is described in Shiji 63 as having had an audience with Duke Xian of Qin 219 years after the death of Confucius. Most enigmatic of all is the figure of Zhan He (詹何), mentioned in the HFZ as a foreseer (338). Qian believes the figure 'Laozi' was popularized by none other than Zhuang Zhou himself who apparently delighted in inventing philosophical characters and then attributing words of wisdom to them. He even fabricated a number of disciples for his Laozi and arranged several meetings between him and the historical Confucius (Qian 1956:223-224). However, since none of the maxims attributed to Lao Dan in the 'inner' chapters of the Zhuangzi are found in any extant version of the Laozi, Qian assumes that the latter did not yet exist when the 'inner' chapters were composed. In the 'Tianlun' chapter of the Xunzi, however, Laozi is characterized as 'discerning about bending (i.e. submission), but lacking insight into extending (i.e. assertive action)'

(老子有見於謠無見於信 . Xunzi 64.17.51). Since this brief description accords well with the gist of the Laozi, Qian regards it as good evidence of the book's existence. Of the three historical figures whose identities have become conflated in the evolution of the Laozi traditions, Zhan He is the most likely to have authored a book in the period between the composition of the 'inner' chapters of the Zhuangzi and the Xunzi. Qian identifies him as a contemporary of King Xiang (襄) of Chu (r. 298-262 B.C.). The implication of Qian's theory is that Zhan He simply attributed his own book to the wise 'old man' of Zhuangzi's 'inner' chapters; thus, it became known as the Laozi.

The obvious contrast between the traditionalists' and Qian's use of these sources lies in the thoroughgoing skepticism Qian brings to the Shiji biography of Laozi. While declining to accept Sima Qian's statements at face value, Qian Mu nevertheless assumes that they contain certain historical truths which when purified of legendary elements are confirmed or, at least, not contradicted by other pre-Han sources. Thus, the primary object of his investigation is less the date of the Laozi text than the identity of the historical figures hidden behind the epithet 'Laozi'. One might say that he succeeds in rewriting the first part of Shiji 63 and then rests content with the very plausible suggestion that the composition of the Laozi can be dated between the 'inner' chapters of the Zhuangzi and the Xunzi.¹⁴

The third approach to the authorship of the Laozi differs

markedly from Qian's in that it is scarcely concerned at all with the Laozi legends or the Shiji biography. In this approach, exemplified by the Japanese scholars Kimura Eiichi (see Hurvitz 1961) and most recently Shima Kunio (KS 1-7), the main focus is on the transmitted versions of the text itself and the many passages parallel to the Laozi found in other early texts. The Laozi is here treated not as the work of a single author, but as a patchwork compilation which evolved cumulatively into its extant form over a period of several centuries. In his study Shima first attempts to date the emergence of a core text and then to delineate the stages of accretion through which it passed as it came to assume its present form. The object of the investigation is thus the words of the text itself and their co-occurrence in other texts rather than the personality with which the text has been associated.

The discovery of two second century B.C. MSS. of the Laozi is of no immediate relevance to Qian Mu's or even the traditional theories of authorship since both posit a date of composition for the Laozi that is too early to be called in question by the existence of the MWD materials. On the other hand, Shima's argument, first published in 1973, comes into conflict with the evidence later unearthed at Changsha. The theory of multiple authorship has not been completely refuted, however, and still merits detailed discussion in the light of the MSS.

Shima begins with the 'inner' chapters of the Zhuangzi which, he agrees with Qian Mu, predate the composition of the Laozi. He regards the theory of universal change (物化)

enunciated in the 'inner' chapters, particularly in the 'Qiwulun' as the intellectual antecedent of Laoism. He believes that the philosophy of Laozi emerged as an attempt on the part of Zhuangzi's school to apply his notions about natural change to the world of human affairs. This pragmatic offshoot of Zhuangzi's metaphysics gradually gained currency so that in the later 'outer' and 'miscellaneous' chapters of the Zhuangzi we find not only passages identical with or similar to sections of the Laozi, but in the 'Gengsangchu' chapter locutions such as 'the way/words of Lao Dan' (老聃之道/言). This strongly suggests that by the date of these chapters there existed a body of thought associated with the name Lao Dan. Further evidence of this comes from the 'Tianlun' chapter of the Xunzi (cited above) where Laozi's ideas are briefly described along with those of other Zhanguo thinkers. Finally, in the 'Tianxia' chapter of the Zhuangzi, which contains a similar overview of the intellectual currents of pre-Qin China, Lao Dan is quoted and assigned a position in importance ahead of Zhuang Zhou himself. From this evidence Shima infers that what he calls the 'primitive text' of the Laozi had appeared by the time of the 'Tianlun' chapter of the Xunzi. In this he again agrees with Qian Mu, though Qian, of course, dates the complete Laozi to this period. Shima views the later and fuller account of Laozi's philosophy in the 'Tianxia' chapter of the Zhuangzi as the historical core of Laoism, a standard against which all statements later attributed to Laozi can be tested. Parts of the TTS which neither duplicate nor harmonize with the passage

in 'Tianxia' Shima regards as later accretions to this core (KS 3a).

This is surely one of the most radical criticisms ever advanced of the authenticity of the TTS. Shima marshals support for this view by listing a total of thirteen examples of phrases parallel to the TTS but attributed to quite different sources in pre-Han works. For instance, the phrase 行不言之教 found in Chapter 2 of the TTS is attributed to Huangdi in Chapter 22 of the Zhuangzi. Or again, statements very similar to the 將欲廢之必固興之 將欲奪之必固與之 of Laozi 36 appear in both HFZ ('Shuolin') and the Zhanguo where they are attributed to the Zhoushu (周書). In each of these thirteen cases Shima assumes the wording was borrowed and incorporated into the Laozi from an earlier source. This then is the method by which the text of the Laozi was gradually put together from extremely diverse sources over a period of time extending from the late Zhanguo to the end of Western Han. As for the compiler of the most 'primitive' layer of the Laozi, Shima proposes identifying him as Heshangzhangren (河上丈人).¹⁵

The next stage in the growth of the Laozi, according to Shima, can be inferred from the many verbatim quotations from the text in the HFZ. Still further augmentation had occurred by the time of the Huainanzi. This can be demonstrated, Shima maintains, by the fact that the opening sentence of Laozi 1 quoted in the 'Jielao' chapter of HFZ reoccurs together with the second sentence (i.e. 名可名非常名) added in the 'Daoying' chapter of the Huainanzi. Shima infers that 名可名 ... was added

to 道可道 ... some time between the composition of these two works.¹⁶ Another example of this gradual accretion of phrases to the Laozi comes from comparison of the 'Gengsangchu' chapter of the Zhuangzi again with the 'Daoying'. In the former we find a string of statements attributed to Laozi that appear in Chapters 10, 22 and 55 of the TTS. Though there are points of identity between the two texts, the Zhuangzi passage includes a number of phrases not found in the Laozi. The 'Daoying' version, on the other hand, is identical in every respect with the opening of Laozi 10, including the phrase 專氣至柔 which does not appear in the Zhuangzi. Shima's inference is that this four-character phrase was added to the Laozi sometime between the date of the 'Gengsangchu' and the 'Daoying'.

Chiefly because of obscure chronology, Shima's hypothesis of the patchwork compilation of the Laozi is, up to this point, difficult either to prove or disprove. He begins with a very minimal Ur-Laozi to which substantial layers were added during the late Warring States period. This view of the origin of the text stands in diametric opposition to the traditional assumption that Lao Dan described in Shiji 63 as an older contemporary of Confucius was the sole author of the Laozi. Yet Shima's theory agrees much more closely with what modern scholars have inferred about the methods of compilation and transmission of pre-Han texts (see Lau 1963:147-174). Still, we may question Shima's rather loose criteria for identifying quotations: vague similarity of content to some passage in the TTS of Laozi seems to be all that is required for him to claim a

phrase for his primitive Laoist core.¹⁷ A more fundamental methodological assumption of Shima's also requires examination: he recognizes as belonging to the primitive Laozi only those statements which have been quoted and attributed to Laozi in other texts. Prior to the HFZ, if a quotation is not explicitly attributed to Laozi, Shima assumes that the borrowing went the other way, i.e. the phrase was adopted by the Laozi at a later date. This methodology sounds rigorous; it is, in fact, too rigorous for the material to which it is applied. Just because Laozi 8 is not cited in a single pre-Han source, must we necessarily conclude that it did not become a part of the Laozi until Han times? This strict reliance on quotation, if applied to the dating of other pre-Han philosophical works soon results in absurdity. We know as little about Zhuang Zhou as we do about Lao Dan, yet no one relies solely on citations in other early texts in attempting to date the 'inner' chapters of the Zhuangzi. Admittedly, the lack of any historical reference in the Laozi and the terse, aphoristic style of the text makes it very difficult to spot possible interpolations. Would it be demonstrably wrong, however, to posit the existence of the text of Laozi, substantially as we know it today, in the middle of the third century B.C.? Identical passages contained in later works could then be explained as unacknowledged quotation of this fully-formed Laozi. Perhaps the major difficulty with such general hypotheses as these lies in the fact that we lack a rigorous chronology for the evolution of any pre-Han text in which parallels to the Laozi occur.

With the next step in Shima's argument we reach less speculative ground. Those chapters of the present Laozi not quoted in the Huainanzi, HFZ or Zhuangzi Shima treats as post-Huainanzi accretions to the text.¹⁸ Though the Huainanzi may possibly incorporate some earlier material, it is extremely unlikely that its compilation predates the maturity of its patron, Liu An (179-122 B.C.). D.C. Lau places it at about 140 B.C. (1963:175). The disproof of Shima's hypothesis is, of course, in the existence of the MWD MSS. To reiterate, these two copies of the complete Laozi, corresponding in substance to the transmitted versions, were sealed in a tomb in 168 B.C., and one of the MSS. was almost certainly copied before 206 B.C. Thus, we know now that whatever process of accretion and interpolation occurred in the formation of the Laozi, it had reached virtual completion by 206 B.C. The discoveries at MWD point up the difficulties in attempting to date a text on the basis of parallel passages found in other works, unless the direction of borrowing, i.e. the date of the parallel text, has been established. This is not to say that Shima has been proved completely mistaken in his treatment of much of the Laozi as a patchwork compilation; it merely means that overconfidence in the validity of his dating procedure led him to an erroneous conclusion.

Kimura Eiichi, as summarized in English by Hurvitz, also adheres to the theory that the Laozi underwent gradual augmentation during the Warring States period. However, he is less precise than Shima about the several stages of accretion

through which the text passed simply because he recognizes that short passages and locutions shared by two pre-Han works were not necessarily 'borrowed by either from the other, but rather the common property of all Chinese philosophers of the time' (Hurvitz 1961:315).

Shima next gives examples of some of the ways in which he believes the earlier versions of the Laozi were amplified and expanded: sections were supplemented to give a sense of completeness, the wording of some passages was dilated, maxims and locutions were repeated in different sections of the work and transitional passages supplied. Much of this seems to make very good sense if we push the period of these interpolations back from before 10 B.C. (the approximate date of Liu Xiang's redaction of the Laozi) to almost two centuries earlier for the MWD texts. In one case, Shima's speculation about the late addition of epexegetical words to Chapter 71 is confirmed by the MSS. (Ks 7a, AL 7b.3, BL 7b.11).

The version of the Laozi known to Sima Qian contained over five thousand characters, a figure which tallies well with both the length of BL (5,467 characters) and the several TTS examined by Fu Yi (傅奕) in early Tang times (Shiji 63.6 BL 9a.5, 15b.9 and KS 5b). The work thus described in the Shiji was almost certainly collated with other texts by Liu Xiang at the end of the first century B.C. Though they differ in many matters of detail, the lack of major discrepancies in style and content between the transmitted versions leads Shima to posit Liu Xiang's redaction as the archetype of all extant editions of the

Laozi. Although Liu Xiang's Laozi has not survived, it established in the early first century B.C. a textual orthodoxy which has continued unbroken, according to Shima. The new evidence from MWD suggests that this orthodoxy may extend back as far as the late third century B.C.

If we disregard the mistaken conclusion reached by Shima on the basis of the pre-MWD evidence, is there any way of salvaging his theory of cumulative compilation of the Laozi by adjusting it to the new MS. evidence? If we retain Shima's date for the composition of the Ur-Laozi, the process of accretion and augmentation he describes would have to have taken place between the early third century B.C. and the accession of Han Gaozu in 206 B.C., the latest possible date for the copying of AL. While it is not impossible to conceive of such a process occurring in less than one hundred years, this greatly shortened time-span seems to lend support to the single-author hypothesis. As mentioned above, the mere existence of the MSS. does not offer any sort of proof of either of these views; however, the plausibility of the theory of cumulative compilation has, I believe, suffered in the light of the MS. evidence.

The transmission of the Laozi

The twenty-odd transmitted versions of the Laozi collated by Shima in KS are grouped into six textual traditions: 1) the Yan Zun (嚴遵) text, 2) the Wang Bi (王弼) tradition, 3) the Fu Yi (傅奕) or guben (古本) text, 4) the Xiang'er (想爾) texts from Dunhuang, 5) the Heshanggong (河上公) tradition, and 6) the text

accompanying the commentary composed by the Tang Emperor Xuanzong (玄宗御注本). With the aim of establishing the relative age and thus authenticity of each of these traditions, Shima traces their lines of descent through bibliographic records as well as official and Daoist historical writings. This is a task requiring the command of a great number and variety of sources together with carefully considered speculation with which to fill the inevitable lacunae in over a thousand years of bibliographic tradition. The length and intricacy of Shima's arguments fully reflect the complex nature of these problems. What follows is no more than a summary of his conclusions, some of which in the light of the new MS. material suggest fruitful avenues for future research.

The Yan Zun (YZ) text

A brief biography of Yan Zun is found in Hanshu 42 where he is mentioned as a mentor of Yang Xiong (53-18 B.C.), making him roughly contemporaneous with Liu Xiang. Because this text does not differ significantly from the other transmitted versions, Shima concludes that Yan must have based his text on Liu Xiang's redaction. Yan is further credited with a commentary in two juan which disappears from bibliographic notice after Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen xulu (經典釋文序錄) of c. 580. His text of the Laozi is known as Zhiqui or Laozi zhiqui (指歸) and beginning with the Suishu bibliography is variously listed as having 11, 14 and 13 juan. By Song times a commentary by Gushenzi (谷神子) had become attached to this text and it is

this version with commentary, minus the first six juan corresponding to the 'Daojing', that has been preserved in the Daozang.

The Wang Bi (WB) text

Though or perhaps because Wang Bi (d. 249) composed an influential commentary on the Laozi, the present state of both his text and commentary is extremely corrupt, according to Shima. The work is listed in the bibliographies of Sui, Tang and Song times and is quoted by Yan Shigu (581-645) in his commentary to the Hanshu. By this time, however, an attempt was being made by supporters of the Heshanggong text to homogenize Wang Bi's version with their own in the interests of religious orthodoxy. Though Wang Bi's text survived in a mutilated state, there was evidently a period in the Southern Song when it all but disappeared from sight. The earliest edition of the text extant today is found in the Zhengtong Daozang of 1445 and here it is obvious that both the Laozi and its commentary have suffered heavy alteration in the direction of the Heshanggong tradition. All later redactions of Wang Bi's text stem from this corrupt version.

The Fu Yi (FY) text

Fu Yi (558-640) served as Grand Astrologer (太史令) in the early years of the Tang dynasty. His text of the Laozi together with a commentary, which may have been no more than a collection of sound glosses, was transmitted intact until the end of the

Song. By the time of the compilation of the Daozang in the first half of the fifteenth century, the commentary had been almost entirely lost. In addition to the Daozang edition, a slightly altered version of FY was the basis of a recension of the Laozi by Fan Yingyuan (范應元) of the Southern Song. Thus, Fan's text (FY) is treated as belonging to the Fu Yi tradition in Shima's variorum.

Shima quotes from a Song account preserved in the Daozang a passage describing Fu Yi's collation of various texts in the preparation of his recension (KS 10b). Mention is made in this passage of a text reported recovered from the tomb of Xiang Yu's concubine, Yu Ji (虞姬). If Fu Yi had access to such a presumably pre-Han text and actually made use of it in his collation, we might then expect to find in his redaction some earlier readings not preserved in the other TTS. This possibility will be investigated more closely when we examine passages from the MWD MSS. and compare them with the versions recorded in KS. Shima's description of FY as having been heavily contaminated by other traditions does not bode well, however (KS 51b).

The Xiang'er (XE) texts

This text represents considerable tampering with Liu Xiang's recension and together with the Heshanggong tradition has exerted great influence on the transmission of the Laozi. Though no mention of XE is made in the bibliographic chapters of the Sui and Tang histories, Lu Deming records a 'Xiangyu' (想余)

commentary attributed to both Zhang Lu (張魯, d. 216), the grandson of Zhang Daoling (張道陵) and a certain Liu Biao (劉表). The only other bibliographic entry for XE from the medieval period is found in the 'Guangshengyi xu' (廣聖義序) by the late ninth century Daoist Du Guangting (杜光庭). Here the commentary is attributed to Zhang Daoling himself. Probably not long after this, XE disappeared from sight until the turn of this century when several MSS. belonging to this tradition were discovered at Dunhuang. Shima argues at some length in favor of identifying Zhang Lu as the editor of this text. The commentary apparently embodies the interpretation of Zhang Lu but was put into writing by his pupil Xu Laile (徐來勒); thus, it should properly be known as the 'Zhangxu' text. However, as Shima explains, the surname Zhang of the patriarchs of the Daoist church was anathematized and in this case Xiang was substituted (KS 21a). Xiangxu (想徐) became, in the process of transmission, corrupted to Xiangyu (想余) as found in the bibliography of Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen. Still later, 余 was misread as the grass form of the graph 爾 (viz. 尔) or possibly as 尔, a frequently encountered graphic alternate for 爾, and thus the referentless name 想爾 was born.

The Heshanggong (HSG) text

Sima Qian makes brief reference to a Heshangzhangren (丈人) in the Shiji (80.17) in a context that would place him chronologically in the middle of the Warring States period. A later legend concerning the transmission of Laozi's teachings

through HSG to Han Wendi is found in some versions of Ge Hong's Shenxianzhuan (神仙傳) but Shima concurs with other scholars in regarding this latter account as an interpolation (KS 26a, 53a.40). The earliest mention of the HSG edition of the Laozi is found in the Lianglu (梁錄, 520-526), a bibliography of the early sixth century, now known only through extensive quotations preserved in the bibliographic chapter of the Suishu of 656. The Lianglu attributes a commentary on the Laozi to Heshangzhangren of the Warring States period, but this work had been lost by the time the Sui bibliography was compiled. Shima presents a long and intricate refutation of this traditional attribution and seeks to demonstrate that the HSG text and comentary are both forgeries of the late fifth century. No doubt the strongest evidence in his favor is the fact that the commentary makes extensive use of earlier commentaries on the Laozi, including works as late as that of Gu Huan (顧歡, fl. 483). On the other hand, we find the HSG commentary itself quoted by Huang Kan (皇侃, 488-545) in his scholia on the Lunyu (論語義疏). This allows us to date the HSG commentary quite precisely to the late fifth or early sixth century. The exact derivation of the HSG text is more difficult to determine because of the likelihood of contamination between texts even after the transmitted traditions had become established. Shima cites a number of examples which support his contention that the HSG text is a redaction of the XE (KS 32b).

The Xuanzong text

This edition of the text was produced with commentary by the Tang emperor between the years 723 and 732. Xuanzong based his redaction on the XE and HSG texts, selecting readings from both. Thus, it represents a blending of two earlier traditions and must be used with care in collation. All later editions of the Laozi are likewise composite versions and so have little value as textual witnesses.

Shima's variorum and recensions

The history of critical recensions of the Laozi begins with Lu Deming's Daodejing yinyi (道德經音義). Lu accepted WB as the most authentic text and compared it to other versions, particularly the HSG. Unfortunately, by his time the former had already become contaminated by the latter. Until Qing times little was accomplished in the area of textual analysis of the Laozi other than the noting of variants. Shima Kunio's purpose in preparing KS was to classify all the best extant editions according to the textual tradition to which they belong and then to produce a recension for each tradition. He has also included a large number of parallel passages and verbatim quotations from the Laozi found in a wide variety of sources extending from the pre-Han corpus to the Taiping yulan of 983. He quotes in full the early commentaries (i.e. XE, WB and HSG) as there are not a few cases where, in reiterating the Laozi text, the commentaries preserve readings which in the text itself have been corrupted through the influence of other traditions. For each of his six recensions, he provides notes in classical Chinese on the source

and extent of contamination between texts as well as the rationale for his choice among the variants. Finally, he suggests that his recensions of the 'Daojing' of WB and the 'Dejing' of YZ taken together form a definitive text (定本) of the Laozi.

It remains for the present author to clarify the approach to the study of the MWD MSS. adopted in this essay. If, for instance, the MSS. differed radically from the TTS of the Laozi, there would be cause for attempting a reassessment of early Daoist thought. This, however, is not the case. To be sure, there are a number of brief passages 'missing' in the MSS. and thus perhaps later interpolations.¹⁹ Likewise there are a few individual words and a phrase or two unique to the MWD versions of the text.²⁰ There are even cases of the additional particles of the MSS. disambiguating difficult readings in the TTS.²¹ The number and importance of these discrepancies, however, is not sufficiently great to urge a complete rethinking of the Laozi. The value of the evidence which can be gleaned from the silk MSS. is of a different kind.

