

Kajikō Shōku "Rōshi Dōtokukyō" no kenkyū: Keichō kokatsujiban o kiso to shita honbun keitō no kōsatsu [Research on the Heshanggong Commentary of "Laozi Daodejing": Study of the Textual Foundations of the Old Printed Editions from the Keichō Era] 河上公章句『老子道德經』の研究—慶長古活字版を基礎とした本文系統の考索

YAMASHIRO YOSHIMARU 山城喜恵. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院, 2006. 956 pages. ISBN 9784762927607. ¥25,000.

Professor YAMASHIRO Yoshimaru's magisterial survey of the textual tradition of the *Heshanggong* commentary adds a fresh perspective to the broad body of Sino-Japanese scholarship published over the past two decades. It is well known that despite its role in the development of religious Daoism, the *Heshanggong* commentary has not been widely studied in the West, and Alan K.L. Chan's *Two Visions of the Way* remains the sole initiative; only one outdated translation of this work by Eduard Erkes has been published so far in English.²⁷

Profiting from his previous research, published in the *Shiokōbunko ronshū* 東洋文庫論集 between 1992 and 2006, Yamashiro's study examines the Japanese printed editions of the *Heshanggong* commentary through meticulous textual analysis. This rich volume is divided into four distinct parts, each preceded by its own introduction and conspectus, closing with two text editions: one critical collation of the thirty-one examined works, and a final reproduction of the Keichō Era (1596–1615) printed edition or *Keichō kokatsujiban* 慶長古活字版, which the author believes represents a superior text, "surpassing the Song edition of the *Sibaocongkan* 四部叢刊 printing" (p. 6).

The first part is mainly dedicated to examining the previous studies on the textual tradition, those of Takeuchi Yoshio 武内義雄, Naitō Motoharu 内藤幹治, Shima Kunio 島井男, Fujiwara Takao 藤原高男, Wang Ka 王卡, and specially Zheng Chenghai 鄭成海, whose recently republished critical edition is mainly based on the *Sibaocongkan* text, a nineteenth century copy of a Song text that, from internal evidence, can be traced back to the reign of Emperor Xiaozong 孝宗 of Song.²⁸ After a brief study of the importance and difficulty of the *Heshanggong*, this part ends with a short description of the thirty-one editions used by the author, most of them Japanese.

What follows is intended to demonstrate that all previous assumptions on the textual priority of the Song editions are misguided, and that the Japanese printed editions offer a more faithful testimony to the original text. I will evaluate this assumption shortly. Part two,

²⁷ There is, however, a Dutch translation by B.J. Mansvelt Beck, *Laozi. Daodejing* (Utrecht: Servire, 2002).

²⁸ See Alan K.L. Chan, *Two Visions of the Way* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1991), p. 234, note 3, for the identification.

which is the main body of this study, begins by examining the tradition and reception of the *Hexianggong* in China and Japan, during the Tang 唐, Six Dynasties 六朝, and Song 宋 periods, concentrating in the different phases of acceptance and the creation of the editions under study. Professor Yamashiro focuses on the discrepancies and variations between the Japanese *testimonia*, listing every paradigmatic form attested in these texts and attempting to explain the causes: misprints, external contamination, etc. The second chapter of this part concentrates on particular differences between the *Keichō* text (regarded as the *constitutio textus*), the *Yōmei bunshō* 陽明文庫藏 from the end of Muromachi era 室町時代 (c. 1570), and two Chinese editions, the *Sibucanglan* and the *Shideng* 世德堂 from 1532. The author mainly focuses on auxiliary sinograms, such as 也 *ye*, 之也 *zhiye*, and 者也 *zheyue*, a peculiarity of the Japanese printed editions absent in Song and Tang received texts (the Tang editions found in Dunhuang usually omit all the auxiliary sinograms at the end of a sentence). The same procedure is repeated with the remaining editions, offering a meticulous and methodologically sophisticated analysis of each remarkable variant.

Part three constitutes a detailed exposition and comparison of eight Japanese editions and some commentaries, with their respective affiliations. After the notes and bibliography follows a critical text collating the studied editions, and eight comparative tables showing the statistical differences between them, taking as reference both the *Keichō* and the *Sibucanglan*. From this analysis Yamashiro draws the conclusion that three main textual families existed: the Tang, the Japanese *testimonia*—these two closely related and representing a purer textual branch—and the remaining and corrupted Song editions. Finally, the author provides a full reproduction of the *Keichō* text.

