

---

# SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 199

March, 2010

---

Other *Laozi* Parallels in the *Hanfeizi*:  
An Alternative Approach to the Textual History of the  
*Laozi* and Early Chinese Thought

by  
Tae Hyun KIM

Victor H. Mair, Editor  
*Sino-Platonic Papers*  
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA  
vmair@sas.upenn.edu  
www.sino-platonic.org

# SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

FOUNDED 1986

## *Editor-in-Chief*

VICTOR H. MAIR

## *Associate Editors*

PAULA ROBERTS     MARK SWOFFORD

**S**INO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series dedicated to making available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor-in-chief actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including romanized modern standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed, and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered.

*Sino-Platonic Papers* emphasizes substance over form. We do, however, strongly recommend that prospective authors consult our style guidelines at [www.sino-platonic.org/stylesheet.doc](http://www.sino-platonic.org/stylesheet.doc). Manuscripts should be submitted as electronic files, preferably in Microsoft Word format. You may wish to use our sample document template, available here: [www.sino-platonic.org/spp.dot](http://www.sino-platonic.org/spp.dot).

Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web at [www.sino-platonic.org](http://www.sino-platonic.org). Issues 1–170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan. You should also check our Web site at [www.sino-platonic.org](http://www.sino-platonic.org), as back issues are regularly rereleased for free as PDF editions.

*Sino-Platonic Papers* is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Other *Laozi* Parallels in the *Hanfeizi*:  
An Alternative Approach to the Textual History of the *Laozi*  
and Early Chinese Thought

by

Tae Hyun KIM 金泰炫

taehyun@berkeley.edu

Abstract

This article deals with the textual history of the *Laozi*, focusing on quotations by the authors of the Jie Lao and Yu Lao (JYL) chapters of the extant *Hanfeizi*. Comparing them with early *Laozi* parallels (PL) of the Guodian (GD) and the Mawangdui (MWD), I analyze some significant textual differences among the three and attempt to find what the differences imply with regard to philological and philosophical concerns. Claiming that, at the end of the Warring States and the very early Western Han period, the *Laozi* had not yet been completed and that it underwent several further processes toward becoming a unified and established 5,000-word *Laozi*, I analyze the way in which the text was evolving from the GD PL to the JYL PL, and to the MWD PL. Based on text analysis comparing the early *Laozi* PLs, this paper explores not only what the early PLs variously testify, but also, who, in what philosophical, cultural and political circumstances, and with what intention, contributed to the gradual, multi-layered textual evolution of the early PLs toward one complete text, later entitled “*Laozi*.” This textual study of the *Laozi* helps to reexamine conventional categories for early Chinese philosophical schools such as Confucianism or Daoism. Furthermore, this attempt also validates the view that the establishment of the *Laozi* is associated with that of other texts that have been classified separately in philosophy.

## Contents

### 1. Historicizing the text

- 1-1. The cases of the *Mengzi*, *Xunzi*, and *Zhuangzi*
- 1-2. The *Laozi* and its text formation process

### 2. Two chapters of the *Hanfeizi* and newly excavated *Laozi* parallels

- 2-1. The question of the authorship of two chapters
- 2-2. The question of the date of creation
  - 2-2-1. The date relationship among two new finds and the Jie Yu Lao
  - 2-2-2. Two questions on the Guodian: the textual characteristics and date of creation
  - 2-2-3. The Mawangdui finds: the date of creation and the textual characteristics
  - 2-2-4. What makes the Guodian and Mawangdui finds intriguing

### 3. Textual Characteristics of the *Laozi* parallels quoted in the Jie Lao and Yu Lao chapters

- 3-1. Table comparing characteristics of the *Laozi* parallels found in the Jie Lao, Yu Lao, Mawangdui, and Guodian texts
- 3-2. Preliminary reflections
  - 3-2-1. Neither from the same parallels nor by the same author
  - 3-2-2. The meaning of the argument
- 3-3. Regarding the possibility of arbitrarily selected quotations and commentaries
  - 3-3-1. Complete sections
  - 3-3-2. Maintaining the section order of the Mawangdui parallels
  - 3-3-3. Beginning with the 38th section of the received text
  - 3-3-4. The case of the Yu Lao
  - 3-3-5. Conclusion
- 3-4. Textual differences between the *Laozi* parallels of Jie Yu Lao and of Mawangdui
  - 3-4-1. Arbitrary arrangement of sections and chapters
  - 3-4-2. Non-existent lines in the Mawangdui

3-4-3. Different words or arrangements

3-4-3-1. The case of Jie Lao 1

3-4-3-2. Jie Lao 8: Transposition case I

3-4-3-3. Yu Lao 4: Transposition case II

3-4-3-4. Yu Lao 5: Transposition case III

3-4-3-5. Conclusion

3-4-4. Non-existent lines in the Jie Yu Lao *Laozi* parallels: The case of Jie Lao 6

3-5. Philosophical characteristics of the *Laozi* parallels in the Jie Yu Lao: Summary

**4. Conclusion**

## 1. Historicizing the text<sup>1</sup>

Before examining various questions concerning the textual history of the *Laozi*, I attempt to explain a tacitly assumed but too often carelessly ignored or insufficiently examined question in the study of early Chinese texts and history: that many early texts may have undergone multiple text formation processes before their establishment as the sole extant version, that there remains even in extant texts some convincing evidence to attest to this complexity, and that this complexity seriously asks to reconstruct how to read an early Chinese text. Beginning with a textual examination of three well-known cases, I attempt to formularize my intellectual concerns regarding the *Laozi*, and, eventually, early Chinese philosophical texts in general.

### 1.1 The cases of the *Mengzi*, *Xunzi*, and *Zhuangzi*

Mengzi witnessed some of Kongzi’s sayings in the book named after him, *Mengzi*:

Kongzi said, “Humanness cannot be regarded in the same way as other ordinary values. If the king of a state were in favor of humanness, there would be no more enemies under heaven.”

孔子曰：仁，不可爲衆也，夫國君好仁，天下無敵。（離婁 上）

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to express my deep gratitude to Professor Mattias Ludwig Richter of the University of Colorado at Boulder, who has helped me to newly understand the question of the title of the Mawangdui texts and their physical and internal relatedness. Without many helpful discussions with Prof. Richter via dozens of emails, and his extremely kind intellectual explanations responding to my questions on the Guodian and the Mawangdui *Laozi* parallels, I would not have gained the insight necessary to explain the material characteristics in the Mawangdui PL, which have led me to offer this explanation of the text formation process of the *Laozi* in the early Han. I also sincerely and warmly thank Professor Victor H. Mair of the University of Pennsylvania. He has been the first reader and the important reviewer for all of the papers that I have written. Had it not been for his warm-hearted encouragement of my work, this paper as well as others could never have materialized and been published. Finally, I am grateful to Paula Roberts, Associate Director for the Center for East Asian Studies, University of Pennsylvania, who carefully edited the drafts and added polish and consistency to the finished work, and to Mark Swofford, whose careful attention to technical details ensured that the appearance of this paper correctly presents my intentions.

Kongzi said, “Young men, listen to this song. If it (the water of Canglang 滄浪之水) is clean, one tends to wash the string of his bamboo hat. If unclean, one washes his feet. The water itself brings about the circumstance.”

孔子曰: 小子聽之, 清斯濯纓, 濁斯濯足矣, 自取之也. (離婁 上)

Kongzi said, “Would he who wrote this poem know Dao? If he could rightly govern the state and his family, who dares to insult him?”

孔子曰: 爲此詩者, 其知道乎. 能治其國家, 誰敢侮之. (公孫丑 上)

These quotations by Mengzi are not found in the extant *Lunyu*, which has been believed exclusively to deliver Kongzi’s authentic sayings. It is uncertain why these quotations of Mengzi were excluded in the establishment of the *Lunyu*. But the fact that Mengzi lived about 100–150 years after the time the historical Kongzi actually lived, could be justification for the premise that the quotations of Mengzi can also be valuable in studying Kongzi’s own thought as well as the thought interpreted and regarded as his by successors in the middle of Warring States. It is rarely denied that Mengzi set himself to defend Kongzi’s teachings and cause them to succeed, and based on such a conviction, that he had no hesitation in arguing and defeating other philosophical rivals. Nevertheless, some of Mengzi’s quotations of Kongzi actually are not found in the extant *Lunyu*; this point has been ignored and forgotten in the study of Kongzi’s thought.

There is another similar example in the extant *Xunzi*. Xunzi critically mentions that Mengzi followed the idea of Wuxing 五行 in the “Fei Shi’erzi” 非十二子 chapter. Nowhere in the extant *Mengzi*, however, can one find the Wuxing chapter or any equivalent idea that Xunzi referred to. It was through two surprising archaeological finds at the end of last century, at Mawangdui and Guodian, that the chapter or the idea began to be recognized. Admittedly, scholars still argue over whether the document entitled “Wuxing” by contemporary Chinese scholars is actually related to Xunzi’s statement and, furthermore, the authentic thought of Mengzi.<sup>2</sup> Regardless of whether it in fact reflected the thought of Zisi 子思 and Mengzi or not,

---

<sup>2</sup> The attempt to dissociate the text from Mengzi’s thought has been representatively made by Ikeda Tomohisa. See his *Maōtai Kanbo hakusho gogyōhen kenkyū* 馬王堆漢墓帛書五行篇研究 (Tokyo: Kyuko shoin, 1993).

an interesting point is that Xunzi, active 30–50 years after Mengzi’s death, regarded the idea of Wuxing as a Mencian one, and that the extant *Mengzi* does not include this idea. Textually, what do these circumstances indicate? Is it just that Mengzi and Xunzi were misinformed about their seniors, Kongzi and Mengzi?<sup>3</sup> Considering that the extant *Lunyu* delivers the ideas of the Confucian successors alongside Kongzi’s, that it has some chapters that definitely were edited by later compilers,<sup>4</sup> and that Mengzi was regarded as the most successful student in the middle Warring States period, not very far from the time of Kongzi, one can justifiably claim that the quotations of Mengzi are, at least, not inferior in value to the sayings in the *Lunyu*.

The fact that the extant *Lunyu* and *Mengzi* do not include the statements that were actually regarded as Kongzi’s and Mengzi’s by their near contemporaries, Mengzi and Xunzi, provides modern scholarship with a meaningful problem of transmitted texts: there were diverse

---

<sup>3</sup> In discussing the philological or philosophical characteristics of the unearthed manuscripts, it is crucial that the recent scholarly discussion on the excavated manuscripts should be based on more thorough philological reexamination of all kinds of extant texts, such as the *Mengzi*, *Xunzi*, or the Inner Chapters of the *Zhuangzi*, that have been established as authentic, as the standard by which to determine the dates of other texts and representative works for a specific period.

<sup>4</sup> Cui Shu 崔述 (1740–1816) of Qing had already pointed out that the last ten chapters in the extant *Lunyu* might have included several interpolations by successors. Fujitsuka Chikashi claims that the last five chapters, the 16th to the 20th, of the *Lunyu*, particularly reflect followers’ ideas. See Fujitsuka Chikashi 藤塚隣, *Rongo Sōsetzu* 論語總說 (Tokyo: Koubundou, 1949). Positing the fourth chapter of *Lunyu*, “Li Ren” 里仁, as the most reliable, Bruce Brooks and Taeko Brooks present the way in which the other 19 chapters by Kongzi’s successors developed and distinctly interpreted the thought of their master, Kongzi. Even though it is not necessary to follow all the estimations presented by the authors, it is still worth paying attention to what in their achievement is a scholarly perspective that they named “the accretion theory,” which means that the *Lunyu* and even all pre-Han texts were basically created neither at one single time nor by one single author or one group. See Bruce Brooks and Taeko Brooks, *The Original Analects: Sayings of Confucius and His Successors* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998). Based on the recently excavated texts, William Boltz also presents a hypothesis that early Chinese texts were originally developed from small, discrete, and self-contained units, “building blocks,” and that evidence for this is shown in the new finds. See his “The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts,” in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, edited by Martin Kern (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 50–78.



sayings or statements at that time, which could have been incorporated into, but were eventually lost or excluded by leading compilers from the final drafts of the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi*.<sup>5</sup>

Such a careful reexamination of textual questions in extant texts necessitates asking some hermeneutical and historical questions: How do textual compilation, arrangement, editing, and expansion relate to the establishment and survival of texts in a specific political, cultural, and intellectual circumstance? Who were the compilers of the early texts? Are the texts truly the “early ones”? What aspects have made us assume or believe that the texts are old and sufficiently genuine? Fundamentally, where and how do we begin our research into the intellectual history of the Warring States?

In addition to the question of textual inclusion and exclusion in an early Chinese philosophical text, there is another important question: this is about reading a text through emphasizing its textual history. Scholars have elaborated on a paradigm that I call “essentialization.” This consists of certain simple stages: estimating the date of a text, assigning an author to the text, and pursuing a consistent interpretation of its philosophy. For example, regarding the making of Zhuangzi philosophy, which has been believed to show properly one minor but increasingly influential philosophical stream at the time of middle Warring States, scholars have formalized and categorized the following items:

- Main Text: the Inner Chapters of the *Zhuangzi*;
- Date: approximately the middle Warring States;
- Author: Master Zhuang, a person named Zhuang Zhou;
- Philosophy: (radical or therapeutic) relativism and skepticism;
- Author intellectually related to: Hui Shi.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> As to the relationship between Mengzi and the *Lunyu*, the fact that Mengzi witnessed many sayings of Kongzi not appearing in the extant *Lunyu* seems to imply that, at the time of Mengzi, mythified stories about Kongzi already existed, and his successor accepted them as valuable and genuine. This tendency towards mythification of the historical Kongzi is already shown in a lost text, *Kongzi Shilun* 孔子詩論, of the *Shanghai Museum Chu Bamboo Slips*; Asano and Lewis persuasively describe this process in the Warring States and Han periods. See Asano Yuichi 淺野裕一, *Kōshi shinwa* 孔子神話 (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1997), and Mark E. Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York, 1999).

However, it has been pointed out that this profiling lacks concrete historical evidence to prove its validity, and there are meaningful statements and testimonies that contradict this conventional formulization, even in the same or related texts.<sup>7</sup> I believe that, as in the cases of the *Mengzi* and *Xunzi*, there is no way to successfully resolve the obvious textual and philosophical contradictions that occur in the text, if one sticks to the essentializing strategy.<sup>8</sup>

An effective alternative to essentializing the text might be the “historicization of text,” as I call it, that is, seeking to track the historical formation processes of a text based on existing

---

<sup>6</sup> A similar tendency in research is shown in works by Li Xueqin 李學勤, Jiang Guanghui 姜廣輝, and Pang Pu 龐朴, who attempt to assign the Jingmen Guodian “Confucian” texts to Zi Si 子思, a grandson of Kongzi, and his school, which was philosophically succeeded by Mengzi. See Li Xueqin, “Xingwen guodian Chujian zhong de Zi Sizi” 荊門郭店楚簡中的子思子, *Zhongguo zhixue* 中國哲學 20 (1999):75–80. Jiang Ganghui, “Guodian Chujian yu Zi Sizi” 郭店楚簡與子思子, *ibid.*, 81–92. Pang Pu, “Kong Meng zhijian” 孔孟之間, *ibid.*, 22–35. For more recent work by a younger scholar who is following this scholarly trend, providing one of the most influential views on the Guodian “Confucian” texts in present-day Chinese academia, see Liang Tao 梁濤, *Guodian Zhuojian yu Simeng xuepai* 郭店竹簡與思孟學派 (Beijing: Renmin daxue, 2008).

<sup>7</sup> In the case of the *Zhuangzi*, these problems have been properly pointed out by Christopher C. Rand. See his “Chuang Tzu: Text and Substance,” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 11(1983):5–58.

<sup>8</sup> By this, I do not mean that, because the text incorporation and expansion were too arbitrary, entirely lacking any kind of consideration of the philosophical affinities among the units or sources incorporated into a text, it is completely impossible to build a consistent philosophical interpretation of text. I admit that there might have been criteria on which to judge or assist in determining their appropriateness for incorporating into the text. However, even though it is true that the criteria actually existed and were exercised, the criteria applied must have been highly diverse and loose, as is shown in the *Laozi* or *Zhuangzi*. This significantly weakens the persuasiveness of the traditional approach to an early Chinese text, that is, consistently formulized and systematically constructed reading of a text, which I called “essentialization.” I believe that the *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi* are good examples for disproving the validity of such a consistent reading, and that the tendency to philosophically essentialize a text has kept scholars in the field of early Chinese thought from paying close attention to the counterexamples in the text and significant philological conclusions that contradict the essentialized view, and, more importantly, from differently imagining what the text says. For example, as I will discuss below, the fixed idea that the *Laozi* is intrinsically different from Confucian texts has effectively blocked any imagining that the Guodian *Laozi* parallels could be associated textually or philosophically with other Guodian Confucian texts. In effect, this has made the textual quest on the *Laozi* uncritically limited in the *Laozi* parallel sources.

textual and circumstantial evidence. Rather than trying to find a way to penetratingly interpret a whole text on some accepted assumption of the author(s) and philosophical consistency or a dominant concern with the content, a more realistic approach is to situate the text in the historical process, discern multiple textual and philosophical pieces of evidence to show its interconnection to the evolving historical context, and try to explain its incorporation, corruption, replacement, and expansion in terms of textual and philosophical history. As this paper shows, this approach tends to prove that the demarcation and classification of the so-called pre-Qin texts according to conventional understanding of philosophical schools (*jia* 家) is neither clear nor definitive.

## 1-2. The *Laozi* and its text formation processes

Taking this critical approach to the early Chinese philosophical texts, I examine the philological problems of the *Laozi*, which has long been regarded as having the most complicated and disputed textual history, and now, following two recent archaeological finds at Mawangdui (hereafter MWD) and Guodian (GD), produces increasingly intense debate. In my view, the best strategy to explain its abstruse textual composition and establishment is to take the historicization approach, an approach that is supported by the recent discoveries of two different parallels to the text that later became known as the *Laozi*.

I focus on analyzing two chapters of the *Hanfeizi* (Jie Lao 解老 and Yu Lao 喻老; hereafter JL, YL, or JYL), in which a distinct *Laozi* parallel (hereafter PL) was quoted.<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, the significant value and meaning of the quotations of the *Laozi* PL in the *Hanfeizi* for the most part has been underestimated in the textual study of the *Laozi*. Though scholars are increasingly aware of the textual significance of the two chapters in the *Hanfeizi*, particularly after unearthing archaeological documents at GD and MWD, many still tend to take it for granted or assume that the JYL quotations just reflect the MWD De and Dao texts, or prepare for the Wang Bi redaction. The scholarly interest in the JYL has been generally in the

---

<sup>9</sup> In this paper, I will not call the source of the quotations in the two *Hanfeizi* chapters the *Laozi*, but, more neutrally, the *Laozi* parallels (PL). The reason will be explained in detail later.

significant textual similarity between JYL and MWD, such as the transposition of chapter order (*pianshu* 篇序),<sup>10</sup> but not in their significant differences.

This seems to be associated with the fact that, in spite of a huge amount of research, the discussions about the codification of the *Laozi* have reached an academic stalemate, finding no breakthrough to transcend the old solution that is not very different from the answers acquired from much research on MWD around 20–30 years ago. Despite the recent excavation of many hitherto unknown texts, whose philosophical nature resists classification into a specific school, scholarly imagination about the *Laozi* is still limited by the documents called “*Laozi Daodejing*.” Accordingly, the GD finds could also be regarded as doing nothing more than adding one more piece of material to several *Laozi* redactions.

I believe that this recalls two fundamental mistakes in the conventional approach to the GD or MWD finds: The first is to apply to the new excavations the *given* frameworks of understanding and categories/terms like Confucianism (Rujia), Daoism (Daojia), or Legalism (Fajia), and not to philologically or philosophically relate a text of an assumed specific school to other texts of other schools, even though it is generally agreed that the GD and the MWD documents were established before categorization by Sima Tan and Liu Xiang/Xin<sup>11</sup>; they are, in fact, *ex post facto* terms. Second, it needs to be noted that many scholars uncritically have entitled the parallel texts in the GD and MWD the *Laozi* without convincing evidence. This unproved preconception of the text title has made the discussion of the text more confusing. Free from the established categorizations and preconceptions, and joining a refreshed view with arguments regarding the *Laozi* accumulated during the last hundred years, it might be possible to

---

<sup>10</sup> I use the term “chapter” for the *pian* 篇 of the *Laozi* and “section” for the *zhang* 章.