Until as recently as ten years ago the extant MSS. remains of pre-Han China were confined almost entirely to epigraphic materials, stelae, the Shang and Zhou bronzes and the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. The extensive pre-Han literary corpus was known wholly through the medium of TTS. It is this body of often copied and recopied data on which linguists have, faute-de-mieux, based their observations and hypotheses on the nature

of the early Chinese language. The obvious philological value of early MS. material lies in its use as the best available touchstone for these descriptions and analyses of classical Chinese.²²

In studying an early Chinese MS., the student is forced to become his own editor, applying what he knows of paleography, historical phonology and grammar to the decipherment and interpretation of the text before him. If it is a text which also exists in transmitted versions, his task will be lightened by the TTS themselves and the help afforded by a tradition of scholarly interpretation embodied in commentaries. But his investigation will also be complicated by the need to compare scrupulously the MSS. with the transmitted versions and to consider their inter-relationship. Theories of the derivation of textual witnesses are necessarily based on the investigation of the nature and extent of variation between them. The two essays which follow aim to clarify what is meant by 'variation' in the context of the MWD MSS. The first is a classification and discussion of the several kinds of variation possible between single graphs (i.e. substitution variants) in the MSS. and TTS. In the second, selected passages will be collated in an attempt to discover what the different types of variation reveal about the derivation of the two MSS. and the quotations from the Laozi found in HFZ.

Finally, the heuristic nature of these studies must be emphasized. It would be overly sanguine to expect definitive evidence on the date of the Laozi or the course of its

transmission to emerge from this study. At this early stage in the author's acquaintance with the methodology of textual criticism, his objective must remain a humble one: to achieve a clear perception of some of the problems encountered in the study of early Chinese MSS. He takes heart, however, in the frequently encountered assertion that textual criticism is a skill learned more by grappling with a MS. than by the mastery of manuals. If this is so, then the pedagogical value of the exercise remains intact. The good critic aspires to the impartiality and clear reasoning enjoined in the critical writings of A.E. Housman and to the scrupulous attention to detail which can lead to the results claimed by Alphonse Dain: 'On n'oubliera pas ... que tous les progrès de la philologie ont été faits autour du problème de l'édition des textes' (1964:159).

Notes to Introduction

1. The term 'transliteration' is here used in the specialized sense given it by Alphonse Dain (1964:125): 'the operation [or result] of transcribing a text from the earlier graphic style of the exemplar to a more modern style'. The MWD MSS. themselves are written in the small-seal and clerical scripts; the versions of these MSS. published in periodicals and book form are all transliterations into kaishu.

2. Principal sources for this brief summary on the MWD excavations and recovery of the silk MSS. are as follows: Hunansheng 1974, Xiao 1974, Tang Lan et al. 1974, Gao Heng and Chi Xichao 1976, Buck 1975, Loewe 1977 and Li Xueqin 1979.

3. Li was probably already Chancellor (丞相) to King Wuhui (吳回) of Changsha when the Han central government enfeoffed him as Marquis of Dai in 193 B.C. He died seven years later in 186 B.C. (Shiji 19.6, Hanshu 16.618, Ma 1972:16). His name is found written 利蒼 on one of the seals recovered from his tomb, 利倉 in the Shiji and 黎失蒼 in the Hanshu.

4. In his position as Chancellor, Li was apparently succeeded by a certain Yue (越) who in 184 B.C. was enfeoffed as Marquis of Liling (醴陵. Shiji 19.6, Hanshu 16.624).

5. The importance of the figure of Huangdi in the 'Shidajing' has led other scholars to identify this text with the Yellow Emperor's (Book of) Lord and Vassal (黄帝君臣) or the Li Mu (力牧), both listed in the Hanshu bibliography (30.1731).
6. Steve Dickinson of the University of Washington has written an exploratory study of this problem, 'Historical Implications of the Ma Wang Tui texts: Huang-lao Taoism Reconsidered'.
7. Concerning the evolution of these styles of script we have the testimony of Xu Shen (30-124) in the preface to the SW (Duan 1815:15.20) and Ban Gu (32-92) in the bibliographic chapter of the Hanshu (30.1721). The small-seal represents a modification of the style which had developed in the state of Qin during the Zhanguo period. On the unification of China by Qin Shihuang in 221 B.C. it was made the standard. The clerical script began as a simplification of the small-seal, a kind of shorthand for use in record-keeping, and later established itself as a standard script.
8. Examples of the small-seal and clerical graphs are copied from Akai 1974.
9. The Chinese scholars who have written on the dating of the Laozi MSS. differ among themselves on the question of when an emperor's personal name became taboo. Xiao Han (74:41)

dates AL between 206 and 195 B.C., implying that 邦 became taboo only on the death of Liu Bang. Gao Heng and Chi Xichao (LZ 111,120), on the other hand, assume that the taboo against 邦 began in 206 B.C. when Liu Bang became emperor; hence, they date the copying of AL to before 206 B.C. Similarly, they state that BL must have been produced by 194 B.C. when Huidi assumed the throne. Although the locus classicus for the tabooing of names states that the taboo went into effect only after the completion of funeral rites (卒哭乃諱. Liji SSJZS:5.58b), this probably refers to Zhou practice. In the Han it was customary to avoid the personal name of the reigning emperor as is shown by an amnesty proclaimed for violators of the current taboo by Han Xuandi, Liu Bingyi (病已), in 64 B.C. (Hanshu 8.256, quoted in Chen Yuan 1928:129). Both syllables of Xuandi's first name (recorded in Hanshu 8.238) are very common words in Chinese. This had led to frequent violation of the taboo which, in the end, prompted the Son of Heaven to give himself a new name, Xun (詢), thereby releasing 邦 for general use once more. This bit of evidence supports the earlier dates for the Laozi MSS. proposed by Gao and Chi.

10. Xiao Han extends the possible date of BL down to the end of the Empress Lu's regency in 180 B.C. He does not explain why he thinks the taboo against Huidi's name did not go into effect until eight years after his death. Incidentally, the fact that we find such uniform avoidance of the graph 邦 in

BL casts suspicion on the frequent assertion that tabooing practice in the Han was much less strict than in later times. Hu Shi has written at some length on this topic citing many instances in the transmitted versions of the Shiji, Hanshu etc. where taboos were not followed (Hu 1943, 1943a). The evidence from Eastern Han memorial stelae makes it clear that the observance of taboos in that period was indeed lax. The only Western Han evidence available, that from transmitted literary and historical documents, is much less reliable since the likelihood of the later restitution of once-tabooed graphs is quite high. The very early Han date of BL suggests that the scribe may have been following a stricter Qin practice of tabooing which was gradually relaxed as the Han dynasty progressed. Further study of early MS. materials will be necessary before the details of Western Han tabooing can be clarified.

11. The sequence of passages (identified by their later chapter numbers) cited in the 'Jielao' is as follows: 38, 58, 59, 60, 46, 14, 25, 1, 50, 67, 53, 54. For the 'Yulao': 46, 54, 26, 36, 63, 64, 52, 71, 64, 47, 41, 33, 27. Chapters 59, 60 and 47 are quoted in their entirety. Citations from Chapters 46 and 54 are found in both the 'Jielao' and 'Yulao'; when taken together, these quotations form the whole of the transmitted versions of these two chapters.

12. In his annotations on an edition in 13 juan of the Laozi

zhiqui (老子指歸), Chao Gongwu observes that its chapter division differs slightly from the other editions (言者本), implying by this expression that it is nonstandard (Chao 1967:2.693).

13. Graphic divergence between the two MSS. is common, but only infrequently does it point to a difference in meaning. In other words, one often finds the same morpheme given two different graphic realizations in the MSS. The reason for this is the lack of graphic standardization in earlier stages of Chinese. (See Part One below on loan characters.)
14. Qian dates the death of Zhuang Zhou to 289 B.C. or a little later (1956:564). Xunzi died in the middle of the third century B.C. (Lau 1963:175); thus, according to Qian's hypothesis, the Laozi was composed some time in the first half of the third century B.C. This late Zhanguo date is corroborated by the rhyming evidence in the text which has been analyzed by Karlgren (1932) and reassessed in the light of the new MS. evidence by Pulleyblank (1979:1-12).
15. Qian Mu regards 'Heshangzhangren' as an agnomen of his candidate for 'the real Laozi', Zhan He (1956:266). Elsewhere (KS 7a) Shima suggests as a possible author of the 'primitive' Laozi the figure Gengsangchu (庚桑楚), a character Sima Qian denies ever existed (Shiji 63.10). Given the fragmented nature of the evidence and the

number of variables involved, one can only remark that this sort of speculation is of little help in achieving a better understanding of the text.

16. The first sentence is quoted alone elsewhere in the Huainanzi ('Fanlun'), as noted by Shima (KS 4a). This can be explained by the existence of two versions of the Laozi at the time the Huainanzi was compiled, Shima suggests, one more 'primitive' and the other incorporating later interpolations. 'Fanlun' quotes from the former, 'Daoying' from the latter.
17. This leads to some rather far-fetched parallels, e.g. the identification of 人皆求福己獨曲全, attributed to Lao Dan in 'Tianxia' with Laozi 22 曲則全 枉則正, or the claim that the meaning of 以深為根 also from 'Tianxia' is somehow related to 是謂深根固蒂 of Laozi 59, or that 道昭而不道, 言辯而不及 from 'Qiwulun' is the ultimate source of 名可名非常名 of Laozi 1 (KS 3a, 6b).
18. Shima's listing of the chapters of the Laozi not quoted in the Huainanzi (KS 4b) is marred by inconsistency. Chapters 17, 29 and 66, for example, contain phrases also found in the Huainanzi.
19. In addition to the two sentences in Chapter 71 discussed in Shima's preface, I have noted the following passages in the

TTS which lack reflexes in the MSS. Reference to KS will show that many of these passages are also omitted from one or more of the transmitted versions.

Chapter 2 生而不有

3 為無為

15 孰能

23 信不足焉有不信

24 喘者不久
跨者不行

25 周行不殆

27 常善救物

29 或噓或吹

30 大軍之後有凶年

34 萬物恃之以生而不辭
衣被萬物

37 無為而無不為

39 萬物無以生將恐滅

73 是以聖人猶難之

20. An obvious example is the opening of Chapter 37 where the MSS. have the sentence 道恒无名 (AL 14a.10, BL14b.7). The TTS all show 道常無為而無不為 (KS 130).

21. 恒天欲也以觀其眇, 恒有欲也以觀其所噉 (AL 8b.9). Though BL is defective for part of this passage, it retains the

particle 也 in both sentences. All the TTS lack these two occurrences of the particle 也; hence the punctuation of this passage has long been a point of controversy. The presence of 欲 in the MSS. means that 欲 must be understood as object of the verbs 无/有 and thus translated '...always rid yourself of desires in order to observe its secrets;/But always allow yourself to have desires in order to observe its manifestations' (Lau 1963:57). The alternate interpretation which originated in the Song dynasty punctuated after 无 and 有, yielding '...let there always be non-being, so we may see their subtlety (i.e. the subtlety of the ten thousand things),/ And let there always be being, so we may see their outcome' (Chan 1963:97, also 99.5 for a discussion of this controversial reading).

22. This is not to claim infallibility for any single early MS.; but, at the very least, one can be certain that such a source will not contain errors from a later age. That the MSS. do provide clarification of moot points in the grammar of Old Chinese is shown in the case of 弗/不. Several conflicting descriptions of the distinction between these two negatives have been proposed; the evidence from AL and BL confirms the validity of one of those descriptions for the period of the MSS. The controversy and the new evidence have been summarized by Pulleyblank (1979:17-22).

Part One

The editing of MS. material generally proceeds from decipherment and transcription/transliteration to collation with other witnesses and finally interpretation. In other words, discussion of the relationship of a MS. to other versions of the same text must be founded on a clear understanding of the nature and extent of variation between the versions being compared.

In the case of the MWD MSS. of Laozi, the work of decipherment and transliteration has largely been completed by a team of Chinese scholars who have direct access to the MS. remains. To date they have published four transliterations of the MSS., each incorporating revisions of its predecessor.¹ Of the two used as sources for this study, one (LZ) is annotated and contains much helpful information on the meaning of rare graphs and the reconstruction of corrupt passages.² However, there has yet been no general classification of the ways in which the TTS vary from the MSS. at the level of single graphs. In the first part of this section we will attempt such a classification in the belief that it will facilitate later discussion of the connection between the MSS. and other versions of the Laozi.

Once a graph from the MS. has been deciphered and transliterated into its modern kaishu equivalent, the next step is to determine its relation to the corresponding graph or graphs in the TTS of the Laozi. At the graphic level this

relationship will be one of identity, which, of course, creates no difficulties, or non-identity which can be accounted for in one of the following ways.

I. Taboo characters

This category was referred to in the Introduction as a means of dating the copying of these two MSS. In addition to the alternation noted there between in AL and in BL and the vast majority of TTS, the following graphs usually occur in the TTS in place of the taboo characters found in the MSS.:

滿 for 盈, personal name of Han Huidi (r. 194-188 B.C.)

常 for 恒, personal name of Han Wendi (r. 179-157 B.C.),
always in TTS

開 for 啟, personal name of Han Jingdi (r. 156-141 B.C.),
always in TTS

不 for 弗, personal name of Han Zhaodi (r. 86-73 B.C.).

人 and 民 alternate frequently and quite unpredictably both between MSS. and TTS and between the various TTS themselves. Since both graphs appear in the MSS., the confusion between them in the TTS is probably older than the tabooing of 民, personal name of Tang Taizong (r. 627-650), though the Tang taboo may well have aggravated the confusion.

Just because a TT does not observe one of the above taboos cannot be taken as proof that its prototype dates from before the time the taboo went into effect. It was common practice to

restore the original graphs to TTS after a taboo became inoperative, though, of course, there was a great deal of variation in the degree of thoroughness with which this was done. It appears that sometimes it was not done at all as in the cases of and in the TTS of Laozi. In accounting for this phenomenon we have to assume that the function of these graphs as substitutes for taboo words in the Laozi was forgotten.

II. Semantic Variation

This is a kind of variation in which neither of the graphs involved was ever tabooed, yet both readings make good sense as they stand. The variants are often synonyms reflecting a difference in phrasing rather than in basic meaning.

1. 云有余而益不足 BL 8b.7

益] 補 most TTS (KS 216, Ch. 77)

2. 故立天子置三卿 AL 5b.7

卿] 公 all TTS (KS 184, Ch. 62)

3. 道者萬物之注也 BL 5b.12

注] 奧 all TTS (KS 184, Ch. 62)

This sort of variation between the MSS. and the TTS is, on the whole, relatively rare. In comparing a single TT to the MSS. one will find a number of these variants; however, as there are, in most cases, other textual traditions which will be found to agree with the MSS., the MWD material offers little previously unattested data of this kind.

Since the above two types of variation are semantic in nature they are not treated in the published transliterations of the MSS. One uncovers them by collating the MSS. with the transmitted versions of the text. The remaining three kinds of variation however, represent deviation from modern graphic standards and hence are 'corrected' or at least noted in BS as follows: x (y). This simply means that MS. graph x should be understood as graph y. In LZ this convention has been refined so as to distinguish between MS. graphs which are patently incorrect (i.e. miswritings, graphs which represent words inappropriate to the context) and non-standard graphic forms (i.e. allographs) of words appropriate to the context (i.e. abbreviated forms and loan characters). In LZ the former are emended between wedge-shaped brackets while the standard forms for the latter are provided in parentheses.

III. Graphic confusions (Miswriting)

There are a few examples in the MSS. where miswriting is the only possible explanation for a given graph. This conclusion has been reached only after careful consideration of the meaning, phonetic shape and graphic form of the word in question. The rationale for emending the MS. reading is as follows:

- a) The meaning of the MS. graph precludes treating it as a semantic variant; it cannot be made to fit the context.
- b) Phonological disparity between the variants precludes the treating of one as a loan character for the other.

c) The graphic similarity of the variants suggests scribal error.

In such cases emendation is by reference to a superior witness, the other MWD MS. whenever possible.

4. 若民恒是死 AL 7b.11

是] 畏 BL 8a.7

The word 是 in the context of the above passage simply does not make good sense. The superior reading 畏 is preserved not only in BL, but in all the TTS as well (KS 210, Ch. 74). The wide phonetic disparity between these variants corroborates the impression that AL at least was transcribed by sight from another MS., rather than taken down from dictation. To write 是 for 畏 involves a visual, not an aural, confusion.

One occasionally encounters examples of variation which are amenable to more than one interpretation. Either semantic variation or miswriting seems to provide a possible explanation for the next example.

5. 瀟呵始萬物之宗 AL 9a.9

瀟] 淵 BL 9b.7

SW 瀟 深清也从水肅聲

The syllable written 瀟 *si^hôk is found 淵 *'iwen ('watery abyss') in all the TTS (KS 60, Ch. 4) as well as in BL. Though no early textual examples of the AL graph have survived, it is

recorded in the SW with a definition ('deep and clear') which permits a perfectly sensible reading of 5: '(The Dao is) deep and clear like the great ancestor of the phenomenal world' (reading 始 as 似). I have counted two other occurrences of the graph 淵 in AL (LZ 20, 28) where BL and the TTS (KS 68, 128; Ch. 8, 36) record 淵, and one in the unique AM (24b.4). In all three of these cases 淵 does indeed appear to be the superior reading because of the presence of rhyming words in the environment.³ The question is whether 淵 in 5 should be considered an error for 淵 along with the majority of occurrences of 淵 in AL. There are two complementary principles which the Western textual critic might invoke at this point: utram in alterum abiturum erat -- 'which reading would be more likely to have given rise to the other?' -- and the answer, difficilior lectio probior -- 'when presented with two readings, one easier to understand than the other, the editor generally accepts the latter as the more reliable or original, on the assumption that the scribe would tend to interpolate or simplify the text he was copying in the easiest possible manner' (Kleinhenz 1976:285). If the 淵 in BL is explained as the interpolation of a relatively common synonym (a facilior lectio) for the rare 淵, then AL can be accepted as the sole witness of an earlier textual tradition. There is, to be sure, an argument from the principle of Ockham's razor which favors the uniform treatment of all occurrences of 淵 in AL and thus the emendation of 5 to 淵. This is persuasive but not conclusive because it discounts the genuine possibility that the variant in 5 is an

occurrence of the word attested in SW. In favor of the reading in AL it is worth remarking that because a scribe is capable of mistaking 淵 for 瀟 three times does not mean he is incapable of copying 瀟 correctly. The single general principle of textual criticism is that 'each case is special' and deserves its own special solution.⁴ In the present case one is hard put to choose between the alternatives.

IV. Simplified Graphs

This type of variation is best described as a scribal shorthand in which enough of the graph is retained to allow recognition while the rest of the strokes are abbreviated. Its use is ubiquitous in both MSS. Some of these simplified graphs are themselves hapax legomena (see below) and may reflect scribal idiosyncrasy.

𠂔 for 𠂔 BL 2a.5, 9b.4, 11b.9

𠂔 for 聖, unique to BL where it occurs at least six times, 3b.7 passim

𠂔 for 爵, AL 3b.12

The contrastive distribution of these abbreviated graphs would suggest that AL and BL were transcribed by different hands.

V. Loan Characters (假借字)

Loan characters (LC) make up by far the largest category of single-graph variant in the MWD Laozi MS. Every LC gloss

(signalled x (y) in BS and LZ) implies the following relationship: MS. graph x is to be pronounced and understood as the less ambiguous (y) designated by the commentator. There are many hundreds of passages in the TTS of the early Chinese literary corpus which without recourse to this simple device of textual criticism would today remain impenetrable or at least invite serious misreading. The reasons for this are simple: standardization of the Chinese script was first promulgated in 221 B.C. by Li Si, prime minister of the First Emperor of Qin. Hence, any written material which predates this graphic reform will reflect the heterogeneous scribal practices of Zhou times. This is most emphatically demonstrated by the multiplicity of graphic forms found in the early bronze inscriptions. Furthermore, since a relatively high degree of graphic uniformity among scribes at the far-flung reaches of the Chinese empire cannot have been achieved for many centuries, it should come as no surprise that we continue to find large numbers of LC and 'non-standard' graphs on original documents which postdate the reform, such as the MSS. recovered at MWD. It seems reasonable to speculate that Li Si's standardization of the script had immediate effect on scribal practice only at the short-lived Qin court and perhaps its major provincial outposts. It was the continued maintenance of a single graphic standard at the court of the Han and later dynasties that over the centuries fostered the dissemination of a uniform script throughout the empire.

The ease with which a single LC equation can disentangle a

difficult phrase of classical Chinese has, quite predictably, led to the frequent misapplication of LC glosses in exegesis. The equating of graph x which no one can understand in the context with a more easily explicable (y) soon becomes the unskilled commentator's solution to almost all textual difficulties, particularly if he is prepared to ignore that certain degree of phonetic similarity supposed to obtain between x and (y). If x is to be pronounced and equated semantically with (y) in a given context, the assumption is that the normal pronunciation of x should not differ too widely from that of (y), otherwise graph x would not have been pressed into service by scribes to write the syllable elsewhere commonly represented by graph (y). In other words, x when used as an LC is a purely phonetic symbol; its usual semantic associations are irrelevant. For example, 肅 in 5 above could never function as an LC for 淵 simply because *s₁i^hok is phonetically incompatible with *'iwen; it is inconceivable that one could do duty phonetically for the other. Hence, they must be treated either as semantic variants (i.e. 肅 and 淵 read as independent words) or as a case of miswriting. Clearly, the phonetic affinity between x and (y) must be demonstrated in terms of the reconstructed values for Old Chinese (OC). For this reason the examination of LCS to discover the precise degree of phonetic divergence permissible between the pronunciations of x and (y) could not begin until the phonology of OC had been reconstructed in detail.

