

Browsing along the Dao: Notes on the Schipper-Verellen Companion to the *Daozang*

T. H. Barrett

School of Oriental and African Studies

The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang. Edited by Kristopher Schipper and Franciscus Verellen. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Three volumes in one case. Pp. xxii + 1637. \$175.00/£105.00.

The discovery of Taoism has been one of the most significant developments in scholarship on East Asia and on religion in general of the entire twentieth century, even though in truth it was very largely a development only of the second half of that century. From the very first contacts between China and the modern Western world in the late sixteenth century right up to the 1950s, the Taoist priesthood was regularly denounced as a collection of charlatans, and their canon virtually ignored. The efforts made by men and women of many lands to reverse this neglect and establish Taoist Studies on a professional basis internationally constitute a story that has been told elsewhere, but in any version of that story, along with the names of such pioneers as Henri Maspero, Chen Guofu 陳國符 and Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豊, one always finds mention of K. M. Schipper, the first scholar to combine textual study of the Taoist religion with substantial fieldwork in Taiwan in the company of its practitioners. It was he who initially suggested in 1976 that work on the Canon—a body of writing that since its modern reprinting in 1926 had been researched only by scattered individuals such as those just named—should be the topic of collective research on a coordinated Europe-wide and indeed international basis. The results of this collaborative effort are now before us, and surely open up a new era in our studies, fully justifying the label on the box of this set: “A milestone in the study of religion and the history of China, this work is the first complete investigation of Taoism based on the in-depth analysis and contextualization of all texts within the Taoist canon.” The project has certainly already stimulated some impressive publications along the way, such as Piet van der Loon (1920–2002), *Taoist Books in the Libraries of the Sung Period: A Critical Study and Index* (London: Ithaca Press, 1984), a superb piece of individual scholarship now much cited in the entries here. But although hitherto some piecemeal progress had been made in assessing the value of the (roughly) one and a half thousand separate texts, there was no place where all this basic information was collected, and even after the appearance of a Chinese annotated catalogue in 1991 (the origins of which are described here on p. 47), this still provided virtually no information concerning the findings of Western or Japanese research.

So here, after many years of unremitting effort, we have a firm base line for further progress, as is made clear on the same page, “the first word about a given text, not the last,” but even so a remarkably comprehensive and well presented work of reference. The initiator of the project can feel justifiably proud, not simply of carrying to its end a pioneering project on such an epic scale, but of choosing a fellow editor with quite unusual talents to bring the project to a conclusion. Franciscus Verellen is not simply a scholar of Taoism but also an academic administrator with an remarkably cosmopolitan background and experience, the sort of person without whom an international project on this scale could easily have run on even longer to no good purpose. The University of Chicago Press should be congratulated as well on having produced a work that is physically a pleasure to use, its pages generously and clearly laid out and its three durable volumes brought together in an attractive case. The fifty-four block print illustrations, too, (listed on pp. ix–x) from the pages of the Canon are deployed most skillfully to break up the massive accumulations of solid bibliographical information. The decision to use English throughout the body of the work, though with a generous helping of Chinese characters, cannot have been a simple one for what was originally a multi-lingual project involving almost no native speakers of the English language, but is entirely vindicated by the result, and most especially since it enabled the choice of a North American academic press—fortunately indeed one already experienced in the production of demanding reference projects, such as the admirable Chicago volumes on the history of cartography.

As with all reference works, one knows well enough that their true value only becomes apparent after years of use, and so the very idea of attempting to review these volumes seems in a way somewhat inappropriate. Even so, on the basis of less than twelve months acquaintance, I can testify with full confidence that this set is not simply useful for occasional reference, but is also an excellent product for recreational browsing. There is much that I have already learned that I certainly would not have learned in any other way, and I foresee many years of use, and many years of pleasure, still ahead. Even for those whose interests in the Taoist religion are no more than sporadic and half-hearted, it is still a work that is well worth possessing, rather than consulting in the library, in that it can provide an education in Taoist literature up to the Ming in a completely painless way. Perfect it is not, of course, but it much better than many less complex collaborative ventures have turned out to be. This is a book that I can confidently predict will undoubtedly win prizes, wherever there are prizes to be won.