However, while the book provides a useful and in-depth treatment of the presented data, there are some features that appear much less successful. First, rather than following the method of textual criticism developed by German philologists (Friedrich Wolf, Immanuel Bekker, and Karl Lachmann), the author relies on the more conventional approach of presenting the textual variants by embedding them in the main body of the text. This arrangement could be useful in an edition of a classical work that has little textual variance, but in this particular case, making use of thirty-one editions with their individual differences, it only makes working with the text more difficult to manage. An independent critical apparatus would be most welcome.

A second problem lies in the adhesion to a single text, instead of establishing a *constitutio textus* by comparing the different family editions. Reasons behind the author's preference for this particular Japanese edition rely upon its assumed affinity with the oldest Tang data. I will give, however, some examples of how this reasoning does not effectively implement the philological criteria for critical editions of classical texts, the so-called canons of Tischendorf and the Metzger Criteria. First, the antiquity of a given text does not guarantee its superiority, especially if the *textus receptus* (Tang dynasty) is later than the archetype (late-Han–Six

Dynasties). An example can be seen in line seven of the third chapter of the *Heshanggong* commentary: Song editions have the reading 謂聖人治國與治身同也 *wèi shèngren zhìguó yǔ zhìshēn tóng yě* ("Meaning that the sage governs the country *in the same way* as he governs his body"), but the *Keichō* gives a different reading: 謂聖人治國猶治身也 *wèi shèngren zhìguó yóu zhìshēn yě* ("Meaning that the sage governs the country *just as* he governs his body"). There is no *a priori* reason to consider the Japanese rendering superior to the Chinese one, and vice versa. But if we take into consideration other Chinese editions, we can see how the Song text may preserve a more correct variant: Comparing the editions assembled by Qiang Siqi 強思齊 at the end of the Tang Dynasty, by Gui Youguang 歸有光 in Ming times, and the one contained in the Daoist Canon, one finds that none includes the word 同 *tóng* while each does preserve the 與 *yǔ*, thus making this text from the Qiang Siqi and Gui Youguang editions dubious. However, the *Qianshu zhiyao* 前書治要 Tang compilation offers the same *restitutio* as the *Keichō* concerning this line by changing 與 *yǔ* into 猶 *yóu*, an addition probably realized in order to make the text more readable since 同 *tóng* was not present anymore in the editions used by the Tang compiler of the *Qianshu zhiyao*. This is a more plausible scenario for the origin of the *Keichō* when the whole corpus data of the *Heshanggong* editions is taken into consideration, viz. that textual variations may have travelled to Japan from a specimen descendant of the Qiang Siqi, and closely related to the *Qianshu Zhiyao*. The same structure 'x' 與 'y' 同 (也) 'x' *yǔ* 'y' *tóng* (*yě*) is not uncommon in the *Heshanggong*: We can see it in lines sixteen and seventeen of the sixteenth chapter and also in lines eight and nine of the twenty-third, both instances occurring also in the *Keichō*.

I will give a final example of how a bad reading present in the printed texts analyzed by Professor Yamashiro can be seen in the first chapter of the *Daodejing*, line five. The Song text reads 始者 道本也 *shǐ zhě, dào běn yě* ("The beginning is the Origin of the *Dao*"), while the *Keichō* has 天地始者 道 *tiāndì shǐ zhě, dào* ("The beginning [of] Heaven and Earth [is] the *Dao*"). Again, the Song reading seems more likely to preserve the original text, and the edition of Qiang Siqi provides us again with a new clue: While, like the *Keichō*, it lacks 本也 *běn yě*, it does preserve the original reading 始者 *shǐ zhě*. All the remaining Chinese editions agree with the Song text against the Tang variant found in Qiang and its Japanese descendants. Moreover, the absence of 之 *zhī* in 天地始者 *tiāndì shǐ zhě* is quite suspicious, since the *Daodejing* verse has it. In both instances the *Keichō* seems to represent a late state of the defective Tang texts.

Finally, an important methodological flaw in the statistical analysis presented in the final pages of this book should be pointed out: these ciphers offer a false image of the distance between the analyzed texts by making indiscriminate use of non-important variants, such as auxiliary words.

Overall, it must be emphasized that the perusal of this study provides a welcome addition to the research of early medieval Daoism from a philological perspective, and its

transmission to Japanese soil. Despite minor flaws, the reader cannot help but admire the author's titanic effort to encompass the vast amount of textual evidence presented here. Professor Yamashiro's bold vindication of the *Koteho* edition will no doubt inspire heated disputes, but will also serve as an additional resource for further textual criticism. Alan K.L. Chan's call for a more critical and updated translation of the *Hsinshanggong* commentary still remains.

CÉSAR GUARDE-PAZ, University of Barcelona