Bernhard Karlgren's reconstruction of the sound system of

OC was first published in 1940 and then, in a revised and expanded version, as GSR in 1957. Armed with this battery of systematic phonological data, he proceeded to examine critically the language of the TTS of the Zhou classics and in particular to scrutinize some of the thousands of glosses embedded in the commentaries to these early texts. The results of these labors can be found in a long series of articles extending from 'Glosses on the Kuo Feng Odes' (1942) right up to 'Moot Words in Some Chuang Tse Chapters' (1976), the last paper he published before his death in the autumn of 1978. His work on LCS takes the form of a long, critical review of over two thousand such glosses proposed by Chinese commentators from as early as the Eastern Han down to the present (Karlgren 1967). In the body of the article he dismisses many hundreds of LC proposals as 'phonetically impossible' on the grounds that the reconstructed normal pronunciation of x differs too widely from the reconstructed pronunciation of (y). For Karlgren, an LC equation is legitimate only when the phonetic disparity between x and (y) does not exceed the phonetic bounds of any single xiesheng (XS) series as Karlgren has defined and reconstructed them.

'XS series' is the name given to a group of graphs all of which employ the same phonetic 'speller' in their construction, e.g. the element 兂 in GSR #324 which includes compound graphs with such disparate modern pronunciations as rùi 兂, yùè 兂 and shuō 兂. The fact that a single graph 兂 with a meaning and pronunciation of its own (modern duì) was used repeatedly as a

phonetic element in the construction of compound graphs can only mean that at the time of their first appearance in the Zhou dynasty the pronunciations of 銳, 閱 and 言說 must all have been quite close to the pronunciation of 兗. This is one of the fundamental assumptions on which the work of reconstructing OC proceeds. Karlgren, incorporating additional evidence from other sources, reconstructs the pronunciation of these three graphs as *di_ŋwad, *di_ŋwat and *si_ŋwat respectively. Because the members of a XS series all share a common phonetic element, it goes without saying that such graphs can always, in principle, function as LC for each other. Karlgren, in fact, refers to members of the same phonetic series as 'authorized' LC. By tabulating the degree of phonetic variation found among the syllables of each XS series in OC and then grouping initials and rhymes separately, Karlgren provides a convenient array of the criteria by which he judges the validity of LC glosses (1967:10-17).

These basic points can easily be illustrated by a few examples from the MSS. Whenever we find, for instance, 胃 in the MSS. for 謂 in the TTS, we can immediately accept the former (lit. 'stomach') as LC for the latter ('call, refer to') because they both belong to the same XS series. This sort of LC, ubiquitous in the MWD material, is indicative of the low level of graphic standardization at the time the MSS. were copied. All cases of this type of alternation between members of the same phonetic series (兼 for 廉, 申 for 神, 郊 for 交, 始 and 怡 for 似, 聞 for 𡗗 etc., etc.) are unarguable as LC

and hence not further dealt with in this study. In some cases, the LC graphs belong to different phonetic series but are homophonous as far back as we can reconstruct them (e.g. ^{KK}𠂔 for 逝 and 周 for 舟). Finally, there is a large number of instances in which the graphs are not related and the syllables they represent are only imperfect homophones: 之 for 恃, 負 for 倍, 弄 for 寵, etc. The use of 之 to write 恃, however, is still acceptable since both syllables belong to the same rhyme group (之) while their initials, though not identical, do co-occur within single phonetic series. (止, a homophone except for tone of 之 is the phonetic in 恃.) Likewise, 負 in the MSS. is admissible as an LC for 倍 in the TTS because the phonetic variation between these two syllables can be found within individual XS series. (不 rhymes with 負 and is phonetic in 不, a word which rhymes with 倍; the initial consonants of 負 and 倍 are identical.) The fact that 弄 appears in BL for 寵 can be explained by pointing out that words homophonous (except for tone) with 弄 occur within the XS group to which 寵 belongs (viz. ^{KK}寵). Having laid aside this sort of orthodox LC, we will in the remainder of this section, examine loan variants from the MWD Laozi which do not seem to fit these basic criteria. As a heuristic guide in these analyses we will continue to use the phonetic contours of the XS series as best we can determine them, although further study of MS. and epigraphic sources may reveal that the LC practice of different periods and areas of pre-Qin China was not always congruent with what we know of XS phonetics.

As has been suggested above, Karlgren, on the basis of the same working hypothesis, was led to reject many LC glosses proposed by Chinese commentators who lacked his knowledge of the phonology of OC. To refute these dubious equations, he found it necessary to advance a set of criteria by which the validity of all LC glosses could be assessed. Quick to realize that the XS series of OC constitute a fossilized record of early LC practice, he adopted ad hoc the phonological contours of each of these series as a set of limits within which all valid LC proposals ought to be confined. Even as little as twenty years ago, Karlgren was unfortunately not in a position to infer the criteria governing LC use from a careful study of the occurrence of LC in early MSS. since at the time of his researches there were no such MSS. available. He seems occasionally to have made use of evidence from the bronze inscriptions, but, on the other hand, he did not undertake a thorough empirical study of LC practice in this important source. It is certainly true that, even when working with early MS. material, one ought to begin by testing the phonetic variation between each pair of LC against the variation found within XS series since each of these constitutes a cluster of primordial LCs; however, until sufficient data has been compiled, it is clearly a priori to claim that for all time and all place LC practice was limited by the phonetic bounds of these series. For one thing, this claim requires the concomitant assumption that, prior to standardization, all users of the written language had either innate or learned command of those phonetic bounds to guide them

in their orthography. In their transcriptions of documents, by sight and perhaps by ear, and in the composition of original material, it is the actual practice of scribes, observable in their MSS., which must be treated as the primary data from which we may then proceed to infer the general principles governing the use of LC in OC. Working from TTS, the victims of centuries of copying, editing and type-setting, Karlgren had no choice but to attack the problem of LC in reverse by advancing a set of 'principles' long before all the evidence is in. In a more constructive vein, the quantities of early MS. and epigraphic material now becoming available for study permit us to turn our attention from the TTS to a heuristic, empirical examination of precisely what LC practice meant to those who themselves composed and first copied the early documents. The gradual accumulation of LC data from these sources will, at some future date, either confirm our working hypothesis or point up its need for revision.

There is, of course, another level at which Karlgren's LC procedure can be called in question. This is the validity of his OC reconstructions themselves. For nearly every step of the argumentation in his LC article, the point d'appui remains his own hypotheses concerning the phonetic value of the syllables of OC. In the 1940's when his reconstruction first appeared his theories had few contestants; still, on general principles, it should be obvious that if the reconstructions themselves can be shown to be faulty, then his system of LC criteria will be invalidated. Over the years certain inconsistencies in his

treatment of the XS series and flaws in his methodology of reconstruction have become apparent. In many matters of detail, where the evidence is so often exiguous and/or equivocal, Karlgren's theories have evoked criticism and counter-evidence or at least, counter-interpretations of what evidence exists. A number of linguists have been motivated to fashion their own reconstructions of OC, witness the systems of Dong Tonghe, F.K. Li, Zhou Fagao and E.G. Pulleyblank. While this study cannot attempt an investigation of all the points of divergence among these reconstructions, reference will be made to them where relevant to the LC evidence discussed below.

Hapax Legomena

Hapax legomena (HL) do not form a separate class of textual variant; they are rather graphic forms unattested in the extant lexica of the Chinese script. In the present study, the term HL is used to refer to graphs not recorded in the largest lexicon of the modern kaishu script, the Zhongwen dacidian. Dictionaries of graphic forms found in bronze inscriptions have not been scrupulously searched. Yan Lingfeng provides a convenient list of the HL in the two Laozi MSS. (ST 41-44). Most of these unattested graphs form a sub-class of LC since through their obvious XS affiliations they can be linked phonetically to the graphs in the TTS.

6. 萬物草木之生也柔脆其死也榘𣎵 AL 8a.7

榘] 枯 . 𣎵] 槁 all TTS (KS 214, Ch. 76)

𣎵 is merely an unattested member of the phonetic series

which uses 高 as its speller, any of whose members can stand for any other. The standard graphic form of this syllable has 木 as signific. 木車, on the other hand, represents a syllable now written with a graph of a different XS series. This is still valid, however, since the series spelled with 車 includes 庫, homophonous except for tone with OC 枯.

7a. 不貴難得之騰 AL 6a.7

騰] 貨

BL 6b.1, all TTS (KS 190, Ch. 64)

7b. 萬物將自惹 AL 14a.10

惹] 化

BL 14b.7, all TTS (KS 130, Ch. 37)

In these two HLS 為 has been used as phonetic in place of the speller 化 of the standard graphs found in BL and the TTS. The loan of 為 for 化 is phonetically acceptable since both words belong to the same rhyme group and differ only slightly in kind but not place of initial articulation. This alternation between spellers is still found in the modern script where both 謊 and 訛 are accepted graphic forms of the word 謊 meaning 'falsehood'.

Some problematic single graph variants

8. 功述身苒 AL 9b.12

述] 遂 . 苒] 退 BL 10a.10

The transmitted versions of this passage show three different readings: one identical to BL, and two slightly

expanded versions, viz. 功成名遂身退 and 名成功遂身退 (KS 70, Ch. 9). In his translation W.T. Chan rejects the longer versions with their mention of 'fame accomplished' as incompatible with Daoist detachment from the quest for worldly success (1963:115). In any case, it is clear that the graphs 述 and 芮 in AL correspond in some way to 遂 (or possibly 成) and 退 in all other versions. What is the nature of the correspondence?

成 'complete, accomplish' is a synonym of 遂 and thus should be treated as a semantic variant. The two belong to completely different rhyme groups (耕 and 微 respectively) and thus are phonetically too distant to be considered LC.

The interpretation of 述 as LC for 遂, however, is quite acceptable despite Karlgren's objections that the correspondence is 'phonetically strained' or 'somewhat poor' (1967:#1551). These two words belong to the hekou category of the 微 rhyme which means that both syllables have a medial -w- followed by a mid-vowel and closed by a dental consonant. Karlgren reconstructs them in Ancient Chinese as *dz'iu_ət and *zwi- respectively. (His Archaic reconstruction of these initials is not reliable.) The co-occurrence in XS series of the initials represented by dz'- and z- in Karlgren's system can be exemplified by the pairs 順/巡, 將/序 and the double reading for 食, *dz'io_ək and *zi-. The final of the yin rhyme of this group has been reconstructed in various ways, as *-d and *-r by Karlgren and Dong, as *-d by Li, as *-r by Zhou and as *-l > -j by Pulleyblank. The validity of these reconstructed values does

not concern us here, the point to note being that there are contacts within XS series between the gù and rù subdivisions of the rhyme (e.g. 瘁/萃, 費/弗 and 氣/迄). Seen in the light of this evidence, it should be clear that 述 is an acceptable LC for 遂. Furthermore, both Karlgren (1967:#1549) and Shirakawa (1974:2.146) note that on early Zhou bronzes 述 often has the meaning of 遂 'consequently, thereupon', indicating that this loan has a long history.

These two words share the root meaning of 'follow a course' and may possibly be cognate. 遂 as a full verb means 'follow through, complete, accomplish,' but as a connective in narrative it introduces the last stage in a sequence of actions, 'thereupon, consequently'. 述 always functions as a full verb in OC usually with the sense of 'transmit, carry on' implying strict adherence to an earlier example or orthodoxy. This is one possible implication of Confucius' description of himself as a care-taker of Zhou tradition, a faithful transmitter of the way of the sage-kings, not an innovator---述而不作 (Lunyu 11.7.1).⁵ The sentence 父作之子述之 from the Zhongyong (SSJZS:5.885b) also exemplifies this basic meaning of 述: '(Wenwang's) father founded (the dynasty) and his son carried on'.

The second LC equation in 9 above, 芮 used to write 退, is more complex. Karlgren reconstructs the two syllables *^hniwəd and *t'wəd showing discrepancy both in the type of initial and the height of the nuclear vowel. Correspondence between ^h- and t'- is relatively rare but not unknown (能/態, 難/漢 and

耳 phonetic in 耳 7). As for the finals, several of the members of the phonetic series 內 belong in their Guangyun and modern readings to a different Middle Chinese (MC) rhyme (霽) from that of the speller 內 (隊). Because none of these aberrant syllables (viz. 芮, 內, 蚘) is found in rhyming position in the Shijing, phonologists have had little choice but to project the MC vocalic value back to OC and assign these words to the 祭 rhyme in spite of the fact that 內 with its mid-vowel belongs to the 微 group. This incongruence between the XS series and rhyme group has led Pulleyblank to hypothesize a secondary origin for the MC low vowel of 芮, i.e. a shift from an earlier mid-vowel shared with 內 to MC *-iaj^h by the time of the Guangyun (1979:25).

Turning now to the paleographic evidence, we find some indirect confirmation of this hypothesis. In the first place, 退 itself is a clerical-script simplification in which the earlier graphic form has been distorted beyond recognition. (退 certainly has no phonetic connection with 良 *kən, in spite of the appearance of the modern graph.) The syllable we today write 退 is found in SW written with the graph 𨔵 and glossed 卻 'decline; withdraw'. Xu Shen says it also means 'walk slowly' and then lists what he considers its three semantic components: 辵 'small steps', 日 'sun' and 夊 'walk slowly'. Though Xu does not identify a phonetic element among these, Pulleyblank (1979:26) has proposed that 日 may serve that function here. SW also records the variant graph 𨔵 and the form 迨 is preserved in the Yupian of the sixth

century. Assuming that 內 functions as phonetic in both these forms, it is then easy to see how 芮, a member of the same phonetic series, could have been used as a loan for 退. (Another example of this LC correspondence occurs at AL 7a.8.) Furthermore, the existence of these graphic variants and of the loan of 芮 for 退 in AL suggests that Karlgren's *ńiwad may be incorrect for 退 which probably still had a mid-vowel and rhymed with 內 in the second century B.C.

The reconstruction of OC 芮' is complicated by the fact that, on the one hand, it has as its phonetic a rusheng-syllable ending in -p (入), while on the other, it is found rhyming with words of the 微 group (Karlgren's *-d) in the Shijing. To account for this discrepancy between XS speller and rhyming behavior, Karlgren reconstructs 芮' with a final *-b (homorganic with the -p of 入) which, by the time of the composition of the Shijing had dissimilated to *-d permitting rhyming with 微 words. This hypothesis satisfies the demands of both XS construction and rhyming and has been adopted by Dong and F.K. Li. It is, however, highly speculative in terms of general phonetics. Pulleyblank has proposed a different solution to this problem. He regards the MC departing tone as the reflex of an earlier *-s suffix and thus reconstructs OC 芮 with a final *-ps. Assuming assimilation of -p to -s, he sketches the following phonetic development: *-ps > *-ts > *-s > MC *-j. By the time of the Shijing, 芮 would have ended in *-ts permitting rhyming with gusheng words of the 微 group (*-ls in Pulleyblank's reconstruction).

9. 榧散 {則為器} AL 13a.3

榧] 榧 BL 13a.12, KS 110, Ch. 28

榧, a word meaning 'canopy', occurs four additional times in AL (10b.12, 13b.6 and 14a.11 twice) where BL and the TTS (KS 82, 120, 130, Ch. 15, 32, 37) consistently have 榧 or the homophonous 朴. The remaining three instances of this word in BL and the TTS (Chapters 19, 28 and 57) occur in parts of AL which are defective. 榧, as its use of the phonetic element 屋 suggests, has a velar initial while 榧 begins with a bilabial---an alternation quite unusual within XS series, but not altogether unknown. One example is found in the pair 變/灣, *pian and *'wan in Karlgren's Ancient reconstruction. Xu Shen's analysis of 美, the speller in 榧, also points to a possible connection between these two types of initials: 𠂔 *kiung is identified as the phonetic in 美 *b'uk. (These two syllables belong to the same rhyme group, 東/屋, and the alternation between final -k and -ng is attested within the phonetic series spelt with 𠂔 by the word 葦 *kiuk.) To account phonetically for this correspondence between initial velars and bilabials is not easy. It may point to an early cluster incorporating both of these stops, but until more evidence is available, this explanation remains very speculative. In any case, the variant for , confined to AL, is highly idiosyncratic.

10. 天毋已清將恐蓮 BL 2a.9

毋] 無 . 蓮] 裂 all TTS (KS 136, Ch. 39)

Despite differences in XS affiliation pointing to different pronunciations in OC, in Han times the two syllables written 毋 and 無 became homophones so that 無 is often found in TTS as an LC for 毋. It would be anachronistic to assume that 毋 was here a loan for 無, however, since the MWD MSS. appear to preserve the modal distinction between these two syllables. This suggests that they may still have been distinct in pronunciation as well. Though commonly called a 'negative imperative', this description of 毋 is misleading, since, as the present example shows, the word can occur in a subordinate clause and have a third-person subject. Thus, the range of its usage exceeds the boundaries of what is normally understood as the imperative mood in Indo-European grammar (Lü 1955:24-35). A more accurate description, 'subjunctive negative', has been suggested by Pulleyblank (1979:23).

The difference in finals between 蓮 -n and 裂 -t is not recognized by Karlgren in his stated principles as acceptable in LC practice, even though examples of this type of phonetic alternation can be found within XS series (旦/但, 盾/膽, 吻/勿, 按/頓, 分/餐 etc.). Further confirmation of the validity of the loan in this example is provided by four rhyme words, all from the rusheng division of the 祭 group, 發, 歇, 竭 and 歎. Finally, another example of a syllable in final -n, written 連, loaned for a syllable in final -t (烈) is found at BM 40b.7 where the rhyme word is 活. Although in the present

cases 蓮 and 連 were clearly used to write a syllable ending in -t, this sort of alternation is quite uncommon and presents unsolved problems of phonetic interpretation. One might surmise that the two MSS. graphs actually had unattested readings in -t and proceed to look for further evidence of this phenomenon in dateable MS. material. Such evidence might allow us to assign it to a restricted time period or possibly a dialect area.⁶

11. 有餘者歟之 AL 8a.9

歟] 云 BL 8b.6

SW 云 有所失也

The alternation of 歟 in AL for 云 in BL occurs three times in this section of the text. 云 appears thrice again at BL 3b.3 where AL is defective. All transmitted versions have the graph 損 in each of these six instances (KS 216, 156; Ch. 77, 48). 歟 is HL but obviously belongs to the phonetic series whose speller is 員. 員 has readings in both the 元 and 文 rhyme categories and its XS affiliates include syllables in either rhyme. 云 is homophonous with 員 in its 文 rhyme reading. (These two graphs, 云 and 員, form an LC pair elsewhere in the MWD MSS., AM 12a.4.) The difficulty comes in relating the MS. graphs to the 損 of the TTS. Though SW clearly states that 員 is phonetic in 損, the disparity between initial *g- and s- precludes for Karlgren (GSR #435a), Tōdō (1965:695) and Shirakawa (1974:12.75) treating the variants 云/損 as LC. Alternation between velar and sibilant initials within a

single XS series is certainly not unknown; F.K. Li provides eight examples of this sort of contact and incorporates the evidence into his reconstruction, proposing *gwjən for 員/云 and *skwənx for 損 (1975:241). Yan's suggestion (ST 22) to construe 云 as LC for 耘 'lose', or, according to the SW definition, 'to have lost something', works phonetically, but 耘 seems to fit less well than 損 'reduce' into the same context with 有餘 'superabundance' and 補 'supplement'.

12. 逢 刺 蠅 地 虺 螫 AL (LZ 5)

刺] 癘 . 蠅] 虫 . 螫] 赫 BL 4b.7

(cf. KS 170, Ch. 55)

刺, though unattested, is no doubt a graphic variant for 虫刺 *lât found in the Tangyun. The Guangya preserves the form 螫 and glosses it 'scorpion'. This word may well be related to 蠅 属 *liad 'stinging insect' as well as 虺 *t'ad 'scorpion'.

The MS. graph transliterated 虫 in LZ is, according to the accompanying note (LZ 15.22), equivalent to 虫, an archaic form of 虺. These three graphs are members of XS series which rhyme in the 微 category, and in addition, all three have velar initials; hence they are incontestable as LCs. The interesting thing to note is that for a graph which Karlgren reconstructs *xiwər in AL we find 虫 in BL. The tradition that 虺 and 虫 are merely graphic variants for the syllable *xiwər has been disputed by Karlgren (GSR #1009a) who reconstructs 虫 as *d'îōng, phonetic in 虺 *d'îōng, 虺 虫 *diōng and 赤虫 *d'ōng. The existence of these phonetic compounds is persuasive evidence for

Karlgren's hypothesis; on the other hand, the alternation between 𧈧 and 虫 here in the MWD MSS. would seem to confirm the traditional reading of *xiwər for 虫. One possible way to resolve the conflicting evidence would be to recognize that 𧈧 may not be a phonetic compound graph at all. Just as characters such as 森, 轟, 品, 磊 and 犇 do not include phonetic elements but are themselves primary graphs, so the pronunciation of 𧈧 need have no connection with the phonetic value of 虫. In the case of such obviously compound graphs as 融 and 赤, 虫 is indeed phonetic, but, as noted in SW (s.v. 融), it is surely an abbreviated version of 𧈧, and thus visually identical with 虫. In the evolution of the Chinese script the gradual abridgement of phonetic elements is a common phenomenon. Many examples could be quoted in which the archaic phonetic has undergone such simplification as to become identical in the modern kaishu reflex with a completely unrelated graph: 津 with its phonetic 盡 (not 津), 舍 phonetic in 活, 者 (unrelated to 曰) phonetic in 書, and 省 whose original speller was 生, not 少. The use of 𧈧, abridged to 虫, as phonetic in 融 and 赤 can thus be regarded as simply a further example of this well-attested phenomenon. This allows us to retain the traditional equation between 𧈧 and 虫, a correspondence corroborated by the graphic variation between AL and BL. Finally, it should be noted that the alternation between 𧈧 and 赫 in the passage above exemplifies the coexistence of palatal and velar initials within a single XS series, a phonetic correspondence often ignored by Karlgren and others.