Though it would be tedious to give the contents in full detail, a brief sketch may suffice to demonstrate the main features of the ensemble of different components brought together here. The organization of the work is outlined on p. xi, following the table of contents for the first volume, and the User’s Guide may be found on pp. xvii–xix. After the prefatory matter, the work proper begins with a lengthy exposition of the history of the Canon, leading up in its final paragraphs to a short history of the Tao-tsang Project itself, extending in all to p. 52. Thereafter the rest of Volume One covers texts divided chronologically into two groups, first up to the end of the Six Dynasties and then from the Sui through the Tang to the Five Dynasties, with each chronological section divided between a grouping of those works in general circulation and those transmitted within the religious tradition itself, and then within these two groups further subdivided by genre—the full scheme for the volume appears on

pp. v–vii. Each section, furthermore, right down to the subdivisions by genre, is introduced by a lucid editorial overview. Volume One is not simply confined to texts surviving in the current Taoist Canon, but includes a small number of works recovered from among the Dunhuang manuscripts, for which the full list of eight items of this sort may be found on pp. 1439–40 of Volume Three. The same pattern of organization exhibited in Volume One is repeated in Volume Two, which cover the Song, Yuan and Ming dynasties under the rubric “the Modern Period.” Volume Three starts with “Biographical Notices: Frequently Mentioned Taoists,” providing some information on all those sufficiently important to be indicated by capitalization of their names in the two earlier volumes. Next follows the bibliography, divided between primary sources and secondary sources mentioned in the body of the work, plus some more general secondary studies relating to the *Daozang*. Pages 1335–45 detail the careers of the various contributors, and list the contributions (including introductory material) made by them within the body of the work. Three indexes come next: the first is in effect a table of contents, showing sequentially where every text has been treated within the scheme just described; the second is a sequential listing of the contents of the Canon according to the “Schipper numbers” determined earlier in the concordance to titles published in Paris by the editor in 1975, with cross-references to the pages where they are mentioned; the third is an index by pinyin title giving Schipper number plus the same page references. Next a very useful Finding List of texts ordered by Schipper number allows the owners of the 1978 Yiwen 藝文 or Xinwenfeng 新文豐 reprint of the 1926 edition or the 1988 “corrected” edition to go straight to the texts of the Canon in any of these differently packaged reproductions of the *Daozang*, thanks to the full volume and page numbers provided. Finally, a General Index of well over one hundred pages provides access to the many names and terms mentioned throughout.

This arrangement is all very clear and helpful, and I would only raise a few quite minor quibbles as to the generally excellent level of presentation. First, in introducing the finding list it might have been very useful to mention the 1993 article by Judith Magee Boltz published in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* as “Notes on Modern Editions of the Taoist Canon,” and duly listed here on p. 1305 of the Bibliography, since this in effect provides full details of mistakes made in these reprints—even in the 1988 version—by way of the missing out or misplacing of folios, etc. It is a pity indeed that this vital research tool could not have been reprinted itself as part of Volume Three—editorial permission from the original publishers would certainly have been forthcoming for such a venture. Secondly, a clear explanation in a prominent place should have been given to the *implications* of the editorial principle that where works only appear in the Canon as incorporated into later works, they are listed under the date of the latter, for this means, for example, that one searches in vain for the famous Guo Xiang commentary to the *Zhuangzi* before the Tang, since it first appears (p. 294) only with the Tang sub-commentary of Cheng Xuanying. Likewise, the Lu Chongxuan commentary on the *Liezi*, composed c. 740, appears only in the Song (p. 684), together with the three other commentators of that date with whom Lu’s remarks are collected. Even better than any explanation, cross-referencing notices where one might have expected to find reference to Guo or Lu could have cleared up any potential confusion. Thirdly, the principles upon which the Pinyin Index are based (p. 1441) could have been explained more clearly—these are not simply alphabetic, but depend on

how the syllables in the titles have been concatenated, which is often a somewhat subjective matter that a student working from the Chinese characters will sometimes have to guess at.