<sup>11</sup> For the historical emergence of the term philosophical school (*jia* 家), in early Chinese philosophy and its implication, there have been several works published. See the following: Sarah Queen and Harold Roth, “A Syncretist Perspective on the Six Schools,” in *Sources of Chinese Tradition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 278–282; Michael Nylan and Mark Csikszentmihalyi, “Constructing Lineages and Inventing Traditions through Exemplary Figures in Early China,” *T'oung Pao* 89 (2003), 1–41; Kidder Smith, “Sima Tan and the Invention of Daoism, ‘Legalism,’ et cetera,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 62.1 (2003):129–156; Sarah Queen, “Inventories of the Past: Rethinking the ‘School’ Affiliation of the *Huainanzi*,” *Asia Major* 14.1 (2001):51–72.

move one step closer to the historical truth of the *Laozi* with which the two archaeological finds provide us, and to find an alternative approach to the understanding of the text and, furthermore, to early Chinese philosophical history.

To clear up these mistakes, reconstructing the JYL PLs ignored due to their assumed legalistic nature, and comparing them with the other early PLs of the *Laozi* (GD and MWD) beyond the conventional categorization, I seek to historicize the formation processes of the text.

In this paper, first, I densely discuss some important but debatable questions relating to the JYL chapters. Then, by comparing the reconstructed quotations in the JYL with early *Laozi* PLs, I attempt to historicize the process toward a complete text, to identify some significant textual and philosophical characteristics, to note variance and change from the establishing transitions, and to clarify their scholarly implications in our understanding of the *Laozi* text and the early history of Chinese philosophy.

## 2. Two chapters of the *Hanfeizi*, JL and YL, and newly excavated *Laozi* parallels

### 2-1. The question of the authorship of two chapters

The extant *Hanfeizi* consists of 55 chapters. Even though Sima Qian gave testimony that the writings of Han Fei amount to about 100,000 words, it is hard to take his statement at face value and to believe that the text was entirely from Han Fei’s hand. Modern scholarship on the authenticity of the *Hanfeizi* provides some concrete and plausible evidence to refute Sima Qian’s assertion of the single author and to make it clear that there are a great many chapters written by others, not by Han Fei, even though it fails to arrive at one settled conviction about the authorship of the *Hanfeizi*.<sup>12</sup>

On the question of the authors of the two *Hanfeizi* chapters, Jie Lao and Yu Lao, which have in them quotations parallel to the extant *Laozi*, there are two conflicting opinions: one claims that the thought of the *Laozi* that is presented in the chapters provides philosophical foundation for the whole text, the *Hanfeizi*. Feng Youlan, Chen Qiyu, Wu Xiuying, Li Dingsheng, Ohama Akira, and Yoon Chanwon hold this position, pointing out that several statements in different chapters of the *Hanfeizi* philosophically coincide with the thought of the *Laozi*. The other separates these chapters from the other chapters of the *Hanfeizi*, since the philosophical concerns presented in the two chapters are obviously distinct from those in other chapters. Hu Shi, Rong Zhaozhu, and Kimura Eiichi defend this position.

The significance of their authorship has been explained not only by the fact that the

---

<sup>12</sup> There are two typical examples of this: (1) research by Rong Zhaozhu, which basically relies on Hu Shi’s skeptical viewpoint of the extant *Hanfeizi* (see Rong Zhaozhu 容肇祖, “Han Fei de zhezuo kao” 韓非的著作考, in *Gushibian* 古史辨, edited by Luo Genze 羅根澤 [Taipei: Minglun, 1971], 4:653–679, and (2) a representative Japanese work by Kimura Eiichi: Kimura Eiichi 木村英一, *Hōka shisō no kenkyū* 法家思想の研究 (Tokyo: Daikūsha, 2006). Arguing the contrary, there are several views that support the theory of historical authorship by Han Fei. For this, see Jean Levi, “Han fei tzu,” in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, edited by Michael Loewe (Berkeley, Calif: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley 1994), 115–124.

chapters have been believed to be the first commentaries on the *Laozi* in history, but also by their distinct and unique philosophical concerns, the so-called *legalistic* interpretation of the *Laozi*, which naturally has been assumed to be a philosophical corruption and distortion of its thought, such as are naturalism or primitivism.<sup>13</sup> The scholars, who distinguish the chapters from others of the *Hanfeizi*, emphasize that the topics of the chapters are not related to Han Fei's primary concerns, epitomized as the realistic political theory and the art of individual survival in the time of political pandemonium. Furthermore, they point out that his realistic concerns, which dominate most of the contents of the *Hanfeizi*, may seriously conflict with the arcane, cosmological, and mystical teaching of the *Laozi*, since Han Fei actually condemned that kind of philosophy, which can be utilized to weaken the efficacy of law.<sup>14</sup>

Was Han Fei interested only in political realism? Does his concern necessarily conflict with cosmology or metaphysics? The answer to these questions seems to be "no." One thing to be considered more seriously in Han Fei's philosophy is the time at which he lived, the end of the Warring States period, when he could have observed all the possible kinds of philosophy of

---

<sup>13</sup> For example, Benjamin Schwartz says: "The book of Han Fei-tzu contains two chapters which are presented as Legalist commentaries on certain passages in the *Lao-tzu*. ... In stunning contrast to Lao-tzu's primitivism, however, man's true nature will be realized precisely *through* the sophisticated machinery of a developed Legalist sociopolitical order." (Benjamin Schwartz, *The World of Thought in Ancient China* [Cambridge, Mass., and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985], 343–344.) This statement is based on his own assumption that the *Laozi* consistently succeeds in reflecting the thought of a historical thinker, Master Lao, who, he believes, lived before Master Zhuang and Huang-Lao scholars of the Jixia 稷下 Academy (see his book, 187). In contrast to Schwartz, Angus Graham notes that the two chapters of the *Hanfeizi* have "little to mark them as Legalist." See Angus Graham, *Disputers of the Tao* (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1991), 285. Also, as I discuss later, Graham is skeptical of the historicity of Master Lao and situates the creation date of the *Laozi* after that of the Inner Chapters of the *Zhuangzi*. I do not agree with Graham's own assumption that the Inner Chapters were basically from Master Zhuang's hand. In any case, his standpoint on the textual establishment of the *Laozi* and historicity of Master Lao contrasts with Schwartz's assumption.

<sup>14</sup> This attempt to distinguish the *Hanfeizi* from the *Laozi* by employing hermeneutical criteria has not satisfactorily succeeded in providing an acceptably objective plausibility, and, more importantly, this approach still may depend on the assumption of the philosophical substantiality of such texts as the *Laozi* (cosmology, mysticism, anarchism) and the *Hanfeizi* (political realism, absolutism, anti-cosmology).

early China. Particularly, besides the fact that Han Fei was born in the Han state where Shen Buhai was charged with the tasks of minister,<sup>15</sup> Sima Qian attested in the biography that Han Fei had studied under Xun Qing,<sup>16</sup> frequently referred to as Xunzi (Master Xun), who attempted to critically synthesize all kinds of developed philosophies of the time under the umbrella of

---

<sup>15</sup> Shen Buhai's philosophy has often been assumed as an influential and fundamental source for Han Fei's intellectual maturity. For an excellent explanation of Shen Buhai's philosophy, see Herrlee G. Creel, *Shen Pu-hai: A Chinese Political Philosopher of the Fourth Century B.C.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

<sup>16</sup> Sima Qian's biography of Han Fei is as follows:

Han Fei was a prince of Han, in favor of the study of name/form and law/art which takes its root in the Huang-Lao philosophy. He was born a stutterer and was not able to dispute well, but he was good at writing papers. Together with his friend, Li Si, he served Xun Qing, and Si himself admitted that he was not as competent as Fei. Seeing Han was on the decline, he often remonstrated with the king of Han by submitting papers, but the king did not agree to employ him. At this, Han Fei was frustrated with the reality that, in governing a state, the king did not endeavor to refine and clarify the juridical system of the state, to control his subjects by taking over power, to enhance state property and defense, or to call and employ the wise by enhancing the state. Rather, the king employed the corrupted and treacherous and put them in higher positions over the wise. He regarded the intellectuals as a disturbance to the Law by employing their literature, and thought that knights violate the prohibition of the state by using armed forces. While the state was in peace, the king liked to patronize the honored; while in need, he employed warriors with armor and helmet. So the cultivated men could not be employed and the men employed could not be cultivated. Severely distressed over the reality that men of high integrity and uprightness were not embraced by the subjects with immorality and corruption, he observed the changes in the gaining and losing of the past. Therefore, he wrote several papers like *Gu Fen*, *Wu Tan*, *Nei-Wai Chu*, *Shou Lin*, and *Shei Nan*, which amount to one hundred thousand words. However, while Han Fei himself knew well of the difficulty of persuasion and created the detailed writing, *Shei Nan*, he eventually killed himself at Qin. He could not escape the trap of words for himself.

韓非者，韓之諸公子也。喜刑名法術之學，而其歸本於黃老。非爲人口吃，不能道說，而善著書。與李斯俱事荀卿，斯自以爲不如非。非見韓之削弱，數以書諫韓王，韓王不能用。於是韓非疾治國不務脩明其法制，執勢以御其臣下，富國彊兵而以求人任賢，反舉浮淫之蠹而加之於功實之上。以爲儒者用文亂法，而俠者以武犯禁。寬則寵名譽之人，急則用介冑之士。今者所養非所用，所用非所養。悲廉直不容於邪枉之臣，觀往者得失之變。故作孤憤五蠹內外儲說林說難十餘萬言。然韓非知說之難，爲說難書甚具，終死於秦，不能自脫。

See Sima Qian. *Shiji*. Beijing: Zhonghua. 7:2146–8.



Kongzi, his great Master. Xunzi's philosophy is generally thought to center around the discussion of orders characterized as the ideology of Li (obeying orders 禮).<sup>17</sup> In that all beings and things in the universe are systemized by a sacred principle and rule that is believed to be given by nature, Xunzi's philosophy satisfactorily matches Huang-Lao's outlook. What makes the problem more complicated is the possibility of Han Fei's intellectual interaction with Huang-Lao, which has been regarded by some skeptical scholars to be associated with the JYL chapters, given the fact that his thought actually had grown out of the ideas of Shen Buhai and Xunzi, whose interests were quite close to Huang-Lao philosophy.<sup>18</sup>

What, then, is the Huang-Lao philosophy? To answer this, it is necessary to note that recently there has arisen increasing doubt and skepticism about Huang-Lao, regarding not only its definition but also the consistency of its ideas and its historical reality. In fact, as Ikeda Tomohisa points out, in the extant texts, which have been regarded as those of the pre-Qin, there is no text referring to the term at all. If strictly applied, in fact, the term is only justifiable after the early Western Han.<sup>19</sup> While the term seems to be overused among scholarly works, the

---

<sup>17</sup> The term, Li 禮, has been most frequently translated as "ritual" in English. Recently, Martin Kern provides excellent and sophisticated explanations on the Li and its religious, political, cultural implications in relation to the formation of early Chinese texts. See Martin Kern, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2000); Martin Kern ed., *Text and Ritual in Early China* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005). I do not have a particular objection to the translation as "ritual." However, I think it needs to be pointed out that, in some cases, another translation of the technical term would be better than "ritual," which means an actual religious ceremony; for example, when used together with other technical terms like Ren 仁 and Yi 義, the term seems to imply a mental and ideological value rather than a religious ceremonial procedure. The value codified as Li is understood as a mental ideology to make the established orders like social hierarchy absolutized and sanctified (i.e., by employing old sages as makers of the orders) and thus to justly force people to follow them. For this reason, in this paper, I am reluctant to adopt the dominant translation, "ritual," for the term Li, and prefer another translation, "obeying orders," which is tentatively coined by myself.

<sup>18</sup> For example, see Nathan Sivin, "Drawing Insights from Chinese Medicine," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 34.1 (2007): 43–55; Kim Kyungsoo 김경수, *Chulto munheon ul tonghaseo bon Jungguk godai sasang* 출토문헌을 통해서 본 중국 고대 사상 (Seoul: Simsan, 2008), 99–183.

<sup>19</sup> Due to its intrinsic difficulty as a technical term, Ikeda gives two kinds of possible usage of the term Huang-Lao,

critical questions concerning it have remained unsettled<sup>20</sup>: Can Huang-Lao unambiguously be used to describe the philosophical circumstances of the middle and late Warring States periods? What is its denotation? Does it guarantee philosophical consistency in the texts that have been understood and classified as “Huang-Lao”? Why should Huangdi combine with Laozi?<sup>21</sup> etc.<sup>22</sup>

In fact, because of these fundamental problems, it seems nearly impossible to define clearly and correctly what Huang-Lao was. Thus, if it is necessary to continue using the term to describe the historical entity related to the compilation of some texts and envisioning of Daoism represented by Lao-Zhuang, I must admit that I hold a loose and hypothetical definition of that term.<sup>23</sup> As for the definition of the term Huang-Lao, I adopt that given by Roth.<sup>24</sup>

---

with regard to its philosophical denotation. See Ikeda Tomohisa, *Rō Sō shisō* 老莊思想 (Tokyo: Hōsō daigaku, 2000), 80–99.

<sup>20</sup> A representative work by an Eastern scholar is Asano Yuichi 浅野裕一, *Kōrōdō no seiritzu to tenkai* 黃老道の成立と展開 (Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1992). As is well shown in this work, Eastern academia has generally assumed that there actually was a consistent philosophical trend from the middle of the Warring States period to early Western Han. However, in fact, the more detailed and critical questions as to its definition have not been asked, nor has a more accurate searching for its denotation been attempted. Robin Yates attempts to point out one potential intellectual source, Yin-Yang theory, for the Huang-Lao ideas, based on examinations of Yinqueshan and Mawangdui finds. See Robin Yates, *Five Lost Classics: Tao, Huang-lao, and Yin-yang in Han China* (New York: Ballentine Books, 1997). See also Robin Yates, “Yin Yang Texts from Yinqueshan: An Introduction and Partial Reconstruction, with Notes on their Significance in Relation to Huang-Lao Daoism,” *Early China* 19(1994):74–144.

<sup>21</sup> Li Ling gives a possible explanation for this combination in light of concerns for justifying longevity. See Li Ling 李零, “Shou ‘Huang-Lao’” 說黃老, *Daojia Wenhua Yanjiu* 道家文化研究 (1994), 154.

<sup>22</sup> The skeptical question about the definition of the term Huang-Lao, moreover, can be combined with the criticism of the conventional categorization of philosophical schools in the pre-Qin period. Particularly, the so-called Daoism matters: Who belonged to the Daoist group? What are the proper criteria to distinguish Daoists from non-Daoists? The Legalist school is questionable, too: Who were the Legalists? Were the Huang-Lao scholars also Legalists? Into what categories such as Daoism and Legalism does Huang-Lao fit? Admittedly, these questions are hard to answer clearly. This implies that the conventional categorizations of philosophical schools cause great confusion in understanding early Chinese philosophy, especially of the late Warring States period, whose chief characteristic was that of synthesis.

<sup>23</sup> By the acceptance of the term, I do not mean that the *Laozi* or its unique idea, which consists of half of the

- a. Cosmology: based upon Dao as the dominant unifying power in the cosmos.
- b. Self-cultivation: the attainment of Dao through a process of emptying out the usual contents of the mind until a profound state of tranquility is achieved.
- c. Political thought: the application of the cosmology and methods of self-cultivation to the problem of rulership.

These so-called Huang-Lao concerns, the cosmology of Dao, self-cultivation, and views of naturalistic and cosmic politics, are highly concentrated in the following four chapters in the *Hanfeizi*: 解老, 喻老, 主道, 揚權, and the difference shown in these chapters is also related to their stylistic uniqueness in the literary sense, which is different from the literary style of other chapters in the text.<sup>25</sup> Thus, I think that, even though, as Chen Qiyu claims,<sup>26</sup> besides the four chapters, one could find evidence showing affinity with Huang-Lao thought, it is hard to prove that Han Fei philosophy is essentially based on Huang-Lao thought or the *Laozi*, since the cases are evidently few and their influences do not seem significant in the representative chapters or even in the whole of the *Hanfeizi*. In this sense, it seems hard, at least, to assert that the author of the two chapters is undoubtedly Han Fei himself. In my opinion, if the term definition, Huang-Lao, were acceptable, it would be rather more reasonable to think that their authorship should be ascribed to the Huang-Lao scholars.

---

philosophical contents in the term, "Huang-Lao," was already fully established before or during the late Warring States period. Also, I am not saying that, except for Huang-Lao, the other terms for philosophical schools like Rujia, Daojia, or Fajia should be abolished. I acknowledge that the term Huang-Lao needs to be refined or replaced.

<sup>24</sup> Harold Roth, "Some Methodological Issues in the Study of the Guodian *Laozi* Parallels," *The Guodian Laozi – Proceedings of the International Conference, Dartmouth College, May 1998*, ed. Sarah Allan and Crispin Williams (Berkeley, Calif.: The Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2000), 84.

<sup>25</sup> This concentration is quite similar to the three homogeneous chapters of the *Guanzi*, 心術 上/下, 內業, which are philosophically heterogeneous with other chapters.

<sup>26</sup> See Chen Qiyu 陳奇猷, "Han Fei yu Laozi" 韓非與老子, *Daojia Wenhua Yanjiu* 道家文化研究 6(1995):183–191.

It is also necessary to notice that there are three more chapters, Liu Fan 六反, Nei Chu Shuo Xia 內儲說下, and Nan San 難三 of the *Hanfeizi*, that quote sayings of Lao Dan 老聃 or Laozi 老子. They refer to such sayings as follows:

Lao Dan has a saying and it says: “If knowing satisfaction, one would not suffer an indignity. If he knows self-restraint, one would not be in peril.”

老聃有言曰: 知足不辱, 知止不殆 (六反)

In the sayings of Lao Dan, there is a saying about losing a fish. ... Thus he says, “The profitable means of state cannot be seen by people.”

在老聃之言失魚也. ... 故曰 國之利器, 不可以示人 (內儲說下)

It is said “Undertake difficult tasks by approaching what is easy in them, do great deeds by focusing on their minute aspects. ... Preeminent is one whose subjects barely know he exists.”<sup>27</sup>

圖難者於其所易也, 爲大者於其所細也. ... 太上, 下智有之 (難三)

“Governing a state by knowledge is to rob the state.”

以智治國, 國之賊也 (難三)

The sentence of Liu Fan coincides with a line in the 44th section of the received text (hereafter, R text) of the *Laozi*, that of Nei Chu Shuo Xia, with a line in the R section 36, and those of Nan San with a line in the R sections 64, 17, and 65. Given that these chapters have been suspected to be Han interpolations, this circumstance corresponds to the fact that Xunzi, Han Fei’s Master, mentioned Laozi as a figure for the first time in early Chinese history. There are still some important things to keep in mind: 1) in the extant *Hanfeizi*, we have only a few cases in which the extant *Laozi* is obviously quoted; 2) not only in the *Hanfeizi*, but also in other ancient texts, there is no firm evidence to indicate that the 5,000-word *Laozi* was already

---

<sup>27</sup> This translation of the *Laozi* is from Victor Mair, *Tao Te Ching: The Classic Book of Integrity and the Way* (New York: Bantam Books, 1990), 33, 79.

established in Han Fei’s time,<sup>28</sup> even though the author of the *Jie Lao* referred to “the book.”<sup>29</sup> The only thing certain is that the sources of the sayings were increasingly being assigned to the figure Lao Dan. Therefore, although it is possible that Han Fei could have known of the figure or the text that came to be entitled *Laozi*, this does not necessarily mean that the early *Laozi* was already established at the time of creation of the two chapters.<sup>30</sup>

If there is no necessary and sufficient evidence to establish that one complete 5,000-word *Laozi* existed in the late Warring States, or even that the quotations in the two chapters necessarily require the pre-existence of the complete *Laozi* text, we should not call the sources of the quotations in the two chapters the *Laozi*,<sup>31</sup> but instead just “parallels” to the extant *Laozi* text.<sup>32</sup> If rigorous standards are applied, there is no evidence to confirm that the textual source of the quotations was entitled “*Laozi*” at the time of its creation. This issue is related to a dubious question of authorship of the chapters’ titles, “*Jie Lao*” (Explaining the *Laozi*) and “*Yu Lao*” (Figuring the *Laozi*), that the chapter titles would have been made, not by the authors, but by the

---

<sup>28</sup> This is the reason I disagree with Zhu Xinyi, who assumes that JL and YL reflected the 5,000 established *Laozi*, like the MWD manuscripts. Zhu Xinyi 朱心怡, *Tianzhidao yu renzhidao – Guodian chujian Ru-Dao sixiang yanjiu* 天之道與人之道 – 郭店楚簡儒道思想研究 (Taipei: Wenjin, 2004), 38–42. In addition, the negation of the early establishment of the *Laozi* is not a preassumption for this study, but a conclusion I came to after this research. The reasons, evidence, grounds for the conclusion will be shown exhaustively below.