13. 哭國相聖 BL 7a.2

哭]鄰 AL 6b.7

哭 is HL; however, its phonetic value can be reconstructed through XS connections and its function here as an LC. It occurs again at BL 11a.9 where all the TTS show 鄰 (KS 82, Ch. 15). (AL is defective at this point.) The graph 哭 belongs to the phonetic series spelt with 文 most of whose members have initial m-. One member of the series, the word written 吝, however, is found with initial l- in the Guangyun and modern dialects, necessitating the reconstruction of an initial cluster in OC, *ml-. The present LC equation confirms this reconstruction since the syllable which 哭 writes also has an l-initial. As for the finals, although 文 and 鄰 belong to two distinct rhyme groups in terms of Shijing rhyming (文 and 真), the two had coalesced completely by Han times, making this sort of loan not only possible but quite common (Luo and Zhou 1958:36). The following example provides further evidence that the breakdown in distinction between the 文 and 真 groups had already occurred by the time the MWD MSS. were copied.

14. 百仞之高始於足下 KS 188 (YZ) (Ch. 64)

仞]仁 AL 6a.4, 仞 BL 6a.10

In view of the merger of the two rhyme groups 文 and 真 by the time of the MSS., the use in AL of 仁 to write 仞 seems unobjectionable. Relating the initial affricate of 仞 in BL to the initial nasal of 仞 is more problematic. SW provides some

suggestive etymologies.

GSR #365a 𠂔 *ts'ien 十百也从十人聲

GSR #555a 次 *ts'ier 不前不精也从欠二聲

GSR #564a 二 *niər

GSR #364a 年 *nien 穀熟也从禾𠂔聲

Xu Shen's graphic analyses of 𠂔, 次 and 年, if valid, point to the co-occurrence within single XS series of the OC homorganic initials *n- and *ts'- (Pulleyblank 1962:133). Though this phonetic alternation is, no doubt, a valid one, in the interests of accuracy, let us reexamine Xu Shen's graphic analyses in the light of some pre-Han script forms.

Taking 次 first, Xu's treatment of 二 as phonetic appears sound and even suggests a cognate relationship between the two words since 'come second, be inferior' and 'order, sequence' are among the common meanings of 次. Shirakawa cautions against this etymology for the graph, however, by demonstrating that many of its earliest uses can be related to the meaning of 欠 'yawn' (1974:8.200-203). He is not clear on how the two dots (sometimes three in oracle bone forms) to the left of 欠 ought to be understood, but he apparently thinks that the use of this graph to write a word meaning 'secondary; sequence' and other unrelated words represents early loan practice. Though this may be a valid observation, it does not of itself refute the proposed cognate relationship between the words *ts'ier and *niər; it merely suggests that the analysis of the graph 次 into 二 and 欠 may be incorrect on etymological grounds.

Xu Shen's treatment of 𠂔 as phonetic in 年 is motivated by

the small-seal form he quotes as headword---^𠂔 in kaishu transliteration. Shirakawa notes that the graph ^𠂔 first appears on late Zhou bronzes; earlier forms, including the many occurrences in the oracle bone inscriptions, consistently show 𠂔 (人) as the lower element (1974:7.93). Though he prefers to explain this primitive graph as a picture of a grain-carrying celebrant in a harvest rite, the 人 here may well function as phonetic. The fact that a graph with speller 人 came by the late Zhou to be written with phonetic 𠂔 could be interpreted as further evidence of the affinity between the initials of the two words represented by these graphs, a relationship reiterated in the analysis of 𠂔 itself. Finally, although ^𠂔𠂔, adduced by Xu as an 'older graphic form' (古文) of 仁, is not attested in the pre-Han epigraphic corpus, there remains the possibility that 𠂔 here functions as phonetic in a graph homophonous with 人.

Reassessing the evidence in this way with a view to greater historical accuracy has not significantly changed the nature of the case; on balance, the paleographic data supports the acceptance of 𠂔 as LC for 仁.

15. 天將建之女以茲垣之 AL 7a.4

建]救 all TTS (KS 197, Ch. 67)

女以]如以 BL 7a.12, 若以 HFZ 379, 以 all TTS

垣]衛 HFZ, TTS.

LZ (17.45) explains the MS. 建 as a copyist's error for 𠂔, a variant form of 救; in fact, 建 ('establish') is

unobjectionable semantically and, furthermore, it rhymes with 士亘, the MS. variant in the second clause of this passage. For this reason it seems preferable to regard the MS. reading as independent of the TTS rather than proposing a loan relationship between 士亘 and 衛.⁹

At this point we must digress from the consideration of LC to discuss a syntactic problem raised by this example. The MS. versions of this passage exhibit what appears *prima facie* to be an inversion of the two clauses of a condition, the protasis (女/如以茲士亘之) following the apodosis. This sort of inversion is virtually unattested in the TTS of the Zhou classics, except in a small number of cases where the sentence has exclamatory force as in Mengzi 4.1A.7 and 19.3A.3. The present example from the Laozi MSS., however, is a declarative statement; so to construe it as 'Heaven intends to establish someone [as sovereign], if it walls him around with compassion' violates the known rules of OC syntax. In reading the transmitted versions of this sentence, the problem never arises since the troublesome words 女/如/若 have in every case been deleted: 'What heaven succours it protects with the gift of compassion' (Lau 1963:129). Unless we propose on the basis of this example in the MSS. and HFZ to abandon the syntactic rules for conditional sentences in Chinese, the solution to this problem lies in rejecting the *prima facie* interpretation of 如 and 若 as words meaning 'if' and proposing other semantic values for these graphs. In his Jingzhuan shice (經傳釋詞), a compendium of particle usage in the Zhou and early Han corpus, Wang Yinzhi

lists examples of 若 used like 乃 in texts chronologically not far removed from the Laozi, such as the Guanzi and Mengzi (1798:7.23-24). This usage is also found in one of the other MWD texts, the Shidajing (BM 24b.1, 27b.2, 9, 30b.6). Wang Yinzhi quotes a passage from Laozi 13 in which he glosses the graph 若 as 則. This passage appears in AL as

16. 故貴為身於為天下若可以迺天下矣 AL 10b.3.

'Hence, he who would rather be in control of himself than control the world can (then 若) be entrusted with the world.' (BL 10b.12 varies insignificantly.) Both the FY and HSG texts show 則 for 若 here (KS 78). This solution is applicable to the occurrence of 若 in the HFZ reflex of Laozi 67 quoted above, but what of 女/如 in the MSS.? If we return to Chapter 13, we find another example of this curious use of 女 in the sentence parallel to and following 16:

17. 愛以身為天下女可以寄天下 AL 10b.4, (BL 11a.1 has final 矣.)

'He who loves to treat himself as the whole world can be given custody of the empire' (cf. Lau 1963:69). In the transmitted versions of this sentence one finds in place of 女 the graphs 若 (XE, WB), 則 (FY) or 乃 (HSG). The 若, of course, should be understood as 乃 as in Wang Yinzhi's examples. But is there any possibility of construing 女 as a connective particle here? Wang quotes examples of 如 used to mean 乃 and 則 (1798:7.12-13) and perhaps the neatest solution would be to treat these examples of 女 in the MSS. as loans for 如 in this sense. There remains another possibility, however, suggested by the editors of LZ. They regard 女 here and at AL 11a.1, BL

11a.11 (KS 82, Ch. 15) as a graphic error for 安 (LZ 63.14). 安 is occasionally found even in TTS as a connective with the sense of 乃 or 於是 (Wang 1798:2.11-12). In the Laozi MSS. this use occurs four times in Chapter 17 (AL 11a.8, BL 11b.6) and 18 (AL 11a.11, BL 11b.8) where some of the TTS retain the synonymous 焉 (KS 86, 88). Thus, if 女 is accepted as a plausible scribal error for 安, the difficult MS. readings in Chapters 13 and 67 can be resolved in a manner which accords with the stylistic features of this version of the text (viz. the use of 安 as an initial conjunction). Pulleyblank has further suggested that this 女 may be phonetic in 安 and hence an orthodox LC for that word. If the solutions either by assuming scribal error or an LC connection between 女 and 安 seem too speculative, 女 here can be understood as LC for 如 meaning 乃 or 則 as proposed above. In either case, a reading is produced which does not violate the rules of OC syntax.

18. 雖有環官燕外則昭若 BL 13a.2

雖]唯 AL 12b.5

環官]榮觀 most TTS (KS 106, Ch. 26)

若]然 all TTS

The interpretation of this brief passage has exercised the ingenuity of many commentators and translators. It is preceded by the statement that 'the gentleman when travelling all day never lets the heavily laden [baggage] carts out of his sight' (Lau 1963:83). 榮觀 in the next line has been variously

translated as 'magnificent view' (Waley 1958:176 and Chan 1963:146) and as 'camp and watch-towers' (Duyvendak 1954:67, reading 營 for 榮) while the editors of LZ read the MS. graphs 環官 as 闌食官 and paraphrase 'rest houses for travellers' (33.44). One of the reasons for these widely divergent interpretations is to be found in the use of the concessive 雖 'although' in BL and all the TTS. The context is not well defined here and none of the readings makes for a smooth and obvious extension of the meaning of the previous sentence. Ten years before the MWD MSS. were unearthed D.C. Lau proposed understanding 雖 as 唯 'it is only...' (1963:189). This seems to produce the least difficult reading and is confirmed by AL: 'Only when there are enclosures and look-out towers does he dwell at ease and hence is detached'. This is the most satisfactory interpretation because it reiterates from the previous sentence the gravity of the gentleman's concern in arriving without loss or mishap.

The variation between 環 in the two MSS. and 榮 in all the TTS allows two interpretations. At first sight, an LC relationship appears unlikely since 環 belongs to the 元 rhyme and 榮 to the 耕 rhyme. Furthermore, sense can be made of the MS. version as it stands by reading 環官 as 'enclosures and watch-towers' (官 LC for 觀) or possibly 'encircling watch-towers'. This interpretation would mean that the graph 榮 (for 營 meaning 'encampment') in the TTS is a semantic variant rather than an LC for 環 or vice-versa. It is, however, possible to account phonetically for the presence of 榮 in the transmitted

versions. The speller in the graph 環 is an abbreviated 袁 (GSR #256), a 元 rhyme word as are nearly all of the members of its phonetic series. The graphs 袁 and 媛, however, belong with 榮 to the 耕 category as shown by their rhyming behavior in the Shijing (discussed in Karlgren 1964:#299). 榮 which shares the phonetic 榮 with 榮 is a graphic variant of 袁; thus, it is possible to construe 環 as an LC for 榮. In the present state of our knowledge of OC rhyming, 袁 and 環 are distinct and do not inter-rhyme. The fact that they share the same phonetic is puzzling since members of the same XS series generally all fall within the same rhyme group.

One other point worthy of mention in connection with 18 is the use of 若 as an adverbial suffix. Though examples of this usage can be found in literature as late as Eastern Han, this function of 若, dating back to the Odes, seems gradually to have been taken over by the particle 然 as in the TTS.

19. 皆知善訾不善笑 AL 8b.12

訾]斯 BL 9a.10, all TTS (KS 56, Ch. 2)

It is, of course, possible to understand 訾 in AL as an orthodox LC for 此; if, however, it is construed as a loan for the 斯 of BL and the TTS, then it calls into question Karlgren's reconstruction of *-iǎ_nr for the final of phonetic series 此, GSR #358. The series has traditionally been assigned to the OC 支 rhyme whose reconstructed value consists of mid-vowel and a velar final. The rationale for Karlgren's splitting of the OC

rhyme and reconstructing $*-i\check{a}r$ for series 此 is to be found in a few anomalous rhymes in the Odes, one of which includes a graph with phonetic 此 (1954:304).¹⁰ The words collected here belong to OC rhyme groups 微(尾), 脂(通), 支(此) and 元(鮮) whose established values Karlgren is then required to homogenize in order to produce a reconstruction which will preserve the rhyming. The question to be asked here is how heavily these cases of hedge rhyme ought to be weighed in phonetic reconstruction. There certainly exists good evidence against treating series 此 separately from the rest of the OC 支 rhyme group. In the first place, 此佳 rhymes with three other words of the 支 group in Shijing 46.197.5. Secondly, the OC demonstratives 此 and 是 $*\check{d}i\check{e}g$ are no doubt cognate and, unless there is reason to believe their pronunciations diverged very early, reconstruction ought to confirm this etymological link. It seems clear that in positing OC $*-i\check{a}r$ for the entire phonetic series 此 on the basis of a putative rhyme between 此, 迺 and 鮮, Karlgren has allowed the exceptional hedge rhyme an importance out of proportion with the bulk of the evidence. F.K. Li's more conservative reconstruction of $*tsjig$ for 訾 and $*sjig$ for 斯 agrees more closely with the rhyming evidence reviewed above. It should be noted, however, that the alternation between s- and ts- within the same XS series is not common and that 訾 as LC for 斯 is on phonetic grounds less likely than 訾 as LC for 此, a member of its own series.

20. 三者不可致計故園{而為一} AL 10b.6

計] 詰 all TTS (KS 80, Ch. 14)

園] 然 君 BL 11a.3, 混 all TTS

'These three things are incalculable/cannot be scrutinized; thus they meld into a unity.' The MS. reading with 計 is semantically quite acceptable, although the transmitted version is perhaps to be preferred because 詰 makes a better rhyme with 一. Rhyming between the gù and rù categories of the 脂 group is not unknown in the Odes (43.191.5, for example) is attested throughout the Han and as late as the sixth century (Pulleyblank 1973:371). Its occurrence here between 計 and 一 suggests that the sibilant final of 計 was still audible in early Han times. One could even go a step further and speculate that the revision in later texts of 計 to 詰 might represent an effort to retain the rhyme after the final *-s of the former syllable had disappeared.

園 and 然 君 are both HL. Yan (ST 42) reads 園 as 園 which permits interpretation as a loan graph for the homophone commonly written 渾 or 混 as in the TTS. LZ (31.23) links 園 to 橐 found in SW meaning 'carry-all' and pronounced *g'wən. 然 君 's phonetic 君 places it in the same rhyme group (文) with the above words with an initial of the same type. LZ (63.15) reads this unattested graph as a loan for 纒 'cord' but there is no need to take this literally as the graph is, of course, an acceptable substitute for 混.

21. 紉仁棄義{民}復畜茲 AL 11b.1

畜] 𡩺 BL 11b.10, all TTS (KS 90, Ch. 19)

Here again there are two ways of dealing with the variant in AL. If we wish to bring the variant 畜 into line with the 𡩺 of all the other versions, we must posit an LC relationship between the two words. 畜 has a number of readings all of which are found together with 𡩺 in the 幽 rhyme. One of these readings (許救反) differs from the phonetic value of 𡩺 (呼教反) only slightly in that it has a medial glide $-i-$; this sort of alternation, however, is characteristic of some phonetic series in this rhyme group; 討 *t'og with its phonetic 肘 *ti_nôg (abbreviated to 寸) and 巾壽 *d'i_nôg/櫛壽 *d'ôg are two examples. As an LC for 𡩺 then, 畜 is quite acceptable.

There is a possibility that these two words are related etymologically. The connection between filial piety and fostering, caring for one's aging parents is implicit in the structure of the graph 𡩺 composed of an abbreviated character 老 'aged' and the graph for 'offspring' 子. This connection is later explicitly drawn in Confucian ethical writings like the Liji (𡩺者畜也, SSJZS:5.830b). One of the common meanings of 畜 is 'to rear, foster', though in the extant Zhou corpus my impression is that this meaning of the word is applied most frequently to the raising of domestic animals. In the language of the bronze inscriptions, however, 畜 is often found in a sacrificial context suggesting that the word's earliest associations were with the nurture of the ancestors' spirits by means of offerings (Shirakawa 1974:8.129). The syllables

written 孝 and 畜 are thus not only close enough phonologically to be loaned for each other, they appear to be related etymologically as well.

If there is any value in applying standards of consistency to the sayings of Laozi, then our LC solution to the problem raised by the reading in AL must seem rather dubious. In the passage just preceding the sentence quoted in this example, Laozi inveighs against 'filial compassion' (孝慈) as the result of discord among family members: 六親不和安又孝慈 (BL 11b.8). To claim that the people will again be filial (as if that were their original, uncorrupted state), if the ruler 'exterminates benevolence and discards rectitude' (Lau 1963:75) plainly contradicts the disparagement of filiality in the previous passage. A way out of this dilemma is provided by reading AL as it stands: 'Exterminate benevolence, discard rectitude and the people will again foster compassion', i.e. simple, basic sympathies will find their natural expression when people are no longer constrained to act out the imposed social virtues of 仁義 (and 孝 too, no doubt, if this interpretation is correct). This reading would mean treating 孝 in BL and all the TTS as LC for the 畜 of AL rather than the reverse.

22. 友弱勝強 AL 14a.8.

友]柔 BL 14b.6, all TTS (KS 128, Ch. 36)

The graph in AL transliterated 友 actually looks something like 𠂔. (ST 42 transliterates it 𠂔.) Earlier forms of the

modern graph 友 consist of a pair of 又, appearing in the oracle bone script as 𠂔 and as 𠂔 on the bronzes. Admittedly, none of these bears a very close resemblance to the MS. graph here, but LZ (35.64) relates this form to the guwen graphs found in SW under 𠂔, viz. 𠂔 and 𠂔. The note goes on to say that this 友 *giǔg should be regarded as LC for the 柔 *niôg of BL and the TTS, but at first sight this appears unlikely. The two words belong to different Shijing rhymes, 之 and 幽, and the disparity between the two initials, velar and nasal, seems irreconcilable. On the other hand, if on these phonetic grounds we reject 友 as LC for 柔 and read the line as it stands ('The amicable and weak overcome the strong'), we have then introduced into the Laozi a new concept---友, a word used nowhere else in the entire text. The compound 柔弱, however, occurs repeatedly, three more times in AL (8a.6, 7 and 8) and again at the beginning of Chapter 78 (KS 218) in the TTS where the MSS. are defective. Thus, in the context of the entire Laozi, the evidence would seem to urge accepting 友 as LC for 柔, in spite of our assumptions about what should constitute an orthodox LC. On the other hand, it is certainly true that the equation of the MS. graph with 友 may be incorrect, though I am unable to suggest an alternative interpretation at this time. At the present state of our knowledge this problem admits no easy solution.

23. 知快出安有大偽 AL (LZ 23)

快] 慧 BL 11b.8, most TTS (KS 88, Ch. 18)

While 快 is unarguably a member of the 祭 rhyme, the precise status of 慧 and its XS derivatives is a matter of controversy. Neither 慧 nor 慧 is used as a rhyming word in the Shijing. 慧, however, rhymes with words of both the 脂 (屈 and 馬, 55.222.2) and 微 groups (寐, 46.197.4). Inter-rhyming between these two groups is already attested in the Shijing, but the status of another of the rhyming words in Ode 197.4 (淠) is also in dispute. Dong places it in the 微 group while Karlgren reconstructs it as a member of the 祭 rhyme (*p'iad). Thus, the bulk of the early Zhou evidence, scanty as it is, would seem to argue for the reconstruction of 慧 with the nuclear mid-vowel -ə- characteristic of both the 脂 and 微 rhyme groups. The data from Han dynasty rhyming is not plentiful either, but some of the evidence cited by Luo and Zhou (1958:169, 171, 255) suggests that 慧 and its derivatives, all of them gusheng words, may have shifted in Han times to the 祭 group. From the early Han there is an example of 慧 rhyming with 察 and 失, both rusheng syllables, the former of the 祭 category, the latter of the 脂 category. (As mentioned previously, rhyming contacts between gu and rusheng syllables of the same rhyme are rather common, cf. Pulleyblank's reconstruction of final *-ats > -as for the 祭 rhyme and *at for its rusheng analogs.) 慧 and its derivatives apparently still rhymed in both the 祭 and 脂 categories in the Later Han. Luo and Zhou cite an example in which 脂 / 微 words (these two

categories had merged completely by this time) inter-rhyme with 車 and a rusheng word from the 祭 group. Finally, there is another example from the Later Han which shows rhyming between 慧 and 勢, the latter a member of the 祭 group. The occurrence of 快 as LC for 慧 in AL would seem to support the hypothesis that 慧 changed rhyme categories from 脂/微 to 祭, though it would be difficult on the basis of the present evidence to date this change. The same apparent shift from an earlier nuclear mid-vowel (微 rhyme) to the lower -a- (祭 rhyme) was cited above as a possible explanation for the discrepancy in MC rhymes between the members of the XS series with the phonetic 內 (see discussion of example 8).

24. 高者印文 AL 8a.9, BL 8b.6

印] 抑 most TTS (KS 216, Ch. 31)

SW 𢇛 按也从反印 抑俗从手

The MS. graph 印 looks remarkably like the modern 印 MC *iǎn- 'seal' and is glossed by the editors of both BS and LZ (12, 47) as 抑 *'iək 'press down'. (Cf. the synonym variants in two of the TTS: 案 in YZ and 押 in one XE.) In fact, what is now written 印 is found in the small-seal script as 𢇛 while *'iək was composed of the same two graphic elements aligned horizontally rather than vertically, 𢇛. Xu Shen describes the graph as 印 'turned around' and notes that 抑, a vulgar form, is accompanied by the hand radical. The MS. graph here is simply the SW form transposed, as Yan points out (ST 24). What we

today write 抑 should properly be constituted 抑, as found on the Xixiasong (西狹頌), a memorial stele dated 171 (reproduced in Akai 1974:648). The modern kaishu form with 印 as its 'phonetic' is a patent misspelling since *'iək has no phonetic or semantic connection with the XS series Karlgren reconstructs *ngang.