Any reader with a passion for error might add to this short list a number of misprints and minor mishaps, but I have only noted these incidentally below where I have reading notes on some entries. For quibbling over issues of scholarship is quite another matter. The field of Taoist studies is still a young one, and in some areas many important questions, though much debated, remain far from resolved. In other areas very little research has yet been carried out, so all assertions must remain tentative. It is thus inevitable that not every statement made in the work under review will be greeted with complete approbation. This remains true even where the levels of scholarship on display here are nothing short of virtuosic. The General Introduction, for example, displays a staggering wealth of knowledge, but even here I remain to be convinced on one or two particulars. On p. 6, for example, the highly misleading distinction made by many twentieth-century scholars between *daoia* 道家 and *daoiao* 道教 as representing two distinct phenomena confounded in the Western term Taoism is disposed of succinctly but most effectively. I doubt, however, that Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) was the first to make this spurious distinction in these terms, and suspect that the opposition is, as expressed in this manner, a much more recent one. The source cited, moreover, reads to me as if Zhu Xi simply used the two terms interchangeably, as most Chinese writers did in pre-modern times. This is not however to deny that something somewhat similar to the basic idea conveyed by the contrastive use of *daoia* and *daoiao* is very old. As early as the fifth century we find Buddhist polemicists trying to split Taoism up into different elements in a sustained attempt to deny it legitimacy. These polemical materials (on which I have some unpublished research) do not deploy a consistent terminology, but do exhibit a consistent desire to split off Laozi, a figure whose writings were respected by all, from the practitioners of a religious tradition that the Buddhists found increasingly threatening as it cohered into more organized patterns. They also try on occasion to split off *yangsheng* 養生 practices, which were again widely accepted and indeed sometimes not unlike Indian practices accepted within the broader Buddhist tradition, as at least tolerable. The main division, then, is the very one embodied in the organization of the work under review between a literature in common circulation and an “inner” (one might say “*neibu*” 內部) literature claiming a privileged status. It was this category of Taoist material that Buddhism could not countenance. Given that Buddhism had its own very clear notion of the privileged, higher status of the Buddha’s word, their tactics seem entirely understandable, but not quite the same as those embodied in the *daoia/daoiao* opposition. This opposition, to me, seems much more redolent of Western notions about the relative value and status of philosophy and religion, perhaps filtered through Japan. It is possible, however, that Zhu Xi’s analysis—and the outlook of other intellectuals on Taoism in the late imperial period—could have been influenced by the long-term effect of these Buddhist polemics, which were after all constantly reprinted as part of the Buddhist canon. For that matter, the Buddhist influence on the structure of the Canon, and its twelve-fold subdivisions, which have attracted the attention of several recent Japanese scholars of Taoism, could have been mentioned somewhere in this essay. From a very early period the two great traditions interacted in complex ways which often make it difficult to exclude

information concerning one of them from narratives ostensibly solely devoted to the other, and bibliography is but one area where this would in my estimation seem to hold true.

Similarly, at a later point in this essay the author—not without reason—attributes the decline in respect for the Taoist Canon to the Manchu Emperors (p. 39). It is true that these men tended to be strong supporters of Buddhism, and the imperial dimensions of Manchu Buddhism have become increasingly apparent in recent research: one may point, for example, to such recent monographs as Patricia Berger, *Empire of Emptiness: Buddhist Art and Political Authority in Qing China* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003), though this is merely representative of a broader trend in reassessing a dynasty that, after all, was unique in publishing the Buddhist canon in four languages—Chinese, Tibetan, Mongol and Manchu. But though the emperor's monopoly over printing the Taoist Canon from the Ming blocks undoubtedly restricted its circulation, I have demonstrated that even so the *Daozang* could be bought and sold on the open market, and not simply acquired as a reluctant imperial gift.¹ As for the exclusion of Taoist material from the great *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 project, then it must be said that the emperor of the day was at least even-handed, in that not much more Buddhist material was allowed entrance, despite his private beliefs. The rationale offered by the scholarly editors responsible for the project for excluding much of the literature from the two great religious canons undoubtedly reflects in part their anti-clerical bias, but in part it pays due regard to bibliographical precedent, and deserves to be carefully studied. For the nineteenth century, moreover, the repairs carried out on the Beijing copy used as the basis for the 1926 reprint could have been mentioned since, as is made clear in the note by Judith Boltz mentioned above, the effects of this 1845 activity has yet to be properly assessed.

Amongst the entries in the body of the work, it seems almost pointless to discuss those texts on whose value for tracing the rise of Taoism a great deal of ink has already been spent. If the contributors had dealt comprehensively with the ins and outs of these controversies it would at the very least have resulted in a much less companionable *Companion*. But sometimes a little hint of debate could perhaps have been injected without any undue complication. On p. 120, for example, the date of “ca. 255” would seem to be assigned as quite unproblematic to the entire text number 789, which would seem a little cavalier when a small minority of scholars still find some problems with the document containing this date, and several more would probably hesitate to extend it to the whole corpus with any degree of certainty. On pp. 277–80, by contrast, what is still probably a minority interpretation concerning the amount of late material in the *Taiping jing* 太平經 is argued with great cogency, and though one hopes that this essay is taken seriously, some indication of the widespread unproblematic acceptance of an early date for most if not all of the text by many—including, as it would seem, the authors of two recent translations into modern Chinese—would not have gone amiss. And, one might add, the translation of a substantial portion of the text into English that has appeared most recently at the very least provides a

¹ T. H. Barrett, “The Taoist Canon in Japan: Some Implications of the Research of Ho Peng Yoke,” *Taoist Resources* 5, no. 2 (December 1994), pp. 71–77.

coherent presentation of the case for taking most of its material as genuinely older than the period indicated here.²