<sup>29</sup> Ironically, such a reference without any specific text title may support the significant possibility that the sources quoted in the chapters were clearly recognized as the *Laozi* or the *Daodejing*.

<sup>30</sup> If the chapters, *Jie Lao* and *Yu Lao*, were not from Han Fei’s own hands, why were they incorporated into the text, the *Hanfeizi*? It seems that by incorporating the documents of Huang-Lao, whose concerns were basically in the order of human, state, and cosmos, the compilers could have intended to achieve more philosophical integrity of Han Fei’s thought, which deals with the problem of law and political arts, and that his thought was apparently grounded in the thought of the text called *Laozi* at the time of compilation, which constitutes a philosophical core of the Han Huang-Lao thought.

<sup>31</sup> The reason I use the plural form “sources,” not the singular “source,” is, as will be discussed later, that I do not think the quotations in the two chapters are from one identical source.

<sup>32</sup> This is my standpoint about the title of the text known as *Laozi*, penetrating all early parallels of the extant *Laozi* from GD, to JYL and even to MWD. I try to keep thoroughly to this view in this paper.

compilers of the *Hanfeizi*, given that the titles exactly reflect the format of the commentary, echoing the contents of each. This question of chapter title is significant, because it indicates that the chapters could not have been based on the text with the authentic “*Laozi*,” now known as it really is. This intriguing point is seen again in the question of the titles of the MWD parallel texts, which obviously are improved and much more sophisticated than JYL PL in their physical contents and philosophy.

## 2-2. The question of the date of creation

When were the chapters and their quotation sources created? Assuming that quotations in the JYL reflect the MWD or the extant received text of the *Laozi*, some argue that the two chapters were basically created during or after the time of Wen Di 文帝 of the Western Han,<sup>33</sup> who has been recognized as a royal supporter of Huang-Lao thought in the Western Han history. Concerning the fact that “heng” 恒, the name of Wen Di, was tabooed in the JL chapter, and, instead, a similar character, “chang” 常, replaced it, Kim Hongkyong argues that this implies the *Laozi* of the JL were created at the time of Wen Di on the throne, or right after.<sup>34</sup> However, to be more persuasive, this argument has to be sure of its own premise that “chang” was not used before Wen Di of Western Han, and that instead “heng” had been used. But this seems unlikely. First, the A bundle of Guodian *Laozi* parallels, which was apparently established earlier than the Wen Di, has a character that can be transcribed or replaced as the modern Chinese character, “chang.”<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, texts such as *Mozi*, *Xunzi*, *Guanzi*, and the four texts in the MWD

---

<sup>33</sup> For example, Bruce Brooks argues that the chapters were created at the time of Wen Di. For his understanding of the whole of the *Hanfeizi* as well as the two chapters, see <http://www.umass.edu/wsp/chronology/overview.html#hfz>. I am grateful to Professor Brooks, via an email correspondence, for bringing my attention to his own date estimation on the two chapters and the *Hanfeizi*.

<sup>34</sup> See Kim Hongkyung 김홍경, *Noja-Sam'ui gisul, nulgunyiui norae* 노자-삼의 기술, 늙은이의 노래 (Seoul: Dulnyuk, 2003), 29–30.

<sup>35</sup> See Li Ling 李零, *Guodian chujian jiaoduji* 郭店楚簡校讀記 (Beijing: Beijing Daxue, 2002), 4. But as Li also points out, the chang and heng are understood as interchangeable in the Guodian texts as well as the MWD PL.

manuscript B, often misleadingly called *Huangdi Sijing*, also have the character used as a noun.<sup>36</sup> Although works like the *Mozi* or *Xunzi* could have been revised or rewritten after Wen Di, it is hard to argue convincingly that the "chang" was used only as a substituting word for "heng" as the latter was taboo, and that this is a textual sign for determining the date of the creation of the text.

In the study of the *Laozi*, not of the *Hanfeizi*, what is more important but, unfortunately, has been too often ignored is that the thing we need to pay most attention to is the textual date of the quotation sources rather than that of the two chapters.<sup>37</sup> This does not necessarily dismiss the earlier suggestions related to Wen Di of Western Han, since, even if the chapters were actually created during/after the reign of Wen Di, it is certainly possible that the quotation sources in the chapters could have been made and circulated earlier, and even if some words or sentences in the sources could have been corrupted by cultural or political circumstances such as the "tabooed character tradition," it is possible that the sources still maintain the more significant features as texts quoted, such as their general contents, arrangement of sentences or sections, etc., and these characteristics can still satisfactorily show how different the sources were from the MWD and the received *Laozi*. The "chang," for example, is an acceptable piece of evidence for proving that the Jie Lao chapter was made during/after Wen Di. But while the sources quoted in the JL had the word "chang" in them, there are still sufficient variances to argue that they could have been textually different from the MWD texts and the transmitted *Laozi*; thus one can still argue that the quotation sources were created earlier than Wen Di and even the MWD PL of the extant

---

<sup>36</sup> In the case of Warring States literature, which includes "chang" or "changdao," see as follows: *Mozi Harvard Yenching Sinological Index Series* (HYSIS) 486; *Xunzi* HYSIS 474; *Guanzi Yinde* 866–7; Chen Guying 陳鼓應, *Huangdi sijing jinzhuzhu jinyi* 黃帝四經今註今譯 (Taipei: Shangwu, 1995), 73.

<sup>37</sup> The discussion on the text date of the quotation sources and the chapters, in particular, was made following my receipt of a brief comment on the first draft of this paper by Professor Edward Shaughnessy, who viewed my previous date estimation of the two chapters skeptically. In my first draft, I attempted to determine the date of the chapters by using a similar method, depending on whether some specific characters are tabooed or not, which was similarly employed for the date estimation of the MWD manuscripts.

*Laozi*. Thus my task is to show what the textually and philosophically meaningful unique characteristics are in the two chapters.

#### 2-2-1. The date relationship among two new finds and the Jie Yu Lao

Before proceeding with a discussion of the variances in the chapters, it is necessary to think more about their chronological relationship to two surprising archaeological finds, GD and MWD, which parallel the extant *Laozi*. This will contribute significantly to my aim to historicize the text formation process of *Laozi*, which, I believe now, is the most persuasive and reasonable method with which to understand the text.

#### 2-2-2. Two questions on the Guodian: the textual characteristics and date of creation

In the studies of the Guodian *Laozi* parallels, there have been two important arguments submitted: their textual nature and the creation date.

The first problem is to clarify what the textual nature of GD finds is: whether each of three GD *Laozi* bundles constitutes an independent text from a source (parallel model), or whether they were sources to be incorporated into the 5,000-word *Laozi* later (source model), or whether they are selected or corrupted editions from the established *Laozi* (anthology model).<sup>38</sup> Scholars are still debating the nature of the GD parallels, dividing broadly into two groups that back the anthology model or the source model and respectively defend these views.<sup>39</sup> On the textual characteristics of the GD PL, significant points have been advance that must be dealt with seriously: First, it is necessary to clarify that we do not have any concrete evidence to be certain that the bamboo slips were entitled and recognized as the text *Laozi*.<sup>40</sup> Hence, strictly speaking, it

---

<sup>38</sup> For this, see Roth 2000, 77–78.

<sup>39</sup> From debates on the *Laozi* at the time of *Gu Shi Bian* to recent controversies on the GD parallels, Shaughnessy organizes and gives critical comments on each. See Edward L. Shaughnessy, "The Guodian Manuscripts and Their Place in Twentieth-Century Historiography on the *Laozi*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 65.2 (2005):417–57.

<sup>40</sup> See William Boltz, "The Fourth-Century B.C. Guodiann Manuscripts from Chu and the Composition of the *Laotzyy*," *Journal of the American Oriental Studies* 119.4(1999):590–608. This inference weakens an argument by Asano Yuichi or Wang Bo, who casts doubt on the source model, critically mentioning, "If it is correct that the three bundles reflect the *Laozi* which was gradually established, why did they share few common sections of the *Laozi*?" This is because they were, without any specific title, just potential sources to be incorporated into or excluded from



could be inaccurate to designate the three bundles as “Guodian *Laozi*”; instead, it is necessary to call them more neutrally “Guodian parallels of the extant *Laozi*” (Guodian *Laozi* PL). If they might not necessarily have been entitled “*Laozi*,” it is hard to argue that the ancestral *Laozi* had definitely been established.

Furthermore, the three bundles are argued to have been made in different places, by different copyists and even at different dates,<sup>41</sup> since not only the bundles’ physical shape, length, and binding condition, but also the styles of handwriting scribed are different. This implies that they could not have come directly from one common ancestral redaction. Harold Roth has convincingly pointed out that there is a significant textual variance in the common section (the 64th section in the R text) between bundles A and C, and that this signifies that their mothers could be not the same.<sup>42</sup> Thus, applying rigorous evidentiary requirements, it should not be taken for granted that there was a common ancestor, and the three bundles as descendants could be partial reflections.<sup>43</sup>

In fact, the attempt to identify the three distinct bundles under the name of the extant *Laozi* has caused the disagreements about the nature and characteristics of the lost document, Taiyi Sheng Shui 太一生水, which follows bundle C and had not been known about at all in history before the excavation, and whose physical appearance and handwriting are basically the same as those of bundle C. William Boltz convincingly points out that we do not have any substantial grounds to distinguish the text from the *Laozi*.<sup>44</sup> In my opinion, the Taiyi Sheng Shui

---

the text later called the *Laozi*. See Asano Yuichi 淺野裕一 ed. *Kodai shisōshi to Kakuten sōkan* 古代思想史と郭店楚簡 (Tokyo: Kyuko Shoin, 2005) 277–282; Wang Bo 王博, “Guanyu Guodian chumu zhujian Laozi de jiegou yu xingzhi” 關於郭店楚墓竹簡老子的結構與性質, *Daojia Wenhua Yanjiu* 道家文化研究 17 (1998):149–166.

<sup>41</sup> The argument of the different creation date was raised by Ding Sixin 丁四新, *Guodian chumu zhudian sixiang yanjiu* 郭店楚墓竹簡思想研究 (Beijing: Dongfang, 2000).

<sup>42</sup> Roth, 2000, 79–81. For a critical comment on Roth’s argument, see Shaughnessy 2005.

<sup>43</sup> This inferential approach invalidates the argument that their contents were intentionally selected by subject. For this argument, see Wang Bo 1998 and Robert Henricks, “Zhiguo Dagang” 治國大綱, *Daojia Wenhua Yanjiu* 道家文化研究 17 (1998):25–63.

<sup>44</sup> Boltz 1999.

could also have been a potential source for the 5,000-word *Laozi*, and the complete exclusion of the Taiyi Sheng Shui implies that there were diverse potential sources to be included in the later text of the *Laozi*, and through several stages of compiling and revisions, a substantial number of sources could have been lost, excluded, replaced, or incorporated in the establishment of the *Laozi*. Interestingly, despite the relatively small number, compared to the Taiyi Sheng Shui, some sentences quoted in the JL PL were also deleted or lost in a later process of text establishment, as was all of the Taiyi Sheng Shui.<sup>45</sup>

Secondly, what is to be paid attention to is that the date creation of the GD PL is not unchallengeable. As the Guodian texts themselves do not give any clue for determining their date, the estimation necessarily relies on the creation date of the Guodian first tomb from which the documents were excavated. Unfortunately, the tomb did not offer up any clues either, and the archaeologists of the GD had to estimate the date of the tomb creation indirectly by comparing the remains of the tomb with those of another nearby tomb, which has a similar style and appearance.<sup>46</sup> The Baoshan second tomb was employed to determine the date of the GD first tomb, and, since the date of the BS had already been agreed to be the late stage of the middle Warring States, the date of the GD first tomb and its documents was also understood as formed around 300 B.C.E. Scholars generally and inevitably regard this estimation as acceptable. There are critical opinions against this settled view, however. Sharply criticizing the premise that the remains of Guodian and Baoshan were free from the influence of Qin cultural style, Wang Baoxuan claims that after the fall of Ying 郢, the capital city of the Chu state, the culture was not immediately and completely taken over by the Qin, and suggests that the date was not the late

---

<sup>45</sup> Asano Yuichi concludes that there is a different understanding of Dao between the extant *Laozi* and the Taiyi Sheng Shui. His explanation could justifiably offer a reason the Taiyi Sheng Shui was thoroughly excluded by the compilers during the establishment of the *Laozi*. However, in order to analyze the difference, he presupposes the earlier presence of the complete *Laozi*, and this seems not easy to defend with extant evidence. See Asano Yuichi 浅野裕一, *Kodai Chugoku no uchuyulon* 古代中國の宇宙論 (Tokyo: Iwanami, 2006), and Asano Yuichi 浅野裕一, ed. 2005, 287–292.

<sup>46</sup> For information on the date estimation and methodology, see three papers by Li Boqian, Liu Zuxin, and Peng Hao in Sarah Allan and Crispin Williams 2000, 9–37.

stage of the middle Warring States, as most argue, but the late Warring States period, 278 to 227 B.C.E.<sup>47</sup> Even though we do not need to follow Wang's specific date estimation of creation of the GD 1<sup>st</sup> tomb, it deserves noticing that his refutation on the officially set date and others' refutation of him eventually disclose that a significant inherent problem of scholarly date assignment of archaeological finds to a specific period is necessarily dubious.<sup>48</sup>

Even though it is acceptable to assume that the tomb was created at the late stage of the middle Warring States period, it is still uncertain when the texts in the tomb were written. Although it must be admitted that the work on date estimation of the texts must essentially be guesswork, this does not mean the work is worthless. Despite its uncertainty, I believe that it is still valuable in thinking of and explaining the textual date and several related problems. The foremost problem is to estimate how much earlier the scribing was than the burial. For example, regarding the GD *Laozi* PL, Asano Yuichi claims that the ancestral complete *Laozi* might have been established in the early Warring States or even at the end of Spring and Autumn.<sup>49</sup> Considering the three distinct copies of the GD with different styles at different times and places to have been in existence around 300 B.C.E., he asserts that the *Laozi* must have been established much earlier than the creation tomb, and would have been widely circulated.

---

<sup>47</sup> For more and specific information about his refutation, see Wang Baoxuan 王葆琰, "Shilun Guodian chujian gepian de zhuanzuo shidai ji qi beijing" 試論郭店楚簡各篇的撰作時代及其背景, *Zhongguo zhixue* 中國哲學 (1999) 20:367. Besides Wang, Ikeda Tomohisa, not as an archaeologist or historian, but as a scholar of early philosophy, also claims the late Warring States period for the date, since he thinks that the Qiong Da Yi Shi 窮達以時 in the GD documents is thought to be philosophically influenced by Xunzi or his successors. See Ikeda Tomohisa 池田知久 ed., *Kakuten soka jukyō kenkyū* 郭店楚簡儒教研究 (Tokyo: Kyoko Shoin, 2003), and his 1998 "Shangchu xingcheng jiduan de Laozi zuigu wenben" 尚處形成階段的老子最古文本, *Daojia Wenhua Yanjiu* 道家文化研究 17:167–181. However, it seems questionable whether we have sufficient reason to surmise that the perspective of "separating Human roles from Heaven's" (*tianren zhi fen* 天人之分) in the Qiong Da Yi Shi must be the result of philosophical influence from Xunzi.

<sup>48</sup> A persuasive objection to Wang Baoxuan's claim was raised by Liu Binhui 劉彬徽, "Guanyu guodian chujian niandai ji xiangguan wenti de taolun" 關於郭店楚簡年代相關問題的討論 In *Jian Bo Yanjiu 2001* 簡帛研究 2001, (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue, 2001).

<sup>49</sup> Asano Yuichi 淺野裕一 ed. 2005, 277–282

The question, whether it is possible to consider the *Laozi* as a text prior to the mid-Warring States or not, had been one of the most controversial problems discussed in the early twentieth century's modern philological movement in China, which was compiled as a seven-volume book under the title *Gu Shi Bian* 古史辨.<sup>50</sup> A significant academic legacy on the *Laozi* inherited from the *Gu Shi Bian* is that there is no early textual or circumstantial evidence to make sure of the historicity of Lao Dan or the *Laozi* before the late Warring States period. Since the debates, no one has satisfactorily succeeded in explaining the questions of why the *Laozi* was not witnessed by any early texts before the *Xunzi* of the late Warring States period, why the historical statements of Lao Dan were circulated only as folklore, as is also shown in the *Zhuangzi*, which is almost the sole early text to refer to the figure who is somewhat similar to our conventional understanding of a person called "Master Lao," and why his biography had to be recorded so ambiguously in the *Shiji* by Sima Qian. This circumstance implies an inherent contradiction to the traditionally settled view of the early establishment of the *Laozi*: popularity and influence assumed, versus the absence of supporting evidence.<sup>51</sup>

Specifically, while the *Mengzi* includes several disputes between Mengzi and famous thinkers of the time, and describes some significant intellectual rivalry and his own critiques of them, the book does not mention Laozi or Zhuangzi.<sup>52</sup> Also, in the ten core chapters of the *Mozi*,

---

<sup>50</sup> Edward Shaughnessy has aptly pointed out the relationship between the Gushibian philological debate, its political and ideological circumstance, and its influence on the formation of modern Western sinology (Shaughnessy 2005). Nevertheless, I believe that, regardless of its political orientation, there have been submitted many arguments which are still insightful and objectively acceptable. In addition, the modern philological movement can be seen as an academical and cultural heir of the traditional Kaozhengxue 考證學 which fully blossomed in the Qing dynasty.

<sup>51</sup> This contradiction has been pointed out by many scholars. See D. C. Lau, *Lao tzu Tao Te Ching* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), 147–174; A. C. Graham, "The Origin of the Legend of Lao Dan," in *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature* (Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986), 111–124; Victor H. Mair, *Tao Te Ching: The Classic Book of Integrity and the Way* (New York: Bantam Books, 1990). Mark Csikszentmihalyi and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Religious and Philosophical Aspects of the Laozi* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 1–31.

<sup>52</sup> Interestingly, according to the *Zhuzi Yulei* 朱子語類, book 125, where Zhuxi's statements on Daoism are concentratedly collected, the fact that, in the *Mengzi*, there are no testimonies about Master Lao or, more strangely,

which has been regarded as early, we cannot find a historical or textual vestige of Lao Dan or the *Laozi*. It was in the *Xunzi* that Laozi and Zhuangzi were first referred to by others in early Chinese philosophical history.<sup>53</sup> The *Zhuangzi*, as the sole text in which Lao Dan or the *Laozi* was mentioned, seems highly dubious as well. Although there are still serious debates on the authorship of the text, the Outer and Miscellaneous Chapters in which quotations from the *Laozi* and Lao Dan appear in concentration have generally been regarded as interpolations by Master Zhuang's successors after the late Warring State period, at the earliest.<sup>54</sup>

Mengzi, Mozi, and Xunzi, assumed as representative thinkers of the Warring States period, did not mention or fiercely rebut Laozi and Zhuangzi, and the authenticity of the Outer and Miscellaneous Chapters of the *Zhuangzi* is highly problematic as evidence in settling the textual question of the *Laozi*—these facts seem persuasively to reflect the historical realities of

---

Master Zhuang, who has been regarded as Master Meng's contemporary, is seen as one of the biggest historical curiosities in early Daoism among Zhuxi's pupils. While similar questions in different forms had been repeatedly asked by students, Zhuxi, who himself was a great philologist of early texts and partially admired Master Zhuang's philosophically grandiose spirit, unlike his harsh depreciation of Master Lao, failed to properly answer the historical problem.

<sup>53</sup> On Xunzi's critique of Laozi, see Xunzi HYSIS 64/17/51. Xunzi mentioned "Laozi knew about shrinking back, but not about stretching out." Of Zhuangzi, see 79/21/22. He commented, "Blinded by Heaven, Zhuangzi ignored humans." But rigorously speaking, they seem to have still not been significantly recognized as intellectual rivals for Xunzi. In the whole volume of the *Xunzi*, they were very preliminarily and simply referred to only once in each of two independent chapters. This circumstance contrasts with that of Xunzi's repeated and harsh reproaches towards Mozi or Gongsun Long.

<sup>54</sup> Feng Youlan, Christopher Rand, and Ikeda Tomohisa argue that the tripartition of the *Zhuangzi* would be fundamentally meaningless. Regarding the textual establishment of the *Laozi*, this denial or doubt, more convincingly, implies that testimonies on the *Laozi* and Lao Dan in the *Zhuangzi* could not be regarded as proving their textual existence before the middle of the Warring States period. See Feng Youlan 馮友蘭, "Zailun Zhuangzi" 再論莊子, in *Zhuangzi zhexue taolunji* 莊子哲學討論集, ed., Zhexue yanjiu bianjibu (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1961), 129–146; Ikeda Tomohisa 池田知久, *Dōka shisō no shin kenkyū – Sōshi wo chūshin to shite* 道家思想の新研究 — 「莊子」を中心として (Tokyo: Kyoko Shoin, 2009). I have attempted to disprove the validity of classification of the *Zhuangzi*, emphasizing the possible interpolations in the Inner Chapters. See my forthcoming paper, "The Qiwlun of the *Zhuangzi*," *Monumenta Serica*, and a paper in preparation, "Zhuangzi as a Huang-Lao ideal."

the *Laozi* (or Lao Dan), the *Zhuangzi* (or Zhuang Zhou), and early Daoism, as against the accepted version which has been regarded as represented by Lao-Zhuang: the historical reality of the Lao-Zhuang tradition seems quite questionable until the end of the Warring States or the early Western Han. We also must consider the problem of the historical origin of the term, Daoism: based on the testimonies of the Lao Dan biography in the *Shiji*, his father, Sima Tan, first referred to the term in the way we now understand it,<sup>55</sup> and he himself also to some extent intended that meaning by serially mentioning Zhuang Zhou, Shen Buhai, and Han Fei, after introducing Lao Dan, and by making Lao Dan the actual founder of a philosophical trend who existed before Kongzi. The issue seems to have been unresolved, or even not obviously raised at the time of Sima Qian.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, these references show that there was some cultural impulse to establish Daoism as a historical fact at and before his time.

### 2-2-3. The Mawangdui finds: the date of creation and the textual characteristics

Scholars generally accept that the date of the two MWD *Laozi* PL is the very early Western Han.<sup>57</sup> The idea of a "tabooed character" has been regarded as an applicable method to determine the dates of the manuscripts: Manuscript A is regarded as having been transcribed around 206–195 B.C.E when Liu Bang was not yet on the throne, since the character "bang" 邦 was not avoided in manuscript A. Applying the same method, scholars believe that manuscript B

---

<sup>55</sup> Admittedly, its denotation by Sima Tan was not for Lao-Zhuang, but for Huang-Lao, as Harold convincingly points out. See his "Psychology and Self-Cultivation in Early Taoistic Thought," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 51.2(1991):599–650.

<sup>56</sup> For an excellent explanation of the nature of Sima Qian's writing on ancient Chinese history and figures in the Han times, see Michael Nylan, "Sima Qian: A True Historian?" *Early China* 24 (2000), 1–44. Even though it is barely possible to argue that the difference between the two is a product of modern European experience and therefore difficult to apply to traditional, esp. early Chinese history, not to distinguish them, it is still important, in evaluating his work as a historical document, to ascertain that his recordings did have a political and cultural orientation in describing figures and events, and conversely that these show what was culturally and politically happening at that time and how it affected his view on related figures or events.

<sup>57</sup> On the basic textual profile of the MWD *Laozi* PL, see Gao Heng 高亨 and Chi Xichao 池曦朝, "Shitan Mawangdui zhongde Boshu Laozi" 試談馬王堆漢墓中的帛書老子, *Wenwu* 文物 222(1974.11):1–7.

was copied around 194–180 B.C.E., when Liu Bang was on the throne, since while “bang” was substituted by another character “guo” 國, the two characters “ying” 盈 and “heng” 恒, which respectively stand for the names of the second and third emperors of the Western Han, were not avoided in manuscript B.<sup>58</sup>

Regarding the textual nature of the MWD *Laozi* PL in light of the history of the *Laozi*, a significant question that has not been given serious attention to contemporary scholars concerns the title of the texts which offer parallels to the De and Dao chapters of the extant *Laozi* text. In my view, the question of the text title of the MWD PL can be explained by some significant textual differences in the two MWD parallel texts, De and Dao, in two different manuscripts, MWD A and B.<sup>59</sup>

Ikeda Tomohisa claims that there was a textual improvement from the MWD A PL to MWD B PL. According to him, the improvement can be detected from the following points: 1) While the MWD A De and Dao PL did not bear any title, the MWD B De and Dao did; 2) MWD A was written on a 24-cm long silk piece, a fabric that was regarded as relatively less prestigious at the time, but MWD B was written on a 48-centimeter long silk piece, which was believed to

---

<sup>58</sup> Besides this “tabooed character” criterion, several points have been made to prove that manuscript A was established earlier than manuscript B. Among these, it is worth noticing the ways in which their paleographical styles compare. While manuscript A was written in the Xiao Zhuan 小篆 style that had been designated as the official style by the First Emperor of Qin, B was in the Li Shu 隸書 style, which had been mostly used in practical affairs like legal suits. Since it is generally believed that Xiao Zhuan, as the official style of Qin, became unpopular after Western Han was established, scholars tend to regard manuscript A as earlier than B.

<sup>59</sup> I admit that the following reflection is basically guesswork. For now, we have only two MWD De and Dao texts that have some different textual characteristics, and no more evidence to support an argument built merely on the differences. Thus, one may point out that we may find that they show merely small differences that could not have been very significant or meaningful at the time of creation, and this finding should not be stretched to fit my argument on the historicization of text. I am grateful to Professor Mattias Richter for pointing this out. Nevertheless, I believe that, as will be shown in this paper, many points that have been regarded traditionally as insignificant, minor, and meaningless in the study of *Laozi* and its early parallels have actually turned out to be very meaningful ones, especially when brought together and consistently analyzed with other evidence. According to my earlier understanding, differences between MWD M and B manuscripts can consist of strongly meaningful evidence for historicization of the *Laozi* text, when compared with other early parallels of the *Laozi* like those in GD and JYL.

be a fabric sufficiently precious to deserve to have a canon written on it, as attested in Wang Chong 王充's *Lun Heng* 論衡. 3) In MWD B De and Dao, there are relatively fewer sentences retouched and corrected than in MWD A PL.<sup>60</sup> Observing that the historical direction was toward an increasing ideological specification,<sup>61</sup> Matthias Richter finds that the MWD B has a strong uniformity in the visual representation of the text, from layout features down to orthography, and even a stylistic regularity of character forms, but that this is different in MWD A. He argues that the orthography that changes from text to text suggests that the individual texts were copied from models produced according to different standards.<sup>62</sup> These suggestions necessitate consideration of the possible philological changes between the two manuscripts during the transitional times.

As in the case of the GD PL, the MWD A De and Dao PL do not bear the titles, respectively De and Dao, in themselves. It is in the MWD B that the title is recorded, and it is noticeable that MWD B is textually and stylistically more refined than MWD A. Considered rigorously, this implies that we cannot be sure that MWD A De and Dao PL were recognized as bearing the titles De and Dao. In addition, it is not clear that the texts were respected as canons (*jing* 經), since they do not have the character in their titles and the only text in MWD B that bears “jing” in its text title is Shi Liu Jing 十六經. As Richter correctly points out, the fact that Shi Liu Jing is explicitly entitled “jing” seems to imply that none of the other texts was understood as a jing. Otherwise a manuscript that is so unusually explicit about the precise

---

<sup>60</sup> See his *Dōka shisō no shin kenkyū – Sōshi wo chūshin to shite*, 73–76. However, Matthias Richter points out that Wang Chong's statement is an example of information that cannot directly and consistently be applied to earlier text production. (This is made in a personal correspondence with me.) According to Richter, the Xing zi ming chu 性自命出 of the GD and the Xing qing lun 性情論 of the Shangbo offer a good example because, while they have different formats, they are both in the largest format in their respective corpuses.

<sup>61</sup> For this, see Matthias Richter, “Gudai wenxian de yanbian: Mawangdui boshu jia ben Laozi di ba zhang wei li” 古代文獻的演變: 馬王堆帛書甲本老子第八章為例, in *Jian Bo* 簡帛 3, (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 2008), 421–431.

<sup>62</sup> See Matthias Richter, “Textual Identity and the Role of Literacy in the Transmission of Early Chinese Literature.” In *Writing and Literacy in Early China: Papers from the Columbia Early China Seminar*, edited by Li Feng and David Branner (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010), 209–247. He emphasizes that the textual differences between MWD A and B show the different production standard of the manuscripts, rather than a textual development.



identity of its texts would have added “jing” to whatever else was understood as a jing, too.

Based on these circumstances, it seems unjustified to entitle the MWD PL “*Laozi*,” “*Dao De Jing*,” or “*De Dao Jing*,” as does the GD PL, in light of serious philological concerns. Instead, it is preferable to call them, more neutrally, “MWD *Laozi* Parallels” or “MWD De and Dao Parallels.” Furthermore, the findings suggest that, possibly even in the early Western Han, the extant text *Laozi* was not yet completely established and that there was needed some additional momentum to incorporate the two textually individual texts into one coherent text, and that the conscious endeavor to create one complete text and assign to the text as sole author Lao Dan had been made even at the time that Sima Qian ambiguously attempted to write a biography of Lao Dan.

#### 2-2-4. What makes the Guodian and Mawangdui finds intriguing

No particular attention has been given to comprehensively researching the *Laozi* PL’s textual or philosophical relationship with the non-*Laozi* texts of the GD or MWD. For example, the discovery of the two MWD silk manuscripts of the *Laozi* parallels was followed by the finding of other lost texts given titles by contemporary Chinese scholars. In the case of manuscript A, there were four lost texts: the Wuxing 五行, the Jiu Zhu 九主, the Ming Jun 明君, and the Sheng De 德聖, which precede the De and Dao parallels that have uncritically been taken for granted to be one book, *Laozi*. Manuscript B included the four lost texts as well, i.e., the Jiang Fa 經法, the Shi Liu Jing 十六經, the Cheng 稱, and the Dao Yuan 道原. If it is acknowledged to be invalid to employ the conventional classification of the early school and identifying the De and Dao PL in MWD A as pure Daoist texts and the other four texts in the same silk manuscript form as Confucian or Huang-Lao texts, one may come seriously to question why the four other texts could be accompanied by the so-called *Daoist Laozi* PL, and what this means in the text establishment of the *Laozi* and in early Chinese intellectual history. While the four lost texts in manuscript B have been paid concentrated attention by Eastern and Western scholarship, the textual and philosophical relationships within manuscript A, or between A and B that share a common text, the *Laozi*, have not been questioned.<sup>63</sup> In this article, which

---

<sup>63</sup> This is also the case with the Guodian slip documents. The fixed categorization of the GD texts into “Confucian”

mainly aims to compare early *Laozi* parallels, there is not room to discuss this important question, i.e., what are the textual and philosophical relationships among the excavated texts. But one must remain aware of the critical point that, in studying the GD or MWD documents, one should not attempt to categorize the texts by applying conventionally established concepts like Confucianism and Daoism. This approach can give some alternative explanations in the study of the *Laozi*.

---

and “Daoist” prevents researchers from finding the philosophical and philological breakthroughs that the GD bundles could possibly provide.

### 3. Textual Characteristics of the *Laozi* Parallels quoted in the Jie Lao and Yu Lao chapters

Now I will examine quotations from the Jie Yu Lao, the main concern of this paper, and clarify their significant textual variations and meanings, comparing them with other extant early *Laozi* PLs, the GD and the MWD. This shows that the quotations in the JYL were from two earlier PLs of the *Laozi*, and that the ancient PLs were in transition from the source stage, such as was the GD PL, gradually evolving to the arranged stage in the JYL quotations, and to the mature stage for independent texts in the MWD PL. By this method, I try to show how the *Laozi* PLs were philosophically and textually developed, and what concerns their compilers had.

In most philological studies of the early *Laozi* PLs, the textual significance of the *Laozi* PL in the JYL has not been understood impartially. To clear up this misunderstanding, it is necessary to accurately determine what kind of quotations exist, and what problems and possibilities arise from them. Accordingly, in the following, I present all the quotations that are included in the JYL, as reconstructed by myself,<sup>64</sup> and give several tables comparing them with other early PLs.<sup>65</sup> This comparison leads to examining their significant textual differences and drawing some textual and philosophical conclusions from them.

The reconstruction of quotations in the JYL consists of several simple stages: identifying the sentences that can be regarded as quotations from a text that cannot be definitely designated

---

<sup>64</sup> I use Chen Qiyu's modern edition as the text of the *Hanfeizi* for this paper: Chen Qiyu 陳奇猷, *Hanfeizi xinjiaozhu* 韓非子 新校注 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 2006), vol. 2.

<sup>65</sup> For comparison, I mainly use manuscript A as a representative of the MWD *Laozi*. However, when unable to read it because of its physical deterioration, I replace it with manuscript B, without adding any special mark to indicate the replacement. Also, for translating ancient Chinese characters from the MWD and GD into modern Chinese equivalents, I am basically indebted to the works of Gao Ming and Li Ling. While all numberings of the GD parallels in this paper are Li Ling's, I do not follow the numbering by Gao Ming, who gives the section numbers of the Wang Bi redaction. Instead, I just order the sections as they are. See Gao Ming 高明, *Boshu Laozi xiaozhu* 帛書老子校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1982); Li Ling 李零, *Guodian chujian jiaoduji* 郭店楚簡校讀記 (Beijing: Beijing Daxue, 2002).

as the *Laozi*, based on extant evidence, arranging them consecutively, finding comparable sections in the MWD and GD, grouping the quotations according to the given sections by other editions, and numbering the groups. Regarding this reconstruction, I refer to two potentially arguable points: First, since it is done for convenient comparison and easy understanding of their differences, this numbering of the JYL PL does not aim to substantialize the section division of received *Laozi* text. No chapter, whether JL or YL, provides sufficient grounds to be sure that their quotations were substantially divided. Interestingly, MWD A De and Dao PL do not show that they could not be completely divided by sections. Nevertheless, since I actually attempt to reconstruct and give numbers to the quotation groups, it may cause or strengthen some misunderstandings that the text that we have recognized as the *Laozi* in the late Warring States period was already divided, or that, more importantly, the sentences that were originally distinct could be believed to be grouped as one with a single meaning through this reconstruction based on the given sections. The latter point is important enough to discuss in more detail.<sup>66</sup> Being carefully aware of these limitations, I emphasize that one cannot find any clue to determine that the quoted *Laozi* PL of the JYL was divided by sections or chapters.

Second, in order to avoid unnecessary dispute, I consider conservatively the matter of the sentences in the JYL as quotations from an ancient *Laozi* PL, and I exclude the sentences that may be understood as repeated references to the original text. Let me take the example of Jie Lao 1. The text of the Jie Lao says, “Thus [it = the book] says ‘obeying orders was intended as simplicity’ 禮薄也.” Since this statement obviously indicates by the signal characters ‘thus... (it) says’ (*guyue* 故曰) that the saying was quoted from an early *Laozi* PL, it could justifiably be suggested that the saying was included in the author’s edition, even though the extant editions do not have it any more.<sup>67</sup> Nevertheless, taking a conservative view, I excluded it from the original

---

<sup>66</sup> In fact, in a discussion of Jie Lao 5 (see 3-2-1 and its footnotes), I examine a possible problem, mentioning Ning Zhenjiang’s suggestion.

<sup>67</sup> It seems difficult to determine definitely what an abridged and extremely simple statement, like this sentence, 禮薄也, was for in the JYL text and in the original text quoted by the authors of JYL. Rigorously speaking, it seems not impossible for such a statement to be included in the original text, and even justifiable to guess that the sentence in the extant *Laozi*, 夫禮者, 忠信之薄也, which I number as JL 1-9, could have been an expanded explanation of

text of the JYL *Laozi* PL, because it could also be a preliminary reference in fully quoting a complete saying, thus, “Generally, obeying orders was intended as the simplicity of loyalty and sincerity 夫禮者, 忠信之薄也.”<sup>68</sup>

However, it is still noteworthy that, even though I take a conservative approach to this reconstruction, I do not consult the extant edition to determine the inclusion of quotations in the reconstructed text. In other words, although a sentence that seems to be a quotation from the *Laozi* PL is not found in any extant *Laozi* redactions, this non-existence does not constitute sufficient grounds to exclude it from reconstruction. Also, I neither emend it nor critically judge it as the author’s intentional distortion. I will simply accept it as it is, as long as I do not have critical reasons to doubt it. Based on this principle, I will point out and discuss the lines which are included in the Jie Lao, but not in the MWD. The cases can be utilized as proofs to show that the JYL *Laozi* PL was in the process of being established.

In the following tables, lines in red mean that they are neither in the JYL *Laozi* PL nor the MWD/GD, nor in the JL or the YL. Green words or lines indicate significant changes in meaning, and blue ones mean that they are transposed. Even if different words are used or some words are missing in any *Laozi* redactions, if I consider that it does not make any significant meaning change, I do not assign any mark for that.

---

the original simple statement of the first sentence, 禮薄也, as shown in the *Mohist Canon* (*jing* 經) and *Explanation* (*jingshuo* 經說). As long as there is no more evidence at this point, however, I will not develop this stance, and exclude the simple sentence from my reconstructed text.

<sup>68</sup> This interpretation contrasts entirely with the conventional understanding of this sentence that belongs to the 38th section of the R text. Since I am referring to the saying quoted in the text of the Jie Lao, I follow the meaning that the author of the Jie Lao provides. I will discuss later the implication of this contrasted meaning in the light of philological and philosophical concerns.

### 3-1. Tables comparing texts of the *Laozi* parallels among the Jie Lao, Yu Lao, Mawangdui and Guodian

#### Jie Lao

1-	JL 1	MWD 1 (R 38)
1	上德不德, 是以有德	上德不德, 是以有德.
2		下德不失德, 是以无德.
3	上德無爲而無不爲也.	上德无爲而无以爲也.
4	上仁爲之而无以爲也.	上仁爲之而无以爲也.
5	上義爲之而有以爲也.	上義爲之而有以爲也.
6	上禮爲之而莫之應, 攘臂而仍之.	上禮爲之而莫之應也, 則攘臂而仍之,
7		故失道.
8	失道而後失德 失德而後失仁, 失仁而後失義 失義而後失禮.	故失道而后德, 失德而后仁, 失仁而后義, 失義而后禮.
9	夫禮者 忠信之薄也, 而亂之首乎.	夫禮者 忠信之薄也, 而亂之首也.
10	前識者, 道之華也, 而愚之首也.	前識者, 道之華也, 而愚之首也.
11	大丈夫, 處其厚不處其薄, 處其實不處其華.	是以大丈夫居其厚而不居其泊, 居其實不居其華.
12	去彼取此.	故去彼取此.

2-	JL 2	MWD 21 (R 58)
1		其政悶悶, 其民惇惇, 其政察察, 其民□□.
2	禍兮福之所倚.	禍, 福之所倚.
3	福兮禍之所伏.	福, 禍之所伏.
4	孰知其極.	孰知其極.
5		其无正也, 正復爲奇, 善復爲妖.
6	人之迷也, 其日故以久矣.	人之迷也, 其日固久矣.
7	方而不割, 廉而不剌, 直而不肆, 光而不耀.	是以方以不割 廉而不刺 直而不肆, 光而不耀.

3-	JL 3	MWD 22 (R 59)	GD B 2:1
1	治人事天莫如嗇.	治人事天莫若嗇.	治人事天莫若嗇.
2	夫謂嗇, 是以蚤服.	夫唯嗇, 是以蚤服,	夫唯嗇, 是以早服,
3	蚤服是謂重積德.	蚤服是謂重積德.	是謂重積德.
4	重積德, 則無不克.	重積德, 則无不克.	重積德, 則無不克.
5	無不克, 則莫知其極.	无不克 則莫知其極.	無不克, 則莫知其極.
6	莫知其極 則可以有國.	莫知其極, 可以有國.	莫知其克, 可以有國.
7	有國之母, 可以長久.	有國之母, 可以長久.	有國之母, 可以長久.
8	深其根, 固其柢, 長生久視之道也.	是謂深根固柢 長生久視之道也.	是謂深根固柢之法, 長生久視之道也.

4-	JL 4	MWD 23 (R 60)
1	治大國者, 若烹小鮮.	治大國 若烹小鮮.
2	以道莅天下, 其鬼不神.	以道莅天下, 其鬼不神.
3	非其鬼不神也, 其神不傷人也.	非其鬼不神也, 其神不傷人也.
4	聖人亦不傷民, 兩不相傷.	非其神不傷人也, 聖人亦弗傷也.
5	兩不相傷, 則德交歸焉.	夫兩不相傷, 故德交歸焉.

5-	JL 5	YL 1	MWD 9 (R 46)	GD A 4:2 (66+46)
1				江海所以爲百谷王, 以其能爲百谷下, 是以能爲百谷王.
2				聖人之在民前也, 以身後之.
3				其在民上也, 以言下之.
4				其在民上也, 民弗厚也.
5				其在民前也, 民弗害也.
6				天下樂進而弗厭.
7				以其不爭也, 故天下莫能與之爭.
8	天下有道, 卻走馬以糞也.	却走馬以糞.	天下有道, 卻走馬以糞.	
9	天下無道, 戎馬生於郊矣.	戎馬生於郊.	天下无道, 戎馬生於郊.	
10	禍莫大於可欲. 禍莫大於不知足. 咎莫憯於欲利.	罪莫大於可欲. 禍莫大於不知足. 咎莫憯於欲得.	罪莫大於可欲. 禍莫大於不知足. 咎莫憯於欲得.	罪莫重乎貪欲, 咎莫險乎欲得, 禍莫大乎不知足.
11		知足之爲足矣.	故知足之足 恒足矣.	知足之爲足, 此恒足矣.



6-1-	JL 6-1	MWD or R
1	道, 理之者也.	
2	得之以死, 得之以生, 得之以敗, 得之以成.	

6-2-	JL 6-2	MWD 58 (R 14)
1		視之而弗見, 名之曰微.
2		聽之而弗聞, 名之曰希.
3		摶之而弗得, 名之曰夷.
4		三者不可致詰, 故混而爲一.
5		一者, 其上不攸, 其下不忽, 尋尋呵不可名也, 復歸於无物.
6	無狀之狀, 無物之象.	是謂无狀之狀, 无物之象,
7		是謂忽恍.
8		隨而不見其後, 迎而不見其首.
9		執今之道, 以御今之有, 以知古始, 是謂道紀.

6-3-	JL 6-3	MWD 45 (R 1)
1	道之可道, 非常道也.	道, 可道也, 非恒道也.
2		名, 可名也, 非恒名也.
3		無名, 萬物之始也, 有名, 萬物之母也.
4		故恒无欲也, 以觀其眇, 恒有欲也, 以觀其小噉.
5		兩者同出, 異名同謂, 玄之又玄, 衆眇之門.

7-	JL 7	MWD 13 (R 50)
1	出生入死.	出生入死.
2	生之徒十有三, 死之徒十有三.	生之徒十有三, 死之徒十有三.
3	民之生, 生而動, 動皆之死地, 亦十有三.	以民生生, 動皆之死地十有三.
4		夫何故也? 以其生生也.
5	陸行不遇兕虎. 入軍不備甲兵,	蓋聞善執攝生者, 陵行不避兕虎, 入軍不被甲兵.
6	兕無所投其角, 虎無所錯其爪, 兵無所容其刀.	兕无所投其角, 虎无所措其爪, 兵无所容其刀.
7	無死地焉.	夫何故也? 以其无死地焉.
8	善攝生.	

8-	JL 8	MWD 32 (R 67)
1		天下皆謂我大 大而不肖.
2		故不肖, 若肖, 細久矣.
3		我恒有三寶之, 一曰慈, 二曰儉, 三曰不敢爲天下先.
4	慈, 故能勇.	夫慈, 故能勇.
5	儉, 故能廣.	儉, 故能廣.
6	不敢爲天下先, 故能爲成事長.	不敢爲天下先, 故能爲成事長.
7		今舍其慈, 且勇. 舍其後, 且先, 則必死矣.
8	慈, 於戰則勝, 以守則固.	夫慈, 以戰則勝, 以守則固.
9	吾有三寶, 持而寶之.	
10		天將建之, 如以慈恒之.

9-	JL 9	MWD 16 (R 53)
1		使我挈有知, 行於大道, 唯迤是畏.
2	大道.	大道甚夷, 民甚好徑.
3	貌施.	
4	徑大.	
5	朝甚除.	朝甚除, 田甚荒, 倉甚虛.
6	服文采, 帶利劍, 厭飲食,	服文采, 帶利劍, 厭飲食,
7	而資貨有餘者, 是之謂盜竽矣.	資財有餘, 是謂盜竽.
8		非道也哉.

10-	JL 10	YL 2	MWD 17 (R 54)	GDB 3:3 (45+54)
1	.			燥勝寒, 靜勝熱, 清靜 爲天下正.
2	不拔.不脫. 祭祀不 絕.	善建不拔, 善抱不 脫, 子孫以其祭祀 世世不輟.	善建者不拔, 善抱者 不脫, 子孫以祭祀不 絕.	善建者不拔, 善抱者不 脫, 子孫以其祭祠不 輟.
3	修之身, 其德乃眞.		修之身, 其德乃眞.	修之身, 其德乃眞.
4	修之家, 其德有餘.		修之家, 其德有餘.	修之家, 其德有餘.
5	修之鄉, 其德乃長.		修之鄉, 其德乃長.	修之鄉, 其德乃長.
6	修之邦, 其德乃豐.		修之國, 其德乃豐.	修之邦, 其德乃豐.
7	修之天下, 其德乃 普.		修之天下, 其德乃博	修之天下, 其德乃博.
8	以身觀身, 以家觀 家, 以鄉觀鄉, 以邦 觀邦, 以天下觀天 下.		以身觀身, 以家觀家, 以邦觀邦, 以天下觀 天下.	以家觀家, 以鄉觀鄉, 以邦觀邦, 以天下觀天 下.
9	吾奚以知天下之然 也. 以此.		吾何以知天下之然哉. 以此.	吾何以知天下然. 以 此.

# Yu Lao

YL 1. Refer to JL 5

YL 2. Refer to JL 10

3-	YL 3	MWD 70 (R 26)
1	重爲輕根, 靜爲躁君.	重爲輕根, 靜爲躁君.
2	君子終日行, 不離輜重.	是以君子終日行, 不離其輜重.
3		雖有環官, 燕處則超若.
4		若何萬乘之王, 而以身輕於天下?
5	輕則失 <sub>臣</sub> , 躁則失君.	輕則失 <sub>本</sub> , 躁則失君.

4-	YL 4	MWD 80 (R 36)
1	魚不可脫於深淵, 邦之利器, 不可以示人.	
2	將欲翕之, 必固張之.	將欲翕之, 必固張之.
3	將欲弱之, 必固強之.	將欲弱之, 必固強之.
4		將欲去之, 必固與之.
5	將欲 <sub>取</sub> 之, 必固 <sub>與</sub> 之.	將欲 <sub>奪</sub> 之, 必固 <sub>予</sub> 之.
6	是謂微明.	是謂微明.
7	弱勝強也.	<sub>柔</sub> 弱勝強.
8		魚不可脫於淵, 邦利器不可以示人.

5-	YL 5	MWD 26 (R 63)	GD A 4:6
1		爲无爲, 事无事, 味不味.	爲無爲, 事無事, 味不味.
2		大小, 多少.	大小之多易必多難.
3		報怨以德.	
4		圖難乎其易也, 爲大乎其細也.	
5	天下之難事, 必作於易.	天下之難作於易.	
6	天下之大事, 必作於細.	天下之大作於細.	
7	圖難於其易也, 爲大於其細也.		
8	聖人蚤從事焉.		
9		是以聖人終不爲大, 故能成其大.	
10		夫輕諾必寡信, 多易必多難.	(combined with YL 5-2)
11		是以聖人猶難之, 故終於无難.	是以聖人猶難之, 故終無難.

6-	YL 6	YL 8	MWD 27 (R 64)	GD A 5:1	GD A 4:5
1	其安易持也, 其未兆易謀也.		其安也, 易持也. 其未兆也, 易謀也.	其安也, 易持也. 其未兆也, 易謀也.	
2			其脆也, 易破也. 其微也, 易散也.	其脆也, 易泮也. 其微也, 易散也.	
3			爲之於其未有也, 治之於其未亂也.	爲之於其無有也, 治之於其未亂.	
4			合抱之木, 生於毫末.	合抱之木, 生於毫末.	
5			九層之臺, 作於藁	九層之臺, 作於	

			土.	累土.	
6			百仞之高, 始於足下.	千里之行, 始於足下.	
7			爲之者敗之, 執之者失之.		爲之者敗之, 執之者失之.
8			是以聖人無爲也, 故無敗也. 無執也, 故無失也.		是以聖人無爲, 故無敗, 無執, 故無失.
9			民之從事也, 恒於幾成事而敗之, 故慎終若始, 則無敗事矣.		臨事之紀, 慎終如始, 此無敗事矣.
10		欲不欲, 而不貴難得之貨.	是以聖人欲不欲, 而不貴難得之貨.		聖人欲不欲, 不貴難得之貨.
11		學不學, 復歸衆人之所過也.	學不學, 復衆人之所過.		教不教, 復衆人之所過.
12		恃萬物之自然而不敢爲也.	能輔萬物之自然, 而弗敢爲.		是故聖人能輔萬物之自然, 而弗能爲.
13					道恒無爲也, 侯王能守之, 而萬物將自化.
14					化而欲作, 將鎮之以無名之樸.
15					夫亦將知足, 知足以靜, 萬物將自定.

7-	YL 7	MWD 15 (R 52)	GD B 3:1	MWD 36 (R 71)
1		天下有始, 以爲天下母.		
2		既得其母, 以知其子, 復守其母, 沒身不殆.		
3		塞其 <sub>□</sub> , 閉其門, 終身不勤.	閉其門, 塞其兌, 終身不侮.	
4		啟其 <sub>□</sub> , 濟其事, 終身不救.	啟其兌, 塞其事, 終身不來.	
5	見小曰明, 守柔曰強.	見小曰明, 守柔曰強.		
6		用其光, 復歸其明.		
7		母遺身殃, 是謂襲常.		
8				知不知, 尚矣.
9				不知不知, 病矣.
10	聖人之不病也, 以其不病, 是以無病也.			是以聖人之不病, 以其病病, 是以不病.

YL 8. Refer to YL 6

9-	YL 9	MWD 10 (R 47)
1	不出於戶, 可以知天下.	不出於戶, 以知天下.
2	不窺於牖, 可以知天道.	不窺於牖, 以知天道.
3	其出彌遠者, 其智彌少.	其出也彌遠, 其知彌少.
4	不行而知.	是以聖人不行而知,
5	不見而明.	不見而明,
6	不爲而成.	不爲而成.

10-	YL 10	MWD 3 (R 41)	GD B 1:1
1		上士聞道, 勤能行之.	上士聞道, 僅能行於其中.
2		中士聞道, 若存若亡.	中士聞道, 若聞若無.
3		下士聞道, 大笑之.	下士聞道, 大笑之.
4		不笑, 不足以爲道.	弗大笑, 不足以爲道矣.
5		是以建言有之曰: 明道如昧, 進道如退, 夷道如類, 上德如 谷, 大白如辱, 廣德如不足, 建 德如偷, 質真如渝.	是以建言有之: 明道如昧, 夷 道如類, 進道若退. 上德如谷, 大白如辱, 廣德如不足, 建德 如偷, 質真如渝.
6	大器晚成, 大音希聲.	大方无隅, 大器晚成. 大音希 聲, 大象无形, 道隱无名.	大方無隅, 大器慢成, 大音希 聲, 大象無形.
7		夫唯道, 善始且善成.	道始無名, 善始善成.

11-	YL 11	MWD 77 (R 33)
1	自見之謂明, 自勝之謂強	知人者智也, 自知者明也, 勝人者有力也, 自勝者強也.
2		知足者富也, 強行者有志也. 不失其所者久也, 死不忘者 壽也.

12-	YL 12	MWD 71 (R 27)
1		善行者无轍迹, 善言者无瑕謫.
2		善數者不以籌策, 善閉者无關鑰而不可啓也.
3		善結者无繩約而不可解也.
4		是以聖人恒善救人, 而无棄人, 物无棄材, 是謂 襲明.
5		故善人, 善人之師. 不善人, 善人之資也.
6	不貴其師, 不愛其資, 雖知大迷, 是謂要 妙	不貴其師, 不愛其資, 雖智乎大迷, 是謂妙要.



### 3-2. Preliminary reflection

#### 3-2-1. Neither from the same parallels nor by the same author

Before examining some characteristics and implications of the *Laozi* PL of the JYL, it is a preliminary requirement to think about whether the two chapters were based on the same earlier *Laozi* PL and written by the same author. I argue that they seem to have been neither based on the same PL nor written by the same author. In order to examine this issue, one needs to look at the cases of JL 5 and JL 10.

First, the JL 5 and the YL 1 share the 46th section of R text.<sup>69</sup> The YL text in its quotation does not mention two conditional clauses, “天下有道” (5-8) and “天下無道” (5-9), but since they are actually referred to and explained by the author in the text of the JL, it seems hard to think that they would not have been in what the YL author saw. But in the JL 5-10, there are two differences. While the JL used the word “huo” 禍, the YL wrote “zui” 罪. In the case of JL 5-10,

---

<sup>69</sup> In his recent remarkable research on the relatedness and the development among early *Laozi* parallels, Ning Zhenjiang suggests that the JL 5-10 should be distinct from the JL 5-9 in contents. Furthermore, he claims that the distinction implies that section 46 of R was not completed at the time of the JL, as seen in the GD 4:2. See Ning Zhenjiang 寧鎮疆, *Laozi zaoqi zhuanben jiegou ji qi liubian yanjiu* 老子早期傳本結構及其流變研究 (Beijing: Xuelin, 2006), 231. His claim can function as a warning for my reconstruction, which is conducted based on the present sections given by early parallel sequences. I grouped the three lines 5-8, 5-9, and 5-10 as one unit, in light of the given 46th section. In this, it might be justifiable to ask whether 5-9 and 5-10 are necessarily or sufficiently regarded as having a similar message. This seems plausible and insightful, supporting the natural formation of line arrangement in the early *Laozi* PL. Nevertheless, I disagree with his suggestion for the following two reasons: First, as I will mention, when arranging the quotations of the JL in a row, the arrangements of JL quotations in many cases exactly correspond to that of the MWD PL. In that respect, even though 5-9 and 5-10 seem to have been differently commented on by the author of the JL, this could be to emphasize that the line sequence, 5-9 to 5-10, had still been held by him, and the line order was taken over to the MWD *Laozi* PL, and was to be grouped as one section. Second, the YL 1, which contains the same lines as the JL 5, shows that they were recognized as relevant in meaning. Even if I disagree with the claim that the authors of the JL and YL and their editions were the same, it is still significant that another author at a similar time and circumstances acknowledged the relevancy or relatedness between the two, 5-9 and 5-10. This raises a question of whether the commentators on the JYL actually distinguished them at their time or not.

considering that “huo” was used twice repeatedly, and that in the parallels of YL, MWD, and GD, the word “zui” was written, this could indicate that the JL author had been mistaken. However, while the JL used the term “yuli” 欲利, the YL, MWD, GD said “yude” 欲得, which is different in meaning. Two consecutive differences between the JL and the YL in the same line, 5-10, can hardly be seen as ordinary mistakes, especially when we assume that they have the same author and are from the same *Laozi* PL.<sup>70</sup>

Another difference between the two chapters is from JL 5-11: While the JL did not mention the sentence at all, the YL referred to and commented on it. The reason the JL did not state the concluding concept “knowing satisfaction” (*zhizhu* 知足), which might require more sophisticated commentary or explanation, could be that the *Laozi* PL had not included the line. As I will discuss, the way in which the author of the JL commented on and explained the *Laozi* seems detailed and not insincere. Concerning the author’s way of commenting on the text, the exclusion raises a possibility that the line on which it is necessary to add commentaries was not included in his edition. In contrast, the YL did refer to the line.

In addition, it is necessary to check textual differences in the JL 10. In contrast to the quotations of JL 10-2, which do not say “what is established” 善建, “what is embraced” 善抱 and “descendants” 子孫, those of the YL do mention them. Although those terms are not clear in meaning, the author of the JL did not quote and explain them. In the case of the YL, this line is quite similar to that of the MWD or GD, but in order to emphasize its meaning, the author added the words “from generation to generation” 世世, which are not shown in any extant edition. Also, except JL 10-2 (=YL 2-2), the YL does not mention any other lines. This typically shows that the quotations of the YL are fragmented in nature.

Besides those textual differences, it should not be underestimated that the two chapters are based on substantially distinct literary forms: while one is mainly explanatory and demonstrative, the other is anecdotal and figurative. Like the clear distinction in literary forms between the “Xiao Yao You” 逍遙遊 and the “Qi Wu Lun” 齊物論 of the Inner *Zhuangzi*, each

---

<sup>70</sup> Ikeda Tomohisa understands this difference as evidence to prove that the parallels went through some textual editing process, for the word replacement from ‘yuli’ to ‘yude’ seems to have been intended for constituting a serial rhyme with other words like keyu 可欲 and zhizhu 知足. See Ikeda 2009, 73–76.

chapter employed a different form, and this might imply that the authors' concerns would have essentially been distinct.

Hence, considering these textually variant cases and different literary forms, it is possible to argue that the two chapters were neither based on the same earlier *Laozi* PL nor written by the same authors.

### 3-2-2. The meaning of the argument

What does it mean that the two chapters could have been from different earlier PLs and different authors? This issue may provide more insights than expected, especially considering that there were two different earlier PLs incorporated together into one text, the *Hanfeizi*, and comparing the circumstances of the *Hanfeizi* with those of the Guodian bamboo texts.

The *Laozi* in the JYL is comparable to the *Laozi* parallels of the GD parallels on two points: First, even though the *Laozi* PLs of the GD and the JYL share one or two common sections, they mostly do not include repeated sections or lines. The two bundles A and C seem to have been from distinct textual ancestors. This circumstance coincides with the case of the JYL chapters. Secondly, in both of them, the order of chapters/sections and the division of sections are not completely the same as those of the R text. The JL or the YL do not provide any clue or grounds to conclude that at the time of JYL, the late Warring States period to the early Han, the *Laozi* PL was divided by chapters or sections, and this circumstance was the same as that of the three GD bundles.

This circumstance that most sections are evenly explicated, except the two chapters, 46 and 54, may explain why they could have been incorporated into one text, the *Hanfeizi*: The two different texts that had been independently created and circulated came to be merged into one text by the compilers. By merging them, the compilers seem in effect to show that by that time they had explained the sections of the PL text more plentiful in the *Hanfeizi*. It would have been more useful to show that Han Fei's thought took root in the philosophy of the text that later came to be known as the *Laozi*.

### 3-3. Regarding the possibility of arbitrarily selected quotations and commentaries

The most important issue weakening the textual value and meaning of *Laozi* PL quoted in

the JYL is that the two chapters seem to comment in part on the early *Laozi* PLs. From this issue, a decisive, complicated question arises: How can one be sure whether the authors of the JYL sincerely quoted the earlier PL they saw without any intentional distortions; and, more importantly, arbitrarily confusing the original section order for their own purposes? By considering some disputable textual variances, I suggest that the quotations in the JYL could not have been arbitrarily selected by the authors.

### 3-3-1. Complete sections

First, it is notable that the reconstructed sections quoted in the JL are quite similar to sections of the MWD PL in several cases. Except for JL 6, which has some unique characteristics in terms of philology and philosophy, the reconstructed old *Laozi* PL of the JL consists of nine groups. In seven out of the nine groups, the contents are almost the same as those of the MWD PL. For example, the JL 1 and JL 2, which respectively belong to the 38th and 58th of the R text, present almost all the lines and contents, although the JL 1 lacks two lines, 1-2 and 1-7, and the JL 2 lacks 2-1 and 2-5.<sup>71</sup> Similarly, the contents of the JL 3 and 4 are also almost the same as those of the MWD PL 22 and 23.<sup>72</sup>

Here it is important to recall that, unlike the MWD or GD PL, which contain only the text without any explanation or commentary, the JL was basically composed as a commentary whereby the author explains the given text. In such literature, that most of the material to which the authors of the chapters refer is basically identical in contents with those of the MWD or GD possibly implies that the author seems to have been transparent in his creation of commentary. If the author had attempted to select and comment on some sayings of the *Laozi* PL text, he would not have needed to refer to and explain almost all sentences in the groups, as is shown representatively in the case of JL 3. Additionally, the sentences do compose a group that became

---

<sup>71</sup> Interestingly, it is known that the present JL 1-2 and 2-5, which exclusively belong to the MWD, would not have been in the early PLs and were probably added by later compilers, since they function just as elaborate comments for JL 1-1 and JL 2-2 to 2-4. Also we can guess that the JL 2-1 of the MWD, which has a different meaning in its context, would not have been in one section that is now the 58th of the R text.

<sup>72</sup> Considering that GD B 2:1, which is equivalent to present section 59, had the same contents in its time, the 59th section of the R text must have been established quite early, and stably circulated or transmitted to other early PLs.

an official section in the R text. That is, the lines, at least in the group to which they belong, were not a completely random selection; they were to compose one section in such later editions as that of Heshang Gong or Wang Bi.

### 3-3-2. Maintaining the section order of the Mawangdui Parallels

One might ask, “if the author of the JL did not selectively quote and comment, why did he skip over the MWD 2 (R 39), and instead refer to the MWD 21 (R 58), when he had finished quoting and explaining the MWD 1 (JL 1 and R 38)?” This could be because the earlier PL text seen by the author actually had such a section order. In fact, it should be acknowledged first that the question itself is based on the unconfirmed assumption that the 5,000-word *Laozi* already existed in a form like the MWD at the time of the JL.

The quotations in the JL preliminarily show the same fixed section order of MWD *Laozi* PL. For example, JL 2, 3, 4 are exactly equivalent to MWD 21, 22, 23 and R 58, 59, 60. Likewise, JL 9, 10 are in the same order as MWD 16, 17, and R 53, 54. That is, the JL already reflected some of the section sequences that had not yet been fixed but would be present in the later text called the *Laozi*. This implies that the author of the JL might already have recognized the sequence of the sentences in his time. This circumstance may lead us to the conclusion that the author did not selectively assign the sentences from one complete text, but rather that he followed the order of sentences in the text that he had seen.

### 3-3-3. Beginning with the 38th section of the received text

It is also significant that the author of the JL started to quote and comment on the sentences of the *Laozi* from the 38th section of the R text, which is the beginning section of the so-called De 德 in the MWD manuscript B, and the De Jing 德經 in the extant *Laozi*. What matters is that the two MWD PLs in manuscript A and B and Yan Zun’s *Laozi* of Han,<sup>73</sup> as well as the *Laozi* of the JL all begin with section 38.<sup>74</sup> Until the MWD PL, the first section in any

---

<sup>73</sup> Yan Zun 嚴遵, *Laozi zhi gui* 老子指歸 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2009).

<sup>74</sup> David Nivison also notes that quotations in the JL beginning with the extant section 38 have a textually significant meaning, showing that they could have been from older parallels. See David Shepherd Nivison, “The Classical Philosophical Writings,” in *The Cambridge History of Ancient China: From the Origins of Civilization to 221B.C.*,

edition of the extant *Laozi* was not yet fully quoted, and even in any other ancient texts, we cannot find any faithful testimonies related to the first section of the extant *Laozi*. The JL also only has one sentence of the first section of the R text in its JL 6-3. I will discuss later in detail the textual difference and meaning of JL 6-3 and the first section of the R text. It possibly shows that the extant first section that begins with description of ineffable Dao and name, “道可道非常道, 名可名非常名,” could not have been completed before the MWD PL. In my view, in the beginning, as is shown in GD PL, there were only independently circulating bundles of maxims, and then, in the stage of two chapters of the *Hanfeizi*, they began to be arranged, organized, and textually expanded. The interim textual sources seem to have been developed into two versions that were interrelated in contents and textually independent, as shown in the MWD B De and Dao text. Through some editorial process, the two texts possibly were merged into one, and in the time of Sima Qian, the one complete text was titled and recognized as the *Laozi* by Lao Dan.

The fact that the author of the JL started his commentary from the 38th section indicates that he commented on the earlier *Laozi* PL from the beginning of his text. This also suggests that his commentary is, at least to some degree, trustworthy, not arbitrarily selecting the sayings.

### 3-3-4. The case of the Yu Lao

In discussing the problem whether the JYL authors intentionally selected sections and sentences from one complete *Laozi*, I have mainly dealt with the case of the Jie Lao. This is because there are obvious distinctions in the manner of quoting and commenting between the Jie Lao and the Yu Lao, and that raises a complicated question concerning the earlier *Laozi* PL of the Yu Lao. My reconstruction of the Yu Lao consists of 12 sections. Among these, there are three sections that are the same as those of the R text in contents — YL 1, 4, and 9. As mentioned in the case of the JL, that the sections 46, 36, 47 are equivalent to YL 1, 4, 9 seems to have been established early.<sup>75</sup> However, since the quotations from the YL are relatively even more

---

edited by Michael Loewe and Edward Shaughnessy (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 799–808.

<sup>75</sup> Interestingly, as shown in the YL 1(=JL 5, MWD 9) and its equivalent parallels of GD, we can suggest that, during the gradual process of establishing the text, the YL 1-8 and 1-9 were not originally there and then were incorporated before the line 5-10. Obviously, those lines are different in meaning from YL 1-10 and 1-11. In addition, the YL 1-11 was not completely fixed there either, since the line did not exist in the JL.

fragmented, as in the case of YL 10, 11, 12, it is possible to argue that the author of YL selectively quoted and explained the earlier *Laozi* PL.

However, it is also possible to argue that, to the contrary, the author of the YL did not select sentences from the *Laozi* PL, when considering the characteristics of quotations in YL. For example, let us look at the case of YL 7. YL 7 consists of two fragmented sentences, 7-5 and 7-10. The YL 7-5 is equivalent to a line of R, section 52, and the 7-10 to a line of R, section 71.<sup>76</sup> What matters is that the author of the YL recognized them as organically consecutive sentences with regard to meaning. This possibly implies that the PL text of the YL author had the lines as one unit, so it organized its sentences differently from the MWD PL or the R text. If it is correct that the *Laozi* PL of YL was unique in organization, there are no grounds to decide that the author of YL selectively quoted the earlier PL.<sup>77</sup>

In contrast to the case of YL 7, since YL 6 and YL 8, which now belong to the 64th section of the R text, were quoted non-consecutively at different places, it strongly raises the possibility that the section was originally divided into two. The GD parallels which divided the sections into A 5:1 and A 4:5 support this possibility. It seems that the YL 6-1 and YL 8-10, 8-11, 8-12 had been independently circulated, and after compiling, they were incorporated into one section.

As shown above, based on these textual characteristics of the *Laozi* quotations of Yu Lao,

---

<sup>76</sup> Ning Zhenjiang suggests that the YL 6-1 and the YL 7-5 were originally connected as one sentence unit. If this is correct, the *Laozi* PL of the YL could properly show that the archetypal sections 64 and 52 had originally been one and became divided into two. However, despite its persuasiveness, I do not follow his opinion, since I have already assumed that the *Laozi* PL of the YL was chronologically later than GD parallels. As shown in the table for the YL 6, the GD A 5:1 and 4:5 already contain the complete contents of the R section 64. This circumstance weakens the possibility that, as Ning argues, the YL 6-1 and 7-5 were originally related.

<sup>77</sup> Considering GD B 3:1, the archetype of the R section 52 consisted of YL 7-3 and 7-4. Apparently, since the YL 7-1 and 7-2 are distinct in meaning and they were not extant before the MWD PL, it is evident that they were incorporated later by compilers. Also, when looking at the YL 7-8, 7-9 and 7-10, which constitute the R section 71, at the beginning, there could have been only 7-10, and during the developing process, the independent but relevant sayings, YL 7-8 and 7-9, combined with 7-10. The compilers seem to have needed to make the relationship one of causality, thus they might have inserted a concluding conjunction, “therefore,” (*shiyi* 是以) at the head of YL 7-10.

it is possible to understand that the author of the YL did not arbitrarily quote the earlier PL, rather that the YL *Laozi* PL could have been a textually distinct text.

### 3-3-5. Conclusion

These pieces of evidence give some persuasive reasons to contend that the JYL authors did not arbitrarily select the sentences for their own purposes. Despite this, one might still ask, however, whether the author might not have slanted the case somewhat in commenting only on selected sections, rather than on all the sayings of the text. For this, it would be vital to examine the textual characteristics of the quotations to verify that the *Laozi* PL in the JYL was not the same as the MWD *Laozi* PL. Even though it appears convincing that the authors of JYL discussed what they saw only in part, if one can make clear that there are several significant textual heterogeneities, the value and meaning of the JYL *Laozi* PL in the textual history of the *Laozi* will be revealed. Thus, in the following, I examine the textual differences of the JYL *Laozi* PL.

### 3-4. Textual differences between the *Laozi* parallels of Jie Yu Lao and of Mawangdui

Most scholars have given their attention to the textual affinities between the JYL PL and the MWD PL, and this has led them to an attitude of indifference towards the JYL PL as another distinct ancient *Laozi* parallel. In order to appreciate the textual value of the JYL *Laozi* PL, one needs to consider the textual heterogeneities between them. I categorize these into four, as follows:

#### 3-4-1. Arbitrary arrangement of sections and chapters

The *Laozi* PL of the JYL does not follow the same order of sections and lines that are present in the MWD or the R text. Although it is correct that the MWD PL (esp. MWD manuscript A) did not have completely fixed section division marks, they did have a flow of sections and chapters. However, in the *Laozi* PL of JYL, the order of the R text is mostly confused. According to the given numbering of MWD and R, the section sequence is as follows:<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> The bold-faced number in this flow means that the order was maintained in the *Laozi* PL of JYL.



The *Laozi* section flow in the Jie Lao:

1 (38) → **21 (58)** → **22 (59)** → **23 (60)** → 9 (46) → None → 58 (14) → 45 (1) → 13 (50)  
→ 34 (69) → **16 (53)** → **17 (54)**

The *Laozi* section flow in the Yu Lao:

9 (46) → 17 (54) → 70 (26) → 80 (36) → **26 (63)** → **27 (64)** → 15 (52) → 27 (64) → 10  
(47) → 3 (41) → 66 (24) → 71 (27)

As is shown in this flow sequence, the section sequence of the JYL *Laozi* PL is not bound by the regularity of the MWD or the R, but is haphazardly arranged. It is difficult to ascertain that the *Laozi* PL of JYL has its own principle of organization for the sentences and groups. This suggests that the early *Laozi* sources were based on independent, accidental, and, most importantly, spontaneous combinations of sentences and meaning groups. This early condition is also shown in the case of three bundles of GD parallels. That is, a textual characteristic of ancient *Laozi* PLs is possibly a spontaneous arrangement. Of course, the *Laozi* PL of JL already had the two sequences, 21 (58) → 22 (59) → 23 (60) and 16 (53) → 17 (54) to be fixed in later text, and the *Laozi* PL of YL had one, 26 (63) → 27 (64). However, since, except for these, they did not follow the order to be seen in the MWD or R, the *Laozi* PL in the JYL seems to have undergone a transition toward establishment.

Another interesting thing is that the traditional division of chapters of the extant *Laozi* text, the Dao Jing and the De Jing, is nullified in this unique organization of the JYL *Laozi* PL. The division has been argued as being unclear (even in the MWD) and perfunctory. While it has been claimed that the Dao Jing (or Dao Pian) mainly deals with Dao as the ultimate truth and the origin of myriad things, and the De Jing (or De Pian) focuses on the actual application of Dao to human life, and especially to politics, by the Sage King, the subjects often overlap and are repeated in both chapters. That is, the chapter content does not need to be divided. Based on the GD parallels and quotations in the JYL, it seems possible to argue that the chapter division was not original but was made by later compilers.

### 3-4-2. Non-existent lines in the Mawangdui

The sentences that are found only in the JYL quotations, but not in the MWD, constitute

good evidence to check the textual heterogeneities between the two *Laozi* PLs. The lines, JL 6-1-1, 6-1-2, 9-3, 9-4, and YL 5-8, are not found in any other *Laozi* PLs or redactions, but only in the JYL *Laozi* PL. Since I discuss the meaning of the JL 6-1-1 and 6-1-2 later, I here examine the JL 9-3, 9-4 and YL 5-8 only.

According to the commentary by the JL author, 9-3 and 9-4 are not likely to be an individual element of one sentence. Based on the commentary text, the meaning of 9-3 seems to have been given as opposite to that of 9-2. Considering that the text explained the meaning of 9-4 as “parts of crooked Dao” (*xiedao zhi fen* 邪道之分), the “jingda” 徑大 of 9-4 seems to imply a part of 9-3, “maoshi” 貌施. Thus, each of JL 9-2, 9-3, and 9-4 seems to be a partial headword of a sentence, and they could imply a paradox, that the great Dao manifests itself through the easy and simple thing or event, which is in meaning closely related to the contents of the MWD 16 (R 53) section. However, it is still difficult to determine exactly what the quotations try to say. Seeing that the author of the JL did not clearly explain them, the words would already have been unrecognizably fragmented and transmitted at the time of the JL. The words at 9-3 and 9-4, which were impossible to decode at that time, seem to have been emended or replaced by later compilers.

Also, no extant *Laozi* PLs have YL 5-8. Since YL 5-8 is in meaning closely related to 5-5 and 5-7, the line perfectly matches the other lines of YL 5. Nevertheless, it was emended and replaced by the sentence 5-9, which is distinct in meaning from 5-8. This replacement is believed to join with 5-5, the other unrelated lines of the YL, like 5-1 to 5-3 and 5-11. I will discuss this in detail later. Accordingly, the lines that are in the JYL *Laozi* can shed light on the idea that the redactions were textually distinct.

### 3-4-3. Different words or arrangements

#### 3-4-3-1. The case of *Jie Lao 1*

The JYL *Laozi* shows differences from the MWD manuscripts by using distinct words or by transposing lines. The most striking case is JL 1. First, it is necessary to pay attention to JL 1-8, since the *Laozi* PL of the JL took a completely opposite philosophical position to the so-called “Confucian” values of humanness (*ren* 仁), righteousness (*yi* 義), and obeying order (*li* 禮): The

*Laozi* PL of JL apparently affirmed these values. Based on some significant evidence, I mentioned earlier that it would be wrong to take for granted that the author of the JL purposefully had distorted the original text for his own purpose. Thus, it is remarkable and intriguing to see that a proto-*Laozi* PL does not necessarily feel antagonistic to the so-called “Confucian” values.

It is well known that two slips of the GD A bundle do not criticize the so-called “Confucian” values of humanness and righteousness (*renyi* 仁義) or sageliness and knowledge (*shengzhi* 聖智).

Without mentioning Confucian values at all, the GD A 4:1 says:<sup>79</sup>

Eliminate knowledge, get rid of distinctions,

And the people will benefit one hundredfold.

Eliminate artistry, get rid of profit,

And there will be no robbers and thieves.

Eliminate emotional activity, get rid of deliberation,

And the people will return to filial piety and compassion...

絕知棄辨, 民利百倍. 絕巧棄利, 盜賊無有. 絕僞棄慮, 民復孝慈.

But the MWD at section 63 (R 19) refers to Confucian values and offers harsh criticism as follows:

---

<sup>79</sup> While the numbering of the GD is maintained by Li Ling, the English translations and modern Chinese equivalents for GD characters above are from Robert Henricks, *Lao Tzu's Tao Te Ching: A Translation of the Startling New Documents Found at Guodian* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 12, 28. However, the translation of the following phrase, 絕僞棄慮, is based on the combination of Qiu Xigui's recorrected transcription of the graph, 慮, and Shaughnessy's reinterpretation of the graph, 僞, which was basically from Pang Pu's suggestion. For these, see Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, “Jiuzheng wo zai Guodian *Laozi* jian shidu zhong de yige cuowu” 糾正我在郭店老子簡釋讀中的一個錯誤, in *Guodian Chujian Guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 郭店楚簡國際學術研討會論文集, ed. Wuhan daxue Zhongguo wenhua yanjiuyuan (Wuhan: Wuhan Remin chubanshe, 2000), 25–30; Edward Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany: State University of New York, 2006), 24–29.

Eliminate sageliness, get rid of knowledge,  
And the people will benefit a hundredfold.  
Eliminate humanness, get rid of righteousness,  
And the people will return to filial piety and compassion.  
Eliminate craftiness, get rid of profit,  
And there will be no robbers and thieves.  
絕聖棄智, 民利百倍, 絕仁棄義, 民復孝慈. 絕巧棄利, 盜賊无有.

Many scholars have attempted to explain this significant phenomenon of the GD A. Here, I explain it in a different way, focusing on comparing the JL *Laozi* PL with the GD PL. First of all, it is crucial that, if it is not necessarily valid to engage in the conventional categorization as “Confucianism” or “Daoism” and to essentialize the contents of early *Laozi* PLs, we actually do not have any definite reason to explain why the *Laozi* should necessarily be against the so-called Confucian virtues like humanness and righteousness. As is shown in the two cases of GD and JL *Laozi* PLs, it is becoming clearer that the *Laozi* PLs at each stage were not necessarily anti-Confucian. Reaching the MWD manuscripts, the compilers seem to have emended the original or adopted anti-Confucian maxims that had probably been in the sources.

Many sentences and sections of MWD De and Dao PL texts seem to, indeed, hold an anti-Confucian stance. For example, as is shown in the case of the extant section 19 mentioned above, in that it aims at attacking the core value of pre-Qin Confucianism, humanness, the following sentence of the MWD B Dao which belongs to the extant section 5 is likely to have been written with a particular philosophical intention: “天地不仁以萬物爲芻狗, 聖人不仁以百姓爲芻狗.”<sup>80</sup> Seemingly, the most striking example which creates and governs the MWD PL’s anti-Confucian propensity is seen in the consecutive sentences which are now section 18 and 19.

---

<sup>80</sup> Significantly, besides the extant 38 sections, there are no more parallel statements on Confucian values in the quotations of the JYL. If it can be assumed that the JYL PL represents a transitional stage for the early PLs, it is highly meaningful that in the early PLs such as GD or JYL, there would not have been such an anti-Confucian statement.

GD A	GD C	MWD (R 18+19)
	故大道廢安有仁義， 六親不和安有孝慈， 邦家昏亂安有正臣	故大道廢案有仁義 <b>知慧出案有大偽</b> 六親不和案有畜茲 邦家昏亂案有貞臣．
絕知棄辨，民利百倍． 絕巧棄利，盜賊無有． 絕偽棄慮，民復孝慈．		絕 <b>聖</b> 棄 <b>智</b> ，民利百倍， 絕 <b>仁</b> 棄 <b>義</b> ，民復孝慈． 絕 <b>巧</b> 棄 <b>利</b> ，盜賊無有．

From the above comparison, two interesting points are revealed: 1) Insertion: In the MWD PL, the sentence, 智慧出案有大偽, appears, but it does not in the GD C. As we know in the cases in the Jie Lao fragments, there could have been some number of sentences or phrases to be incorporated into or eliminated from the MWD. In addition, this lack of the sentence in the GD C may bring about an alternative interpretation of the graph, 安, and, eventually, of the relationship between earlier *Laozi* PLs and Confucian values. I will elaborate on this point below. 2) Rearrangement: According to the GD C, the present chapter 19 could have been textually separated from chapters 17 and 18, and independently circulated, since we know that two bundles of GD A and GD C do not have any necessary link for constituting one complete text, textually or even philosophically, as William Boltz and I have mentioned. That is, going through some multiple editorial processes, the two independent sentences were merged into one to make a serial sentence flow, and some mundane characters were replaced by very important terms like humanness, righteousness, or sageliness, which has been believed to integrate pre-Confucian values. Hence, textually speaking, from these, it may be suggestive that 1) there was a textual expansion, rearrangement, and correction at the time of MWD, concerning the text establishment and the settlement of its relationship to Confucianism, and 2) that, during the text expansion, the MWD seems to have exposed the philosophical antagonism against Confucian values.

Here, it is necessary to examine whether the GD C in itself has any necessity to be understood as having an anti-Confucian stance or not. We know that the GD A is not necessarily anti-Confucian, since the characters for Confucian value in the MWD and extant text, such as

humanness, righteousness, sageliness are not seen in the GD A. What, then about the GD C? Regarding the Confucian value characters, GD C has the following sentences: “故大道廢安有仁義，六親不和安有孝慈，邦家昏亂安有正臣。” The crucial problem is to determine how to interpret the character 安, since depending on the interpretation of the graph, the whole meaning of the sentence can completely be reversed. It is particularly true when considering the sentence was strongly suspected to have been undergone changes during the text editorial process, as I have mentioned above.

Even after the excavation of the GD, many interpreters still take it for granted that the graph in the *Laozi* is a conjunction like 則, 乃, or 於是.<sup>81</sup> However, it is important to remember that the graph can be understood as an interrogative particle like 焉, 奚,<sup>82</sup> and that it is generally not uncommon at all, rather natural to interpret the character in that way in many early Chinese texts.<sup>83</sup> Furthermore, in the GD C, there is obviously a distinct paleographical character that can be transcribed into a conditional conjunction as 則.<sup>84</sup> In addition, it is necessary to remember that this sentence may possibly have undergone some editorial processes, and that the processes may actually have strengthened the anti-Confucian voice of the text. The GD C does not contain the sentence, 知慧出案有大偽, which, in its meaning, may make it hard to interpret the graph as

---

<sup>81</sup> For example, see Ikeda Tomohisa, *Rōshi*, (Tokyo: Tōhō shoten, 2006); Edmund Ryden, *Laozi Daodejing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 38–39.

<sup>82</sup> Matthias Richter suspects that the two ways of interpretation of the graph still remained in the time of the MWD Dao text and that this might have had the effect of causing the reader to insert a hook mark (<) in the text. See his, “Textual Identity and the Role of Literacy in the Transmission of Early Chinese Literature.” In *Writing and Literacy in Early China: Papers from the Columbia Early China Seminar*, edited by Li Feng and David Branner (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010), 209–247.

<sup>83</sup> Actually, Ding Yuanzhi interprets this as interrogative. See Ding Yuanzhi 丁原植, *Guodian Zhuojian Laozi Shixi yu yanjiu* 郭店竹簡老子釋析與研究 (Taiwan: Wanjuanlou, 2004), 347–352. However, Ding still interprets as a conjunction the same graph that occurred in a sentence adjacent to the sentences in question: 信不足安有不信, 猶乎其貴言也.

<sup>84</sup> For example, this graph is shown in the following sentence of the GD: “君子居則貴左, 用兵則貴右.”

an interrogative particle.<sup>85</sup> Finally, there is an interesting counter-example to show that in early Han times, there was a grammatical tendency to use the 安 as an interrogative particle. In the chapter, Ma Ti 馬蹄, of the *Zhuangzi*, there is a case in which the graph 安 has been interpreted as an interrogative particle without issue; it says: “道德不廢安取仁義.” This is quite similar to the GD A statement, “大道廢安有仁義” in sentence structure. The difference in meaning is produced by the negative particle 不 included in the Ma Ti chapter. This circumstance implies that during the time when the chapter was written, approximately the early Han, there was a vestigial use of the graph 安 as an interrogative particle, and it further shows a competing stance to interpret the graph 安 either as an interrogative particle or as a conjunction, as is shown in the MWD Dao text, in relation to acceptance of the so-called Confucian values.

If there is no necessity to understand the graph 安 as a conjunction, the alternative interpretation of GD C would also be valid:

“Thus, the Great Dao has been abolished, how can humanness and righteousness be?

---

<sup>85</sup> Does this sentence of the MWD text in itself offer any evidence to prove that it must have been originally intended as anti-Confucian, or that the graph should be read as a conditional conjunction? No, it seems not. Many do not fail to pay attention to the possibility that the word, Dawei, 大偽, in the MWD could have been a technical term that has a quite positive connotation, “Great Artifice,” which is mainly discussed in the *Xunzi*. I do not entirely agree with the translation for “wei” as artifice, since artifice mainly connotes the negative meaning of a trick. The term wei has generally been used differently from the meaning of trick or intrigue, but rather, as in the case of the *Xunzi*, it can stand for a human’s conscious and gradual behavioral achievement and feat. According to the Zhengming chapter of the *Xunzi*, wei is a man’s eventual cultural achievement, which consists of cumulative emotion from the human heart as a prime sensory organ and practiced human innate capacity (*neng* 能). (My understanding is based on new interpretation of the text given by Edward Shaughnessy. See his *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* [Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006], 27. Concerning the same graph in the GD *Laozi* PL A, Shaughnessy argues that the repeated graph wei 偽 in the last two sentences would actually have been used with different meanings: The first is “emotional activity,” and the latter is “artifice.”) That is, the wei typically represents Xunzi’s dualistic understanding of human self as inborn and acquired, and of human self-realization as an inner training of heart and outer embodiment by learning the great culture (*li* 禮) created by ancient sages. Of course, it is not very clear that the term wei is directly applicable to the MWD Dao. However, if that is possible, the alternative interpretation would be the following: “There has come out wisdom, how can the Great Artifice be?”

The six relationships have been disharmonious, how can filial piety and compassion be?

States and families have been in chaos, how can virtuous officials be?”

Finally, in GD C, there is another statement with the graph 安 as follows: 信不足安有不信. In my opinion, since this sentence is adjacent to the other sentences of Confucian values, and its grammatical position is exactly the same as that of the other sentences, the graph 安 should be understood consistently in interpreting the GD C sentences. Does this sentence support the conviction that the graph must be understood as a conjunction? I disagree with this for two reasons: First, when one understands the 安 just as 則 or 乃, the sentence, 信不足安有不信, is so simplistic, commonsensical, and tautological that there seems no need or necessity to repeat the latter clause, 安有不信.<sup>86</sup> Second, when interpreting the 安 as a conjunction, the sentence does not seem to be very closely related to the following statement: 猶乎其貴言也, since the latter focuses not on the trustworthiness, but merely on words.<sup>87</sup> Thus, my alternative explanation is that the first 信 in the sentence should have been written as 言, and the 安 understood as an interrogative. Hence, my alternative interpretation for this sentence is: “If words have been insufficient, how could there have been distrust?” which means “Since words have been too many, there has been distrust.”

In conclusion, this possibility shown in the GD and MWD PL can support the assertion that the pro-Confucian statements in the JL PL may not be corrupted by intentional editors or

---

<sup>86</sup> The traditional strategy to avoid this difficulty is to stratify the meanings of the graph, 信, repeatedly used: the first graph means trustworthiness of a person at higher position, and the latter is for that of ordinary people. However, such an interpretation cannot be made certain within the text itself. Surprisingly, this has rarely been unnoticed by scholars. Ding Yuanzhi also considers this problem. See his 2004, 337–344. But Ding fails to recognize the consistent interpretation of the graph in the GD C, since he claims the graph in this sentence to be a conjunction but, in the other sentences of Confucian values in the GD C, he argues that the graph functions as an interrogative particle.

<sup>87</sup> Admittedly, in terms of graphical composition, it is generally undeniable that the xin, 信, is intrinsically related to the yan, 言. However, the problem is that the general relatedness in graphical meaning between the two cannot necessarily guarantee or explain with certainty the combination of these two sentences in meaning.



commentators; rather it possibly implies that the early *Laozi* PLs like GD and JL did not distinguish themselves from the Confucian value orientation. Based on this significant evidence, it is suggestive that, around the time of the MWD Dao and De and the compilation of the *Zhuangzi* showing strong anti-Confucian propensity, the conscious and collective movement to an anti-Confucian interpretative stance toward the text that later became the *Laozi* could have been mature to some extent.

Who, then, began the vehement critique of Confucian virtues in certain statements of the MWD PL? Many scholars have found in some chapters of the *Zhuangzi* a similar standpoint and nearly the same sentences that appear in the MWD or extant *Laozi*. In a typical observation, Chen Guying points out that the violent opposition to Confucianism is seen in some of the Outer chapters of the *Zhuangzi*, and their intellectual influence caused the *Laozi*'s originally pro-Confucian standpoint to be changed into an anti-Confucian one.<sup>88</sup> According to Angus Graham and Liu Xiaogan, contemporary philologists of the *Zhuangzi*, the authors' philosophical school of the anti-Confucian chapters of the extant *Zhuangzi* can be defined as "Primitivist" and "Yangist" (in Graham's terms), or as an "Anarchist group" (*wujun* 無君) (in Liu's term).<sup>89</sup> Following the notion that the MWD PL provides the textual evidence to reveal that the *Laozi* had anti-Confucian tendencies, one can infer that the philosophy of the individualistic and politically anarchic group succeeded in (partially or entirely) dominating the MWD *Laozi* PL. Therefore, it might also be suggested that the proto-*Laozis* had been basically free from such a philosophical tendency, that is, individualism and anarchism, and that they were transformed after having being

---

<sup>88</sup> See Chen Guying 陳鼓應, "Cong Guodian jianben kan Laozi shangren ji shouzhong sixiang" 從郭店簡本看老子尚仁及守中思想, *Daojia Wenhua Yanjiu* 道家文化研究 17(1998):64–80. He assumes that the *Laozi* text was already fully established before GD.

<sup>89</sup> Angus C. Graham, "How Much of *Chuang-tzu* Did Chuang-tzu Write?" In *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature* (Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986), 283–321; Liu Xiaogan 劉笑敢, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, Center for Chinese Studies Monographs, no. 65 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1994); Liu Xiaogan, *Zhuangzi zhexue ji qi yanbian* 莊子哲學及其演變 (Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui kexue, 1988).

taken over by the anarchist group, since the two kinds of proto-*Laozi* are, at least, less anti-Confucian than the R text.

However, these arguments seem hard to defend, given the extant textual or historical evidence. First, the JYL *Laozi* PL does not seem anarchic, rather it increasingly supports governance, as I will demonstrate. Second, it is also unclear whether the philosophical inclination of the MWD *Laozi* PL is mainly individualistic and anarchic or not. Rather, it has been pointed out that the MWD PL contents seems more politically oriented than, or at least as much as, the received text. In addition, several other MWD silk manuscripts, like the Wu Xing, Jiu Zhu in manuscript A, or the four texts preceding the De and Dao in manuscript B,<sup>90</sup> which were excavated at approximately the same time as the *Laozi* PL, are not at all dominated by such an individualistic and anarchic socio-philosophical tendency.

More realistically, the denial of the so-called Confucian virtues in the MWD *Laozi* PL should be considered alongside the philosophical characteristics of the compilers who actually contributed to the development of the texts later entitled De and Dao in the MWD B, which is closely associated with the conscious philosophical and textual endeavor toward the gradual establishment of the text. Based on the evidence of the earlier PLs and their textual difference, I assume that the attempt was being made at the time of JYL PL. Thus, I claim that the intensified antagonism toward Confucianism in the MWD and the extant text may have been related to the author of JYL.

Lastly, what should be examined in the philosophical relationship between JL 1 and MWD 1 is associated with the interpretation of a noun phrase, “zhongxin zhi bo” 忠信之薄, of JL 1-9. According to the commentary of Jie Lao, the “bo” 薄 of 1-9 means not “to be rarefied” but “to be simple.” That is, in the JL PL, the character, 薄, seems to be interchangeable for the graph “樸.” Following this, JL 1-9 should be understood as “In general, obeying orders (originally) began from the simplicity of loyalty and sincerity, but (now) is the first cause to

---

<sup>90</sup> There have been disagreements about the title, *Huangdi Sijing* 黃帝四經, for the four texts in the MWD B. See Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, “Mawangdui boshu *Laozi* yiben juanqian guyishu bingfei *Huangdi Sijing*” 馬王堆帛書老子乙本前古佚書, *Daojia wenhua yanjiu* 3(1993):249–55; Robin Yates, “Appendix One: Title of the Silk Manuscripts,” *Five Lost Classics – Tao, Huang-Lao, and Yin Yang in Han China* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1997), 193–194.

bring about disorder!” In this, the conjunction “er” 而 has to be translated just as “but,” not as “and.” This translation, which is based on the JL, contrasts completely with the conventional one which has followed Wang Bi’s understanding: “In general, obeying orders means that loyalty and sincerity are rarified, and this is the first cause to bring about disorder!” Contrary to the traditional understanding of the *Laozi*, the JL PL essentially affirmed obeying orders (*li* 禮). It is more obvious if we consider the meaning of JL 1-8 that supports the so-called Confucian values. This implies that the JL *Laozi* PL could be philosophically different from the MWD or, at least, from the R text, to a great degree.

### 3-4-3-2. *Jie Lao 8: Transposition case I*

Another reason to raise the possibility that the *Laozi* PL of JL was distinct from the MWD PL is that the order of some of the lines quoted in the JL differs from their order in the MWD. For example, in JL 8, a sentence in JL 8-3 of the MWD and the JL 8-9 sentence of the JL express basically the same meaning. However, while the MWD uses this sentence regarding “three treasures” 三寶 as an introduction to this section, the JL PL employs it as a summarizing conclusion. Paying attention not only to the fact that the second part of JL 8-3 of the MWD, “The first is compassion, the second is frugality, and the third is not daring to be ahead of all under heaven”<sup>91</sup> 一曰慈, 二曰儉, 三曰不敢爲天下先, is not present at all in JL 8, but also to the fact that this sentence seems to have been intended to systematically arrange and summarize the three kinds of value, we can suppose that this sentence could have been added by later editors.

If JL 8-3 is an interpolation, the other lines, JL 8-1, 2, 3, 7, 10 of the MWD, which have meanings obviously distinct from those of JL 8-4, 5, 6, 8, also seem to have been added. This implies that JL 8 can be a proto-section of MWD 32 (R 67). Furthermore, we know, from seeing 8-8, that JL 8 contains only one extended explanation of the treasure “compassion” 慈, and this indicates that the two other explanations of the treasures as “frugality” 儉 and “not daring to be ahead of all under heaven” 不敢爲天下先 were not invented or had already been lost by the time of the JL. This suggests that the sentence 8-8, which should have been followed by 8-4, was already transposed at that time. Still, it is also possible that the elaborate comment on

---

<sup>91</sup> This translation is from Mair’s rendition. Victor Mair 1990, 41.

"compassion" had been only 8-8, and through the enlarging process, the additional comment, JL 8-7, was combined.

### 3-4-3-3. *Yu Lao 4: Transposition case II*

The line YL 4-1 is in 4-8 of the MWD *Laozi* PL. The introductory saying was utilized in reverse as a concluding remark. Since the saying "A fish cannot free itself from a deep pond" 魚不可脫於(深)淵 is in meaning quite ambiguous,<sup>92</sup> it is justifiable to ask if it was intended to be united with another sentence, "The profitable means of state cannot be recognized by the people" 邦之利器, 不可以示人. However, since, according to the chapter Nei Chu Shuo Xia 內儲說下篇 of the *Hanfeizi*, the sentences were mentioned together, the two seem to have already been joined from the late Warring States period to very early Han. Nonetheless, some questions still remain. In fact, what the text of the chapter says exactly is as follows: "In the sayings of Lao Dan, there is a saying about losing a fish" 在老聃之言失魚也. However, the MWD and the YL quote just "A fish frees itself from a pond" 魚脫於淵, not "A fish is lost in a pond" 魚失於淵.<sup>93</sup> This can be regarded just as an intentional rephrasing or an easy mistake, but it could also show that there were different competing sayings ascribed to Lao Dan at the time. The expression, "losing a fish," does not seem simply to be a mistake, since it was used in the chapter Da Tie, 大體, of the *Hanfeizi*, which says "a misfortune that the fish is lost in its water" 魚失水之禍. There are two interesting points: First, the chapter does not mention at all that this expression was originally from the *Laozi* PL or Lao Dan. Second, it employs the word "to lose" or "to be lost" 失 instead of "to free from" 脫.

If the terms "fish" and "pond" of the Nei Chu Shuo Xia are correctly used,<sup>94</sup> the chapter can provide us with the reason why the two seemingly unrelated sentences could have been

---

<sup>92</sup> Because of its ambiguity in meaning, Heshang Gong and Wang Bi understood this sentence just as an analogy for the following sentence, 國之利器, 不可以示人. Heshang Gong explained, "魚脫於淵, 謂去剛得柔, 不可復制也." Wang Bi said: "魚脫於淵, 則必見失矣."

<sup>93</sup> Considering the sentence of the text and its verb-object structure, "a saying about losing a fish" 言失魚, the sentence, "魚失於淵," seems unable to be translated using the active voice, as in "A fish loses its pond."

<sup>94</sup> Since the author of the Da Tie who used the phrase "a fish is lost 魚失" intended "king" by the word "fish," his usage of the term "fish" is different from that of the YL author who understood it as meaning "subjects."

joined into one. If “fish” stands for “a powerful subject” and “pond” for “the boundary of the King’s influence,” then the meaning of this sentence is “a fish must not be freed from a deep pond,” which implies “the power of subjects must be restricted within the boundary of the King’s influence.” At this point, the sentence, “魚不可脫於(深)淵,” could be joined with another tactical statement, “The profitable means of state cannot be recognized by the people” 邦之利器, 不可以示人. These two sentences from YL 4-1 could be united in order to function as strategic advice for a king against powerful subjects. In this, YL 4-2, 4-3, and 4-5 seem to function as specific strategies for the king.

Interestingly, the MWD *Laozi* PL used this introductory sentence, YL 4-1, as a conclusion for its section 80. If it is possible to infer the logical relatedness between lines 4-7 and 4-8, since the editors of the MWD thought that “softness and weakness” (*rouruo* 柔弱) means “to stay in a pond,” and “strength” means “to escape from a pond,” as Heshang Gong imagined, they could have transposed 4-1 to 4-8, in order to eliminate the ambiguity of YL 4-1 by juxtaposing it with 4-7. Also, it is possible to imagine that this sentence could have been initially written on a full bamboo strip, and that, during its circulation, the binding string might have been broken, after which the sentence was misplaced to the position of YL 4-8.<sup>95</sup>

### 3-4-3-4. *Yu Lao 5: Transposition case III*

The topic of YL 5 is “a paradoxical realization of opposite actions,” and this has been understood to be related to the actual application of the wuwei 無爲 to real life. Based on the YL and GD, it is known that MWD 26 basically came from two different sources, and this persuasively shows evidence that YL and GD PLs are older than MWD PL. Here, YL 5-7 was transposed to YL 5-4 at the time of MWD Dao. Regarding its relatedness to YL 5-5 and 5-6, the transposition does not seem to have been intentionally designed. Also, the statement about the sage shown in YL 5-8 is replaced by 5-9. While 5-8 is relatively ambiguous in meaning and has the status of being a conclusion of the section, 5-9 is the extended statement of 5-5 to 5-7,

---

<sup>95</sup> Edward Shaughnessy claims several sentences in the *Zi yi* text of the *Liji* were transposed due to the misplaced bamboo strips. See his “Rewriting the *Zi Yi*: How One Chinese Classic Came To Read as It Does,” *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany: State University of New York, 2006), 63–93.

centering around the concept of the sage. This characteristic or reorganization may reflect the fact that YL 5-9 came to the text later. Lastly, it is interesting that YL 5-3 is not attested by any other earlier PLs except the MWD. As is well known, YL 5-3 is actually rebutted in the extant *Lunyu* by Kongzi himself.<sup>96</sup> Based on the YL, YL 5-3 seems to have been joined late to the MWD PL. It also raises the possibility that the section of the *Lunyu* could not have authentically come from Kongzi, or that this saying could have been circulating anonymously.

### 3-4-3-5. Conclusion

Considering the foregoing evidence, the fact that the JL *Laozi* PL, unlike the MWD PL, had distinctive words and a particular sentence order implies that there was obviously a distance in the relationship between the *Laozi* PLs of the JYL and the MWD.

### 3-4-4. Non-existent lines in the Jie Yu Lao *Laozi* parallels: The case of Jie Lao 6

If the JYL *Laozi* PL reflects the process of establishing the text, it is natural that the MWD PL contains more than the JYL PL. What matters is that we must be certain of what the MWD improved on and enlarged. Here, I focus on a typical case, the common section JL 6, which deals with Dao metaphysics. It shows one of the most impressive changes from the JYL PL to the MWD PL.

The quotations grouped as JL 6 have characteristics distinct from those of the other JL quotations. First, they are much more fragmented than other quotations in the Jie Lao. Second, the contents are concentrated on the discussion of the metaphysical characteristics of the great Dao. Based on these two differences, I subdivide them into three categories of difference. The 6-1 sentence is not found in any other editions of the *Laozi*. 6-2 and 6-3 each consist of only one sentence, which belongs, respectively, to the R sections 14 and 1.

Discussion of the “mysterious Dao” began to flourish in the late Warring States period.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> See chapter 14, Xianwen 憲問, section 34 of the *Lunyu*. In this testimony, there are two interesting points: First, the sentence structure of the *Lunyu* is slightly different from that of the YL 5-3: While the 14-34 of the *Lunyu* says “以德報怨,” the 5-3 says, “報怨以德.” Second, in 14-34, there is no statement that the source of this saying was ascribed to Lao Dan or the *Laozi*.

<sup>97</sup> For this, see Liu Weihua 劉蔚華 and Miao Luntian 苗潤田, *Jikha cheolhak* 寂下 철학, translated by Gwak

We can see the elaborate discussions of Dao (*daolun* 道論) in some important texts of the time such as *Guanzi*, the four texts in the MWD B, the Outer and Miscellaneous chapters of the *Zhuangzi*, some chapters of *Xunzi*, or some of *Lushi Chunqiu*, etc. In light of the intellectual and political circumstances, the author of the Jie Lao also attempted to explain the mysterious Dao in detail.<sup>98</sup> In addition, what is interesting is that, without considering the GD PL, neither the MWD nor the R texts can explain properly the sentence order or its combination of JL 6. This implies not only that the JYL *Laozi* PL was unique and distinct in contents and organization, but also that the JYL did not include the Dao discussion that was developed, as in the MWD, since it was in the process of establishment. Specifically, what does the JL 6 say and how is it philosophically prepared for the MWD? For these questions, we must look at JL 6-1, 6-2, and 6-3 in detail.

Regarding JL 6-1, it is significant that the JL *Laozi* PL begins its Dao discussion with 6-1-1, not with 6-3-1, which is the first sentence of the R text. The JL 6-1 deals with the relationship between Dao and the order of things, and notions of beginning and finality through Dao, like completion and end. In this, the Dao as the one origin of all things is understood in relation to a term, Li, 理, which is explained by the JL commentator as a notion of individual order and the principle of things. Li, which was developed and established in the history of Chinese philosophy by later thinkers like Wang Bi, Cheng Xuanying 成玄英, and Zhu Xi 朱熹, had already begun to be gradually presented by the pre-Han/Han thinkers.<sup>99</sup> The Jie Lao chapter is the case in point. Li was mainly understood as the order and principle of an individual thing, as is shown in the Jie Lao quotation 6-1 and its commentary. Besides the JL chapter, we can find an identical case of the term's usage in the text, Jingfa in the MWD B manuscript.

---

Shinhwan 帛書 (Seoul: Cheolhak gwa hyunsil, 1992).

<sup>98</sup> The quotations that I have grouped as JL 6 seem to have reflected all the contents of Dao discussion that the author's *Laozi* PL referred to. It does not seem that the author had shortened the original sentences or arbitrarily selected the sayings of Dao among several other competitive sentences, since elaborating the work of Dao was obviously required plentifully at that time, as is shown in the other chapters of the *Hanfeizi*, Zhu Dao or Yang Quan, as well as other texts like the *Xunzi* or *Zhuangzi*.

<sup>99</sup> On the creation, changes, development, and completion of the term Li, see Zhang Liwen 張立文, *Li* 理 (Beijing: Renmin Daxue, 1987).

When a thing individually matches Dao exactly, it is called "Li" (individual principle 理). The place where Li exists is called "to follow" (*shun* 順). When a thing has some parts that do not match Dao, it is called "to lose Li" (*shili* 失理). The place where Li is lost is called "to rebel" (*ni* 逆). If one sees either following or rebelling as being against its own individual fate, one can know of its survival or death, and flourish or fall.

物各合于道者, 謂之理. 理之所在謂之順. 物有不合于道者, 謂之失理. 失理所在謂之逆. 逆順各自命也, 則存亡興懷可知也. (經法, 論)

The belief that order and laws are not externally imposed on the things and beings of the world, but rather are inherent in their own nature, recalls the logical necessity to relate Li to Fa (law 法), as well as to Dao. JL 6-1-1 shows an example of Dao as the most fundamental origin and the most common principle of all beings and things. Reflecting this overriding importance of the terms Dao and Li and their close relationship, the *Laozi* of the JL seems to have begun the discussion of Dao with this sentence.<sup>100</sup>

It is intriguing that JL 6-1-2 was preparation for a part of the MWD section 58. JL 6-1-2 discusses completeness, realization, and the final destruction of things by achieving Dao. On this point, the sentence contains quite a similar meaning to the cosmic Dao discussion in the Da Zong Shi 大宗師 chapter of the Inner *Zhuangzi*, the authorship of which is in some doubt.<sup>101</sup> Some

---

<sup>100</sup> Chen Qiyong regards this JL 6-1-1 as a commentary of "是謂道紀" which belongs to the 14th section of R text. See Chen Qiyong 2006, 412. However, it is unclear whether JL 6-1-1 would have been for the R section 14 or not. His suggestion basically relies on the assumption that the 5,000-word *Laozi* existed and was referred to by the author of the JL.

<sup>101</sup> This textual skepticism is my own contention. For this, see my unpublished "Zhuangzi as a Huang-Lao ideal"; The Dao discussion of the Da Zong Shi chapter is as follows: "夫道, 有情有信, 無爲無形. 可傳而不可受, 可得而不可見. 自本自根, 未有天地, 自古以固存. 神鬼神帝, 生天生地. 在太極之上而不爲高, 在六極之下而不爲深, 先天地生而不爲久, 長於上古而不爲老. 狔韋氏得之, 以挈天地. 伏羲氏得之, 以襲氣母. 維斗得之, 終古不忒, 日月得之, 終古不息. 堪坏得之, 以襲崑崙. 馮夷得之, 以遊大川. 肩吾得之, 以處大山. 皇帝得之, 以登雲天. 顓頊得之, 以處玄宮. 禹強得之, 立乎北極. 西王母得之, 坐乎少廣, 莫知其始, 莫知其終. 彭祖得之, 上及有虞, 下及五伯. 傳說得之, 以相武丁, 奄有天下, 乘東維, 騎箕尾, 而比於列星." (莊子 大宗師)



consider that the discussion was distant from Zhuangzi's own writing, even though it belongs to the Inner Chapters.<sup>102</sup> JL 6-1-2 shows that the developing *Laozi* was gradually becoming engaged in the discourse of cosmological Dao.

In addition, 6-1-2 could have been closely related to the R section 39. In particular, it is noticeable that the section contains sentences similar in meaning:

From time immemorial, to attain the One is as follows:

Heaven can become clear by attaining the One.

Earth can become peaceful by attaining the One.

The numinous can become divine by attaining the One.

The valley can become full by attaining the One.

Lords and kings can justly govern all under Heaven by attaining the One.

昔之得一者, 天得一以清, 地得一以寧, 神得一以靈, 谷得一以盈, 侯王得一以  
而爲天下正

These sentences of the MWD section 2 (R 39) are similar to JL 6-1-2, in that they mention that cosmogonic and political individuals realize themselves by attaining Dao. Since MWD 2 (R 39) tacitly represents that Dao is understood as the One, its philosophy transcends JL 6-1-2. Even though Dao was, already in JL 6-1-1, understood as having one ultimate origin and principle, this formula, identifying Dao and the One, seems not yet to have been incorporated in the JL *Laozi* PL. The equaling of Dao with the One was already shown in some other texts at a similar time. For example, the Huang-Lao chapter Yang Quan 揚權 of the *Hanfeizi* defines Dao as the One.

Dao is unmatched, therefore it is said to be "the One."

道無雙, 故曰一.

In this sense, it can be suggested that identification with the One existed at the same time, but that the philosophical and religious tendencies were not yet fully engaged in the JL *Laozi* PL.

---

<sup>102</sup> See Qian Mu 錢穆, *Zhuangzi zuanjian* 莊子纂箋 (Taipei: Dongda, 1993), 52.

Because of this, it is natural that JL 6-2 consists of only one sentence, 6-2-6, since the other sentences of 6-2 (MWD 58; R 14) basically deal with the mysterious nature of Dao and its identification as the One. Due to the absence of this identification in the JL, the MWD *Laozi* PL combined the independent sentences concerning the mysterious Dao with 6-2-6 of the JL *Laozi*.

A striking argument surrounding JL 6 is probably from JL 6-3. In 6-3-1, “If Dao can be named as ‘Dao,’ the Dao cannot be the constant Dao” 道之可道, 非常道也, corresponds to the first sentence of the MWD section 45 and the R text section 1. The R first section is the best known in the extant *Laozi* and is believed to be the most representative of Laozi philosophy. However, except for the MWD, in any other extant early texts and early PLs, the section is not found at all. If there had existed only JL 6-3-1 in the *Laozi* of JL, JL 6-3-2, “If Name can be named, the Name cannot be the constant Name” 名可名也, 非常名也, would have been a later *parody* of JL 6-3-1 concerned with the discussion of name/form (*xingming* 形名), and its synthetic elaboration, JL 6-3-3, would have been added to 6-3-2.<sup>103</sup> The discussion of name/form was one of the central philosophical topics in the late Warring States times, and during this period, the discussion seems to have been incorporated into the early *Laozi* PL. The PL’s representative condensation of the attitude towards the discussion seems “名可名也, 非常名也.”<sup>104</sup>

Admittedly, since the metaphysical Dao discussion was already evident in the GD bundles (e.g. A 1:1, 1:2, 3:3, 4:8; C 2:1), it is hard to assert that the discussion was begun by the JYL *Laozi*. However, the difference between the JL *Laozi* and the GD PL is that, as in JL 6-1-1, the former sought to formularize Dao as penetrated order and the mysterious origin of all beings and things in the world, by presenting the relationship between Li and Dao. As such, the quotations of the JL show that the metaphysical discourses of Dao were gradually being

---

<sup>103</sup> It is significant that, by adding JL 6-3-3, the first section expresses that the *Laozi*, in fact, synthetically pursues both of the two dimensions, “the impossible to name” (*wuming* 無名) and “the possible to name” (*youting* 有名). In this sense, the received text of the *Laozi* would have criticized the Qi Wu Lun of the *Zhuangzi*, which strongly defends only the impossible to name in the world.

<sup>104</sup> The discussion of name/form was one of the most important motifs to create the Qi Wu Lun chapter of the *Zhuangzi*. See my forthcoming “The Qiwulun of the *Zhuangzi*: Who Wrote It and Why?” *Monumenta Serica*.

incorporated into the developing *Laozi*. The JL 6 groups that declare Dao to be the one ultimate order and origin were preparing for the unification of Dao with the name/form, which is typically presented in the R section 1, and through its philosophical engagement, the JYL *Laozi* PL helped the MWD PL to support the ideal of sacred governing by grasping Dao (*zhidao* 執道).

### 3-5. Philosophical characteristics of the *Laozi* in the Jie Yu Lao: Summary

Assuming that the *Laozi* PL of JYL was a transitional one as an important textual source for the MWD PL, and comparing its textual characteristics with those of GD PL and the MWD PL, we can summarize the philosophical nature, character, and significance of the *Laozi* PL in the JYL as follows: First, early *Laozi* PLs did not necessarily deny and differentiate themselves from Confucian values and virtues like humanness, righteousness, and obedience. Second, the *Laozi* PL of JYL shows that the metaphysical discussion of Dao on a cosmic scale, Dao as the one origin and fundamental order that penetrates humans, state, and cosmos, was being gradually but clearly engaged in the text. In other words, the JYL *Laozi* began in earnest the Dao discussion of the practical governing of humans, state, and cosmos that is based on the sacred absolute Dao. This point is followed by the third characteristic. Third, the *Laozi* of JYL served philosophically to provide the momentum for the editor of the MWD to combine and actively absorb into the MWD the elements of the name/form discussion and the notion of political governing by one sage king.

#### 4. Conclusion

What is the nature of the text known as the *Laozi*? To answer this question, I suggest historicizing it as an evolving text going through several stages in different times and circumstances, and tracing how the text was gradually developed. The reason I take this strategy is to overcome the essentialistic approach to the text (i.e., seeking a coherent voice in contents such as naturalism or primitivism) and to shed light on the historical and multi-layered reality that the text included diverse sources and philosophical concerns during the time of its establishment. This historicization is also beneficial in explaining many textual and philosophical contradictions that have are evident in other early texts such as *Lunyu*, *Mengzi*, *Xunzi*, or *Zhuangzi*. In addition, it is possible that this implies that the history of early Chinese philosophy, which has been formed on the basis of an uncritical disregard of the formational history of the transmitted texts, needs to be reexamined.

After exploring the historicization of the text, I find that the early *Laozi* PLs do not necessarily oppose Confucian values. To put it in radical terms, the proto-*Laozis* could not have been clearly distinguished from the philosophy that we have called "Confucianism."<sup>105</sup> This philological and philosophical circumstance corresponds to the historical evidence, that, according to a rumor, untraceable even by the Han scholars, Kongzi had asked the value of obeying orders of Lao Dan, it was recognized as never shameful to accept and rather as respectful to exemplify how ardently he sought to learn.<sup>106</sup> Even until the early Western Han, Lao Dan was in fact not disregarded by the successors of Confucianism.

---

<sup>105</sup> These doubts and criticism about the *Laozi* and Lao Dan are also applicable to the text *Zhuangzi*, and to a historical figure, Master Zhuang, who has been believed to have lived in the middle of the Warring States period, having an intellectual relationship with Hui Shi, but his historicity is not verifiable, based on any textual and historical evidence. Some significant anecdotes and episodes in the Inner *Zhuangzi* that thoroughly mock and criticize Confucian values (e.g., discussion of sitting and forgetting (*zuowang* 坐忘) in the Da Zhong Shi chapter) were probably not from Master Zhuang's own hand, but from his successors.

<sup>106</sup> This was pointed out by Angus Graham. See Angus C. Graham, "The Origin of the Legend of Lao Dan," in *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature* (Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies, 1986),

At the time of Xunzi, who first mentioned Master Lao and Master Zhuang as individual philosophical figures in early Chinese history, two changes may be acknowledged: first, around his time, the text began to be selectively incorporated and enlarged; second, the author of the text was beginning to be envisioned as Lao Dan, but this combination was not yet complete at the period of MWD, and it is seen to be stably formulated in the Sima Qian’s Lao Dan biography. The textual evidence showing this change at that time is the *Laozi* quotations in some chapters of the *Hanfeizi*.

The last question to address is, “Who led this significant textual and philosophical change from the late Warring States period to the early Western Han?” Supposing that the MWD *Laozi* PL did not simply oppose Confucian virtues, I argue that the compilers needed *more than* Confucian virtues. The denial was not simply a resistance to or defiance of values, but an expression of pursuing a more fundamental virtue or value beyond the so-called Confucian ones that had dominated after the Zhou political establishment. This explains the reason that the synthetic compilers of the MWD PL adopted the seemingly anti-Confucian sayings in the overriding text at the time of early Han. It was not just to criticize, but rather strategically to embrace and overcome them. At the time of the text’s establishment, the compilers finally moved towards adopting that perspective. This constitutes some significant textual and philosophical divergences between the JL *Laozi* PL and the MWD PL. That is, textually, the MWD PL grew out of the JL PL, as a source and an enhanced and complete edition in physical contents. And philosophically, corresponding to the textual completion, the MWD PL attempted to critically embrace the traditional values and virtues in the name of Confucianism, and, by doing so, the text as well as many other philosophical texts may have contributed more comprehensive,

---

111–124. In the paper Graham intuitively analyzes the way in which the several distinct episodes in the Lao Dan biography by Sima Qian could have been merged into one. Even though his research was not on the philological concerns of the *Laozi* text, his conclusions provide a significant basis on which to understand how the *Laozi* could be canonized and by whom. Even though it does not accord with his own assumption that the Inner Chapters of the *Zhuangzi* were historically created by Master Zhuang, his insight that, in order to secure a superior status to that of Kongzi, Lao Dan was purposefully selected, still seems invaluable. My aim in this article has been to examine the question, who needed to express a philosophy superior to and more authoritative than Kongzi’s thought, and what that stands for in the textual study of the *Laozi*.

synthetic, and accomplished ideas to the Qin–Han intellectual and political reality about how to govern a unified empire. If my assumption is correct that the JYL *Laozi* PL show the textual development from GD PL towards MWD PL, the potential answer seems related to the commentators on the JYL *Laozi* PL.<sup>107</sup> The compilation was a philosophical and political response to a time at which contemporary politics needed an ideology to justify unifying all competing powers, building one new Empire, and sanctifying the new overall order to make all under Heaven follow.

The *Laozi* PL of the JYL shows well how there were various the proto-*Laozis*, and how they were being developed before the MWD. By analyzing and understanding the textual and philosophical characteristics of these transitional sources of the *Laozi*, I found a way to consistently and alternatively interpret the textual history of the *Laozi* and the early Chinese history of philosophy, on the basis of new archaeological finds in the last three decades. In this sense, another *Laozi* PL in the *Hanfeizi* shows an alternate path to the history of the *Laozi* and early Chinese thought.

Finally, in order to consistently and organically interpret them, it is necessary to reflect fundamentally on our conventional categorization of early Chinese philosophical schools. If we continue to substantialize the ex-post categories, this will undermine the new examinations and alternative suggestions that are possible for early Chinese philosophy, with which many newly excavated documents potentially provide us.

---

<sup>107</sup> On this point, it is highly worth recalling that Takeuchi Yoshio concluded that the 5,000-word *Laozi* had been a result of Han Fei’s successors. Takeuchi Yoshio, *Rōshi genshi* 老子原始, in *Takeuchi Yoshio zenshū* 武内義雄 全集 5:5-90 (Tokyo: Kadokawa, 1979), 74–79, and *Rōshi no kenkyū* 老子の研究, in *Takeuchi Yoshio zenshū* 武内義雄 全集 5:92–393 (Tokyo: Kadokawa, 1979), 162–166.

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free. For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

[www.sino-platonic.org](http://www.sino-platonic.org)