The likelihood of a cognate relationship between 抑 and 印 is much greater. To begin with the phonological side of the problem, Karlgren's reconstruction of *'iək for OC 抑 is open to question. To be sure, the word is found in the MC *-iək (耳職) rhyme in the Guangyun; however, in the Shijing it rhymes exclusively with words in final -t (viz. 小 必, 株 and 匹). Dong Tonghe treats this as compelling evidence and reconstructs a final *-t for 抑 in OC. (印, which shares the phonetic 卩 with 抑, is another word that has shifted from a Shijing rhyme in -t to a MC rhyme in -k.) Pulleyblank (1960:61-65) has collected eleven examples of this type of final alternation and concluded on the basis of Tibetan cognates that the velar final may have been the original form but that the dental final had by the time of the Shijing already developed in a prestigious dialect through the assimilation of -k to the high front vowel characteristic of this rhyme. More recently (1980:11), he has advanced a different solution to this problem by proposing the reconstruction of palatal finals for the 眞 rhyme group (i.e. *-c for the 質 category, the rusheng analog of 眞) which yielded dental stops (*-c > -t) in most cases but occasionally velars (*-c > -k). F.K. Li hypothesizes that this unusual phonetic

development can be explained by dialect divergence, a process whereby -t after -i- changed to -k or, in some dialects, the reverse assimilation of -k to -t when -k followed -i- (1975:273). These examples of diachronic correspondence between -t and -k are analogous to the development of -ng readings for syllables rhyming in -n in the Shijing (e.g. 令, 命). Precisely how these changes came about has yet to be agreed upon. Once we accept, on the basis of the Shijing rhymes, final -t for OC 抑, then it remains to be shown that alternation between -t and -n is well attested among cognate words. There are examples available in the very rhyme group (真/質) to which 印 and 抑 belong: 真 'real, substantial' and 實 'solid, substantial'. Among other likely cognates showing this type of final alternation 𢀛 'tough, sinewy', 訥 'speak haltingly' / 𢀛 'glue', 連/列, 寬/闊, and 然/熱 might be cited. The basic meanings of 印 and 抑 are surely close enough to suggest cognation.

25. 然填為器 AL (LZ 21)

然]𢀛 BL 10b.3, 埏/埏 all TTS (KS 74, Ch. 11)

然' and 埏 belong to the same rhyme group so the only point of phonetic divergence between the variants is in the initials, Karlgren's *ń- and *ś-. There are a few XS series in which these initials co-occur; the series spelt with 𢀛, for example, includes 𢀛 *ńiat and 𢀛 *śiad. Other instances have motivated the reconstruction of an initial cluster *sn- (Li 1979:241). With homorganic initials and identical finals, there

can surely be no objection to reading 然/然 as LC for 延.

26. 人之生也柔弱其死也 𢀛 𢀛 賢 強 AL 8a.6

𢀛 𢀛] 𢀛 信 BL (LZ 47)

None of the TTS have the graphs 𢀛/𢀛 and 𢀛/信 or anything corresponding to them (KS 214, Ch. 76). The graph used as a gloss for 𢀛 in LZ, 𢀛, (18.58) is recorded in SW together with its quwen form 𢀛. This latter graph means 'extend across, spread out'. Both 𢀛 and 信 are acceptable LC for 伸 which means 'stretch, extend'. (For an example of a syllable in *n*-loaned for a word in *s*- see Ex. 25.) Thus the MS. passage might be rendered 'Man at birth is soft and weak; at death, stretched out, rigid and stiff'.

27. 𢀛 呵其若浴 BL 11a.11

𢀛] 𢀛 all TTS (KS 82, Ch. 15)

The HL transliterated 𢀛 in both BS and LZ appears on close examination of the MS. photographs to bear a marked resemblance to the clerical script form of 𢀛. For one thing, the top horizontal line is unbroken and lacks the short vertical strokes usually found in radical 140 as written in BL, viz. 𢀛 or 𢀛. Furthermore, the wavy horizontal lines of radical 90, 𢀛 in the MS., are not in evidence. Though it is impossible merely on the basis of photographs to deliver a verdict on this matter, an LC correspondence between 𢀛 *g'i_uwang and 𢀛 *k'wâ^hng is much more

plausible than one between 滌 *tɕiãŋ (?) and *k'wâŋ. If the MS. graph does, in fact, have the phonetic 𪛗, then its affricate initial, incompatible with the labio-velar k'w-, will require a new interpretation for the passage. One possible solution might be to treat 滌 as LC for 滌 *dz'âŋ 'concealed', an appropriate epithet for a valley.

28. 矢元所端其角 AL (LZ 4)

端] 投 most TTS (KS 160, Ch. 50)

Yan treats 端 as LC for 投 (ST 47). At first sight this seems unlikely since members of the XS series with phonetic 端 fall into either the 歌 or the 元 rhyme while 投 and 馬主 (the variant found in three of the XE texts) both belong to the 侯 rhyme. However, there is some evidence from other XS series which seems to point to an affinity between the two groups 元 and 侯. The word 矢豆, for example, is a member of the 元 rhyme, but its phonetic 豆 belongs to the 侯 group. The graph 寇 writes a syllable belonging to the 侯 rhyme but appears to have 元 as its phonetic. Furthermore, one encounters use of the phonetic 需 of the 侯 group to write words belonging to the 元 rhyme (e.g. 虫需, 玉需 and 擣) while 需 itself and 𪛗 both have readings in the 元 rhyme in addition to their 侯 -rhyme pronunciations. Karlgren (GSR #134, 238) treats these double readings as having arisen from a confusion of the two phonetics 需 (侯) and 𪛗 (元). This would explain the phenomenon adequately if it were not for the semantic connection which also

obtains among these words: 孺, 懦, 濡 (all 侯) and 𩇛, 𩇜, 𩇝 and 𩇞 (all 元) share a semantic core 'pliant, weak' and so would appear to be related more intimately than a simple graphic confusion would suggest. One could further adduce the double readings for the character 𩇞 (GSR #131p) where there is no possibility of graphic confusion. This sort of evidence would suggest that the word 𩇞 from the 元 rhyme may at one time have had a reading in the 侯 rhyme.

It is also possible to explain this variant as semantic rather than as an LC. The editors of LZ gloss the MS. graph 𩇞 as 𩇞, but the usual meanings of the latter, 'measure, estimate; move', do not seem to fit the context here. A more satisfactory interpretation of this graph is suggested by the word 金𩇞 recorded in the Fangyen of Yang Xiong (53-18). 金𩇞 is glossed as 金𩇞 'drill' and pronounced like 𩇞, according to Guo Pu's commentary (Zhou and Wu 1956:55.5). Unfortunately, Yang Xiong does not identify the geographical origin of this dialect word, so we do not know if it was current in the Changsha region. Semantically, however, the meaning 'drill, bore' fits the present context even better than 投: 'the rhinoceros will have no place to bore his horn'. The word written 金𩇞 is no doubt related to 𩇞/𩇞 'point, tip'.

29. 直而不𩇞 BL 5a.10

𩇞]𩇞 all TTS (KS 176, Ch. 58)

The use of 𩇞 in BL for 𩇞 in the transmitted versions is

best not considered an LC at all. Although alternation between the stopped finals of rusheng syllables and gusheng words has been noted before both in LC pairs and within single XS series, the difference in vowel, a/o, between these two words presents a serious difficulty. It is precisely this alternation between high and low nuclear vowels which suggests treating these words as synonym variants rather than LC. In several published expositions of his theory of the close/open ablaut in Sino-Tibetan, Pulleyblank has provided numerous examples of this alternation which he regards as distinguishing very broadly 'extrovert' from 'introvert' forms (1963:220-221, 1965 and 1973a). Such a semantic or grammatical distinction is not readily apparent in the present example, but the hypothesis does allow us to relate these two syllables by means of a well-attested phonetic correspondence. Reading 𢆶 as the homophonous 𢆶, the common semantic core of these ablaut syllables seems to be 'spread (out), extend outward'. (The connotation of 𢆶 is 'leak' or 'ooze out', whereas 𢆶 implies 'set out, display'.) Perhaps the meaning of the text here is the one suggested by the WB and HSG commentaries: '(the sage) is straight but does not extend outward' (cf. Chan 1963:203), i.e. he keeps his rectitude to himself without displaying it or extending it as an example toward others.

This section began with a preliminary analysis of single-graph variation between the two MSS. or between the MSS. and TTS. We proposed and illustrated a general classificatory scheme by which every instance of substitution variation can be identified as belonging to one of five types: taboo character, semantic variant, miswriting, simplification or LC. These five categories seem to exhaust all the possibilities of substitution variation in the MWD Laozi and will perhaps prove generally applicable to other OC epigraphic and MS. remains as well. The reason for cataloging types of variation in this manner is not purely descriptive, however. As will become apparent in the next section, the process of collating texts and then interpreting the results of collation requires that a strict distinction be maintained between significant and insignificant variation. The delineation of these five classes of variant greatly facilitates general discussion of their relative significance prior to collation and thus expedites the process of collation itself. It was with this purpose in mind that the classification was undertaken.

The remainder of this section was devoted to a discussion of the category LC and an empirical examination of twenty-odd examples of problematic single-graph variants, most of them LC, from the MSS. As Karlgren has attempted to deal systematically with the phenomenon of LC, his approach was scrutinized. In the following heuristic treatment of individual variants, we tested his working hypothesis which predicts that the phonetic disparity between any two LC will never exceed the degree of

phonetic divergence found within a single XS series. The validity of this hypothesis depends, of course, on how the XS series are defined. The evidence analyzed here would suggest that Karlgren's hypothesis can be retained as valid, if, at the same time, we reject his own arbitrary treatment of certain XS series in GSR. Some of the LC data was found to be highly anomalous and to permit at present only very tentative phonetic interpretation. The object of this part of the essay, however, has not been so much to correct Karlgren and settle difficult issues as to give a clear and balanced account of the linguistic evidence which can be gleaned from the study of some of the substitution variants in the Laozi MSS. Having completed this part of the investigation, we can now proceed to the different task of collation which will require that we not merely describe variants but that we form a judgement as to their relative significance for the tracing of textual history.

Notes to Part One

1. The Chinese team published their first transliteration of the Laozi MSS. in Wenwu 74.11.8-20. This, of course, has now been superseded by subsequent revisions. There also exists a second edition of BS, in simplified kaishu, published in Beijing in 1975. I have been able to consult this transliteration briefly and it appears to have been the basis for LZ, published a year later. The rationale for citing the earlier edition of BS when it can be assumed that LZ represents a better understanding of the MSS. lies in the fact that LZ is printed in simplified characters whereas the earlier BS uses traditional kaishu. As noted above, whenever these two sources differ, LZ is cited as more authoritative, its simplified graphs retransliterated into the traditional forms.

2. One characteristic of these two commentaries on the MSS. is their almost exclusive preoccupation with paleography. One can only admire the command the editors demonstrate of the sources and techniques of wenzixue (文字學), but their analyses invariably fail to explore the phonological implications of the problems raised by the graphic variation in the MWD material. Since any significant problem in Chinese paleography is also a problem in historical phonology, this study attempts to redress the imbalance

found in the notes in LZ (and ST) by treating more fully the phonological side of these questions.

3. LZ 20 shows rhyme between 洲, 天, 信. In LZ 28 and AM 24b.4 the rhyme is between 洲 and 人.

4. A.E. Housman makes this point with his usual incisiveness (1921:68-69).

...textual criticism is not a branch of mathematics, nor indeed an exact science at all. It deals with a matter not rigid and constant, like lines and numbers, but fluid and variable; namely the frailties and aberrations of the human mind, and of its insubordinate servants, the human fingers. It therefore is not susceptible of hard-and-fast rules. It would be much easier if it were; and that is why people try to pretend that it is, or at least behave as if they thought so. Of course you can have hard-and-fast rules if you like, but then you will have false rules, and they will lead you wrong; because their simplicity will render them inapplicable to problems which are not simple, but complicated by the play of personality. A textual critic engaged upon his business is not at all like Newton investigating the motions of the planets: he is much more like a dog hunting for fleas. If a dog hinted for fleas on mathematical principles, basing his researches on statistics of area and population, he would never catch a flea except by accident. They require to be treated as individuals; and every problem which presents itself to the textual critic must be regarded as possibly unique.

In debating whether or not to emend a problematic MS. reading, the rule of thumb enunciated by Eugene Vinaver provides some guidance: '...it is right to preserve a reading as long as it is possible that it comes from the original, and it is wrong to replace it by what is merely probable.' (1939:369). In example 5 above, the SW entry for

滿 makes the reading in AL possible while the rhyming evidence renders the emendation probable.

5. This phrase appears in Mozi as 循而不作 'follow without innovating' (63.39.19). Compare Xu Shen's definition of 述 as 循, a word meaning 'follow a preset course' and related to words like 導, 巡 and 順.
6. In the case of a language like Latin for which a large body of MS. material has been closely studied, it is possible for the medieval period to identify scribes' vernacular languages and to trace diachronic changes in their pronunciation through mistranscriptions of the phonetic values of the original Latin. Since data of this kind can be assembled only from a large range of dateable MSS. all emanating from a single geographical area, it would be premature to hypothesize about dialect distinctions on the basis of the MWD Laozi texts alone. However, it is not unreasonable to expect that close analysis of LC practice in the many MSS. now being recovered in China will, at some future date, provide us with good evidence of OC dialect phonology.
7. The XS relationship between these two graphs is not recognized by Karlgren despite Xu Shen's graphic analysis of 耳 as phonetic in 耳心 (从心耳聲).

8. I quote Xu Jie's redaction of SW, SW_xizhuan (說文繫傳). In Xu Xuan's slightly earlier version 人 is not treated as phonetic but as a second sematic element in the graph 𠂔 (Ding 1960: 952b).
9. There is a strong likelihood that 垣 and 衛 are, in fact, cognate words (Pulleyblank 1973a:121). 垣 'ring-wall' is no doubt closely related to words like 園 'garden wall', 院 'courtyard wall', 環 'ring-shaped jade insignium', 環 'ring', etc. 衛 means 'protect by circular patrol' as suggested by the early graphs which depict a crossroads with feet pointing in opposite directions circulating around a central object interpreted by Shirakawa as a settlement of some kind (1974:5.138). Though 垣 and 衛 *giwad belong to different rhyme groups, 元 and 祭 respectively, the former can be regarded as the 'nasalized counterpart' of the latter (F.K. Li 1975:266) since they share the same initial consonant and nuclear vowel. The precise reconstruction of the final of the 祭 group is a point of controversy among linguists, but all agree it was an alveolar sound and thus homorganic with the final -n of the 元 group.
10. Karlgren follows Duan Yucai (1930:18.82) in treating 訃 as a rhyme word in Shijing 45.195.2. Whether in fact 訃 rhymes with 哀, 違 etc. is open to question. Neither Jiang Yougao (1966:2.2.20a) nor Lu Zhiwei (1948:76) concurs with Duan.

Part Two

'Collation' is, literally, the 'bringing together' of textual witnesses for comparison. This stage of the critical process is ordinarily a preliminary to recension, 'the reconstruction of the earliest form or forms of a text which can be inferred from the surviving evidence.'¹ In the present study, however, since there is no question of attempting the complex task of reconstructing an archetype, collation will be used as a method of describing a textual witness through contrast with other witnesses.

The lemma in this collation will be the acknowledged quotations from the Laozi found chiefly in the 'Jielao' (JL) and 'Yulao' (YL) chapters of the HFZ. These citations will be collated with the MWD MSS. and the TTS found in Shima Kunio's variorum. Strictly speaking, the citations in the HFZ are themselves transmitted versions of the Laozi and thus, unlike the MSS., subject to both the internal corruption characteristic of a long vertical transmission and to horizontal corruption (i.e. contamination) from the other TTS. Is it possible to discover by collation the extent to which these kinds of corruption have occurred? In their original form, the Laozi quotations in JL and YL date to less than a century earlier than the MWD texts and it seems worthwhile to attempt to characterize the state in which they have survived.²

The immediate aim of any collation is the discovery of

variant readings. Once isolated, however, not all types of variation can be considered equally significant. For our present purposes 'significant variation' can be simply defined as discrepancy between the substantives of the textual witnesses. The clear distinction made in Western criticism between 'substantives, the actual wording of a text', and 'accidentals, the transient [graphic] forms' of the words, seems eminently applicable to the criticism of Chinese texts.³ In the present collation it would be mistaken to regard as significant variation in accidentals between the MS. witnesses and the HFZ citations because the best available version of JL and YL is a modern critical edition of the HFZ, a version from which the original accidentals (i.e. simplified forms and LCS) have long vanished through graphic standardization. This principle of discounting variation between accidentals when the sources of the variation are separated by many centuries has been stated by Fredson Bowers (1975:359): '...the distance between the classical holograph and the inscription of the preserved examples makes it impossible, usually, for any of the accidentals to derive from the holograph with enough fidelity for any question of authority to inhere in their forms. Thus...it follows that the establishment of such a text does not include the variant forms of the accidentals.' The lack of an early MS. version of the citations in JL and YL thus restricts us to the investigation of substantive variation; however, we may still be able through contrastive analysis to form an accurate impression of the HFZ version of the Laozi.

The relevant data for this study must be further limited to passages in the JL and YL explicitly acknowledged as quotations from the Laozi by the use of the introductory locutions 故曰, 所謂, 老子有言曰, etc. As a cursory examination of Shima's variorum will show, not only JL and YL but other chapters of the HFZ as well contain passages parallel to Laozi, but since their source is not identified, we cannot assume that they represent faithful citation of the version of the Laozi known to the author. It is just as likely that they are paraphrases of material from the Laozi or perhaps, as suggested by Kimura Eiichi, common maxims current in Zhanguo times and thus do not derive directly from the Laozi at all. The use of 故曰 etc. by HF to introduce a citation suggests, on the other hand, that he is quoting verbatim from a text of the Laozi.

We must immediately insert a caveat here, however, and cite two instances where 故曰 introduces quotations which include emendations of the Laozi apparently made by HF himself. HF was a skilled rhetorician, not a professional scribe, and on occasion his eagerness to drive home a point may well have overcome any scruples he felt about the faithful citation of his sources. This is surely the best way of accounting for the variation in the following two cases.

1. 聖人之不病也以其不病 是以無病也 HFZ 403, KS 204, Ch. 71

其不病]其病病也。無病也]不病 BL 7b.11

AL is defective for most of this passage. Significant divergence between YL and BL is confined to the variant

不病/病病。 However, as noted by Gu Guangqi (HFZ 404.6), there is good reason for supposing that HF modified the original wording of this passage to make it better conform to the historical illustrations he cites. After referring briefly to two incidents from early history he states in conclusion, "The reason the King of Yue became hegemon was that he was willing (不病) to serve. The reason King Wu became king is that he was indifferent (不病) to an upbraiding. Therefore [the Laozi] says, 'The reason the sage meets with no difficulties (不病) is that he does not consider them difficulties (不病); hence, he is without difficulties (無病).'" (cf. Lau 1963:133). The reading 病病 for the second 不病 of the YL, though preserved in every other witness of this passage, is not appropriate to the context created by HF's historical illustrations. In fact, it expresses the meaning opposite to that intended by HF. There are thus good grounds for assuming the variant is an emendation from the hand of HF himself.

2. 自見之謂明 ... 自勝之謂強 HFZ 414, 416; KS 122, Ch. 33

自知明也... 自朕者強也 BL 14a.7

The variant 見 is unique to the YL. Chen Qiyong (HFZ 416) explains it as a deliberate alteration of the text by HF to reconcile Laozi's maxim to the story cited in illustration. The maxim and HF's apologue both point up the difficulty of self-knowledge. In the case of HF's illustration, however, the message is expressed in a simile linking wisdom and the eye: wisdom consists not in the breadth and distance of one's vision,

which imply ambition in this context, but in the ability to see oneself. Therein lies its difficulty. Chen argues convincingly that Laozi's 知 was changed to 見 in order to accord with this imagery. If we accept this explanation of the origin of this 見, the variation then loses significance because it does not represent a traditional reading, but rather an emendation.

The 者 following 知 in all the TTS was probably omitted accidentally from BL. AL is unfortunately defective at this point, but 者 does occur in both MSS. after the subject in each of the other eight parallel sentences which make up this chapter.

The syntax of the YL citations of this passage differs considerably from that of the MSS. and TTS. The latter are sentences consisting of a nominalized verb-phrase and a noun predicate. (The final 也 of the MSS. is required by this grammatical structure; note its preservation in the FY tradition.) The citations in YL are transformations by object exposure of verbal sentences. They can be parsed as exposed direct object (the noun phrases 自見 / 自勝) followed by an anteposed resumptive pronoun 之 (antecedant 自見 / 自勝), the verb (言) and its denominative object (明 / 強). Different as they are in terms of structure, the semantic value of these variants is practically identical (excepting, of course, the discrepancy between 見 and 知). It seems impossible to determine whether HF altered the syntax here by introducing the verb 言 or whether he was quoting accurately from a version of Laozi rather different from the one reflected in the MWD MSS. and the TTS.