As a rule, the bibliographies given at the end of each entry provide very useful tips on further reading, usually naming at least the most helpful publications available by the time that the handbook was finally prepared for publication. In one or two cases, however, a little more information on the value of these publications might have been advisable. For example the *Yunji qiqian* 雲笈七籤, discussed on pp. 943–45, is such a useful source that it might have been worth explaining that the modern typeset edition by Jiang Lisheng 蔣力生 published in Beijing by the Huaxia chubanshe in 1996 that is listed at the end of the piece is useful for its collation of the main surviving editions and a number of other notes, but only the index provided by John Lagerwey in Schipper's *Index du Yunji Qiqian* (see below, under text no. 578) gives a full list of cross-references to other parallel materials elsewhere in the Canon. Cross-referral to these materials and (one trusts) systematic collation would, however, appear to be a feature of the latest annotated modern edition to appear in China, viz. that in five volumes produced by Li Yongsheng 李永晟 for the Zhonghua shuju, Beijing, in 2003 as part of the new series "Daojiao dianji xuankan" 道教典籍選刊. Since the three surviving pre-modern editions also differ somewhat in their arrangement, mention might also have been made of the slim concordance indicating these differences privately printed in Kyoto in 1977 by Nakajima Ryūzō 中島隆藏, *Sanbon taishō Unkyū Shichisen mokuroku* 三本對照雲笈七籤目錄, though this work will probably not be in many libraries outside Japan.

But what should in general be done about the many qualifications, emendations and further explorations that the appearance of a major work of collective scholarship on this scale covering such a number of little-explored sources is bound to provoke? The editor of the 1986 *Indiana Companion of Chinese Literature*, which covered some much more familiar territory, soon accumulated so much new data in the way of additions (usually as the result of new publications) and minor corrections that in 1998 he was able to publish a Volume Two, adding almost two hundred pages of new entries but also an even longer section updating the bibliographical references in the initial publication. One cannot demand a similar venture from the editors of the work under review on top of their already heroic labours, and it seems unlikely that progress in publishing on Taoist texts will be quite so rapid as to demand a further formal publication in a little over a decade. Even so, one can still see the need for some forum to bring together new information as it becomes available. Perhaps an annual slim volume of *Daozang Notes*, at least as an online publishing venture, might commend itself, if not to them, then at least to some interested individual or group of individuals with a talent for editorial activity. The sort of content I have in mind I have tried to exemplify below by some purely personal observations of my own. In part they merely suggest some additional references: recent publications, or translations that were evidently of a quality not worth including in the scope of the more strictly circumscribed bibliography

² Barbara Hendrischke, *The Scripture on Great Peace: The "Taiping Jing" and the Beginnings of Daoism* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006).

given in Volume Three. In part they modify views I have expressed in the past, or provide observations I have not had occasion to publish so far. They represent, of course, rather slim pickings, touching on not much more than one per cent of the total of texts dealt with in Volumes One and Two, as is inevitable for a somewhat occasional reader of the *Daozang*. No attempt has been made to be systematic; to pillage, for example, the annual bibliography of Taoist Studies compiled in Kyoto, and arrange all its relevant contents under the headings for each individual text. I am aware that there are those who could provide much more in the way of notes, and to continue to do so much more assiduously. What interests me much more as a user, rather than as a producer, of such scholarship is how to ensure that this information is smoothly disseminated. So what follows is, as it were, simply a cry for help, which I hope will not go unheeded. During the lifetime of the Tao-tsang Project the one English-language periodical in the field, *Taoist Resources*, has come and gone, suggesting that the formal publishing climate is still not ripe for a full-blown academic periodical, and no organization to parallel the International Association for Buddhist Studies (established together with its own journal) shows any signs of appearing as yet. But perhaps the momentum provided by the appearance of *The Taoist Canon* will stimulate some further international collaboration, in the spirit that first engendered the project that lies behind it. I for one sincerely hope that this is not the end of a remarkable story, but only the first chapter.

The following individual reading notes have been arranged in accordance with their Schipper numbers, and hence in order of their appearance in the Canon, but also include an indication of where in the three volumes of the *Companion* the texts so enumerated are discussed.

292, *Han Wudi neizhuan* 漢武帝內傳

See below, under 598, *Shizhou ji*

573, *Xuanzhu lu* 玄珠錄

To the one reference appended to the entry for this text on pp. 312–13 it is now possible to add a doctoral dissertation in English that presents its ideas in a systematic form, viz. Yam Kah Kean, “The Taoist Thought of the *Xuanzhu lu* (circa 700 CE),” Ph.D. diss. (SOAS, University of London, 2004).