These two examples may raise the suspicion that HF, his use of the quotative expression 故曰 notwithstanding, in fact quoted from his version of the Laozi rather loosely, altering it freely to suit his own arguments. If this could be shown to be the case, any attempt at collation with the MSS. would by the same token become meaningless as the variants in JL and YL would lack any traditional (i.e. pre-HF) validity. That most of the variants in the Laozi citations represent HF's own emendations is certainly one possible hypothesis. I do not believe, however, that it is of much help in explaining the bulk of significant variants. It is one thing to be able to show with a fair degree of plausibility that a particular variant can best be explained as an emendation of the original reading to suit HF's argument. However, to propose that every instance of significant variation can be accounted for in this same way is clearly a priori. This explanation must not be applied mechanically, but kept in reserve for cases of variation which suggest it, i.e. cases like the above in which we observe a close congruence between a variant unique to the HFZ citations of Laozi and the gist of HF's commentary.

In the following exploratory examination of the three witnesses, we must keep clearly in mind all the possible types of corruption which might explain substantive variation. Generally speaking, once a variant can be accounted for as the result of obvious scribal error as in Ex. 7, 15, 29, 31, 46, 47, 80 and 81 below, it loses significance, i.e. it no longer supplies evidence of the separate derivation of the

witnesses. On the other hand, an unaccountable variant may conceivably constitute evidence of a separate textual tradition.

3. 道之可道 非常道也 HFZ 369, KS 54, Ch. 1

道之可道]道可道也. 常]恒 AL 8b.8

Though the final 也 is attested in the Huainanzi and Wenzi reflexes of this passage, none of the TTS retains either 也. This is evidence of what has already been pointed out by other students of the MWD MSS., namely that all the TTS have been heavily edited of particles, particularly final 也 and 矣. One can only hypothesize about why and when this came about. One theory suggests that the early versions underwent a bogus archaization at the hands of editors in order to make the text sound more arcane and oracular (Pulleybank 1979:13-14). In any case, that the particles were deliberately excised from the text seems almost certain. There are simply too many of them for us to assume that they could all have disappeared through accidents in transmission. Furthermore, their highly consistent absence from all the transmitted traditions, with the exception of FY and occasionally HSG, suggests an early date for their removal. It is perhaps not unreasonable to associate this sort of tampering with the text with its use in the popular religious movements of the Eastern Han. One might make the further inference that all the TTS, again excepting FY, derive more directly from such a popular text, already shorn of particles, than from the MWD versions.

Since the variation in syntactic structure between the MSS.

and HFZ versions of this sentence can hardly be attributed to corruption or emendation, it would seem to point to separate textual traditions. The presence of 常 in the HFZ permits two interpretations. Since the original citation probably had 恒, 常 may be the result of contamination from the TTS all of which have the taboo-substitute. It may, on the other hand, conceivably be an intrinsic emendation made in this text during the time the taboo against 小恒 was in effect.

The six-character phrase 不貴難得之貨 found in JL is cited twice by Shima in his variorum, once at Chapter 3 and again at Chapter 64. In the present study this phrase, which occurs only once in the HFZ, is collated with Chapter 64 (Ex. 79).

4. 無狀之狀無物之象 HFZ 368, KS 80, Ch. 14

There is no discrepancy between this quotation in JL, the two MWD MSS. (the last graph in AL is illegible) and any of the TTS. The final 也 found in the Wenzi version of this passage and the 者也 in the Huainanzi can both be explained as grammatically determined by the nominal sentences which incorporate these two noun phrases from the Laozi. These eight words form the predicate of a verbal sentence in the MSS. and most TTS, hence final 也 is not required. The main verb appears to have been dropped from four of the XE texts.

The reflexes of Laozi 25 (noted by Shima in KS 104) are not prefaced by 故曰 and hence not collated here.

5. 重為輕根靜為躁君 HFZ 391, KS 106, Ch. 26

躁]走 AL (LZ 25), BL 13a.1

In this passage there is no significant variation between any of the witnesses. The FY text shows a marked preference throughout the Laozi for the graphic form 立青 while the other TTS almost invariably use 靜. This sort of graphic idiosyncrasy could, of course, have been imposed rather late in the transmission of the text; still, it is one of the features which distinguish the FY tradition from all the other transmitted versions of the Laozi.

6. 故曰君子終日行不離輜重也 HFZ 391, KS 106, Ch. 26

故曰]是以 AL 12b.4, BL 13a.1. 終]象 AL, 冬 BL.

離]離其 AL, 遠其 BL. 重也重 AL, BL.

The initial 故曰 in the lemma is quite possibly a copyist's duplication of previous occurrence of this locution a few words earlier and has perhaps replaced the 是以 found in both MSS. and all the TTS. The variant 聖人 in WB and HSG for 君子 elsewhere appears to be a relatively late emendation attributable perhaps to the influence of popular religious Daoism.

BL alone preserves the reading 遠 where all other texts have 離, a synonym variant. This is one of the few instances of significant variation between the MSS. The pronominal 其 appears in both MSS. as well as in the FY text. My intuition is to regard the version with 其 as an older reading. Because its presence here seems not to be required by the sense or the syntax, it is easier to conceive of its being lost or deleted in

transmission than to propose its later interpolation. As the sentence which precedes the final 也 in the HFZ reflex of this passage does not involve noun predication, the presence of 也 is not obligatory.

7. 萬乘之主而以身輕於天下輕則失臣躁則失君 HFZ 391, KS 106, Ch. 26

主]王 AL 12b.5, BL 13a.2. 輕]亓 AL. 臣]本 AL, BL

The reading with 王 is unique to the MWD MSS. The phrase 萬乘之王 is not attested in any of the major pre-Han texts for which indices have been compiled. 萬 / 千 / 百乘之主 / 君 / 國 / 家 are, on the other hand, common in such Zhanguo texts as Mengzi, Mozi, Xunzi and HFZ. This suggests that the MWD variant may be a scribal error for 主. The fact that both MSS. show the same error is evidence for their common derivation, though, of course, the variation here with other texts is not necessarily separative.

The alternation between 臣 and 本 presents a more complex problem. There is little doubt that this is a very early variant since it is mentioned by YZ in the fragment of his commentary to the Laozi preserved in the Daodezhenjing xuande zuansu (道德真經玄德纂疏) of 964 (KS 41). Thus there is evidence for regarding the 臣 in the YL as a genuine early reading rather than the result of contamination from the HSG tradition. The occurrence of 本 in the XE texts leads Shima to conclude that XE follows 'YZ's alteration' of the reading 臣 and hence that YZ's text was the basis for Zhang Lu's redaction (i.e. the XE text). The presence of 本 in both MSS. proves that

this variant is considerably earlier than YZ; hence, XE may not have been based on YZ at all. Likewise, the reading 臣 of the HSG tradition is not an 'emendation' of YZ's 'emendation' of HFZ, but, more plausibly, a descendant of the genuine pre-Han reading preserved in HFZ. Shima's hypothesis about the late origin of the HSG text leads him to ignore this possibility and to impute corruption to HSG more readily than the evidence seems to warrant.

8. 不貴其師不愛其資雖知大迷是謂要妙 HFZ 417, KS 108, Ch. 27

資] 齊 AL 12b.11. 雖] 唯 AL. 知] 知乎 AL, BL 13a.8.

迷] 眊 AL. 要妙] 眊要 AL, BL

唯 in AL is an LC for the superior 雖 of YL, BL and all the TTS: '...though it seems clever, betrays great bewilderment' (Lau 1963:84). Both MSS. have the graph 乎 after 知. This particle occurs most commonly in classical Chinese as a locative preposition similar in function to 於 or as a final marker of interrogation. Its use here is not particularly well attested and can be described only somewhat imprecisely as a 'pause particle'. Fortunately there is an example from the Shiji (86.22, quoted in Yang 1955:164) whose syntax parallels the Laozi passage rather closely: 荊軻雖游於酒人乎然其為人沈深好讀. 'Though Jing Ke fraternized with tipplers, he was of a pensive and studious character'. One might also adduce a similar use of 乎 in the frequently encountered locution 於是乎 'at this point, then' in the language of the Zuozhuan and Guoyu. I am inclined to regard the MSS. reading 知乎 as more original, but the lack

of 乎 in the YL reflex can hardly be taken as good evidence for separate derivation. The order of the final rhyming binomes found in HPZ and all the TTS is reversed in both MWD witnesses, another bit of evidence in favor of a common derivation for the two MSS., but again, not necessarily a separative discrepancy.

9. 將欲翕之必固強之 將欲弱之必固強之 HFZ 394, KS 128, Ch. 36
翕] 拾 AL14a.7, 搶 BL 14b.4. 固] 古 AL, BL

The variants between YL, the MSS. and the TTS are all LCS and thus lack any significance for the tracing of textual derivation. The agreement of many of the graphic forms found in the TTS with those in the YL is best attributed to the independent graphic standardization of these witnesses rather than to direct transmission between them. Because the process of standardization was occurring *pari passu* with vertical transmission of the texts, it is impossible to assign archetypal authority to any one of these loan variants. Note how even the two MSS. differ in one case in their choice of graphs to write what is presumably the same syllable.

10. 將欲取之必固與之 HFZ 394, KS 128, Ch. 36

取] 奪 AL 14a.8, BL 14b.5. 與] 予 AL, BL

The MWD reading with 奪 is found in all TTS except two of the XE MSS. from Dunhuang and Fan Yingyun's recension. The two Dunhuang texts show 襄 which is no doubt a loan for 攘 'to appropriate, help oneself to'. Since the XE commentary uses

奪 in its paraphrase of this sentence, Shima rightly regards 裏 as a late corruption. FYF selects the reading 取 on the grounds that 奪 is not an early variant and Shima infers from this that the substitution of 奪 for 取 originated with XE. The occurrence of 奪 in both MWD MSS. shows that this variant was current long before the XE tradition was established by Zhang Lu. The only other citations of this passage in the pre-Han corpus, both of them attributed to the Zhoushu (周書) rather than to the Laozi, have 取 as does the quotation in the Shiji suoyin (史記索隱). Barring the assumption that the variant 奪 originated with the MWD texts, this sort of significant divergence between the MSS., the HFZ and other pre-Han sources again implies independent derivation, i.e. the existence of distinct textual traditions even in pre-Han times.

予 and 與 in the sense of 'give' are perfect homophones in OC and often found as textual variants because of their synonymy. The TTS all show 與 as in YL.

11. 魚不可脫於深淵 邦之利器不可以示人 HFZ 392, KS 128, Ch. 36

可脫] 脫 AL (LZ 28), 說 BL 14b.6. 深淵] 淵 AL, 淵 BL

邦之利器] 邦利器 AL, 國利器 BL 示] 視 AL

AL and the Daozang edition of HSG both lack the first 可, reading 'The fish does not get free of the abyss'. The parallelism with the next sentence and the fact that no other pre-Han reflex of this passage lacks 可 suggests that the reading in AL and the HSG text is defective, the result of probably independent and accidental omission of the graph. The

word 深 is found only in the YL citation. In a case like this it is impossible to determine with any degree of certainty whether the variant is intrinsic and thus separative or extrinsic, the result of interpolation. One can only remark that the preservation of such unique readings in the TT of the YL implies that the text has avoided pervasive contamination in the direction of the TTS of the Laozi. On the variation between 淵 and 瀟 see Part One, Ex. 5.

The MSS. are unique in lacking the possessive marker 之 between 邦/國 and 利器. This may point to textual corruption as it is unusual in OC to find two nouns, the first a genitive and the second modified by an adjective, without 之 occurring between them. The variant is probably conjunctive. Note the retention of 邦 in the FY tradition and 視 in three of the XE texts.

The passage from JL first found collated with the opening of Laozi 37 in Shima's variorum (KS 130) has been miscopied. It is correctly reproduced in KS 132 and is treated as a reflex of Chapter 38 in the present collation. The sentence occurs only once in the HFZ.

12. 上德不德是以有德 HFZ 326, KS 132, Ch. 38

There is no variation with the MSS. or any TT.

13. 上德無為而無不為也 HFZ 328, KS 132, Ch. 38

不] 以 AL 2a.2, BL 2a.1

This is yet another case where there appear to have been two textual traditions as far back as the witnesses can take us. The version with 不, preserved in the YZ and the FY tradition, means: 'The highest power is inactive and yet there is nothing it does not accomplish'. The version in both MSS. with 以 instead of 不 is reflected in the WB and HSG textual traditions: 'The highest power is inactive and without a motive [lit. 'a means'] to act' (cf. Chan 1963:167) There is unfortunately no definitive evidence in the context of Chapter 38, or, indeed, in the entire Laozi which gives the lie to either of these variants. The evidence of the MWD MSS., if anything, complicates the issue by showing that the reading 以 is considerably older than the XE texts, the earliest evidence of it heretofore. Thus it seems safe to treat this variant as further evidence of a derivation for the MSS. distinct from that of the version of Laozi quoted in the HFZ.

14. 上仁為之而無以為也 HFZ 329, KS 132, Ch. 38

The final 也 found in JL and both MWD MSS. has not survived in any TT.

15. 上義為之而有以為也 HFZ 330, KS 132, Ch. 38

義]德 BL 2a.2

This variant is no doubt a copyist's error since 上德 is mentioned and described in the same MS. column a short distance above this passage. This sort of error, the obvious result of

scribal inattention, does not constitute evidence of an independent derivation for BL. Since we can provide a plausible rationale for the error in the textual environment, the divergence loses significance. Again, final 也 has disappeared from all the TTS.

16. 禮以貌情也 HFZ 331

Though introduced by 故曰, this sentence is completely unattested in any Laozi witness. As suggested by Song Gaoyuan (松皋圓, HFZ 332.6), 故曰 probably introduces a reiteration of HF's own definition of 禮 found at the beginning of this section of JL: 禮者所以貌情也

17. 上禮為之而莫之應 HFZ 331, KS 132, Ch. 38

應] 應也 BL 2a.3 (AL defective)

The final 也, unique to BL, is not obligatory in this sort of verbal sentence.

18. 攘臂而仍之 HFZ 331, KS 132, Ch. 38

攘] 則攘 BL 2a.3 (AL defective). 仍] 乃 AL 2a.3, BL

AL is legible once again from 攘. The 則 found in BL is retained in all the TTS. Its absence in JL is perhaps due to the presence of HF's commentary between these citations (i.e. Ex. 17 and 18). With the exception of the WB tradition and FYY which have 仍, the TTS all show 仍 as in JL.

19. 失道而後失德 失德而後失仁 HFZ 331, KS 132, Ch. 38

失道]故失道失道矣 AL (LZ 1). 故失道 BL 2a.3

後失德]后德AL, BL. 後失仁]后仁 AL, 句仁 BL

Initial 故 is absent from JL but attested in both MSS. and all TTS. AL repeats 失道 and adds 矣, the result a longer and perhaps more original version of this passage: 'Therefore he loses the Dao. Having lost the Dao, he loses virtue'. Both 后 and 句 are frequently encountered in the MWD MSS. for the standard 後.

20. 失仁而後失義 失義而後失禮 HFZ 331, KS 132,, Ch. 38

後失義]后義 AL (LZ 1), 句義 BL 2a.3. 後失禮]句禮 BL

The many citations of this passage extending from the 'outer' chapters of Zhuangzi to the Taiping yulan, the TTS of Laozi and the MWD MSS. all agree in omitting the second occurrence of 失 in each of these four parallel sentences. As in the case of the 深 unique to YL (Ex. 7), the origin of this variant can only be guessed at; hence there is no justification for treating the discrepancy as separative.

21. 禮薄也 HFZ 335

This brief statement, though introduced by 故曰, has no reflex in any other text of the Laozi. Wang Xianshen (HFZ 336.1) suggests it is HF's own abridgement of the passage from Laozi he quotes next.

22. 禮者忠信之薄也而亂之首乎 HFZ 335, KS 134, Ch. 38

禮]夫禮 BL 2a.5. 薄]泊 BL 乎]也AL (LZ 1), BL

In AL the first seven characters of this passage are illegible. The absence of 夫 from JL can perhaps be accounted for by the presence of commentary between the end of Ex. 20 and the beginning of the present passage. (These are contiguous passages in the MSS. and TTS; all of the latter, except for YZ, retain 夫.) HF's intervening exegesis vitiates the pivotal function of 夫 and provides a reason for its omission. 薄 and 泊 are OC homophones.

The first 也 in JL and BL is unattested in the TTS, though the second is preserved in FY and three of the HSG witnesses. The final 乎, unique to the JL, cannot have its usual function as an interrogative marker here. Yang Shuda (1955:163) lists several examples of 乎 used as a final exclamatory particle, but the presence of final 也 in the JL version of the parallel sentence which follows this one suggests that 乎 here may be a corruption.

23. 前識者道之筆也而禹之首也 HFZ 338, KS 134, Ch. 38

Again, though the first 也 is not preserved in any of the TTS, the second is retained in the FY tradition and two of the HSG texts. The tendency for final particles to be dropped from all but the FY text has been noted earlier. Though JL matches the MSS. word for word in this passage, the variant 始 for 首 is found in all the TTS. The only instance cited by Shima of 首 in this position occurs in a Jin dynasty work Laozi yuwen fanxun.

(老子疑問反訊) by Sun Sheng (孫盛, c. 302-373). Unfortunately, this text is listed neither in Shima's bibliography (KS 35-48) nor in Yan Lingfeng's (Yan 1965), nor in the Harvard-Yanjing index to the Daozang. One can only assume that Shima has quoted the passage from some third work which he fails to identify. Perhaps the only inference one can make on the basis of the distribution of this variant is that 始 has replaced the earlier word to eliminate the repetition of 首 which occurs at the end of the previous sentence.

24. 大丈夫處其厚不處其薄處其實不處其華 HFZ 340, KS 134, Ch. 38

處]居 AL 2a.5, BL 2a.6. 厚不]厚而不 AL (BL defective).

實不]實而不 BL

處 and 居, synonym variants, are frequently found alternating in the TTS. The MSS. show a marked preference for 居 throughout the Laozi. The first occurrence of 居 in the MSS. is reflected only in the Wenzi citation of this particular passage. A number of transmitted witnesses show 居 in the second sentence, however. The 而 between 實 and 不 has perhaps been omitted in AL; it is attested not only in BL but also in the citation of this second sentence in the Wenxuan commentary.

25. 去彼取此 HFZ 340, KS 134, Ch. 38

去]故去 AL 2a.6, BL 2a.6. 彼]皮 AL, 罷 BL

All TTS except YZ show 故 here. 罷 is LC for 彼.

26. 大_望哭晚成大音希聲 HFZ 413, KS 142, Ch. 41

晚]免 BL 2b.5 (AL defective)

No significant variation in any witness.

27. 天下有道卻走馬以糞也 HFZ 359, KS 152, Ch. 46

糞也]糞 AL 3a.8, BL (LZ 38)

Neither the MSS., nor the YL version of this sentence (HFZ 387), nor any TT retains final 也 here. Since this is a verbal sentence, final 也 would seem to be optional. FY preserves the variant 播 for 糞, probably a scribal error induced by the similarity of the two graphs.

28. 天下無道戎馬生於郊矣 HFZ 360, KS 152, Ch. 46

天下無]無 BL 3a.10. 郊知郊 AL 3a.8, BL

The omission of 天下 in BL is quite likely a copyist's error. Final 矣 is unique to the JL reflex; it is absent from the citation of this passage in YL (HFZ 387) possibly because the two clauses of this sentence are there separated by commentary, attenuating the aspectual relationship between them and thus increasing the likelihood of the final particle's omission in the course of transmission. HF's copy of the Laozi possibly had 矣 here, a significant variation from the MS. witnesses.

29. 禍莫大於可欲 HFZ 361, KS 152, Ch. 46

禍] 罪 AL 3a.8, BL 3a.10, YL (HFZ 387). 大於] 大 BL

The JL variant 禍 for the 罪 of YL, the MSS. and TTS is undoubtedly a copyist's error. 禍 has apparently been raised from the beginning of the following sentence, hence the discrepancy is not significant. The omission of 於 in BL is probably also a scribal error. This sentence is unattested in the WB tradition.

30. 禍莫大於不知足 HFZ 361-2, 387; KS 152, Ch. 46

禍] 禍 AL 3a.9

BL is defective for all but the first character of this sentence. Significant variation between the witnesses is lacking.

31. 咎莫憯於欲得 HFZ 387, KS 152, Ch. 46

得] 利 JL (HFZ 362)

BL is defective here. The 憯 of AL, JL and YL is preserved in the FY tradition. Two of the XE texts show 甚, a rhyming synonym variant, while the other TTS have 大. Both of these variants may well be faciliores lectiones.

The JL reflex of this sentence shows the unique variant 利 for 得. This can be accounted for as a transposition of the last word of HFZ's commentary immediately preceding this citation: 退而自咎也生於欲利. It is not inconceivable that the occurrence of 利 in Sima Qian's 'Letter to Ren An' (Hanshu 62.

2727) is a reflex of this early scribal error.

32. 知足之為足矣 HFZ 388, KS 152, Ch. 46

為]小恒 AL (LZ 3)

Because of lacunae we cannot be sure about the MS. version of the last sentence of this chapter, but the occurrence of 小恒足矣 in AL strongly suggests that the MSS. parallel the TTS: 知足之足常足矣. There are at least two possible explanations for the variation between this and the YL reading. Wang Xianshen (quoted in HFZ 390.20) assumes corruption and would restore a second 足 to the YL version between 之 and 為. Equally plausible is the hypothesis that HF has cited only the first clause of this final sentence, a clause which, with or without the word 為, is itself a grammatical sentence. Though there is no conclusive evidence in favor of either of these possibilities, the presence of 為 in YL suggests that the variant is separative. The final 矣 found in all three of these witnesses is retained in all the TTS except the XE tradition.