578, *Shesheng zuanlu* 攝生纂錄

Among the many useful details on the sources for this work included in this notice on p. 356 we find reference to a *Luan xiansheng tiaopi fa* 樂先生調氣法, which is cross-referred to a similarly-entitled text in the bibliography of the *Xin Tang shu*. The most concise and helpful overview of the meditation works attributed to this Buddhist figure of the sixth century is probably that provided by Hisao Inagaki 稻垣久雄, *Ōjōronshū* 往生論註: *T’an-luan’s Commentary on Vasubandhu’s Discourse on the Pure Land: A Study and Translation* (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo, 1998), pp. 97–98, with reference to two further Japanese studies in its footnotes, though one should note too van der Loon, *Taoist Books in the Libraries of*

the Sung Period, p. 114, on the 服氣要訣 as also mentioned more accurately in one Song source overlooked by Inagaki. As shown by the concordance by John Lagerwey included in K. M. Schipper, *Index du Yunji Qiqian* (Paris: Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1981), p. xlvi, material in this compendium under Tanluan's name as *Tanluan fashi fuqi fa* 曇鸞法師服氣法 in fascicle 59 correlates with a portion of *Daozang* text number 825; cf. also the reference to this author's work later in the compendium, p. 70.12a. In 1961 Michihata Ryōshū 道端良秀 published essays both in the journal *Tōhō shūkyō* 18 and in a festschrift for Fukui Kōjun 福井康順 on Tanluan and Taoism, but it will be evident from the preceding details that the relevant material is widely scattered and still requires careful editing.

596, *Danfang jianyuan* 丹方鑑源

It might have been possible in this entry on p. 389 to mention that the monograph by Ho Peng Yoke 何丙郁 listed here collates the text in the Canon against a manuscript which also purports to derive from the Canon, but which is substantially different—the implications of this I have tried to examine in the article cited above, n. 1.

598, *Shizhou ji* 十州記

The discussion of this work on p. 115 gives the date “Probably sixth century.” This would appear to be rather too conservative. As is cogently pointed out, the opening sentence of the text (which presupposes some earlier content) suggests that it has been excerpted from some larger work that also included the *Han Wudi neizhuan* and other materials. The *Sui shu* 隋書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973) 33, p. 983, in listing the *Shizhou ji*, strongly implies that although it was also transmitted independently, it was among the works known to Lu Cheng 陸澄 (425–494) and included by him in his massive geographical compilation, the *Dili shu* 地理書. Works which were composed in time for Lu to include them in this compendium but were apparently left out, for example, are listed after Lu's work, which is thus out of the strict chronological order usually preserved by Chinese bibliographers, and therefore seems to be so placed as to indicate which titles were also subsumed within it. If the *Shizhou ji* was indeed included as a separate work in Lu's *Dili shu*, this would clearly put its independent existence back into the fifth century, and by implication the rest of the associated material whence it was excised, such as the *Han Wudi neizhuan* as well. In any case the *Han Wudi neizhuan*, whether in a version still containing the *Shizhou ji* material within it or not, is cited several times in the last fascicle of the *Qimin yaoshu* 齊民要術, generally dated to c. 533–544. This is admittedly only shortly before the date of first citation offered in the entry on this text, p. 116, which refers to the preface of the *Yutai xinyong* 玉台新詠, usually dated to c. 545. But the *Qimin yaoshu*, compiled in North China, is unlikely to have excerpted a book that had originated only recently in the South, even though it does cite southern works as late as the fifth century. Here again a fifth-century date would seem to be in view, though in fact some would push back composition of this work much earlier:—note Chen Guofu, *Daozang yanjiu lunwenji* 道藏研究論文集 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), pp. 124–26; here this is but one of a number of texts dated by rhyme scheme, in this case as early as the Han. While Chen's observations on Daoist texts in this

posthumous collection are extremely useful, my own view (which I outline in more detail in the preface to a forthcoming republication of a number of Ho Peng Yoke's studies of Daoist texts) is that evidence other than phonological is always welcome, and probably advisable, given the many uncertainties we face over the development—especially regionally—of Chinese phonology, and the complications that may arise from deliberate archaism in the use of rhymes.

693, *Daode zhenjing zhigui* 道德真經指歸

The late Isabelle Robinet, in discussing this text on pp. 289–90, hesitates to endorse the ascription to Yan Zun 嚴遵 (the first character is written wrongly in this entry and on p. 1285) of the Western Han, though she asserts somewhat boldly that we have another, briefer commentary by him—as far as I am aware, this is only fragmentary, and the ascription is also not unproblematic. On pp. 36–37 of an earlier publication, “Buddhist and Taoist Mysteries in the Interpretation of the *Tao-te Ching*,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 2d ser., 1980, no. 2, pp. 35–43, I ventured the opinion that this work could have been a forgery of the fourth century associated with the authorship of the *Liezi*. I would not want to defend this position too strongly, since the temptation to ascribe writings to the reclusive teacher of the famous Yang Xiong 揚雄 must have been strong at any point, and perhaps someone had already succumbed to it at an earlier date, possibly even before the end of the Han.