33. 不出於戶可以知天下 HFZ 409, KS 154, Ch. 47

可以]以 AL 3a.11, BL 3a.10

The 於 found in these three and other early witnesses has not survived in any TT. Of the TTS the FY tradition alone preserves 可以, perhaps reflecting the HFZ version of the Laozi. The 以 of the MSS. is retained in the HSG tradition. Both 可 and 以 are lacking in all other TTS.

34. 不闕於牖可以知天道 HFZ 409, KS 154, Ch. 47

闕] 規 AL 3a.11, 覿 BL 3a.12. 可以] 以 AL 3a.11

(BL defective)

覿 is an acceptable LC for 闕. Again 於 is absent from the TTS, 可以 is preserved in the FY tradition and 以 only in all the HSG texts but one. Many of the TTS show the variant 見 for 知. 見 occurs in the acknowledged citation of this sentence in the 'Daoying' chapter of the Huainanzi. The same passage appears unacknowledged in the 'Zhushu' chapter where the reading 知 is preserved. This strongly suggests that the original 知 has become 見 in the 'Daoying' through contamination from the TTS. Many of the acknowledged quotations in the Huainanzi appear to have been contaminated in this way while the unacknowledged witnesses have survived unscathed.

35. 其出彌遠者其知彌少 HFZ 410, KS 154, Ch. 47

出] 出也 . 遠者] 遠 AL 3a.11

AL is defective following the second 其. Here the two MSS. show significant variation. Whether the variation is separative or not is difficult to determine since the topic markers 也 and 者 are not obligatory here. The HFZ citation agrees with BL.

36. 不行而知不見而明不為而成 HFZ 410, KS 154, Ch. 47

明] 名 BL 3a.1. 不] 弗 BL (AL defective throughout)

This passage is not well preserved in either MS. Though the 名 of BL is reflected in all the TTS, Shima restores 明 to

his recensions of the WB and the YZ traditions on the basis of the wording of the relevant commentaries. 明 / 名 belong to different rhymes and thus are best treated as semantic variants. The TTS all have 不 for the 弗 of BL. The other two negatives are illegible in the MSS. The fact that 弗 was a taboo character during the Former Han suggests that the variant 不, the official ersatz for 弗, is not original. Incidentally, the frequently encountered description of 弗 as subsuming a direct object does not seem appropriate to this example. 為 here is surely intransitive and thus this 弗 cannot be explained as a fusion of 不 and 之.

37. 出生入死 HFZ 371, KS 160, Ch. 50

Both MSS. are partially defective here. What is legible shows no variation with JL or any TT.

38a. 生之徒也 十有三者 HFZ 371 (1.3), KS 160, Ch. 50

b. 生之徒 十有三 HFZ 371 (1.4).

This passage is quoted twice in slightly different form in JL. It cannot be collated with the MSS. because of their defective condition. The TTS all agree with 38b. The particles 也 and 者, because they are not reflected in any other version of the Laozi, have been treated as interpolations by Chinese commentators on the JL (HFZ 373.5).

39. 死之徒 十有三 HFZ 371, KS 160, Ch. 50

The legible fragments of the two MSS. show no variation with JL or the TTS.

40. 民之生生而動動皆之死地之十有三 HFZ 371, KS 160, Ch. 50
而民 生生 動 皆之死地之十有三 AL 3b.6, BL 3b.10

BL differs from AL here only in the character 儻, an LC for 動. 而 is omitted from the beginning of the JL version because the quotation is interrupted by HF's exegesis; hence, we cannot be certain whether or not HF's version of the Laozi contained this particle. It is preserved in the YZ and FY texts.

With the exception of the FY text, all the TTS exhibit wording apparently derived from the shorter version of the MSS. The complete agreement of the two MSS. is again worth noting. It seems impossible to determine with any certainty the nature of the relationship between the longer version of this passage found in JL and the shorter form appearing in the MSS. They are semantically equivalent and the MS. version may conceivably be the product of early editing of the more original longer version, but there is no way of substantiating this. There are other cases of variation between the slightly fuller version of a passage in the HFZ citations and the more concise MS. versions. (Cf. Ex. 52, 72 and 73 below.)

The MSS. and JL preserve a reading in the last half of this passage which is unattested in any TT. 皆 is omitted from all of the transmitted versions but FY, three of the HSG texts and a quotation in the Wenxuan commentary. The third occurrence of 之

appears as 亦 in FY, FYY and two WB witnesses only and is omitted elsewhere. Both Chen Qiyou (HFZ 374.13) and Shima (KS 161) explain this occurrence of 之 in JL as a graphic error for 亦. (The miswriting of 之 for 亦 in certain versions of Ch. 60 was noted as early as Tang times by Cheng Xuanying, 成玄英, as quoted in KS 11b.) However, the fact that both MSS. also show 之 would seem to authenticate the JL reading. Furthermore, although the two graphs 之 and 亦 could perhaps be mistaken for each other in grass-script (see examples in Akai 1974:19-20, 40), they are quite distinct in both MS. script-styles and much less likely to be confused (cf. 攴, 夾 in AL and 土, 夾 in BL). Thus 皆之死地之十有三 can be defended as a genuine pre-Han reading which has undergone partial omission and or emendation in its transmitted reflexes. It is easy to surmise why such faulty transmission may have occurred: as it stands in the MSS. and JL the string of eight graphs is not easily interpreted. 十有三 almost surely means 'thirteen' rather than 'three out of ten' as WB and other commentators have felt constrained to interpret it, but it is impossible to say with any certainty what 'thirteen' things are being referred to. HF explicates 'thirteen' as the four limbs and nine orifices of the body but this interpretation does not seem to fit the instance of 十有三 in Ex. 40. The meaning of the last occurrence of 之 is also problematic. Construing it as the subordinating particle of possession, the string reads 'all go to the thirteen places of death'. If, on the other hand, this 之 is read 'go', as suggested by the punctuation of Gu Guangqi (HFZ 373.12), the

result is even less satisfactory: 'all go to the place of death, go to the thirteen'. It is, of course, possible that the reading in the MSS. and JL is itself defective and that the corruptions found in the transmitted versions represent attempts to make sense of what was already in pre-Han times a corrupt passage. There appears to be no ready solution to this puzzle.

41. 善攝生 HFZ 372, KS 160, Ch. 50

攝] 執 AL 3b.7, BL 3b.11

This citation is introduced by the quotative verb 言 and is reflected in all the TTS. The occurrence of 執 *tjəp in the MSS. is best treated as a synonym variant for 攝 *śhiap.

42. 陸行不遇兕虎入軍不備甲兵 HFZ 372, KS 160, Ch. 50

陸] 陵 AL 3b.8, BL 3b.12. 遇] 辟 BL. 兕] 矢 AL, 𪛗 BL.

備甲兵] 被甲兵 AL, 被兵革 BL

The variant 陵 for 陸 is shared by the MSS. and is probably a graphic error. The compound 陸行 is not attested in early texts. 辟 of BL (AL is defective) is retained in the YZ text written 避. This probably represents a textual tradition distinct from that of JL and the other TTS rather than a miswriting of 遇, as Shima proposes (KS 161). 矢 is an LC and 𪛗 an alternative graphic form for 兕 'rhinoceros'. The reflex in the TTS of the second sentence parallels the version in AL graph for graph. 備, a 之 rhyme word and 被, a 哥欠 rhyme word, are not LC but substantive variants.

43. 兕無所投其角虎無所錯其爪 HFZ 372, KS 160, Ch. 50

投] 犮 AL 3b.8 (BL defective). 爪] 蚤 AL, BL 4a.1

On the variant 犮 see Part One, Ex 28. 蚤 is occasionally found as LC for 爪 in the TTS of the pre-Han corpus (examples in ZD, s.v. 蚤 def. 3.1).

44. 兵無所容其刃 HFZ 372, KS 161, Ch. 50

The MSS., defective for most of this passage, show no variation with JL or the TTS. The 刃 of the JL witness has apparently been miscopied as 刀 by Shima.

45. 無死地焉 HFZ 372, KS 161, Ch. 50

Again, there is no variation between AL (BL is defective) and JL. The final 焉 is preserved in the FY text only.

46. 見小曰明 守柔曰強 HFZ 400, 403; KS 164, Ch. 52

Both MSS. are partially defective at this point. No variation occurs between the legible graphs and YL. Two of the XE MSS. show corruption here. One repeats the first 曰 and has replaced 守 with 用, the latter apparently raised from the beginning of the following sentence. This second scribal error is also found in another Dunhuang MS. Curiously, Shima (KS 165) has selected 用 as the original reading in the XE tradition.

47. 大道貌施 HFZ 380, KS 166, Ch. 53

行於大道 唯他是畏 BL 4a.11 and LZ 40 (AL defective)

Since these two expressions are both introduced in the JL by the locution 所謂, it seems worthwhile to collate them with the other witnesses. 大道 is attested in every text but the word 唯 is unique to the HFZ. The commentators (HFZ 381.2) offer speculative explanations for this graph including the hypothesis that it is a corruption. With the exception of two XE MSS. where 甚, apparently raised from the following sentence, has replaced 是, the TTS all agree with BL. (A similar scribal error was noted in the same two Dunhuang MSS. in the previous example.) 他 is, of course, an 'authorized' LC for the 施 of the TTS.

48. 徑大 HFZ 380, KS 166, Ch. 53

This is another two-character phrase introduced by 所謂. The word 徑 is reflected in all the TTS in the sentence 大道甚夷而民好徑 (FY). 大 is obviously not associated with 徑 in the TTS. 徑大 is defined by HF as 佳麗 which is in turn glossed as 邪道之分, 'the forking of a by-path (from the main road)'. Gao Heng (HFZ 381.4) attempts to substantiate this etymologically, but the binome 佳麗 is not attested elsewhere with this meaning. Wang Xianshen and Chen Qiyong, on the other hand, understand 佳麗 literally as 'splendid' and construe 邪道之分 figuratively as 'the point of (moral) deviation from the great road (i.e. the Dao)'. For Laozi and HF, a preference for the show and luxury implied by 佳麗 would surely constitute deviation from the Daoist principles of frugality and

simplicity.

The MWD texts here read 大道甚夷民甚好解 (AL 4a.7, BL 4a.11 has 脩解 for 解), showing no apparent reflex of the word 徑 at all. The unique and problematic 解/解 of the MSS. is explained by the commentators as a loan for 山解 'dale' or as an LC for 徑 itself (LZ 14.20). 山解 is not attested in pre-Han texts and 徑 *kieng with its final -ng is perhaps less likely to have been written 解 *keg than is the word 蹊 *g'ieg which means 'footpath' and differs phonetically from 解 only in terms of medial and tone. Thus the variation with 徑 of the TTS appears to be semantic.

The next few phrases from Laozi 53 collated by Shima are not introduced by a quotative verb such as 曰 or 言. Two and three-character fragments have here been woven into the texture of HF's prose in a manner similar to that used in the epexegetical commentaries (詁林) to the Confucian canon by Kong Yingda (孔穎達). They are omitted from the present collation.

49. 帶利劍 HFZ 380, KS 166, Ch. 53

Variation between the witnesses is lacking.

50. 資貨有餘 HFZ 380, KS 166, Ch. 53

資貨] 貨 □ AL (LZ 5), 齋財 BL 4a.12

Only the first graph of AL and the first two of BL are legible. 資貨 is reflected in three of the XE witnesses. The other TTS all show 貨財 (FY tradition) or 財貨 (YZ, one XE, WB

and HSG). No TTS reflects the 廣 (LC for 資) of BL. The remainder of this chapter is too defective in the MSS. for collation. JL cites the words 盜^𠂔 which are reflected in all the TTS, the latter graph in a variety of XS derivatives, viz. 夸, 夸, 跨, 誇 etc.

51. 善建不拔 善抱不脱 HFZ 390, KS 168, Ch. 54

建]建者 BL 4b.2 (AL defective)

Both MSS. are again defective for most of this passage. 者 is retained after both 建 and 抱 in the great majority of TTS.

52. 子孫以其祭祀世世不輟 HFZ 390, KS 168, Ch. 54

以其祭]以祭 BL 4b.2. 世世不輟]不絕 BL (AL defective throughout)

The JL reflex of this passage (HFZ 384) is not preceded by a quotative expression but is woven into the flow of HF's discourse. Curiously, JL parallels the MSS., except for the omission of 以 occasioned possibly by the assimilation of Laozi's phrases to the wording of HF. 以 is preserved in a minority of the transmitted versions, viz. all the WB texts and three out of four of the HSG witnesses. Its omission in the other TTS changes the syntax of the sentence so that the function of 祭祀 shifts from noun to verb. Neither the MSS. nor the TTS contain any reflex of the adverbial 世世 in YL.

53. 修之身其德乃真 修之家其德有餘 修之鄉其德乃長
 修之邦其德乃豐 修之天下其德乃普 HFZ 384, KS 168, Ch. 54

邦]國 BL 4b.3. 普]博 BL (AL defective throughout)

Most of the TTS, notably WB and HSG, show 於 after 修之 in each of these five parallel sentences. Presumably because the verb phrase 有餘 is bisyllabic in contrast to the monosyllabic stative verbs 真, 長, 豐, and 普 in the other four sentences, 乃 is omitted from the second sentence in both YL and the MSS. 乃 occurs even here, however, in the Wenzi reflex as well as in over half of the TTS, leading Shima (KS 169) to infer that this instance of 乃 was added sometime in the Later Han. For the occurrences of 乃 throughout this passage most of the XE texts show 能, quite likely an early LC for 乃. 能 has a reading homophonous with 乃 and often rhymed in *-əg in OC (GSR #885). The taboc graph 邦 is reflected only in the FY tradition. LZ revises the transliteration 博 in BL to 溥. The latter is found in the FY text. 博/溥 and 普 are synonym variants.

54. 以身觀身 以家觀家 以鄉觀鄉
 以邦觀邦 以天下觀天下 HFZ 384, KS 168-9, Ch. 54

Except for the omission in one XE MSS. of the phrase 以鄉觀鄉 and the usual alternation of 邦 (JL, AL and FY) with 國, variation between JL, the MWD texts and the TTS is lacking.

55. 吾奚以知天下之然也以此 HFZ 384, KS 169, Ch. 54

奚]何 BL (LZ 40). 也]茲 BL (AL defective throughout)

奚 and 何 are synonyms; the former is retained in the FY tradition only. All other TTS show 何. 茲 is an LC for the 哉 of most TTS. The final 也 in JL is unattested in the transmitted versions.

56. 禍兮福之所倚 福兮禍之所伏 HFZ 341, 342; KS 176, Ch. 58

AL lacks both instances of the particle 兮 which appears in all the TTS except the XE tradition. The first of these two sentences appears to have been omitted in the copying of BL (LZ 50.23) while the second is only partially legible.

57. 孰知其極 HFZ 343, KS 176, Ch. 58

孰]孰 BL 5a.9 (AL defective)

A large majority of the TTS have the 孰 of BL. HF seems to understand 孰 literally: 故諭人曰孰知其極 "Thus he instructs people 'Be thoroughly familiar with its extremes'". If HF had construed 孰 as an interrogative (i.e. LC for 孰), it is unlikely he would have used the verb 諭. 孰 is also found in two XE texts.

58. 人之迷也其日故以久矣 HFZ 344, KS 176, Ch. 58

迷]迷 BL 5a.10. 故以]固 BL (AL defective throughout)

FY retains the topic marker 也; FY, FYY and YZ retain final 矣. The 以 of JL is found, written 已, in FYY only.

59. 方而不割 廉而不歲 真而不肆 光而不耀 HFZ 345, KS 176, Ch. 58

廉]兼 BL 5a.10. 歲]刺 BL. 肆]紕 BL.

耀]眺 BL (AL defective throughout)

歲] 'cut' and 刺 'prick, stab' are synonym variants. The latter is unique to BL; most TTS show 歲] or 穢 both of which rhyme with 割. If we assume the rhyme is original, then 刺 is best explained as a scribal error for 歲] since the MS. graph is clearly a clerical-style form of 刺. On 紕 for 肆, see Part One, Ex. 29. 眺 *t'ioŋ is an acceptable loan for 耀 *d̥ioŋ.

60. 治人事天莫如嗇 HFZ 349, KS 178, Ch. 59

如]若 BL 5a.12 (AL defective throughout)

Though most TTS collated by Shima reflect the 若 of BL, 如 is found in YZ and Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen citation of WB as well as WB's commentary. The of the WB texts can therefore be attributed to contamination. All but one XE text show 式 for 嗇. Unfortunately, the XE commentary to the 'Dejing' has not survived, so we do not know whether 式 was interpreted literally ('model, pattern') there. 式 *s̥iək is most likely a semantic emendation rather than an LC for 嗇 *s̥iək.

61. 夫謂嗇是以蚤服蚤服是謂重積德 HFZ 350, 351; KS 178, Ch. 59

謂]唯 BL 5a.12 (AL defective throughout)

The TTS all reflect the 唯 of BL, the FY texts showing the homophonous 惟. The 謂 of JL is not a loan for these words, but

more probably a scribal error. 以 is preserved in YZ, most of the XE texts and the FY tradition; other TTS appear to have replaced this 以 by 謂. 服 appears as 伏 in four XE witnesses, an emendation attributable to XE, according to Shima. Another possibility would be to regard the homophonous 伏 and 服 as early LC each of which came with the passage of time to be interpreted literally. Lu Deming cites this passage from WB with 復 and WB's commentary uses 復 in its paraphrase of this sentence. The extant WB texts, however, show 服 here. FYY (quoted by Shima KS 179) regards 復 as WB's own emendation. The 服 in the textual witnesses of the WB tradition would then be attributable to contamination. 服 and 復 belong to different rhyme groups (之 and 幽 respectively) and could not be loaned for each other. All the TTS show 謂之 for the 是謂 found in JL and BL. The final character 德 is defective in BL.

62. 重德則無不克無不克則莫知其極 HFZ 351, 352; KS 178, Ch. 59

AL is defective throughout and BL for most of this passage. The second 則 has been omitted from YZ and four XE witnesses.

63. 莫知其極則可以有國 HFZ 352, KS 178, Ch. 59

None of the legible graphs in either MSS. show variation with JL. Both the MWD witnesses are defective where 則 would occur; this conjunction is preserved in the FYY text only. The presence of 國 in AL here proves that 國 in the TTS represents

the original reading and is not a taboo-substitute for 邦. Incidentally, the wide-spread substitution of 國 for 邦 in the TTS of the pre-Han corpus has no doubt obscured the semantic distinction between these two words. Even Xu Shen, who lived, of course, after the tabooing of 邦, merely glosses each in terms of the other. A worthwhile investigation of the distinction would obviously have to be restricted to pre-Han epigraphic and MS. materials.

64. 有國之母可以長久 HFZ 353, KS 178, Ch. 59

No variation occurs between any of the witnesses. BL is defective at 以長.

65. 深其根固其柢震坐久視之道也 HFZ 354, KS 178, Ch. 59

其根] 榑 AL (LZ 7), 根 BL 5b.2. 其柢] 依 AL, BL

This passage is preceded in the MSS. by 是謂 which may have been omitted from JL as redundant. On the other hand, YZ and one XE text also lack these two words. The three Dunhuang MSS. show 是以 here. Shima incorrectly regards the resulting string as ungrammatical. It is not, if one punctuates after 柢. In fact, the final 也 of the JL and the MWD witnesses seems to urge treating the last six characters in the TTS as an independent nominal sentence. The TTS all reflect the MWD MSS. in lacking 其 before 根 and 柢. 榑 is LC for 根. The 帶 found in YZ, XE and HSG is probably cognate with 柢. Though they belong to different OC rhymes (祭 and 脂), 柢 has an MC reading

homophonous with 莖 and the syllables are synonymous, meaning 'base of a plant stalk'. No TT has preserved final 也.

66. 治大國者若烹小鮮 HFZ 355, KS 180, Ch. 60

國者] 國 BL 5b.4 (AL defective throughout)

The nominalizing particle 者 is preserved in Wenzi, YZ and FYY. Most XE texts show the synonym variant 腥 'fresh meat' for 鮮. FYY has 鱗, perhaps originally a scribal error for 鮮.

67. 以道莅天下其鬼不神 HFZ 356, KS 180, Ch. 60

莅] 立 BL 5b.4 (AL defective)

立 in BL is most probably an LC for its XS derivative 莅 which appears in all the TTS. It is difficult to perceive from Karlgren's reconstruction the phonetic affinity between 立 *gliəp and 莅 *liəd. He does not group them in the same phonetic series and, furthermore, treats 位 *giwəd as a third, unrelated entity. It can be shown, however, that 位 and 莅 both have 立 as their phonetic, even though Xu Shen regards 位 as a semantic compound (从人立). SW lacks an entry for 莅 and the homophonous 洫; it does, however, define another homophonous graph 立隸 as 臨 'approach, oversee'. This same gloss applied to 莅 in the Guangyun and the use of 隸 for 莅 in the reflex of this very passage from the Laozi in the commentary to the 'Chuzhen' chapter of the Huainanzi (quoted in Ding 1960:6870b) confirm the fact that 隸 and 莅 are graphic variants for the same syllable. In his graphic analysis of 隸 Xu Shen treats 立 as

signific and 𠂔 (Karlgren's *d'əd/*diəd) as phonetic. 𠂔 itself means 'come up to, reach' (从後及之也) and appears to be related etymologically to 莅. The phonetic connection between 莅 and 立 is paralleled by the use of 𠂔 as an abbreviated phonetic (省聲) in 𠂔 *d'əp, a word synonymous with 𠂔 (與𠂔同), according to Xiaoxu edition (小徐本) of SW. The phonetic correspondence between gusheng syllables reconstructed with final palatal glides *-j^h by Pulleyblank and rusheng syllables in -p is further borne out by the following cognate pairs, many of them related graphically as well: 內/納, 暨/及, 對/答, 蓋/闔, 際/接, 世/葉 and 執/執 (Pulleyblank 1962:233-234, cf. Dong 1967:241 and Li Fang-kuei 1975:257-268). This pattern of evidence justifies treating both 立 and 𠂔 as phonetic in 𠂔 (𠂔 is, of course, signific as well) and grouping 位 and 莅 together with 立 in the same XS series.