713, *Daode jing lunbing yao yi shu* 道德經論兵要義述

Besides the Japanese study mentioned in the entry on p. 291, there is now a readily available translation of this work into English: Ralph D. Sawyer, *The Tao of Peace: Lessons from Ancient China on the Dynamics of Conflict* (Boston: Shambhala, 1999), even if this provides no information of an academic nature on alternative editions and so forth, though I know of no earlier printed editions. Some useful additional references in Chinese, Japanese and English on this text may be found by consulting the entry on “Laozi” by Alan Chan in the online *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

725, *Daode zhenjing guangsheng yi* 道德真經廣聖義
(and cf. also 678)

To the references listed at the end of this entry, p. 294, one may now add a full monograph in Chinese: Jin Duiyong 金兌勇, *Du Guangting “Daode zhenjing guangsheng yi” de Daojiao zhexue yanjiu* 杜光庭《道德真經廣聖義》的道教哲學研究 (Chengdu: Ba-Shu shushe, 2005), though the author's interests are as indicated not primarily bibliographical; he mentions (on p. 24) but does not exploit the very useful material (to which I hope to dedicate a future study) preserved in Japan concerning the printing of this work in 912, and his list of cited works in the text on pp. 39–41 would appear to my eye to be incomplete. In other respects, however, this volume of research is a very welcome addition to our knowledge. Also useful for this text and other Tang commentaries on the

Daode jing is Dong Enlin 董恩林, *Tangdai “Laozi” quanshi wenxian yanjiu* 唐代《老子》詮釋文獻研究 (Ji'nan: Qi-Lu shushe, 2003), which appends a checklist of Chinese research in this area from 1984 to 2000.

733, *Liezi Chongxu zhide zhenjing shiwen* 列子沖虛至德真經釋文

The first two characters in this title (p. 682) seem to be an editorial expansion, though the text is referred to in some sources as *Liezi shiwen*. Problems arise in assessing its value in that the preface explains that it is a Song (1069) expansion of a manuscript of Tang date that had been somewhat poorly transmitted. In unpublished work I have shown that there are some clues as to how to differentiate these two layers of material, but that a closer study is needed. The copyist named as responsible for the manuscript, Xu Lingfu 徐靈府, is given the date “fl. 815,” which represents the last possible date at which he could have completed his work, since he signs himself as a resident of Hengshan 衡山, where we know from his work on the *Wenzi* 文子 he resided from 809 until that year (cf. p. 297). It is impossible to judge accurately that date of the work copied, but it does mention the Tianbao 天寶 era that ended in the year 756 as in the past, so the late eighth century would seem a fair assumption.

749, *Tongxuan zhenjing* 通玄真經, with commentary ascribed to Zhu Bian 朱弁

The very interesting suggestion on p. 298 that this must be a Tang commentary dating to c. 758–769 certainly has merit. It seems most unlikely that the two Song catalogues cited here in support of authors other than Zhu Bian, which both date back in origin to the mid-twelfth century, would have given these attributions if they had any evidence that the text actually derived from the work of a very well known contemporary who died in 1144 and who does not seem to have served as an official in the part of China mentioned by the author of the text. Cf. the study of Zhu Bian on pp. 547–53 of Robert M. Gimello, “Wu-t'ai Shan during the Early Chin Dynasty: The Testimony of Chu Pien,” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 7 (1994), pp. 501–611.

735, *Nanhua zhenjing kouyi* 南華真經口義

This commentary by Lin Xiyi, a thirteenth-century figure, discussed here on pp. 675–76, has been the topic of investigation by Hermann-Josef Röllicke, e.g. in *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 51, no. 3 (1997), pp. 787–804, “Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in the Exegesis of the *Zhuangzi*: A Case-study of Lin Xiyi's 林希逸 (ca. 1210–ca.1273) Preface to his Commentary on the *Zhuangzi*, *Zhuangzi kouyi fati* 莊子口義發題.” The subsequent impact of this commentary as reprinted (though not, one imagines, from the *Daozang* edition) in Japan is the topic of Peipei Qiu, *Bashō and the Dao: The Zhuangzi and the Transformation of Haikai* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005).

838, *Yangxing yanming lu* 養性延命錄

The latest investigation of this fascinating text, here discussed on pp. 345–46, is

Michael Stanley-Baker, “Cultivating Body, Cultivating Self: A Critical Translation and History of the Tang Dynasty *Yangxing yanming lu* 養性延命錄 (Records of Cultivating Nature and Extending Life)” (Master’s thesis, Indiana University, 2006). This study, in examining my own earlier suggestions as to a possible date of composition, concludes that the compilation of the work should be placed in the eighth century.

885, *Huangdi jiud shendan jingjue* 黃帝九鼎神丹經訣

The research of Fabrizio Pregadio cited here (p. 379) at the end of the entry is now much more readily available in his monograph *Great Clarity: Daoism and Alchemy in Early Medieval China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006), Appendix C—needless to say, this volume also contains many useful details on a number of other alchemical texts.

928, *Xuanjie lu* 玄解錄

Although I cannot add to the excellent entry concerning this text itself, on p. 395, I have tried to clarify the circumstances under which the text we now have in different versions (cf. p. 396) came to be printed: T. H. Barrett, “Religion and the First Recorded Print Run: Luoyang, July, 855,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68, no. 3 (2005), pp. 455–61.

936, *Dahuan xinjian* 大還心鑑

The entry on p. 409 notes that this text is attributed to a Hanshan zi 寒山子, but rejects the ascription on the grounds that Ma Ziran, who died in 856 (but cf. the notice on p. 1270), is also cited. This is fair enough, but begs the very vexed question as to the dates of the person or persons known as Hanshan. I have argued in a contribution to Peter Hobson, trans., *Poems of Hanshan* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2003), pp. 126–28, that the attribution, taken together with an account of Hanshan preserved by Du Guangting, suggests that Buddhists and Taoists were contesting possession of the Hanshan legend from the early or mid-ninth century onwards. Since the contest seems to have been won by the Buddhists by the end of the tenth century, to judge from the dominance of Buddhist sources in the Hanshan legend as we now know it, the likelihood is that this text dates to before the start of the Song, to c. 850–950.

1015, *Jinsuo liuzhu yin* 金鎖流珠引

In the discussion of this text, pp. 1076–79, mention is made (p. 1078) of my 1990 suggestion that its apparent reference to a Tibetan threat would place its composition before the middle of the ninth century. But there are problems with the terminology involved: in the eleventh century “Tufan” 吐蕃 could indicate “Tibetan” to a Tangut, but “Tangut” to a Song Chinese: cf. Ruth Dunnell, *The Great State of White and High: Buddhism and State Formation in Eleventh-Century Xia* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i, 1996), pp. 41, 77, and note also pp. 98–99. Since the standpoint of the text is that of a Chinese speaker, it is

conceivable that the reference is to a Tangut threat, and so that the date could be later than I at first imagined, though Tang circumstances still seem to fit well. Cf. Judith M. Boltz, *A Survey of Taoist Literature, Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries* (Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1987), p. 262, n. 41.

1026, *Tianyin zi* 天隱子

Although there is widespread acceptance of the association between this work, and especially the commentary, and the great Tang Taoist Sima Chengzhen 司馬承禎 (647–735), as in the entry on p. 303, I have considerable doubts as to whether this ascription can be genuine. Part of the problem is that the text is not attested before some material from it turns up c. 1151 in the *Daoshu* 道樞, text no. 1017, which as is pointed out with good reason on p. 781, has a way of mangling the items it anthologizes, thus giving a very poor witness as to the earliest version of any text—this problem also affects our early knowledge of the *Hua shu*, mentioned below. However the reference to Tianyinzi and Sima Chengzhen in *Daoshu* 13.4b derives from a postface attributed to Sima absent in the *Daozang* text but present in several later Ming editions. The preface under Sima's name is also cited about the same time in the *Junzhai dushu zhi* 郡齋讀書志 (Yuanben 袁本) 3B.34b (as cited on p. 84 of Piet van der Loon's index in his *Taoist Books in the Libraries of the Sung Period*; I have only had access to a typeset edition) and preserved in much the same form at the front of the Canon copy. The *Junzhai dushu zhi* itself cites the opinion of the lay Buddhist Wang Gu 王古 that Sima was the actual author, and since Wang Gu lived from the eleventh century into the twelfth, as shown by Chen Shiqiang 陳士強, *Fodian jingjie* 佛典精解 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992), p. 137, the book must date back somewhat further. Lu You 陸游, for that matter, has a piece on the *Tianyin zi* in his *Weinan wenji*, 26, as included in *Lu You ji* 陸游集 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976), vol. 5, p. 2227, written in 1190, attributing this statement to Su Dongpo 蘇東坡 (1036–1101), which would place its existence firmly in the eleventh century. The *Daoshu* citation and other Song period bibliographers' references do not allow us to be sure that the book included commentary attributed to Sima, as it does today, but this is confirmed by a postface written by Wu Lai 吳萊 (1297–1340), preserved in his *Yuanying Wu xiansheng ji* 淵穎吳先生集 (*Sibu congkan* 四部叢刊 ed.) 12.8b. Late Ming editions of the *Tianyin zi* contained in collectanea such as the *Zi Hui* 子彙 edition of 1577 reproduced in the *Congshu jicheng* 叢書集成 and elsewhere preserve a colophon of 1162 suggesting that they derive from a Southern Song version of the text. It is worrying, therefore, to find in such versions commentary in the eighth and final section of the text (p. 9 as printed in *Congshu jicheng*), adducing Buddhist texts, that has been omitted in the *Daozang*, especially since one of these texts is the *Yuanjue jing* 圓覺經. This Chinese product was probably already available in the early eighth century when Sima was still alive, but the indications are that it was not very widely known, and it would have been very odd for a Taoist master to cite it. Cf. Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄, *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshiteki kenkyū* 宗密教學の思想史的研究 (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo, 1975), pp. 105–8. Though more careful study is clearly needed, I would suspect that a late Tang, Wudai, or even eleventh century date of composition might be quite likely, as in the case of text no. 1053, below.

1032, [*Yunji qiqian*], quoted fragments of the *Dongxuan zhuan* 洞仙傳

This early hagiographical work, preserved in the famous Song compilation of the early eleventh century, is mentioned on p. 889 as a work of the Six Dynasties, which is, of course, correct. But a more specific time and place of composition have been suggested by Li Fengmao 李豐楙, “*Dongxian zhuan zhi zhucheng ji qi neirong*” 洞仙傳之著成及其內容, *Zhongguo gudian xiaoshuo yanjiu zhuanji* 中國古典小說研究專集 1 (1979), pp. 77–97; it is evidently from the sixth century south of China.

1041, *Lingqi benzhang zhen jing* 靈棋本章正經

The entry for this text on p. 82 has accidentally misprinted the second character in the name of the commentator He Chengtian 何承天. The monk of the Western Jin responsible for the transmission of this work, whose name is given here in the variants Fawei 法味 (during a period when no monk was known simply by their personal name) and Chang Fahe 常法和 looks as if he should perhaps be Bo Fawei or Fahe 帛法和. Four monks with names identical to this as to the first two characters are known to have been alive at this time; two were even blood relations: cf. Erik Zürcher, *Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), pp. 76–77 and n. 204, p. 342; as he notes on p. 281, the first character in the name would originally have indicated a monk from Kucha, though at least three of these men were Chinese disciples, or even disciples of a Chinese disciple of a foreign monk. Curiously, however, if the Buddhist element “Fa” is dropped, one is left perhaps with the name Bo He 帛和, an individual said to have been associated with the transmission of occult texts, according *inter alia* to his biography in the *Shenxian zhuan* 神仙傳: note Robert Ford Campany, *To Live as Long as Heaven and Earth* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), pp. 133–37. Ralph Sawyer and Mei-chun Lee Sawyer, *Ling Ch'i Ching: A Classic Chinese Oracle* (Boston: Shambhala, 1995) have provided a readily available translation of the *Lingqi jing*.

1044, 1478, *Hua shu* 化書

The entries on pp. 309–12 concerning the two versions of this text credit the doctoral work of John Didier for some of their information. A revised version of the bibliographical material in this doctorate has now been published by its author as “Messrs. T’an, Chancellor Sung, and the *Book of Transformation (Hua shu): Texts and the Transformations of Traditions*,” *Asia Major*, 3d ser., 11, no. 1 (1998), pp. 99–150.

1053, *Wu zunshi zhuan* 吳尊師傳

This allegedly Tang biography, mentioned briefly on p. 314, cannot be what it seems. Jan De Meyer, in his thorough monograph *Wu Yun’s Way: Life and Works of an Eighth-Century Daoist Master* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), pp. 7–8, follows Jiang Yin 蔣寅 in pointing out that it must be later than the *Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書 biography of its subject, and may date to the eleventh century.

1129, *Daojiao yishu* 道教義樞, by Meng Anpai 孟安排

The entry on p. 442 gives brief but useful references to recent scholarship, but on p. 1270 the short biography of its author seems to indicate a misapprehension concerning our main source of information on him, since it is stated that the piece in question cannot be by Chen Ziang 陳子昂 [656–695] (*sic*), presumably because it is dated 699. There are some mysteries surrounding the circumstances of Chen's death, but no reason to doubt that it took place either late in 699 or early the following year: cf. Richard M. W. Ho 何文匯, *Ch'en Tzu-ang: Innovator in T'ang Poetry* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1993), p. 53. The ascription of this source concerning Meng to a contemporary is thus entirely reasonable.

1255, *Laozi weizhi lilue* 老子微旨例略

The entry for this text on p. 78 might have mentioned the existence of a substantial parallel version to the material here that survives in quotation elsewhere in the *Daozang*, viz. *Yunji qiqian* 1.2b–1.6b. Modern editors, e.g. Lou Yulie 樓宇烈, *Wang Bi ji jiaoshi* 王弼集校釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), collate these two sources.