FY and all but one of the HSG texts show 著 after 天下.

68. 非其鬼不神也其神不傷人也 HFZ 356, KS 180, Ch. 60

The TTS all lack both occurrences of 也 in JL and the MSS.

69. 聖人亦不傷民 HFZ 357, KS 180, Ch. 60

不傷民]弗傷 AL 5a.11, 弗傷也 BL 5b.5

AL becomes defective after the graph 傷. 弗 in the MSS. is best treated as a contraction of the negative 不 and an object pronoun 之 that has the 人 of the previous clause, 非其神不傷人也, as its antecedent. JL has 不 which here does

not subsume an object; thus the text shows 民 in the usual post-verbal object position. Incidentally, there is a curious shift in the JL from the use of 人 as object of 不傷 in the previous sentence to the use of 民 in this passage. This surely suggests corruption but it is impossible to say which variant was original. 民 is preserved only in the FYY recension while the MSS. and all other TTS show 人.

70. 兩不相傷則德交歸焉 HFZ 357, KS 180, Ch. 60

則]故 BL 5b.6 (AL defective)

The 則 of JL is reflected in the FYY text. Shima seems to regard this as a late emendation. YZ lacks any word here, but the remaining TTS all have 故. Final 焉 is found in all transmitted versions save the XE tradition.

71. 圖難於其易也為大於其細也 HFZ 396, KS 186, Ch. 63

難於難乎 AL (LZ 8) (BL defective)

大於]大乎 BL (LZ 43) (AL defective)

Though both MSS. are defective for most of this passage, variation between 乎 and 於 can be discerned. 於 seems to be by far the most common locative particle in the MWD witnesses of the Laozi; it even appears later in the same chapter in AL (5b.11 and 6a.1; BL is defective) and throughout Chapter 64 in both MSS. It is difficult to account for the sudden appearance of 乎 here. Both 乎 and 於 are curiously preserved in the FY tradition, producing the reading 圖難乎於其易為大乎於其細. Both

occurrences of 其 are omitted in YZ and XE.

72. 天下之難事必作於易 HFZ 396, KS 186, Ch. 63

難事必難 AL 5b.11 (BL defective)

The longer YL version of this passage is reflected word for word in the FY tradition. Most of the other TTS shorten this wording by omitting 之. YZ omits 天下之 and 必, but no witness agrees perfectly with the MWD version.

73. 天下之大事必作於細 HFZ 396, KS 186, Ch. 63

大事必大 AL 5b.11 (BL defective)

The variation between YL, AL and the TTS parallels that of the previous example, except that 天下 is here omitted from five XE texts as well as YZ. These XE witnesses all show 小 for 細.

74. 其安易持也 其未兆易謀也 HFZ 400, KS 188, Ch. 64

AL is legible for the first sentence, including 也, and the characters 易 謀 only. BL is defective throughout the passage. No TTS retains either instance of final 也 attested in YL.

75. 欲不欲而不貴難得之貨 HFZ 404, KS 190, Ch. 64

貨 賈騰 AL 6a.7

On this variant see Part One Ex. 7a. 而 is lacking in all TTS.

76. ^學不^學復歸象人之所過也 HFZ 405, KS 190, Ch. 64

不^學] 不學而 AL 6a.8. 復歸] 復 AL, BL 6b.1

The 而 of AL (lacking in BL) is found reflected as 以 in the FY text. 復 appears to have been emended to 備 in all but one of the XE witnesses. 歸 and the final 也 of YL are unattested in any other version of this passage. The locution 復歸 occurs six times elsewhere in the MSS. and TTS of Laozi, once each in Chapters 14, 16, and 52 and three times in Chapter 28. YL may possibly preserve the original reading here, the 歸 of which must have been dropped very early from certain seminal witnesses. The variant is not semantically significant, but does provide another bit of evidence of the lack of contamination from the TTS in the HFZ witnesses.

77. 恃萬物之自然而不敢為也 HFZ 407, KS 190, Ch. 64

恃] 能輔 AL 6a.8, BL 6b.2. 不] 弗 AL, BL. 為也] 為 AL, BL

The YL variant 恃 is unique as is the 能 in the MSS.; all TTS show 以輔. 不 in YL and the TTS is probably a taboo-substitute for 弗. In this case 弗 incorporates an object whose antecedent is 萬物之自然. The optional final 也 of YL is retained in the FY tradition. Three of the HSG texts show 焉 here which also probably refers back to 萬物之自然.

78. 以智治國國之賊也 HFZ 861, KS 192, Ch. 65

智治] 知知 AL 6a.10, BL 6b.4. 國] 邦 AL

This quotation appears in the 'Nansan' chapter of HFZ, but

as it is introduced by the phrase 老子曰, it is included in this collation. The second 知 in the MSS. seems amenable to two interpretations; it may be an LC for 治 or Laozi may possibly be punning deliberately here on the use of 知 to mean 治. (There are examples of this usage in ZD, s.v. 知, def. 17.) The 邦 of AL is unattested elsewhere, all texts showing the substitute 國. The final 也 of 'Nansan' and the MSS. is found in FY only.

79. 知足不辱 知止不殆 HFZ 952, KS 148, Ch. 44

This citation in the 'Liufan' chapter of HFZ is also explicitly acknowledged by the introductory 老聃有言曰. BL is defective for all but the first two characters of Chapter 44, but the other witnesses, including AL, show no variation with the 'Liufan' version.

80. 吾有三寶 持而寶之 HFZ 379, KS 196, Ch. 67

吾] 我 恒 AL 7a.1, BL 7a.8. 寶] 葆 AL, 琫 BL. 持] 市 BL

The AL version of these two sentences reads 我恒有三葆之 which is a solecism. This corruption can easily be explained by assuming that the copyist's eye jumped from the 葆 at the end of the first sentence to the same graph at the end of the second sentence, omitting the two intervening graphs 持 and 而. The 吾 of JL finds its unique reflex in the FY text. 恒 is unique to the two MWD MSS. In five of the XE texts 持而寶 has been transposed and appears as 寶而持. YZ, WB and all but one HSG text show 保 for the homophonous 寶. 市 is an LC for 持.

81. 慈故能勇 儉故能廣 HFZ 376, 377; KS 196, Ch. 67

慈] 夫 茲 BL 7a.9 (AL defective). 故能] 敢 能 BL

Initial 夫 may have been omitted from the JL because this citation has been isolated from its context in Chapter 67 where 夫 functions as a pivot between the enumeration of the 'three treasures' and the explanation of their efficacy. (Cf. a similar case of the likely omission of 夫 in Ex. 22.) 敢 in BL for 故 elsewhere is no doubt a copyist's error, 敢 having been raised from the following sentence.

82. 不敢為天下先 故能為成事長 HFZ 378, KS 196, Ch. 67

事] 器 BL 7a.10

The second occurrence of 為 is preserved in the FYJ recension alone. The omission of this 為 in the other TTS changes the function of the following 成 from adjective ('completed, mature') to verb ('become'). AL agrees with JL in having 事 for the 器 of BL and all the transmitted witnesses. This is another case where the two MSS. diverge significantly.

83. 慈於戰則勝 以中則固 HFZ 379, KS 197, Ch 67

於戰] 以戰 BL 7a.12 (AL defective). 勝] 勝 BL

Again, initial 夫 appears to have been omitted by HF as in Ex. 85. It is retained in all the TTS. 於 is unique to JL and is probably an error for 以. Wang Xianshen remarks in his commentary on this passage (HFZ 379.2) that a pause should come after (夫)慈. This sets 慈 off as the topic of both parallel

four-character comments which follow: 'Through compassion, one will triumph in attack and be impregnable in defence' (Lau 1963:129). Four XE texts and the FY tradition show 陳 for 戰; one XE text has 陣, a graphic variant of 陳. 陳' *d'iĕn and 戰 *tĭan are synonym variants, 陳 'battle array' here used as synecdoche for 戰 'offensive warfare'. 正 appears in the FY texts and one XE witness for the 勝 found elsewhere. Another XE text has 政. Shima regards both 陳/陣 and 正/政 as emendations originating with XE which have contaminated the FY tradition.

The remaining phrases in the JL parallel to the end of Laozi 67 are not acknowledged citations and hence have been omitted from this collation.

As was noted repeatedly in the discussion of the data presented above, it is often impossible on the basis of the available evidence to determine the relative authority of two variant readings. The text chosen as a lemma in this collation is not itself an early MSS. but a witness whose earliest extant version is a printed edition dating from the Qiandao period (1165-1173) of the Southern Song, some thirteen centuries after the death of its reputed author. Because of this enormous lacuna in our knowledge of the transmission of the HFZ, we can hardly insist on the hypothesis that all of its unique variants, except those clearly attributable to scribal error, date from pre-Han times. It is certainly possible that none of them do. On the other hand, the high incidence of agreement between JL, YL and the MWD MSS. in the use of particles would suggest that

the HFZ citations of the Laozi have escaped pervasive corruption and survive today in a relatively unadulterated state, at least as far as substantives are concerned. Though we cannot determine with any certainty whether any of the unique variants in HF's quotations of Laozi are authoritative, the very fact that these unique readings have survived at all is surely further evidence that JL and YL are relatively free from contamination. The collation has failed to uncover any evidence of homogenization of the citations with the TTS such as can be discerned in the acknowledged quotations from Laozi found in the Huainanzi. The inference that can, I believe, be drawn from the collated data is that the instances of significant semantic variation found between HFZ and the MWD witnesses in Ex. 7 (臣/本), 10 (取/奪), 13 (以/不) and 42 (遇/辟) as well as the cases of add-omission in Ex. 52, 72 and 73 and possibly the syntactic variation of Ex. 2 and 3 point to the existence in pre-Han times of separate textual traditions of the Laozi. It is possible then that HF was citing from a version of the text substantially different from that preserved in the MWD MSS.

A second inference that it seems to me can be drawn from the data concerns the derivation of the TTS. In each of the four cases of semantic variation between the HFZ and the MSS. we found both variants reflected in the TTS. This implies that, whatever the nature of the recension of the Laozi produced by Liu Xiang in the first century B.C., it may not have been the archetype of all the transmitted versions. Obviously, if likely pre-Han variation is preserved in the TTS, one can assume that

the lines of derivation for at least some of the TTS reach back beyond Liu Xiang to the discrete, pre-Han textual traditions which I believe the collation allows us to posit.

The collation has also thrown some light on the special nature of the FY text, mentioned in the Introduction to this study. The many instances of this text's retention of particles (Ex. 22, 23, 58, etc.) and its occasional reflection of readings otherwise unique to JL (Ex. 33, 40, 55 and 80) fully substantiate the Song description of FY as a recension based in part on pre-Han witnesses. (The relevant passage, quoted in KS 10b, mentions YL, but curiously not JL, as one of FY's sources.) Though the result is a composite version and thus by no means infallible, the evidence makes it abundantly clear that FY is the most reliable of the complete transmitted witnesses.

Finally, some inconclusive evidence concerning the derivation of the two MWD MSS. has also been noted. Ex. 6, 19, 42 and 82 all contain what may be separative variants. Cases of conjunctive variation between the two MSS. and all other witnesses were also found (Ex. 7, 8, 11, 40, 41, 77 and 80). However, it would clearly be premature to attempt an interpretation of this data without collating AL and BL in their entirety.

Notes to Part Two

1. See: Encyclopedia Britannica, 15th ed., s.v. 'Textual Criticism' by E. J. Kenney for a clear exposition of the critical process.

2. On the assumption that JL and YL were composed by HF himself, they can be dated to before 233 B.C., the year of his death according to the Shiji (63.15). The attribution of these two chapters as well as other Daoist passages in the HFZ to HF has been disputed by Rong Zhaozu (1927:99-101) who argues that because in the genuine 'Wudu' chapter 'abstruse sayings' (微妙之言) are described as unsuitable for use in governing (HFZ 1058), it is unlikely that HF would have written a commentary on the Laozi. That 'abstruse sayings' necessarily refers to the Laozi is, of course, an arguable assumption on the part of Rong. He recognizes only two of the extant 55 chapters of HFZ as genuine and suggests that JL and YL were interpolated by early Han Daoists. We have, on the other hand, Sima Qian's description of HF's thought as deriving from the doctrines of Huanglao (Shiji 63.14). Since the Shiji was completed c. 91 B.C., to save Rong's hypothesis requires the assumption that Sima Qian was completely unsuspecting of the extensive and, from his standpoint, recent Laoist interpolations in the HFZ. The authorship and precise date of JL and YL is not, however, immediately relevant to our

present purpose, the collation of three early witnesses of the Laozi.

3. The terms 'substantives' and 'accidentals' were first used by Walter Greg in his essay 'The Rationale of Copy-Text' (1951). For the concise definition of these terms I have followed the phrasing of Bowers (1950:13, 1962:1).

Bibliography

Akai Kiyomi 赤井清美

1974 Shotai-jiten. Tōkyō: Tōkyōdō.

Bowers, Fredson

1950 'Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an illustration from Dryden'. Modern Philology 48.12-20.1962 'Established Texts and Definitive Editions'. Philological Quarterly 41.1-17.

Buck, David D.

1975 'Three Han Dynasty tombs at Ma-wang-tui'. World Archaeology 7.1.30-45.

Chan Wing-tsit

1963 The Way of Lao Tzu (Tao-te ching). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Chao Gongwu 晁公武

1967 Junzhai dushuzhi. (Reprint of Wang Xianqian's 1884 edition). Taipei: Guangwen shuju.

Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, ed.

1958 Hanfeizi jishi. (Expanded and revised edition in 2 vols.). Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju.

Chen Yuan 陳垣

1928 Shihui-juli. (1962 reprint). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.

Dain, Alphonse

1964 Les Manuscrits. (Nouvelle édition revue). Paris: Société d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres'.

Ding Fubao 丁福保, ed.

1960 Shuowen-jiezi-qulin. (Reprint with Supplement of 1928 edition, 12 vols.). Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan.

Dickinson, Steve

1979 'Historical Implications of the Ma Wang Tui texts: Huanglao Taoism Reconsidered'. Unpublished seminar paper.

Dong Tonghe 董同龢

1967 Shanggu yinyunbiao gao. (Reprint of Guoli zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan 18.1-249.). Taipei: Lianguofeng chubanshe.

Duan Yucai 段玉裁

1930 Shuowen-jiezi-zhu (Wanyou wenku ed., facsimile of 1815 printing). Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.

Duyvendak, J.J.L.

- 1954 Tao Te Ching: The Book of the Way and Its Virtue.
London: John Murray.

Encyclopedia Britannica, 15th ed. (1979). S.v. 'Textual
Criticism,' by E.J. Kenney.

Housman, A.E.

- 1921 'The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism'.
Proceedings of the Classical Association 18.67-84.

Hu Shi 胡適

- 1943 'Lianghan linwen puhui kao'. Tushu jikan, new series
5.1

- 1943a 'Du Chen Yuan Shihui juli lun Han hui zhutiao'. Tushu
jikan, new series, 5.1

Both of the above reprinted in Hu Shi xuanji: kaoju.
Taipei: Wenxing shudian, 1966.

Hunansheng bowuguan, Zhongguo kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 湖南省博物館

- 1974 'Changsha Mawangdui er-, sanhao Hanmu fajue jianbao'.
Wenwu 1974.7.39-48.

Hurvitz, Leon

- 1961 'A recent Japanese study of Lao-tzu'. Monumenta Serica
20.311-367.

Gao Heng 高亨 and Chi Xichao 池曦朝

- 1976 'Shitan Mawangdui Hanmuzhong de boshu Laozi'.
Reprinted, revised from Wenwu 1974.11.1-7 in Mawangdui
hanmu boshu zhengli xiaozu, Mawangdui Hanmu boshu
Laozi, pp. 109-128. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe.

Greg, Walter W.

- 1951 'The Rationale of Copy-Text'. Studies in Bibliography
3.19-36.

Henricks, Robert G.

- 1979 'A note on the question of chapter divisions in the
Ma-wang-tui manuscripts of the Lao-tzu'. Early China
4.49-51.

Jiang Yougao 江有誥

- 1966 Jiangshi yinxue shishu. (Photoreprint of 1814
edition). Taipei: Guangwen shuju.

Karlgren, Bernhard

- 1932 'The poetical parts in Lao-Tsi'. Göteborgs Högskolas
Årsskrift. 38.3.1-45.

- 1954 Compendium of Phonetics in Ancient and Archaic
Chinese. Reprinted from BMFEA 26.

- 1957 Grammata Serica Recensa. Reprinted from BMFEA 29.
- 1964 Glosses on the Book of Odes. Reprinted from BMFEA 14 (1942), 16 (1944), 18 (1946).
- 1967 Loan Characters in Pre-Han Texts. Reprinted from BMFEA 35-39 (1963-1967).
- Kleinhenz, Christopher, ed.
 1976 Medieval manuscripts and textual criticism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Department of Romance Languages.
- Lau D. C.
 1963 Lao Tzu Tao Te Ching. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Li Fang-kuei
 1975 'Studies on Archaic Chinese'. Translated by G.L. Mattos. Monumenta Serica 31.219-287.
- Li Xueqin 李學勤
 1979 'Mawangdui boshu jianyao jieshao'. Unpublished workshop paper.
- Loewe, Michael A.N.
 1977 'Manuscripts found recently in China: a preliminary survey'. T'oung Pao. 63.2-3.99-136.
- Lu Zhiwei 陸志韋
 1948 Shiyun pu. Yanjing xuebao monograph 21.
- Lü Shuxiang 呂叔湘
 1955 'Lun wu [毋] yu wu [勿]'. Reprinted in Hanyu yufa lunwenji, pp. 12-35. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe.
- Luo Changpei 羅常培 and Zhou Zumo 周祖謨
 1958 Han Wei Jin Nanbeichao yunbu yanbian yanjiu. Pt.1. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe.
- Mawangdui Hanmu boshu zhengli xiaozu 馬王堆漢墓帛書整理小組
 1974 Mawangdui Hanmu boshu (yi). Shanghai: Wenwu chubanshe.
 1976 Mawangdui Hanmu boshu Laozi. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe.
- Ma Yong 馬雍
 1972 'Daihou he Changsha chengxiang'. Wenwu 1972.9.14-21.
- Pei Xuehai 裴學海
 1933 Gushu xuzi jishi (1962 reprint) Taipei: Guangwen shuju.
- Pulleyblank, E.G.
 1962 'The consonantal system of Old Chinese'. Asia Major N.S. 9.59-114, 206-265.

- 1963 'An interpretation of the vowel systems of Old Chinese and of written Burmese'. Asia Major N.S. 10.200-221.
- 1965 'Close/Open ablaut in Sino-Tibetan'. Lingua 14.230-240.
- 1973 'Some further evidence regarding Old Chinese -s and its time of disappearance'. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London 36. pt. 2.368-373.
- 1973a 'Some new hypotheses concerning word families in Chinese'. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 1.1.111-125.
- 1979 'Linguistic notes on the Laozi manuscripts'. Unpublished workshop paper.
- Qian Mu 錢穆
1956 Xiangqin zhuzi xinian. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Rong Zhaozu 容肇祖
1927 'Han Fei de zhuzuo kao' Zhongshan daxue yuyan lishi yanjiusuo zhoukan 1.4.94-106.
- Shen Qianshi 沈兼士
1945 Guangyun shengxi. (1960 reprint). Beijing: Wenzi Gaige chubanshe.
- Shima Kunio 島邦男
1973 Roshi kosei. Tokyo: Kyuko shoin.
- Shirakawa Shizuka 白川靜
1974 Setsumon shingji. Kobe: Hakutsuru bijutsukan.
- Shisanjing zhushu. (Photoreprint of 1816 woodblock edition.)
Taipei: Iwen yinshuguan, 1976.
- Tang Lan 唐蘭 et al.
1974 'Zuotan Changsha Mawangdui Hanmu boshu'. Wenwu 1974.9.45-57.
- Vinaver, Eugene
1939 'Principles of Textual Emendation'. Published in Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends, pp. 351-369. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press.
- Waley, Arthur
1958 The Way and Its Power: A Study of the Tao Te Ching and Its Place in Chinese Thought. (Paperback edition). New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Wang Yanzhi 王引之

1798 Jingdian shici. (1931 reprint). Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.

Xiao Han 曉函

1974 'Changsha Mawangdui Hanmu boshu gaishu'. Wenwu 1974.9.40-44.

Yan Lingfeng 嚴靈峰

1965 Lao Lie Zhuang sanzhi zhijian shumu (shang pian). Taipei: Zhonghua congshu pianshen weiyuanhui.

1976 Mawangdui boshu Laozi shitan. Taipei: Heluo tushu chubanshe.

Yang Shuda 楊樹達

1955 Ciguan. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.

Zhou Fagao 周法高

1973 Hanzi gujin yinhui: A pronouncing dictionary of Chinese characters in Archaic and Ancient Chinese, Mandarin and Cantonese. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Zhongwen dacidian. (1st revised edition). Yangmingshan: Zhonghua xueshuyuan, 1973.

Zhou Zumo 周祖謨 and Wu Xiaoling 吳曉鈴, eds.

1956 Fangyan jiaojian ji tongjian. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe.