

JOHN DIDIER

Messrs. T'an, Chancellor Sung,
and the *Book of Transformation (Hua Shu)*:
Texts and the Transformations of Traditions

THE LEGACY OF THE *HUA SHU*

The tenth-century *Hua shu* 化書 (“Book of Transformation”) thoroughly syncretizes significant elements of Taoist, alchemical, Buddhist, and Confucian, as well as ancient Mohist, Divine Agriculturalist, and Huang-Lao, thought. Published initially in 930 by the powerful Southern T'ang (937–976) chancellor Sung Ch'i-ch'iu 宋齊丘 [邱] (886–959), this work, although relatively unknown, has played an important role in the history of Chinese thought by influencing considerably Taoist alchemical and, I have argued elsewhere, *tao-hsüeh* (“Neo-Confucian”) traditions during and after the Sung dynasty (960–1279).¹

Perhaps in part because of general scholarly disinterest in the disunified and chaotic Chinese tenth century,² with a few notable exceptions scholars – modern and pre-modern, Chinese and non-Chinese – largely have ignored the *Hua shu*. Thus, despite Hu Shih's 胡適 (1891–1962) claim that the work expresses one among the most highly systematized philosophies in Chinese

I WOULD like to thank Denis Twitchett for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper, as well as the anonymous readers at *Asia Major* for their insightful suggestions and corrections. All remaining errors and oversights are the author's responsibility.

¹ The work under investigation here (referred to below as *HS*) is entirely distinct from the 12th-c. *Wen-ch'ang hua shu* 文昌化書 (*The Book of Transformations of Wen-ch'ang*); Terry Kleeman, *A God's Own Tale: The Book of Transformations of Wenchang, the Divine Lord of Zitong* (Albany: State U. of New York P., 1994). “Hua shu” has not always been named so; variant titles include: *Tan-tzu hua shu* 譚子化書 (*The Book of Transformation of Master Tan*); *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* 齊丘子 (*The Master [Sung] Ch'i-ch'iu*); and *Sung Ch'i-ch'iu hua shu* 宋齊丘化書 (*The Hua shu of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu*); see appendix, below. On 930 as the year of publication, see Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's “Author's Preface to *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*” (“*Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu tzu-hsü*” 齊丘子自序) is in *Shuo-fu* 說郛 (Han-fen-lou recension, in *Shuo-fu san-chung* 說郛三種; Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1988) 42, p. 27a (vol. 3, pp. 698–99); and Tung Kao 董誥, *Ch'üan P'ang wen* 全唐文 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1983; hereafter *CTW*) 870, pp. 14a–b (vol. 18, p. 11489).

² One recent exception is Johannes L. Kurz, “Sources for the History of the Southern Tang (937–975),” *Journal of Sung-Yüan Studies* 24 (1994), pp. 217–35.

intellectual history and Hsiung Shih-li's 熊十力 (1883-1968) recognition of the importance of the work's political thought,³ only a handful of scholars in the twentieth century have even commented on the book. Among the most notable of these have been Alfred Forke, who courageously initiated Western attempts to understand the *Hua shu*,⁴ Hsiao Kung-ch'uan 蕭公權, who, like Hsiung Shih-li, found in the *Hua shu* significant political thought,⁵ Joseph Needham and colleagues, who have understood the *Hua shu* better than most and noted its value in the history of scientific thought (optics and acoustics) and philosophy (epistemology),⁶ and Ch'ing Hsi-t'ai 卿希泰 and Jen Chi-yü 任繼愈, eminent historians of thought who have recognized many salient aspects of the philosophy of the *Hua shu*.⁷ Perhaps the most significant contributions to contemporary *Hua shu* studies include Frank Fiedeler's thirty-year-old dissertation on the work and Ting Chen-yen 丁禎彥 and Li Ssu-chen's 李似珍 recent publication of the *Hua shu* text in its first punctuated, modern type-set edition.⁸ Aside from these, this writer's recent Ph.D. dissertation and several articles by mainland Chinese scholars should be mentioned as further sources of information on and analyses of the *Hua shu*.⁹

³ See Hu Shih, *Hu Shih ti jih-chi shou-kao-pen* 胡適的日記手稿本 (Taipei: Yüan-liu ch'u-pan-she, 1989), vol. 2 (Sept., 1921-April, 1922), entry April 23. In a supplement to a letter he wrote to Hu Shih titled "On Reading the *Tan-tzu Hua shu*," Hsiung Shih-li cited *HS* extensively and discussed aspects of its thought related to the tumultuous political situation in China earlier in this century. See Ch'ih Yün-chih 恥云志, ed., *Hu Shih i-kao chi pi-t'ang shu-hsin* 胡適遺稿及塔藏書信 (Ho-fei: Huang-shan shu-she, 1994), vol. 38, pp. 585-93. I am indebted to Ying-shih Yü for having directed me to both Hu's and Hsiung's comments.

⁴ Alfred Forke, *Geschichte der mittelalterlichen chinesischen Philosophie* (Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter and Co., 1934), pp. 338-49.

⁵ Hsiao Kung-ch'uan, *Chung-kuo cheng-chih ssu-hsiang shih* 中國政治思想史 (1945-46; rpt. Taipei: Chung-hua wen-hua shu-chü, 1954), vol. 3, pp. 434-39. Largely following Hsiao, both Sa Meng-wu 薩孟武, *Chung-kuo cheng-chih ssu-hsiang shih* (Tai-chung: San-min shu-chü, 1969), pp. 335-39, and Jen Chi-yü, *Chung-kuo che-hsüeh shih* 中國哲學史 (Shen-yang: Jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1964 and 1979), vol. 3, pp. 143-50, have treated the political thought in *HS*.

⁶ Joseph Needham et al., *Science and Civilisation in China* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1954-7) 1 (1954), p. 45; vol. 2 (1956), pp. 450-52; vol. 4 (1962), pt. 1, pp. 92-93, 116-17, 206-9.

⁷ Ch'ing Hsi-t'ai, *Chung-kuo Tao-chiao shih* 中國道教史 (Chengtu: Ssu-ch'uan jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1992), vol. 2, pp. 484-92; Jen Chi-yü, ed., *Tao-tsang ti-yao* 道藏提要 (Peking: Chung-kuo she-hui k'o-hsüeh ch'u-pan-she, 1991), p. 788, no. 1035.

⁸ Frank Fiedeler, *Hua Shu, Das Buch des Verwandeltens: Darstellung der Lehre und Übersetzung des Textes; Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis chinesischer Philosophie* (Ph.D. diss., Nürnberg, 1967).

Ting Chen-yen and Li Ssu-chen, eds., *Hua shu, Tao-chiao tien-chi hsüan-k'an ser.* (Peking: Chung-hua, 1996), in addition to collating early editions have appended documents relevant to a historical investigation.

⁹ John Didier, "Way Transformation: Universal Unity in Warring States through Sung China: The Book of Transformation (*Hua Shu* 化書) and the Renewal of Metaphysics in the Tenth Century" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton U., 1998), including an analysis of its philosophy and a contex-

Although it certainly is not insignificant that prominent twentieth-century scholars such as Hu, Hsiung, Forke, Needham, Hsiao, Jen, and Ch'ing have stressed the importance of the *Hua shu*, we should recognize that the work likely was better known in China prior to the twentieth century. The *Hua shu* is listed in most of the salient Sung, Yüan, and Ming catalogues, and historically many well respected scholars, teachers, writers, and thinkers have praised, criticized, quoted from, or otherwise noted or commented on the work. For instance, of such intellectuals living in the Sung and Yüan periods (to 1368) we may mention those both "extramundane" (*fang-wai* 方外) such as Ch'en T'uan 陳搏 (d. 989), Chang Wu-meng 張無夢 (d. ca. 1045), Ch'en Ching-yüan 陳景元 (ca. 1024-1094), Hou Shan-yüan 侯善淵 (fl. ca. 1192), and Po Yü-ch'an 白玉蟾 (1134-1229),¹⁰ as well as those more mundane, including Lu Tien 陸佃 (1042-1102), Chang Lei 張耒 (1054-1114), Huang Chen 黃震 (1213-1280), Wang Ying-lin 王應麟 (1223-1296), Yü Yen 俞琰 (1258-1314), Lu Yu 陸友 (ca. 1300), and Sung Lien 宋謙 (1310-1381).¹¹ Furthermore, textual and philosophical evidence also clearly links the *Hua shu* with the central *tao-hsüeh* thinkers Chou Tun-i 周敦頤 (1017-1073), Shao Yung 邵雍 (1011-1077), Chang Tsai 張載 (1020-1077), and Chu Hsi 朱熹 (1130-1200).¹²

tualization in Chinese intellectual history of the Warring States (401-256 BC) through Sung (960-1279 AD) periods, an annotated translation, biographical analyses of the two reputed authors, and a history of editions. For mainland China studies, see bibliography in *ibid*.

¹⁰ On Ch'en T'uan and Ch'en Ching-yüan, see below. Hou Shan-yüan quoted from *HS* in his *Shang-ch'ing t'ai-hsüan-chi* 上清太玄集, printed in *Cheng-t'ung tao-tsang* (cited n. 16, below), item no. 730. Po Yü-ch'an relied heavily on *HS* for his theoretical approach to both alchemy and life; see his *Ch'ung-kuan Po chen-jen chi* 瓊瑯白真人集, printed in *Tao-tsang chi-yao* (cited n. 16, below), vol. 14. Other important Taoist thinkers whom the *Hua-shu* influenced include Li Tao-ch'un 李道純 (fl. ca. 1340-80), Chao I-chen 趙宜真 (fl. ca. 1340-80), and Liu I-ming 劉一明 (1734-1821). See *ibid.*, pp. 503-19. For specific references, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 504-8, 674-742 (notes given there), and 1091-97.

¹¹ Huang Chen, *Huang-shih jih-ch'ao* 黃氏日抄, printed in [*Wen-yüan ko*] *Ssu-k'u ch'üan shu* [文淵閣] 四庫全書 (Taipei: Shang-wu, 1983; hereafter *SKCS*) 55, pp. 42a-45b (vol. 708, pp. 419-20). Lu Tien's *Pi-ya* 碑雅 (TSCC *chien-pien* edn.; Taipei: Shang-wu, 1965-66), vol. 380, pp. 26, 142, 205, 237-38, 270, 393, and 526, quotes extensively from *HS*. Chang Lei wrote a colophon to it in which he grudgingly acknowledged the author's perspicacity ("Shu *Sung Ch'i-ch'iu Hua shu* hou" 書宋齊丘化書後; "An Afterword Description of *Sung Ch'i-ch'iu Hua shu*", in *Chang Lei chi* 張耒集 [Peking: Chung-hua, 1990], vol. 2, ch. 53, p. 807. Wang Ying-lin quoted it in *K'un-hsüeh chi-wen* 樹學紀聞 (SKCS vol. 854, p. 491). Yü Yen quoted from *HS* and deliberated on the matter of authorship in both his *Chou-i ts'an-t'ung-ch'i fa-hui* 周易參同契發揮 (1310; collected in *TT* no. 627) 8, pp. 4b-5a; 9, p. 6a, and his *Hsi-shang fu-t'an* 席上腐談 (TSCC, vol. 128) B, p. 19a. Sung Lien commented on a *HS* in his possession; *Chu-tzu-pien* 諸子辯 (KHCPTS edn.; Taipei: Shang-wu, 1968), vol. 17, p. 25). Lu Yu's *Yen-pei tsa-chih* 研北雜志 (in *Pao-yen-t'ung pi-chi* 寶顏堂秘集; hereafter *PYTC*, which is itself published in the collection *Pai-pu ts'ung-shu chi-ch'eng* 百部叢書集成 [Taipei: I-wen yin-shu kuan, 1965; hereafter *PPTS*] B, pp. 1b-2a) claims that others had praised the theory of calligraphy espoused in *HS* (see n. 76, below).

¹² See Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 347-601.

Additionally, like the Sung *tao-hsüeh* scholar Huang Chen before them, seven prominent early Ming *hsin-hsüeh* Confucian thinkers wrote appreciative commentaries on the *Hua shu*, including the particularly renowned Wu Yü-pi 吳與弼 (1397-1469), his student Ch'en Hsien-chang 陳獻章 (1428-1500), and Hsüeh Hsüan 薛瑄 (1389-1464).¹³ Given the philosophical connections that exist among Ch'en Hsien-chang, his student Chan Jo-shui 湛若水 (1466-1560), and the supremely influential Wang Yang-ming 王陽明 (Wang Shou-jen 王守仁; 1472-1529), then it is very possible that the *Hua shu* remained influential in *hsin-hsüeh* and *tao-hsüeh* circles throughout the Ming.¹⁴ Indeed, one renowned thinker often associated with *hsin-hsüeh* developments, Li Cho-wu 李卓吾 (1527-1602), more commonly known as Li Chih 李贄, considered that, among Taoist works, along with the *Tao-te-ching* 道德經 and *Kuan-yin-tzu* 關尹子 the *Hua shu* was of supreme importance.¹⁵ Therefore, to Li, the *Hua shu* superseded even the *Chuang-tzu* 莊子 as a representative work of Taoist speculative philosophy and self-cultivation.

Finally, we may note the significance of the fact that, in one form or another, the *Hua shu* has been collected in most major Taoist compendia, including 1. Tseng Ts'ao's 曾慥 (fl. ca. 1106-1151) *Tao shu* 道樞 collection of texts and commentaries, published in 1136, wherein Tseng venerated the *Hua shu* by placing it second from the beginning; 2. Tung Chin-ch'un's 董蔭醇 fourteenth-century *Ch'ün-hsien yao-yü tsuan-chi* 群仙要語彙集; 3. the *Cheng-t'ung Tao-tsang* 正統道藏 of 1444-46; 4. the *Wan-li Hsü-tao-tsang* 萬曆續道藏 of 1607; and 5. the *Tao-tsang chi-yao* 道藏輯要, compiled between ca. 1700 and 1906.¹⁶

¹³ *Ho chu-ming chia p'i-tien chu-tzu ch'üan-shu* 合語名家批點諸子全書, Yang Shen 楊慎 (1448-1559), ed.? (Hangkow, 1621-27). Other commentaries on the *Hua-shu* collected therein include those by Yang Shen, Ts'ao Tuan 曹端 (1376-1434), Ts'ai Ch'ing 蔡清 (fl. 1465-88), and Ch'en Chen-sheng 陳真晟 (fl. 1450s-60s), all significant thinkers of the Ming period.

¹⁴ On influences among Ming Neo-Confucian thinkers, see Ch'ien Mu 錢穆, *Sung-Ming li-hsüeh kai-shu* 宋明理學概論 (Taipei: Hsüeh-sheng shu-chü, 1977), or, for instance, Julia Ching and Chaoying Fang, trans. and annot., *The Records of Ming Scholars* (Honolulu: U. Hawaii P., 1987). For a philosophical connection between HS and Wang Yang-ming, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 598-601.

¹⁵ Li Cho-wu 李卓吾, *Hsü-fen-shu* 續焚書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1959; based on a Ming edn. now in the library of the Chung-kuo k'o-hsüeh-yüan), ch. 2, p. 67, "Tao-chiao-ch'ao hsiao-yin."

¹⁶ All citations, below, from *Cheng-t'ung tao-tsang* 正統道藏 of 1444-46 (rpt. Shanghai: Han-fen-lou, 1926; hereafter, *TT*) use the number as identified by Weng Tu-chien 翁獨健, *Tao-tsang tzu-mu yin-te* 道藏子目引得, Harvard-Yenching Inst. Sinological Index Ser. 25 (Peking, 1935). A version of HS is in no. 724. The *Tao shu* version of HS, titled *Wu-hua* 五化, or *Five Transformations*, is in *TT* no. 641, ch. 1, pp. 8a-12b. *Ch'ün-hsien yao-yü tsuan-chi* contains a HS version, called *Tan-tzu hua shu* 譚子化書, in *TT* no. 998, ch. A, pp. 11b-16a. The *Wan-li Hsü-tao-tsang* (1607) version is in *TT* no. 1107, and that of *Tao-tsang chi-yao* 道藏輯要 (photoprnt. of 1917 edn.; Taipei: K'ao-cheng ch'u-pan-she, 1971; hereafter *TCY*), in vol. 12, pp. 5203-54. See Liu Ts'un-jen, "The Compilation and Historical Value of the *Tao-tsang*," in Donald Leslie et al., eds., *Essays on*

This background demonstrates that the *Hua shu* deserves more attention than it has received. This is evident especially when we note that the early history of the *Hua shu* remains so murky that we still do not really know either who wrote the book or the identities of two of the three people traditionally thought to have been the book's author.

Regarding this issue of authorship, the origins of the *Hua shu* have been disputed since the eleventh century. Initially published under the authorship of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu in 930, since 1060 Taoist apologists have argued that in reality an eremite, T'an Ch'iao 譚峭, wrote the book. They claim variably that T'an gave the book to Sung or that Sung either brutalized or murdered T'an in order to claim and publish the *Hua shu* as his own. As versions of this tale gained currency throughout the eleventh through fourteenth centuries, the claim for T'an's authorship of course also accumulated momentum such that, since the fourteenth century, all editions of the *Hua shu* have been published as the work of T'an Ch'iao.

The second hurdle that *Hua shu* studies must overcome is the fact that T'an Ch'iao's very identity is unclear. Through the centuries many commentators have identified him with another tenth-century character of identical surname and engaged in apparently similar pursuits in roughly the same southeast region as T'an Ch'iao. This is T'an Tzu-hsiao 譚紫霄. Still, the identification of these persona as one man is anything but certain.

The immediate task of this article is to demonstrate that these issues of identity and authorship can be resolved to the degree that we may conclude that T'an Ch'iao and T'an Tzu-hsiao were two distinct individuals and, while T'an Ch'iao almost certainly conceived of the *Hua shu* philosophy and wrote most of the work, one must allow for Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's contributions. Additionally, this paper is intended to bring the influential *Hua shu* to light in order that its significance in intellectual history and its reflections of tenth-century Chinese social and cultural historical circumstances might assist other scholars in their efforts to illuminate this still understudied period.

Below, following a brief introduction to the organization and apparent intellectual thrust of the *Hua shu*, we will review and analyze all known biographical-hagiographical evidence pertaining to the barely accessible T'an Ch'iao, and then will consider any reasonable conclusions derived therefrom against what is knowable about the historically better represented T'an Tzu-hsiao. Thereafter we will trace the textual history of the *Hua shu* and, in light of

the Sources for Chinese History (Canberra: Australian National U., 1973), pp. 107-10; Didier, "Way Transformation," p. 1103, n. 16.

these findings, examine some structural inconsistencies among editions of the *Hua shu* in order to illuminate the work's untidy authorial history.

WHAT IS THE *HUA SHU*?

All extant complete editions of the *Hua shu* consist of 110 articles apportioned among six sections or chapters. In the order of their appearance the chapter titles are "Way Transformation" (*Tao-hua* 道化), "Arts Transformation" (*Shu-hua* 術化), "Potency Transformation" (*Te-hua* 德化), "Benevolence Transformation" (*Jen-hua* 仁化), "Food Transformation" (*Shih-hua* 食化), and "Frugality Transformation" (*Chien-hua* 儉化). In his tenth-century "Preface" to the book Sung Ch'i-ch'iu explained that a ruler ought to engage one of these political "transformations" in accordance with the specific socio-political circumstances that he faces. Thus, in the best of circumstances, "Way Transformation" is sufficient. When this is untenable, however, Sung advised that the ruler employ "Arts Transformation." And when this in turn becomes insufficient to ensure the stability of the state, Sung advised that the ruler engage "Potency Transformation" to rectify the situation, and so on, until, in the worst of socio-political conditions, the ruler can implement only "Frugality Transformation," which is to say that, by being frugal and causing all in the empire to follow his economical lead, the ruler can "transform" the people into being peaceful and cooperative subjects.¹⁷

This is not the place to discuss at length the various philosophies expressed in the six chapters, but suffice it to say that from the abstract mystical principle of rulership furthered in chapter 1 especially, the *Hua shu* appears to move in subsequent chapters increasingly toward evincing various important psychological tenets that one ought to employ or understand in ruling the mundane world. That is, the ostensible trends of the book's contents, from chapters 1 to 6, are that it proceeds from the ideal to the actual, and from the abstract to the physical. As the ideal socio-political environment described in chapter 1 degenerates progressively to become the dangerous circumstance represented in chapter 6, likewise the appropriate methodology or approach according to which one interacts with and manipulates those changing environments also degenerates from an ideal abstract principle of paradisiac rule to an homely but safe practice of simply supplying physical food and shelter to the people. Thus, the *Hua shu* appears to be a *defensive* hierarchical ordering of political philosophies: one begins with the ideal methodology or *hua* but retreats to more realistic strategies as the ideal state cannot be maintained.

¹⁷ Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, "Preface," in *CTW* 870, p. 14a.

However, these are incorrect interpretations of the *Hua shu* that result from reading the text as it has been transmitted in its corrupted structure. This structural corruption occurred early on in the transmission of the text, and in this article I demonstrate what these corruptions are and how they likely came about. I will show that, when – on the basis of solid evidence – we simply redistribute the weight of the six chapters such that in fact we recognize only five, then it becomes eminently clear that, converse to what we have been led to believe, the book advises that one must begin with frugality and simplicity (chapters 5 and 6) and only gradually develop his rulership through the stages of humaneness (chapter 4), potency (chapter 3), and so-called "arts" (chapter 2), until he finally achieves the ultimate principle of Way Transformation ("Tao-hua," chapter 1). Furthermore, the concept of *hua* in the *Hua shu* involves matters far beyond the socio-political such that the universal principle outlayed in chapter 1, "Way Transformation," is at the most fundamental level both metaphysical and epistemological, describing an all-infusing, all-embracing, omnipresent, and both immanent and transcendent universal reality. Although the present paper is not the appropriate context in which to develop arguments regarding the philosophical content of the *Hua shu*, it still will become apparent through study of the work's structure that chapter 1 should be separated out from the other chapters and recognized to constitute not an integral chapter of, but instead a prefatory body to and enveloping principle of, the book. We thus should understand the *Hua shu* to be quinary, not sexpartite.

RECONSTRUCTING A BIOGRAPHY OF T'AN CH'IAO

Commencing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, scholars began to notice that some writers/editors were treating as though they were one individual two historical persona surnamed T'an who had lived during the tenth century and engaged in "Taoist" activities. The first to call attention to this concern was Hu Ying-lin 胡應麟, who in 1586 in his *Ssu-pu cheng-o* 四部正訛, after having outlined some of the important events known of each T'an's life, merely shrugged his shoulders over the matter of identity, writing, "... Their also having been contemporaries of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, were the two T'ans one person? I cannot determine it."¹⁸

Approximately two-hundred years later the editors of the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao* could only agree with Hu Ying-lin that the problem seemed insoluble, writing that, "The activities and traces of learned gentlemen outside the square (*fang-wai-chih-shih* 方外之士, or what we might understand to be

¹⁸ Hu Ying-lin, *Ssu-pu cheng-o* (KHCPTS edn., vol. 17) 2, p. 59.

“extramundane” intellectuals) are uncertain. Moreover, there are no [records] to follow and by which to examine [the issue] closely.”¹⁹ As we will see further below, it would be another 100 years before anyone in known records again took up the issue and attempted to resolve it. But since, in order to adjudge the validity of these scholars’ arguments, it is necessary to understand the background sources on T’an Ch’iao and T’an Tzu-hsiao from which they worked, then we must ourselves first review these sources.

T’an Ch’iao can be identified *vis-à-vis* T’an Tzu-hsiao by concentrating on three aspects of each man’s life: his period, region, and direction of activity. I will show that, while T’an Ch’iao engaged in internally directed mystical alchemical pursuits in primarily the north between the years 860 and 910, T’an Tzu-hsiao was active in the externally directed work of shamanic ritual manipulations exclusively in the southeast between approximately 910 and 995. We begin below with T’an Ch’iao.

T’an Ch’iao’s earliest biography – also his first mention in any source – is in the “Continued Biographies of Immortals” (*Hsü-hsien-chuan* 續仙傳), a work written by Shen Fen 沈汾 between approximately 935 and 958.²⁰ From T’an’s biography in the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* we learn that he was born to a very well educated father, T’an Chu 譚洙, who served in a fairly high position in the central administration of the T’ang dynasty (618–907). From an early age T’an Chu educated his son in the classics and histories, but T’an Ch’iao also indulged his own fascination with classic hagiographies of immortals. This culminated in the son’s leaving home to roam over a period of many years several northern mountains, including first Mount Chung-nan 終南 (in Shensi) and then Mounts T’ai-po 太白 (in Shensi), T’ai-hang 太行 (in Honan/Shansi/Hopei), Wang-wu 王屋 (in Shansi, north of Lo-yang), Sung 嵩 (in Honan), Hua 華 (in Shensi), and T’ai-yüeh 泰嶽 (that is, Mount T’ai, in Shantung).²¹ He then returned to Mount Sung where, during ten-years’ study with a Taoist priest (or priests), he obtained the immortalist “arts of avoiding cereals and nourishing

¹⁹ Chi Yün 紀的 et al., eds., *Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu tsung-mu t’i-yao* 四庫全書總目提要 (KHCPTS edn.) 23, “Tzu-pu” 子部, “Tsa-chia lei 雜家類” A, pp. 14–15 (p. 2464).

²⁰ Shen Fen, *Hsü-hsien-chuan* (hereafter, *HHC*), in *TY* no. 138, ch. 2, pp. 17b–18b; and *TY* no. 700 (*Yün-chi ch’i-ch’ien* 雲笈七籤) 113B, pp. 41a–42a. On *HHC*, see Didier, “Way Transformation,” pp. 937–43.

²¹ Mt. Chung-nan is a range stretching from T’ien-shui, Kansu, in the west, through Shensi south of Ch’ang-an, and on to P’ing-ting-shan in Honan. Its principal peak was in the southern portion of the T’ang capital Ch’ang-an county. Sung, Hua, and T’ai were among the five sacred mountains as described in the ancient *Book of Documents* (*Shang-shu* 尚書) and, based on that, *Shih-chi* 史記 (Taipei: Ting-wen, 1987), pp. 1355–56, where Sung is the central peak of the five, Hua the western, and T’ai the eastern peak. The other two are Mt. Heng 衡 (the southern peak), and Mt. Heng 恆 (northern).

ether” (*p’i-ku yang-ch’i chih shu* 辟穀養氣之術). Throughout his itinerant life he braved the elements without shelter and ate next to nothing. So advanced were his arts that at times he slept for days without moving, all the while breathing almost imperceptibly. He was a philanthropist, giving away nearly all of the wealth that his father biannually sent him, quickly spending the remainder in taverns. Later he refined and perfected his elixir of immortality at the mountain Nan-yüeh in east-central Hunan 南嶽 (that is, Mount Heng 衡山), whereafter he could transform his shape at will, entering fire and water without being harmed.²² Then he traveled to Mount Ch’ing-ch’eng 青城山 (one of the Ten Heavenly Grottos of Taoist tradition) in Szechwan, wherefrom he disappeared.

From this biography we can glean three important points. First, until very late in his life, when he spent an unknown amount of time at Nan-yüeh in the south and later retired to Mount Ch’ing-ch’eng in the far southwest, T’an Ch’iao pursued his arts exclusively in the north. Second, T’an Ch’iao obviously directed his attention inwardly to nourish his immortal body. In another important twelfth-century source, the *Nan-yüeh tsung-sheng chi* 南嶽總勝集, we find additional evidence that strongly supports the report in the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* that T’an Ch’iao pursued the internal elixir at Nan-yüeh (Mount Heng, in Hunan).²³

Third, we learn in the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography a great deal about the possible range of years of T’an Ch’iao’s life. Already the date of the work’s composition is sufficient to reasonably distinguish T’an Ch’iao from T’an Tzu-hsiao, the latter of whose later lifespan we will see clearly post-dates the latest possible year of composition of the *Hsü-hsien-chuan*. Indeed, in all of Shen Fen’s *Hsü-hsien-chuan* the latest known temporal reference is to events of the 930s.²⁴ This strongly suggests that T’an Ch’iao’s life of at least average length began before the turn of the tenth century. Internal evidence in his *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography not only supports this contention incontrovertibly, but also establishes a likely year of birth for T’an Ch’iao of approximately 860.

First, we learn that T’an Ch’iao’s father T’an Chu served the central government of the T’ang dynasty as a director of studies in the Directorate of Education.²⁵ That it was the T’ang proper (618–907) and not either the Latter

²² Water- and fire-walking are common motifs throughout Taoist literature from the earliest times. Many characters with such abilities are found in *Chuang-tzu*, *Lieh-tzu*, *Lao-tzu*, *Huai-nan-tzu*, and *Pao-p’u-tzu*, sometimes seen as expressions of one’s internal perfection.

²³ Ch’en T’ien-fu 陳田夫, *Nan-yüeh tsung-sheng chi* (1164+; in *TY* no. 332; hereafter, *NYTSC*), p. 4b; *Ta-tsang-ching* 大藏經 (Yedn.; rpt. Taipei: Hsin-wen-feng ch’u-p’an kung-ssu, 1974), vol. 51, no. 2097, pp. 1058, 1071. This text refers specifically to T’an’s “strengthening of his inner medicine,” i.e., elixir of immortality. On *NYTSC*, see Didier, “Way Transformation,” p. 910, n. 22.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 940–43.

²⁵ See Charles O. Hucker, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford

T'ang (923-935) or Southern T'ang (937-976) is known by the fact that, when T'an Ch'iao as a young man expressed his wish to leave home to live on Mount Chung-nan, "His father, considering that Mount Chung-nan was near the capital [and home], permitted him to do this."²⁶ As Lin Sheng-li has pointed out, since the only capital close to Mount Chung-nan was Ch'ang-an, and this city ceased to serve as the capital after the fall of the T'ang in 907, then the events of the biography involving "the capital" only could have occurred during the T'ang proper, or prior to 907.²⁷ But we also know from this context that T'an Ch'iao was a mature man at the time that he left Ch'ang-an for Mount Chung-nan. Therefore, he could have been born no later than 890.

In fact, other evidence in the biography suggests that T'an Ch'iao might have reached adulthood by approximately 880, which would mean that he was born no later than circa 860. This evidence is that, prior to T'an Ch'iao's having expressed his yearning for freedom on Mount Chung-nan, his father, T'an Chu, admonished him to pursue an official career through the *chin-shih* examinations. Now, in 880 Huang Ch'ao took and ransacked the capital Ch'ang-an. At this time, the disorder that prevailed both in Ch'ang-an and throughout what had been the T'ang territory might have discouraged many from seeking advancement through the examination system.²⁸ Indeed, after 880 the capital was sacked twice more, sending the T'ang emperor fleeing each time, so that, in fact, for the remainder of the T'ang the empire existed virtually in name only. According to such reasoning, then, T'an Ch'iao ought to have been born no later than about 860.

Indeed, additional sources support this estimate of T'an Ch'iao's birth. First, an early secular source informs us that T'an Ch'iao's father, T'an Chu, from 871 to 873 served as the prefect of T'ai prefecture 台州. This confirms that T'an Ch'iao lived no earlier than this last half-century of the T'ang, and

U.P., 1985), p. 459, no. 5821. The director was subordinate in the Directorate only to the chief chancellor (or libationer): normally one, rank 4b2 in the T'ang.

²⁶ HHC 2, p. 17b.

²⁷ Lin Sheng-li 林勝利, "Tzu-hsiao chen-jen T'an Ch'iao k'ao-lüeh" 紫霄真人譚岬考略, in *Chung-kuo Tao-chiao* 中國道教 11 (1989-3), pp. 33-34.

²⁸ It is true, however, that the number of candidates sitting for the examination diminished only slightly after 880 (see Hsü Sung 徐松, *Teng-k'o-chi k'ao* 登科記考 [Peking: Chung-hua, 1984], vols. 2, 3). Lin, "T'an Ch'iao k'ao-lüeh," p. 34, reasons however, that the year after which the government ceased to be effective was 895. On Huang Ch'ao's rebellion, see Howard S. Levy, *Biography of Huang Ch'ao*, Chinese Dynastic Histories Translations 5 (Berkeley: U. California P., 1961). On the sorry state of affairs esp. in Ch'ang-an but also throughout China following Huang Ch'ao's occupation of the city, see Robert K. Somers, "The End of the T'ang," chap. 10, Denis Twitchett and John Fairbank, gen. eds., *The Cambridge History of China*, vol. 3, *Sui and T'ang China, 589-906, Part I* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1979), pp. 682-789, esp. pp. 745-47.

also supports the 860 *terminus* for his birth.²⁹

Second, a very important eleventh-century source provides not only testament to T'an Ch'iao's period of activity but, in addition, crucial evidence relevant to the understanding of the history of the creation and transmission of the *Hua shu*. This is prominent Taoist priest and publisher Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon to the *Hua Shu*" ("*Hua Shu* hou hsü 後序," hereafter "Colophon"), which he dated in the fourth month of 1060.³⁰ Therein Ch'en Ching-yüan related a story involving T'an Ch'iao and the *Hua shu* that had been told him by his master Chang Wu-meng 張無夢 (fl. ca. 960-1040) who, in turn, had heard it directly from a contemporary witness to the events. This witness was Chang's own master, the famous and later-apotheosized Taoist priest Ch'en T'uan 陳搏 (d. 989), known especially for his diagrams and charts that eleventh- and twelfth-century sources report reached and influenced deeply the early *tao-hsüeh* cosmologists Chou Tun-i and Shao Yung.³¹ According to this

²⁹ Ch'en Ch'ing-ch'ing 陳普卿, comp., *Chia-ting ch'ih-ch'eng-chih* 嘉定赤城志 (pref. 1223; 1818 edn.; rpt. Taipei: Ch'eng-wen ch'u-pan kung-ssu, 1983) 8, p. 23b (p. 7129). T'ai was a superior prefecture centered around Lin-hai district [Hsien], in the area surrounding present-day Lin-hai, Chekiang; see Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修, *Hsin T'ang shu* [Taipei: Ting-wen shu-chü, 1979] 41, p. 1063.

A search through *Chiu T'ang shu* 舊唐書 and the *Hsin T'ang shu* 新唐書, as well as in the *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 for years 827 through the end of the T'ang yields no mention of T'an Chu, but this is not a barrier to assuming such an appointment. As the prefect of a superior prefecture, T'an Chu held the rank of 3b, which was four classes above the 4b2 rank as director of studies in the Directorate of Education. Assuming that he progressed from lower to higher ranks, then he would have served as director of studies prior to 871. In this case, T'an Ch'iao would have been born no later than the early 850s. However, we cannot confirm that T'an Chu advanced from lower to higher ranks. In fact, it is possible that he was demoted to director of studies after his tenure as prefect of T'ai expired in 873. No entrances to or exits from the post of director of studies are recorded after the years 820 and 840, respectively; Sun Kuo-tung 孫國棟, *T'ang-tai chung-yang chung-yao wen-kuan ch'ien-chuan-t'u-ching yen-chiu* 唐代中央重要文官遷轉途徑研究 (Hong Kong: Hsin-ya yen-chiu-so, 1978), pp. 165, 168, 639, 640. In fact, a "demotion" might have been considered an opportunity not only to escape the war-ravaged south, but also improve one's future lot in civil service by working within the central government in the national capital. In such a case, T'an Ch'iao still would have been born around 855-65.

³⁰ Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon to the [text of] *Hua shu*" ("*Hua shu* hou hsü") appears in numerous editions, but the earliest version is found in the biography of T'an Ch'iao in Chao Tao-i's 趙道一 *Comprehensive Mirror on Generations of Perfected Immortals and Embodiers of the Way* (*Li-shih chen-hsien t'z'iao t'ung-chien* 歷世真仙體道通鑑 (1294; in *TY* no. 147; hereafter *LSCM*) 39, pp. 17b-18b. This source records both the "Colophon" and the HHC biography. On the versions of the "Colophon," see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 944-55. On Ch'en Ching-yüan, see Piet van der Loon, *Taoist Books in the Libraries of the Sung Period* (London: Ithaca Press, 1984), pp. 10-11, and Judith Boltz, *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries* (Berkeley: U. California P., 1987), pp. 203-5.

³¹ See Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 561-69. On Ch'en T'uan's life, see Livia Kohn, "Ch'en T'uan in Legend and History," *Taoist Resources* 2.1 (1990), pp. 8-21, and Li Yüan-kuo 李遠國, *Ssu-ch'uan Tao-chiao shih-hua* 四川道教史話 (Chengtu: Ssu-ch'uan jen-min ch'u-pan-shé, 1985), pp. 56-60.

report from Ch'en T'uan's own disciples, T'an Ch'iao was Ch'en T'uan's *shih-yu* 師友, or teacher.³² And that Ch'en T'uan indeed shared an intimate intellectual relationship with the author of the *Hua shu* is borne out unmistakably by a surviving fragment of one of Ch'en T'uan's writings.³³ The knowledge of the existence of this relationship helps to affirm the accuracy of our general dates for T'an Ch'iao's life, for we can compare them against those of Ch'en, T'an's better-known student.

Although we cannot take seriously a certain P'ang Ch'üeh's 龐覺 assertion that Ch'en T'uan was active as early as the eighth century,³⁴ according to Ch'en's official – but still problematic – biography in the *Sung shih*, he lived for nearly 100 years.³⁵ Prior to 933–34, when he sat for and failed the licentiate examination,³⁶ Ch'en T'uan had, during decades of roaming throughout the disrupted empire,³⁷ already gained fame for his poetry.³⁸ Although there is no precise information concerning his beginnings, from his obvious maturity both before and in the 930s, he seems to have been born no later than 900.³⁹ In such a case, then T'an Ch'iao, as his teacher, ought to have been born no later than 880, but, as we have seen, likely earlier in the decades preceding this.

³² *Shih-yu* can refer to a somewhat ambiguous relationship described by both of its composite characters, *shih* (teacher) and *yu* (companion, friend), but, given the close intellectual connection (n. 33, below), I understand it as something closer to teacher. See precedents: "Biography of Tung Chung-shu," in *Han shu* 漢書 [Taipei: Ting-wen shu-ch'ü, 1987] 56, p. 2526; and "Biography of Li Ying," in *Hou Han shu* 後漢書 [Taipei: Ting-wen shu-ch'ü, 1987] 67, p. 2191. In the latter, the meaning of "teacher" is clear; Li Ying "by nature was selective and lofty. He took only Hsün Shu and Ch'en Shih, of his native commandery, to be his teachers (*shih-yu*)." Cf. biog. of Hsün Shu (*Hou Han shu* 62), concerning the relationship between Li Ying and Hsün Shu: "the renowned worthies of the contemporary generation (107–126 AD), Li Ku and Li Ying, both honored [Hsün Shu] as their teacher (*shih* 師)," p. 2049.

³³ See the fragment, taken from Ch'en's "T'ai-hsi ch'üeh" 胎息訣. Li Yüan-kuo, "Ch'en T'uan 'Wu-chi-t'u' ssu-hsiang (an-so chien chi ch'i yüan-yüan yü ying-hsiang te k'ao-ch'a)" 陳搏無極圖思想探索兼其淵源與影響的考察, *Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu* 世界宗教研究 (1987.2), pp. 95–105, and Ch'ing, *Tao-chiao shih*, p. 491, believe that it is evidence of such a relationship. It does in fact, clearly invoke the terminology and context of *HS*; see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 918–19.

³⁴ Ch'en Meng-lei 陳夢雷 et al., eds., *Ku-chin t'u-shu chi-ch'eng* 古今圖書集成 (1726 edn.; rpt. Taipei: Wen-hsing Shu-tien, 1964), ch. 252 ("Sect. Immortals," Biographies, no. 29), p. 452.

³⁵ T'o T'o 脫脫 et al., *Sung shih* 宋史 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1977) 457, p. 13420. Problems with this biography are discussed in n. 44, below.

³⁶ Chu Hsi, *Wu-ch'ao ming-ch'en yen-hsing-lu* 五朝名臣言行錄 10, p. 2a (SPTK edn., vol. 16, p. 193). Pao Yüeh's 陶岳, *Wu-tai-shih pu* 五代史補 (1012), appended to the *Chiu Wu-tai-shih* 舊五代史 [Taipei: Ting-wen shu-ch'ü, 1980] 119, p. 1585, reports that Ch'en failed several examinations. Shao Po-wen's 邵伯溫 12th-c. *Wen-chien lu* 聞見錄 claims that Ch'en T'uan passed the licentiate (SKCS edn., vol. 1038, ch. 7, p. 11a [p. 732]). As Shao was particularly sympathetic to Ch'en's Taoist priestly learning and activities, then his account is less reliable.

³⁷ *Wu-ch'ao ming-ch'en yen-hsing-lu* 10, p. 2a [p. 193].

³⁸ *Sung shih* 457, p. 13420.

³⁹ Livia Kohn comes to this conclusion in "Ch'en T'uan in Legend and History," pp. 8–9.

Finally with regard to dates, we may compare information provided in the "Colophon" with the dates of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's life, in order to demonstrate once more the likelihood of T'an Ch'iao's having been born in the 860s or so. Briefly, Sung, having died in 959 at age 73,⁴⁰ was born in 886 or 887. Now, in Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon" Chang Wu-meng reported Ch'en T'uan's having told him that, "My teacher T'an Ching-sheng (that is, T'an Ch'iao, Ching-sheng 景升 having been his courtesy name) wrote the *Hua shu* at Mount Chung-nan... Touring San-mao (Mount Mao, in Kiangsu province), he passed through Chien-k'ang (the city of Nanking) where, seeing... Sung Ch'i-ch'iu... [asked him] to preface [the *Hua Shu*] and pass it on to later generations."⁴¹ From this we learn that T'an was a teacher to not only Ch'en T'uan but also Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. And just as in the case of Ch'en T'uan, this surely means that T'an was Sung's senior by a decade or more. Therefore, from this angle, T'an Ch'iao would have to have been born no later than 875, but probably much earlier. Considering all the evidence reviewed previously that indicates that the year of T'an's birth was ca. 860, as well as additional textual evidence from the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* that demonstrates that his biography contains information dating to no later than the 930s, then we can postulate with confidence that T'an Ch'iao lived between the years 860 and 940.

Aside from confirming these dates, it is important now to attempt to establish an outline of T'an's life. Considering that our primary concern is with the origins and development of the *Hua shu*, for us the two most significant elements of T'an's life are his associations with Ch'en T'uan and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. If we grant our sources employed thus far some degree of credibility, then we know that T'an met Sung in Nanking, but we still have no clear indication of when this occurred. Neither do we know where or when T'an became Ch'en's teacher. The following section collates several disparate sources in an attempt to elutriate these sibylline matters.

Despite Ch'en T'uan's fame, reliable and reasonable sources on his life are, as in the case of T'an Ch'iao, few. Aside from knowing that he sat for and failed the licentiate examination in 933–34, we also can be fairly certain that beginning in the late 930s or early 940s Ch'en T'uan established himself and an influential intellectual community on Mount Hua in Shensi. Sometime be-

⁴⁰ Ma Ling 馬令, *Nan Tang shu* 南唐書 (SKCS vol. 464) 4, p. 4b (p. 266); 20, p. 6b (341); Lu Yu 陸游, *Nan Tang shu* 南唐書 (SKCS vol. 464) 2, p. 14a (p. 399); 4, p. 6b (409); and Wu Jen-ch'en 吳任臣, *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu* 十國春秋 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1983) 20, p. 296. Lung Kun's 龍巖 11th-c. *Chiang-nan yeh-shih* 江南野史 states only that Sung Ch'i-ch'iu was over seventy when he died (hereafter, *CNTS*; in SKCS vol. 464) 4, p. 8a [p. 91]).

⁴¹ "Colophon," in *LSCH* 39, pp. 17b–18b.

fore this he was at Mount Wu-tang, in southeast Shensi/northwest Hupei,⁴² for an unknown length of time. Otherwise, we only can place Ch'en solidly in Szechwan in 937. There his name appeared on a stele inscription that, erected at the T'ai-ch'ing Phalanstery 太清觀 of Ch'iung-chou 邛州, commemorated his having studied respiratory and meditational practices with the Master of Ceremonies there, Ho Ch'ang-i 何昌一.⁴³ From Ch'iung-chou Ch'en traveled to Kuan-chung 關中, or the Wei River valley, in Shensi. As Mount Wu-tang is in the general region that lies between Szechwan and Shensi, then perhaps Ch'en visited this marchmount during his travels in these areas, in or soon after 937.⁴⁴ From Mount Wu-tang Ch'en then might have left for Mount Hua, where we know that he remained for most of the remainder of his life, a life that ended in 989.⁴⁵

From the evidence reviewed thus far, it appears that T'an and Ch'en perhaps met at the T'ai-ch'ing Phalanstery in Ch'iung-chou, Szechwan, in or around 937. Certainly, T'an's *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography concludes with his disappearance from nearby Mount Ch'ing-ch'eng in what we have reasoned to have been the 930s.⁴⁶

However, it is unlikely that T'an and Ch'en met and interacted in Szechwan in the 930s, for the time that Ch'en could have spent there, from 934 to

⁴² See Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 922–24. On the location of Mt. Wu-tang, see T'an Ch'i-hsiang 譚其驥, *Chung-kuo li-shih ti-t'u chi* 中國歷史地圖集 (Shanghai: Ti-t'u ch'u-pan-she, 1982), vol. 5, p. 91.

⁴³ Wen T'ung 文同, *Tan-yüan-chi* 丹淵集 (1051; SPTK edn., first series, 1929; vol. 47), p. 495.

⁴⁴ Ibid.; see also Lu Yu, *Lao-hsüeh-an pi-chi* 老學菴筆記 (12th-c.; in *Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan* 學津討原, collected in *PPTS*, collection 46, vols. 212–14) 6, pp. 8a–b.

⁴⁵ One cannot be certain of any of these dates and locations because *Sung shih*, the primary source for Ch'en's life, is self-contradictory. This and another source (Chu Hsi, *Wu-ch'ao ming-ch'en yen-hsing-lu* 10, p. 2a [p. 193]) report that Ch'en went to Mt. Wu-tang after he failed the examination in 933–34. *Sung shih* claims that he stayed there for twenty-some years, after which he moved to Mt. Hua for the remainder of his life. This means that Ch'en went to Mt. Hua only after 954. And yet, *Sung shih* also claims that during the years 976–984 Ch'en spoke of his having lived at Mt. Hua for "over forty years" (*Sung shih* 457, p. 13420).

⁴⁶ Li Chien-i 李簡易, *Hun-yüan hsien-p'ai-t'u* 混元仙派圖 (pref. 1265), quoted in idem, *Yü-hsi-tzu tan-ching chih-yao* 玉籙子丹經指要, *TT* no. 115, "Chüan-shou" 卷首, p. 2a, claims that T'an's teacher was in fact Ho Ch'ang-i of the Phalanstery. But this source is not reliable as history. It is Li's attempt retroactively to link his own heritage in internal alchemy with the famous Chung li Ch'üan 鍾離權 and Lü Yen 呂巖; see Jen Chi-yü, *Chung-kuo Tao-chiao shih* 中國道教史 (Shanghai: Jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1990), pp. 439, 452–54, and 490–95. *Hun-yüan hsien-p'ai-t'u* ahistorically calls Ho Ch'ang-i and T'an Ch'iao the 3d and 4th generational disciples of their rough contemporaries Chung-li and Lü. Apparently, Li drew on his knowledge of Ch'en and T'an's relationship and both men's presence in Szechwan to try to connect T'an with Ho. See Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 924, 930–32.

937, would have allowed for an unlikely short span for T'an to have become his *shih-yu* or teacher – and one must also consider the protracted amount of time needed to travel on unkept roads through warring or ravaged areas during the tenth century, reducing further the amount of time allowed for T'an and Ch'en to have developed this relationship.

Neither is it likely, then, that T'an and Ch'en spent time together at either Kuan-chung or Mount Wu-tang, partly for the same reason. Ch'en traveled to Kuan-hsi and probably also Mount Wu-tang from Szechwan after 937, and most likely settled in at Mount Hua by 940 or so. Again, this allows for an implausibly short time in Szechwan for the two men to have developed a lasting intellectual tethering. However, even more importantly, T'an is not known to have ever even visited Mount Wu-tang, and, even if he did, according to his itinerary outlined in the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography, it probably would have occurred long before the 930s, when T'an still haunted the northern mountains prior to his ten-year stay at Mount Sung.⁴⁷ These events, most likely having occurred prior to the turn of the tenth century, probably predate Ch'en T'uan's birth.

Another possible locale for the development of Ch'en and T'an's relationship is Nan-yüeh, or Mount Heng, in east-central Hunan. The *Hsü-hsien-chuan* reports that T'an settled for a spell there after having left Mount Sung in the north. Three additional sources support T'an's having been active at Nan-yüeh.⁴⁸ Moreover, the *Nan-yüeh tsung-sheng-chi* places T'an and Ch'en T'uan there together. It reports that, at the Purple Canopy Cloister (Tzu-kai yüan 紫

⁴⁷ *HHC* 2, pp. 17b–18a.

⁴⁸ *NYTSC* (Tversion), pp. 1058–59; Ch'en Pao-kuang 陳葆光, *San-tung-ch'ün-hsien-lu* 三洞群仙錄 (pref. 1154; in *TT* nos. 992–95) 16, p. 17b; and Hung Tzu-ch'eng 洪自誠, *Hsiao-yao-hsü-ching* 消遙雜經 (14th c.; in *TT* no. 1081) 2, pp. 25b–26a. *NYTSC* describes T'an as having settled at the Purple Canopy Cloister (Tzu-kai yüan 紫蓋院) on the western slope of Prostrate Sword Summit (Ts'e-tao feng 側刀鋒), where he "refined the elixir" and picked and ate thaumaturgically potent herbs to assist his "inner medicine." In another entry T'an is said to have later "established his transformation in the Shu (Szechwan) mountains" (ibid., p. 1058), which conforms with the account related in the *HHC* biography of his disappearing from Mt. Ch'ing-ch'eng. Curiously, the *San-tung-ch'ün-hsien-lu*, which names the *HHC* as its source, concludes its record on T'an Ch'iao with the description – identical to that in the *HHC* – of his being able to "enter water without becoming wet, enter fire without being burned, and conceal himself and transform his form" (*TT* no. 995, ch. 16, p. 17b). *NYTSC* contradicts its own previous statement that T'an transformed his state while in the Shu mountains (p. 1058) by also saying that T'an completed his elixir at the Flower Canopy Cloister (Hua-kai yüan 華蓋院) on the southern slope of Flower Canopy Summit (Hua-kai feng 華蓋峰), after which he was delivered from the corpse at Sun-teng Pavilion (*NYTSC*, p. 1059). Although this latter entry might reflect – and misrepresent – similar information provided both internally and in the *HHC* biography (i.e., entering water and fire), it seems more likely that Ch'en T'ien-fu, or whoever further edited *NYTSC* after 1164 (Didier, "Way Transformation," p. 910, n. 22), reported as T'an Ch'iao's activities those that belonged

蓋院), “the two learned gentlemen T’an and Ch’en cultivated the elixir.”⁴⁹ Since the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography informs us that from Nan-yüeh T’an traveled to Mount Ch’ing-ch’eng, wherefrom he thence disappeared, and we have otherwise determined that this most likely occurred in the 930s, then one suspects that T’an and Ch’en met at Nan-yüeh in the 930s, traveled together to Szechwan, and, while T’an explored Mount Ch’ing-ch’eng and then disappeared, Ch’en went on to study with Ho Ch’ang-i in Ch’iung-chou. The trouble with this scenario, again, is that the time frame for the development of a *shih-yu* relationship is improbably brief. Indeed, further investigation, reported below, reveals that T’an and Ch’en most probably met at Nan-yüeh (or elsewhere?) prior to the 930s.

According to Ch’en T’uan’s account of the matters surrounding T’an Ch’iao, Sung Ch’i-ch’iu, and the *Hua shu* – as found in the earliest and most reliable version of Ch’en Ching-yüan’s “Colophon,” when T’an had delivered the *Hua shu* to Sung Ch’i-ch’iu, he merely slipped on his sandals and went on his way, whereto we are not told. Ch’en has informed us, however, of the prior activities of T’an, and in what place T’an met Sung Ch’i-ch’iu, which was Nanking: in the “Colophon” we read Ch’en T’uan’s statement that, “My teacher T’an Ching-sheng wrote the *Hua Shu* at Mount Chung-nan... Touring San-mao (in Kiangsu), he passed through Chien-k’ang (Nanking) where, seeing... Sung Ch’i-ch’iu... [asked him] to preface [the *Hua Shu*] and pass it on to later generations.”⁵⁰ This evidence comports generally with the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography’s account, and demonstrates that T’an traversed China during his lifetime in a clockwise direction, beginning from the northwest, passing through the northeast, moving on to the southeast, where he entered the southern capital of Chien-k’ang 建康 (Nanking), and from there traveling inland along the Yangtze and finally into the southwestern province of Szechwan. In the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* biography we read similarly of T’an that he left Ch’ang-an “to roam

rather to the hagiography of an earlier individual with a similar name, T’an Ch’iao-yen 譚峭岩, active in the 820s and said to have achieved immortality while at Nan-yüeh. Indeed, elsewhere in *NYTSC* some of T’an Ch’iao’s activities are attributed to this man (see below). However, all the evidence besides this one entry in the *NYTSC* clearly places T’an Ch’iao in the latter half of the ninth and into the tenth centuries. Recall especially that T’an Ch’iao’s father, T’an Chu, held official position in the 870s. T’an Ch’iao-yen has two nearly identical biographies that originally were drawn from Chia Shan-hsiang’s now-lost *Kao-tao chuan*. They are found in *LSCH* 38, pp. 15a–b, and *San-tung-ch’ün-hsien-lu* 9, p. 6b. One also can find this biography in Yen I-p’ing’s 研一萍 reconstructed *Kao-tao chuan* 高道傳 (in *Tao-chiao yen-chiu tzu-liao* 道教研究資料 [Taipei: I wen yin-shu-kuan, 1974], vol. 1, pp. 76–77).

⁴⁹ *NYTSC*, p. 1071.

⁵⁰ Ch’en, “Colophon,” in *LSCH* 39, pp. 17b–18b.

Mount Chung-nan... [and later] T’ai-po (Shensi), T’ai-hang (Honon/Shensi/Hopei), Wang-wu (Shansi), Sung (Honon), Hua (Shensi), and T’ai-yüeh (Mount T’ai, Shantung)... [whereafter] Ch’iao then took as his master for over ten years a Taoist priest at Mount Sung... [and] then, later, he resided at Nan-yüeh (Hunan)... Then he entered Mount Ch’ing-ch’eng (Szechwan) and disappeared.”

The *Nan-yüeh tsung-sheng chi* corroborates T’an’s clockwise movement through China, and elaborates on his experiences such that we learn that,

Long ago T’an Ch’iao-yen 譚峭巖, courtesy name Ching-sheng, lived for an extended period at Mount Chung-nan. After a long while, he wrote the *Hua Shu*. Passing through Tung-wu 東吳, he saw Sung Ch’i-ch’iu. He [then] toured Lu Fu (that is, Mount Lu, in northern Kiangsi) and, traveling the Hsiao and Hsiang rivers, [arrived at Nan-yüeh and] refined the elixir here.⁵¹

This supports both Ch’en T’uan’s claim that T’an traveled in a certain clockwise circular trend from northeast to southwest and also the stipulation that T’an passed the *Hua shu* on to Sung Ch’i-ch’iu in Nanking (that is, Chien-k’ang, Chin-ling 金陵, or Tung-wu). The question still remains, however, when, prior to 934, this latter event occurred. The answer lies in knowing at what times Sung Ch’i-ch’iu resided in Nanking. A careful review of various authoritative sources on Sung reveals that he was in Nanking first from 912 to 917, again from 935 to 943, and once more finally from 955 to 959.⁵² Recalling

⁵¹ *NYTSC*, p. 1073. Although normally “Tung-wu” indicates the Wu region in general, since Mt. Mao (another destination, as stated in Ch’en’s “Colophon”) also lay within Wu, then here Tung-wu probably refers to Nanking. The only other location that this term could indicate is Soochow, about 120 miles SE of Nanking, and which Sung Ch’i-ch’iu is never mentioned in any source as having even visited, much less resided in. As indicated in n. 48, above, in this passage a *NYTSC* editor mistakenly ascribed T’an Ch’iao’s activities to the earlier T’an Ch’iao-yen.

⁵² Other than at Chin-ling, Sung resided in Jun-chou 潤州 (Chen Chiang city 鎮江) from 917 to 918, in Kuang-ling 廣陵 (Yang-chou city 揚州 in Kiangsu) from 918 to early 935 (with a brief hiatus at Mt. Chiu-hua 九華山, about 45 miles southeast of modern An-ch’ing 安慶市, Anhui, during 931), in Chen-nan 鎮南 (or Hung-chou 洪州, present Nan-ch’ang 南昌市, Kiangsi) from 942 to 943 and again from 947 to 955, and Mt. Chiu-hua in 931, and again from 943 to 946. Originally he was from Lu-ling 廬陵 in what is now central Kiangsi, although later he considered Hung-chou to be his home. In the first years of the tenth century his father, Sung Ch’eng 宋誠, died while in the service of Chung Chuan 鍾傳, the military governor of Hung-chou 洪州節度使, thus leaving Ch’i-ch’iu to fend for himself. Later, in 912, Ch’i-ch’iu managed to gain the personal and political ear of Hsü Chih-kao 徐知誥 who, later to become the founding emperor (r. 937–943) of the Southern T’ang (937–976), at that time was prefect of Sheng-chou 昇州 (Nanking) under the Wu kingdom (902–37). Especially after 918, Sung Ch’i-ch’iu, as Hsü Chih-kao’s advisor, wielded considerable power in the Kiangnan region. In 937 Hsü named him chancellor on the left, whereafter Sung continued to exercise his formidable power throughout the kingdom of the Southern T’ang. After Hsü Chih-kao died in 943, Sung experienced setbacks, but

that Sung's preface to the *Hua shu* is dated 930,⁵³ then we know that T'an could have transferred the work to Sung only between 912 and 917. Thus, T'an and Ch'en could have met and established their *shih-yu* relationship at Nan-yüeh at any time between 912 and 934. At Nan-yüeh T'an would have informed Ch'en of his having passed on the *Hua shu* to Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, although it is unclear whether or not T'an would have had any reason to complain against Sung at this time.

In summary, it appears as though T'an Ch'iao was born in approximately 860. At maturity, around the year 880, he left home in Ch'ang-an for nearby Mount Chung-nan. After many years of study, late in the ninth century, while still at Mount Chung-nan he at least began the *Hua shu* – or its ancestral text (see below, “Structural Questions and the Issue of Authorship”). Departing Mount Chung-nan, he roamed other northern mountain retreats for several years until he finally settled in at Mount Sung in Honan. There he studied esoteric arts of internal ethereal purification with a Taoist priest(s), perhaps roughly from 902 to 912. After ten years, in the 910s, T'an traveled south-southeast, visiting the Taoist communities at Mount Mao in Kiangsu and then passing through Chin-ling (Nanking), where he met and perchance accepted for an extended period the hospitality of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu.⁵⁴ This occurred sometime between 912 and 917. Having passed on his learning in written form and thus possibly intending never again to enter the mundane human world, he visited Lu Fu (that is, Mount Lu, in Kiangsi) and continued south, perhaps along the Kan River 汗水, and apparently into Kwangtung. From there he turned north again, traveling on first the Hsiao and then the Hsiang River to Nan-yüeh (Mount Heng, on the Hsiang River, in east-central Hunan prov-

ince). There, sometime in the late 910s or into the 920s, he met Ch'en T'uan, to whom he transmitted his learning orally and, likely, also textually. After up to approximately ten years T'an left Nan-yüeh, with or without Ch'en, and traveled northwest to Mount Ch'ing-ch'eng in Szechwan, wherein he disappeared. Later, in 937, Ch'en T'uan traveled (or returned?) to Szechwan independently of T'an Ch'iao.

There exist many other stories and traditions regarding T'an and the affairs surrounding the *Hua shu* that elaborate on the essential outline we have developed above. All are either much later embellishments or unsubstantiated guesses. First and most entertaining, a variable tale is commonly found in pertinent literature (including later, spurious, versions of Ch'en Ching-yüan's “Colophon”) whereby the evil chancellor Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, having discovered the existence of the *Hua shu* while interviewing T'an Ch'iao in Chin-ling, schemes to soften his guest with drink and then steal his *magnum opus*, whereafter he orders his goons to tie up T'an in a sack and hurl him over the steep and deep bank into the Yangtze River. According to some versions, in his sack T'an then floats out to sea, presumably either dead or, as hagiographers would have it, immortal. In other accounts, several months or years later a fisherman pulls the sack from the water, opens it, and discovers old T'an snoring within, his fingernails having grown so long that they've spiralled inward. When awakened and informed that the *Hua shu* had been promulgated in the world, T'an asks to be tied up again in the sack and returned to the river. In still other popular accounts of T'an's end, Sung succeeds in murdering him.

As entertaining as they are, all of these later embellishments have been shown to be spurious both textually and historically. Indeed, popular writers doubtlessly borrowed the entire story of Sung's mistreatment of T'an (the *faux fete* and subsequent removal to the river) from the historical story of Sung's apparent brutal murder of a fellow official at the Southern T'ang court sometime between the years of 937 and 943.⁵⁵

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE LIFE OF T'AN TZU-HSIAO

As a matter of introduction, with regard to the purported relationship of T'an Tzu-hsiao with T'an Ch'iao and the *Hua shu*, the single most important fact is that, despite the comparative wealth of fairly early (tenth to fourteenth centuries) historical sources that touch on Tzu-hsiao, none mentions a connec-

was recalled to the capital in 955 to assist in planning the defense against the invading armies of the Later Chou (950–960) in the north. In 958 he was accused of treason and exiled to his old retreat on Mt. Chiu-hua where, in early 959, he hanged himself.

⁵³ Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, “Author's Preface to *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*,” in *Shuo fu* 42, p. 27a, and *CTW* 870, pp. 14a–b. *CTW* titles the preface “Author's Preface to *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*” (“*Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu tzu-hsi*”). In *Shuo-fu* it is untitled, preceded merely by “*Hua shu*” and the author's name (“T'an Ch'iao of the Southern T'ang, courtesy name Ching-sheng”). *CTW*'s title is unlikely since Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's text referred to the book as “*Hua shu*.” The editors of *CTW* entitled the text perhaps following Sung Lien, who wrote in the fourteenth century that the name on the edition that he possessed was *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* but that the work “also is called *Hua shu*” (*Chu-tzu-pien*, vol. 17, p. 25). For lack of another, I follow *CTW*'s title.

⁵⁴ It is very possible that *HS* was completed in Chin-ling (Nanking) at some time between 912 and 917, or in nearby Kuang-ling between 918 and 930, where Sung Ch'i-ch'iu resided during these years. Assuming the accuracy of *HS*'s 930 date, then the latter is more likely. This means neither that T'an did not write the *HS* ancestral text earlier than 912 nor that T'an and Sung did not meet initially in Chin-ling in the 910s. Matters of authorship are treated fully, below, “Structural Questions and the Issue of Authorship.”

⁵⁵ See Didier, “Way Transformation,” pp. 944–55; also pp. 932–35, discussing a story that began in the 16th c. in gazetteers the point of which was that T'an Ch'iao was from the southeastern coast of Chekiang; but this was ungrounded conjecture meant to suit a historical purpose.

tion with either the *Hua shu* or the name and activities of T'an Ch'iao. Nor, for that matter, does any early source associate in any way T'an Tzu-hsiao with either Ch'en Tuan or Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. These observations alone are sufficient to put to rest any serious concern that T'an Ch'iao and T'an Tzu-hsiao were one man, but below I present additional evidence that demonstrates very clearly that the two T'ans were indeed two distinct men who shared only their surname.

Three biographies of T'an Tzu-hsiao were published within four hundred years of his life. Two, written in the early twelfth century, are historical and more or less reliable sources. They are found in the two works entitled *Nan Tang shu* 南唐書 (*History of the Southern Tang*) by Ma Ling 馬令 and Lu Yu 陸游.⁵⁶ The third is found in Chao Tao-i's 趙道一 thirteenth-century compendium of Taoist hagiography, the *Li-shih chen-hsien t'i-tao t'ung-chien* 歷世真仙體道通鑒.⁵⁷ Chao included in his hagiography of T'an Tzu-hsiao the biographical material compiled mostly by Ma and then embellished slightly by Lu, but Chao emended this basic outline by importing a much unsubstantiated and at times clearly mistaken and controvertible hagiography (hereafter, *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography). Although at times its information provides helpful perspective and additional possibilities, largely we can discount the claims made in the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography. Therefore, in this historically directed paper, while we follow primarily the information provided by Ma Ling and other contemporary and near-contemporary sources, we need not repeat and refute many of the claims made in the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography. These latter are tasks already completed elsewhere.⁵⁸ In general, the more reliable early sources support Ma Ling's account, which biography we take as our standard source for T'an Tzu-hsiao and review below.

According to Ma's *Nan Tang shu*, T'an Tzu-hsiao was native to the south-eastern coastal district of Ch'üan-chou 泉州, which then was part of the Min kingdom (909–946) and presently forms part of Fukien province. During the years 935–939 T'an served as a ranking shaman/Taoist priest at the court of the king of Min, Wang Ch'ang 王昶 (r. 935–9).⁵⁹ Wang Ch'ang bestowed on

⁵⁶ Ma, *Nan Tang shu* 24, pp. 3a–b; Lu, *Nan Tang shu* 17, pp. 13b–14a.

⁵⁷ *LSCH* 43, pp. 8a–10b.

⁵⁸ On the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 962–90.

⁵⁹ On this matter, the most reliable source, T'an Tzu-hsiao's contemporary Tao Ku 陶穀, reported that Wang Ch'ang took T'an Tzu-hsiao as his master; *Ch'ing-i lu* 清異錄 (Ming-era *PYTPC* edn.; rpt. in *PPTS*) B, p. 60a. Edward Schafer, *The Empire of Min* (Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1954), pp. 99, 119, cites an anonymous work of unusual origins (purportedly unearthed by a 16th-c. farmer in Fukien), the *Ch'en-chin-feng wai-chuan*, in which T'an Tzu-hsiao is said to have escorted the palace ladies to the Taoist Terrace of the Three Purities (or Heavens: San-ch'ing t'ai 三清臺), which was built in the Min capital in the spring of 939. All of these sources obviate that T'an was a Taoist priest serving in the late 930s at the Min court of Wang Ch'ang.

T'an an honorific title, "Master Correct One" (Cheng-i hsien-sheng 正一先生), a matter which is corroborated by the usually reliable standard dynastic history for the period, the [*Hsin*] *Wu-tai shih*.⁶⁰ In 946, when the Min fell, T'an removed himself to the Grotto of Rest and Seclusion (Hsi-yin-tung 棲隱洞) on Mount Lu in Kiangsi, where he resided until sometime between 963 and 976. Before 963 T'an had earned great fame as a practicing Taoist priest (*tao-shih* 道士) and healer/sorcerer (*wu* 巫). Ma's writing (and subsequently Lu's and Chao's) relates two impressive narratives of T'an's sorcerous performances that are dated to the years 960 to 963. These stories demonstrate that T'an was a professional sorcerer who hired himself out to wealthy and politically powerful clients. Because of his fame throughout the Southern T'ang kingdom, sometime between the years 963 and 976 the latter monarch of the Southern T'ang, the renowned poet Li Yü 李煜, summoned T'an to his court in Chin-ling. There the king lavished great wealth and an honorific title on T'an. Although Ma's *Nan Tang shu* provides no explicit indication of when T'an died, the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography claims that this occurred on the first day of the fourth month of 973, when T'an was already over 150 years old.⁶¹

Unless we are to believe the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography, the temporal framework provided by Ma's *Nan Tang shu* biography already suggests that T'an Tzu-hsiao could not have been T'an Ch'iao: Tzu-hsiao apparently began his professional career in the 930s just as Ch'iao was checking out. Even if we accept the report in the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography that T'an Tzu-hsiao died on the first day of the fourth month of 973, it is highly unlikely that the T'an Ch'iao that we have come to know in the previous section of this paper could have lived to this age. But additional evidence exists that makes this assessment ever more clear.

First, whereas T'an Ch'iao's father T'an Chu was a capital official who, apart from a two-year appointment in T'ai-chou from 971 to 973, raised his son in the north, T'an Tzu-hsiao's father almost certainly was, like Tzu-hsiao, a priest/shaman. As noted above, both Ma's biography and the [*Hsin*] *Wu-tai shih* report that in the late 930s T'an received the title "Master Correct One," or "Cheng-i Hsien-sheng" 正一先生, at Wang Ch'ang's Min court.⁶² This title

⁶⁰ [*Hsin*] *Wu-tai shih*, "Hereditary House of Min," ch. 68, p. 831, notes that, "Wang Ch'ang was fond of [consulting/employing] occult practitioners (*wu* 巫); he honored Taoist priest T'an Tzu-hsiao as (i.e. by bestowing on him the Taoist appellation of) Master Correct One." In addition, Huang Chen later also noted T'an Tzu-hsiao's having been a "Taoist priest" at the court of Wang Ch'ang (Huang Chen 黃震, *Ku-chin chi-yao* 古今紀要 [*SKCS* vol. 384] 16, p. 42b [p. 319]).

⁶¹ *LSCH* 43, p. 9a.

⁶² Lu Yu claimed that during these Min-court years, T'an also received the title of Honored Immortal of the Golden Gate (literally, "Feathered Guest of the Golden Gate": *Chin-men yü-k'o*

suggests that Tzu-hsiao belonged to the Taoist tradition known as the Correct One (Cheng-i 正一), an ancient tradition usually known as the Way of the Celestial Master (T'ien-shih tao 天師道) that long had been dominant in the Min region. Since the priesthood of the Cheng-i was hereditary,⁶³ then Tzu-hsiao's father also had to have been a Cheng-i priest before him. Now, T'an Chu, director of studies in the Directorate of Education in the capital Ch'angan, very likely was not a Cheng-i priest/shaman.

Still, one might object that the title given Tzu-hsiao does not prove that he was indeed a priest of the Cheng-i tradition. However, further evidence confirms that he was indeed so. First, we know from several sources that T'an Tzu-hsiao was a "Taoist priest." Most importantly, early sources identify T'an as having been either the progenitor or the teacher to the progenitor of a significant Sung dynasty Taoist shamanic sect that clearly derived its techniques from the southeastern Cheng-i tradition. To begin, Lu's *Nan Tang shu* reports that T'an considered himself to be the originator of the Taoist shamanic tradition of the "Correct Methods of the Center [or "mind," "heart"] of Heaven" (T'ien-hsin cheng-fa 天心正法). His involvement with these methods began when his fellow shaman at the Min court, Ch'en Shou-yüan 陳守元 (d. 939), unearthed several tens of charms and talismans that had belonged to Chang Tao-ling 張道陵 of the Han era, the man honored by Taoists as the true progenitor of the Cheng-i teachings and tradition.⁶⁴ Unable to employ them himself, Ch'en gave them to T'an Tzu-hsiao, who easily comprehended and then

金門羽客); see Lu, *Nan Tang shu* 17, pp. 3b-4a, and idem, *Lao-hsüeh-an pi-chi* 5, p. 6b. This is a title for which T'an Tzu-hsiao became famous; still, its verity is unproven. First, the [*Hsin*] *Wu-tai shih* reported the "Master Correct One" title but not this latter. Moreover, both the *Ti-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography and the *Lu-shan chi* (and, following the *Lu-shan chi*, also the *Kan-chu-chi* and the *Pin-t'ui-lu*) claim that it was between the years 943 and 957 at the court of the Southern T'ang that T'an Tzu-hsiao received the title Honored Immortal of the Golden Gate. See *LSCH* 43, p. 9b; Ch'en Shun-yü 陳舜俞, *Lu-shan chi* 廬山記 (first published in 1046; collected in *PPIS*) 3, p. 6b; *Kan-chu-chi* 紺珠集 (origin unknown; 1137 pref. by Wang Tsung-che 王宗哲 [Taipei: Shang-wu, 1970; rpt. of a Ming edn.]) 7, p. 7b; Chao Yü-shih 趙與時, *Pin-t'ui-lu* 賓退錄 (*Shuo-fu* edn. collected in the *Hsüeh-hai lei-pien* 學海類編, rpt. in *PPIS*) 5, p. 5a. Since both the *Ti-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography and *Lu-shan chi* are unreliable sources, if we are to believe in the bestowal of this title at all, then we must recognize that Lu Yu's report that the title was bestowed at Min is more likely to be correct.

⁶³ On these priestly traditions, see Kristofer Schipper, *The Taoist Body* (Berkeley: U. California P., 1993), pp. 55-60. The hereditary nature of the Cheng-i priesthood in Min continues today; see Kenneth Dean, *Taoist Ritual and Popular Cults of Southeast China* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1993), p. 26.

⁶⁴ On Chang Tao-ling (Chang Ling 張陵), see Paul Demiéville, "Philosophy and Religion from Han to Sui," Denis Twitchett and Michael Loewe, eds., *The Cambridge History of China* (Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1986) 1, pp. 815-20; and Timothy Barrett, "Postscript," in *ibid.*, p. 875.

executed them. Hereafter T'an claimed to have obtained Chang Tao-ling's Correct Method of the Center of Heaven.⁶⁵

Significantly, in support of Lu Yu's early-twelfth-century narrative of T'an's apparent claim are the two primary sources preserving the ritualistic and sorcerous practices employed by the T'ien-hsin cheng-fa adherents, the twelfth-century *Tai-shang chu-kuo chiu-min tsung-chen pi-yao* 太上助國救民總真秘要 and the thirteenth-century *Shang-ch'ing t'ien-hsin cheng-fa* 上清天心正法. Therein the editors unequivocally identified T'an Tzu-hsiao as having been either the progenitor or the teacher to the progenitor of these methods, the latter having been identified as Jao Tung-t'ien 饒洞天.⁶⁶ And, indeed, it is instructive to note that the sorcerous arts ascribed to T'an Tzu-hsiao in his *Nan Tang shu* and *Ti-tao t'ung-chien* biographies are found as well scattered throughout both the *Tai-shang chu-kuo chiu-min tsung-chen pi-yao* and the *Shang-ch'ing t'ien-hsin cheng-fa*. The crux of the matter, however, is that Yüan Miao-tung, the editor of the *Tai-shang chu-kuo chiu-min tsung-chen pi-yao*, himself claimed that the T'ien-hsin cheng-fa methods descended from the original Cheng-i tradition of the Han dynasty master, Chang Tao-ling. Therefore, according to all relevant early sources, T'an Tzu-hsiao was a Taoist priest of the greater Cheng-i tradition as employed in Min, and hence almost certainly inherited his priestly position from his priest father. Thus, T'an Tzu-hsiao's father could not have been T'an Ch'iao's father T'an Chu, and, therefore, T'an Tzu-hsiao could not have been T'an Ch'iao.

T'an Tzu-hsiao's connection with T'ien-hsin cheng-fa teachings provides further evidence of his lifespan's having been distinct from that of T'an Ch'iao: the *Shang-ch'ing t'ien-hsin cheng-fa* states that the meeting between T'an and Jao Tung-t'ien occurred sometime after the eighth month of 994.⁶⁷ Although one cannot blindly accept the veracity of this information, neither can one assume the verity of the date of T'an's death supplied by the decidedly unreliable *Ti-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography, which, as mentioned, was the first day of the fourth month of 973. Furthermore, as an intellectual association certainly does exist between T'an Tzu-hsiao and the teachings of the T'ien-hsin cheng-fa sect, then

⁶⁵ Lu, *Nan Tang shu* 17, p. 13b (p. 485).

⁶⁶ Yüan Miao-tung 元妙宗, ed., *Tai-shang chu-kuo chiu-min tsung-chen pi-yao* (IT no. 986; pref. 1116), "Preface," p. 1b. According to this source, T'an began the renewed transmission of the T'ien-hsin cheng-fa. Teng Yu-kung 鄧有功 (1210-1279), ed., *Shang-ch'ing t'ien-hsin cheng-fa* (IT no. 318), "Preface," pp. 1a-b, claimed that T'an Tzu-hsiao taught Jao Tung-t'ien the methods that Jao had dug from the earth following a miraculous vision. However, the idea of Jao and the unearthed talismans likely was imported to his hagiography from the record of Ch'en Shou-yüan's life (see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 974-76).

⁶⁷ Teng Yu-kung's preface (previous n.), pp. 1a-b, claims the date of Jao's revelation to have been the fifteenth day of the eighth month of 994.

the date provided by the *Shang-ch'ing t'ien-hsin cheng-fa* likely is more trustworthy than the information supplied by the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography, the latter of which is of unknown origin. Thus, at best we only can postulate that T'an Tzu-hsiao lived at least into the 970s and, perhaps more plausibly, as late as the middle 990s.

Contemporary evidence further attests to T'an's having belonged to the generation that would have lived to the end of the tenth century. Between 954 and 958 the monarch of the northern state the Latter Chou (951-959), Chou Shih-tsung (r. 954-959), campaigned to conquer the Southern T'ang. Sometime during these four to five years a politically ambitious poet of the Southern T'ang, Meng Kuan, secretly met with Shih-tsung, intending to gain employment. As was customary, Meng Kuan submitted his collection of poems so that Shih-tsung could assess his talent. During Meng's subsequent audience with Shih-tsung, the monarch quoted a poem that Meng had written to a "Mr. T'an of the Grotto of Rest and Seclusion" ("Hsi-yin-tung T'an hsien-sheng" 棲隱洞譚先生), which Mr. T'an certainly was our T'an Tzu-hsiao.⁶⁸ From a description of T'an in this poem, which is now preserved in the *Meng I-chih shih-chi*, we can estimate T'an's approximate age during the period of 946 to 958, when T'an was at the Grotto of Rest and Seclusion: in the poem, Meng particularly alluded to the fact that "Mister [T'an]'s sideburns are graying" (or "Mister [T'an]'s temples are graying": "*hsien-sheng shuang-pin hua*" 先生雙鬢華).⁶⁹ Since this poem was written between 946 and 958, then, with graying sideburns at this time, T'an must have been born sometime between 900 and 920. Likely, as T'an already was mature and a Taoist priest by the time he became active in Min in 935 or so, he would not have been born any later than 915. The year 910 seems most probable when accounting for the timing of T'an's activities in Min, Meng Kuan's description of him, and his apparent transmission of teachings to Jao Tung-t'ien. Thus we may suggest approximate inclusive dates for his life of ca. 910-ca. 995.

⁶⁸ *CNYIS* 8, pp. 8b-9a (pp. 108-9). Recall that, according to both Ma's and Lu's *Nian Tang shu* and the *LSCH*-hagiography biographies, the Grotto of Rest and Seclusion (Hsi-yin-tung) was the name that T'an gave to his residence on Mt. Lu.

⁶⁹ Meng Kuan 孟貫, "Tseng Hsi-yin-tung T'an hsien-sheng" 贈棲隱洞譚先生, in *Meng I-chih shih-chi* 孟一之詩集, collected in Hsi Ch'i-yü 席啟寓, ed., *Tang-shih pai-ming chia ch'üan-chi* 唐詩百名家全集 (1702 edn.; housed in Gest Oriental Library, Princeton University), 45'e 61, p. 1b.

Another contemporary source, the *Tiao-chi li-t'an* 釣磯立談, perhaps by a descendant of Shih Hsü-pai 史虛白 (*SKCS*, vol. 461), p. 10a (p. 50), also records this poem, stating that Meng wrote it to a certain Chang 章; but this is inaccurate, since both the Meng collection and the *CNYIS* state T'an as recipient. Another poem written to "Mr. T'an of the Grotto of Rest and Seclusion on Mt. Lu" is by Li Chung 李中, *Pi-yun-chi* 碧雲集 (SPTK edn.) B, p. 6a. One written honoring a mountain recluse Taoist named T'an is found in Hsü Hsüan 徐鉉, *Chi-hsing chi* 騎省集 (SPPY edn.) 22, p. 1b.

In summary, early sources in no way support the conflation of the identities of T'an Ch'iao and T'an Tzu-hsiao. Rather, they demonstrate clearly that the two T'ans were two men, for the following reasons. First, while many sources connect T'an Ch'iao with the *Hua shu*, none proposes any link between that work and T'an Tzu-hsiao. Likewise, the sources reflect no relationship having existed between T'an Tzu-hsiao and either Ch'en T'uan or Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. If T'an Tzu-hsiao had been T'an Ch'iao, then certainly Ch'en T'uan and, after him, Ch'en Ching-yüan, would have indicated this, especially since Ch'en T'uan lived throughout most of the later period of T'an Tzu-hsiao's life. One also would expect that, if the two T'ans were one man, then the codifiers of the written tradition associated with the T'ien-hsin cheng-fa, that is, Yüan Miao-tsung and Teng Yu-kung, who credited T'an Tzu-hsiao with having originated or enabled the inception of their tradition's techniques and who certainly would have known of T'an Ch'iao, would have identified one as the other. Indeed, it is noteworthy that no early Taoist sources conflate the biographies of the two T'ans. In fact, early texts such as the *Li-shih chen-hsien t'i-tao t'ung-chien* and the *San-tung ch'ün-hsien lu* that include hagiographies of both men do not in any way identify one man with the other.

Other indications that T'an Ch'iao was not T'an Tzu-hsiao include their differences in types, periods, and locations of activity. Their periods and locations have been treated sufficiently, but a final word on their disparate activities is necessary: whereas T'an Tzu-hsiao was a professional institutionalized Taoist priest, that is, a priest engaged in externally directed shamanic or sorcerous methods of healing and liturgy for the sake of gaining emolument, T'an Ch'iao was a wandering eccentric engaged in the internally directed pursuit of immortality or perfection who favored loneliness and remote mountain retreats to the political and economic activity pursued by T'an Tzu-hsiao. Whereas T'an Tzu-hsiao's activities derived primarily from the early (second century) Taoist Cheng-i tradition, that is, the Way of the Celestial Master originated by Chang Tao-ling, T'an Ch'iao's heritage lay more in the later Highest Purity (Shang-ch'ing 上清) tradition, which from its inception in the Six Dynasties period typically emphasized personal cultivation through the refinement of the person.⁷⁰ Furthermore, the father of T'an Tzu-hsiao, as a Cheng-i priest of

⁷⁰ See Michel Strickmann, "On the Alchemy of T'ao Hung-ching," in Holmes Welch and Anna Seidel, eds., *Facets of Taoism* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1979), pp. 128, 167-69; and idem, "The Mao Shan Revelations: Taoism and the Aristocracy," in *TP* (1977) 63, pp. 6-14 (esp. p. 11), 26-27. Of course, by the tenth century, the Cheng-i and Highest Purity traditions had been amalgamated to a certain degree; this is evident in the very title of the Cheng-i T'ien-hsin cheng-fa text, literally, "Highest Purity Correct Methods of the Center (Heart-Mind) of Heaven." Boltz

the Min, could not have been T'an Chu, the father of T'an Ch'iao and director of studies in the Directorate of Education in the T'ang capital.

Finally, if T'an Tzu-hsiao were T'an Ch'iao, then it is incomprehensible that Tzu-hsiao did not speak up about Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's devilish treatment of him and/or appropriation of his *Hua shu*, when, arriving in Chin-ling after 963, he would not have needed to fear the then long-dead Sung Ch'iu-ch'iu. Further, even before Sung's death in 959, the politically well connected T'an Tzu-hsiao residing at Mount Lu would have had ample opportunity to discuss his soured relationship with Sung and the latter's misappropriation of his intellectual property. After all, Mount Lu was a favorite retreat of the court elite of the Southern T'ang, and these elite knew T'an Tzu-hsiao: this is apparent in 1. the fact that two prominent Southern T'ang poets, Meng Kuan and Li Chung (and possibly a third, Hsü Hsüan), wrote commemorative poems to him; 2. Ho Ching-chu's hiring of him; and 3. the Southern T'ang monarch Li Yü's later summons of him. However, as far as the records can demonstrate, T'an Tzu-hsiao never mentioned matters involving Sung Ch'i-ch'iu to anyone, and no one ever asked, for certainly, if he or they had, then Sung's many enemies at the Southern T'ang court would have ensured that the story not be lost to posterity.

PRIOR ATTEMPTS AT CLARIFICATION

The conflation of the two T'ans's identities occurred when sixteenth-century and later editors of some *Hua shu* editions, local gazetteers, and incidental historical sources blindly followed some non-authoritative precedent and, perhaps without any opportunity to consult early sources, only could assume the identity of the two T'ans. In no case has any source shown any true evidence of the identity of the two men.

Nor has anyone been able to *argue* convincingly that T'an Tzu-hsiao was T'an Ch'iao. As far as we know at present, three scholars have attempted to do so. The first was Li Kuang-t'ing 李光廷 who, in a colophon that he appended to the *Hua shu* text and commentary that he published in 1878, briefly reviewed some of the material that we examined in the preceding two sections. Rather carelessly, Li assumed that T'an Tzu-hsiao was T'an Ch'iao merely because in historical sources the former first appears in Min in 935 only a few years after Li believed that the latter had passed through Chin-ling (according to Li, in the year 931) and then disappeared into Nan-yüeh in Hunan.⁷¹ As we

noted the presence of both Highest Purity and Cheng-i elements in the T'ien-hsin teachings: *Survey of Taoist Literature*, p. 35 (and n. 67 there).

⁷¹ Li Kuang-t'ing, *Jung-yüan ts'ung-shu* 榕園叢書 (1885 rpt. of original 1878 edn.; housed in

know from our own analysis, T'an Ch'iao likely had passed through Chin-ling not in the 930s but in the 910s. Furthermore, from Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's own preface to the *Hua shu*, we understand that the *Hua shu* had been published already in 930, a year before Li's projected year of contact for T'an Ch'iao and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. Most troubling historically is the fact that Li made the mistake of employing historical evidence regarding T'an Tzu-hsiao to argue about the life of T'an Ch'iao, all in order to demonstrate that Tzu-hsiao was Ch'iao.⁷²

In more recent times the eminent scholar Yü Chia-hsi 余嘉錫 (1883–1955) also touched on the matter of the two T'ans and, like Li Kuang-t'ing, concluded that they were the same man. Likely the great magnitude of the project at which he was working at the time, the *Ssu-k'u t'i-yao pien-cheng* 四庫提要辨證, caused Mr. Yü to rush through the evidence perfunctorily, for, again like Li Kuang-t'ing, neither is his argument sound. He wrote,

This Tzu-hsiao who from Min traveled through Chien-k'ang (Nanking) tallies with the one that Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon" says saw Ch'i-ch'iu as he passed through Chien-k'ang. This being so, then the Tzu-hsiao of the [*Hsin*] *Wu-tai shih* is the Tzu-hsiao Perfected Man T'an Ch'iao (Tzu-hsiao-chien-jen T'an Ch'iao) that wrote this book (the *Hua shu*). Neither Lu Yu nor Wu Jen-ch'en (authors of Lu's *Nan T'ang shu* and *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu*, respectively), in writing their biographies of Tzu-hsiao, knew that his name was Ch'iao. It is that they had not examined it (the matter) thoroughly.⁷³

Here it is apparent that Mr. Yü mistakenly assumed that both men were named Tzu-hsiao when, in fact, no source dating to earlier than the sixteenth century attributes the name or appellation of Tzu-hsiao to T'an Ch'iao, and then only by mistake.

Finally, very recently the mainland Chinese scholar Lin Sheng-li 林勝利 has arrived at the same conclusion as Messrs. Li and Yü, and, again like them, has been unconvincing in his argument. His article, though dense, informative, and interesting, suffers from several serious flaws. First, from the very title of his article, "Examination of [the Life of] Tzu-hsiao Perfected Man T'an

Harvard-Yenching Library), "Hou-pa" 後跋, pp. 1a–b. To arrive at the year of 931 for the contact between T'an Ch'iao and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, Li assumed that the latter had not been in Chin-ling prior to that year. But from the evidence presented, in fact Sung first resided in Chin-ling from 912 to 917.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 1b. For an analysis of his argumentation, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 1006–10.

⁷³ Yü Chia-hsi 余嘉錫, *Ssu-k'u t'i-yao pien-cheng* (Taipei: I-wen, 1965), p. 847.

Ch'iao," one is aware that Mr. Lin took the identity of the two men as his unarticulated major premise.

Second, he chose to rely on non-authoritative late sources – particularly local gazetteers – that treat the two T'ans as one man, rather than authoritative early sources such as Lu's *Nan Tang shu* – as well as many others, as we have seen – that clearly do not conflate the separate identities of the two men.⁷⁴

Third, he apparently misapprehended another late gazetteer, the *Ta-ch'ing i-t'ung chih*, considering it to have presented a biography that inosculated the two T'ans's lives, when in fact this source contains three biographies of T'an Ch'iao and one of T'an Tzu-hsiao, in all of which the men's distinctive biographical narratives are clearly maintained.⁷⁵

Fourth, Mr. Lin did not cite or otherwise employ some of the most important early sources regarding the two T'ans, including Ma's *Nan Tang shu* and all of the sources involving the T'ien-hsin cheng-fa and T'an Tzu-hsiao's connections with that talismanic-ritualistic-shamanic Taoist tradition or sect. This seriously limited his awareness of important early data, which, in turn, severely attenuates the validity of his argument.

Fifth, reading in the thirteenth-century *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* 佛祖統紀, Mr. Lin mistook a commentative passage later appended to an original entry for the year 957 to itself constitute an entry describing events having occurred in that year. This commentatorial passage describes the interactions of Ch'en T'uan's *shih-yu* T'an Ch'iao with Sung Ch'i-ch'iu in Chin-ling, and is appended to an original passage that describes Ch'en T'uan's other noteworthy affairs that occurred in that year, 957. Physical examination of the text of the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* reveals clearly that the passage on T'an Ch'iao, the *Hua shu*, and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu certainly is an emended commentary intended to supplement the originally entered information on Ch'en T'uan by including the famous narrative about his teacher T'an Ch'iao. Merely the fact that the passage begins indented from the top of the page obviates that it in no way should be misconstrued to represent events purported to have occurred in 957.⁷⁶ Furthermore,

⁷⁴ Lin, "Tzu-hsiao chen-jen T'an Ch'iao k'ao-lüeh," pp. 33–34, who stresses the relevance of the following treatments of the two T'ans as one man: *Ch'üan-chou-fu chih* 泉州府志 (I have consulted the 1763 edn. based on the original edn. of 1612; rpt. T'ai-nan: Teng-wen, 1964) and *Chin-chiang-hsien chih* 晉江縣志 (I consulted the 1765 edn. of Chu Sheng-yüan 朱升元 and Fang Ting 方鼎; rpt. Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, 1967).

⁷⁵ The *Ta-ch'ing i-t'ung chih* 大清一統志 (I have consulted the original 1764 edn. in Gest Oriental Library, compiled by prince Hung Chou 宏書 [Jen-tsung 仁宗]) includes three T'an Ch'iao biographies: 40, pp. 22a–b (Chiang-ning-fu); 124, p. 39a (Ho-nan-fu); 224, p. 40b (Heng-chou-fu); biog. of T'an Tzu-hsiao at 293, p. 31a (Nan-k'ang-fu).

⁷⁶ Chih-p'an 志磐, *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* (pref. 1270; photorpt. of Ch'ing edn.; Taipei: Chiang-su kuang-ling ku-chi k'o-yin-she, 1991) 42, p. 31a.

when we consider that Sung Ch'i-ch'iu dated his preface to the *Hua shu* in the year 930, then it is beyond doubt that the commentatorial passage in the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* was not intended to suggest that the events described therein occurred in the year 957. Mr. Lin's apparent unawareness of Sung's preface and other early sources helps explain his misreading of the significance of the passage.⁷⁷

Sixth, Mr. Lin argued nonsensically that, since T'an Ch'iao had to have met Sung Ch'i-ch'iu prior to 959, when the latter committed suicide, then T'an Ch'iao must have lived to the age of nearly one hundred or, at least, eighty or ninety. Regardless of what other information regarding T'an Ch'iao Mr. Lin had in mind, this is a *non sequitur* and does not assist us in our investigation into the lives of the two T'ans.

Finally, Mr. Lin unfortunately took at face value a statement made in Lu's *Nan Tang shu* that T'an Tzu-hsiao lived to be over one-hundred. Such a claim of longevity is commonplace in Taoist or Taoist-inspired hagiography; without incontrovertible corroborating evidence, it cannot be allowed to influence our judgment.⁷⁸

Despite the present disagreement with Messrs. Li, Yü, and Lin's conclusion regarding the T'ans, we must recognize that all three scholars significantly advanced the sophistication of the arguments concerning the matters surrounding the two T'ans. Furthermore, each scholar also uncovered several previously unknown sources regarding T'an Ch'iao and T'an Tzu-hsiao, all of which have been immensely valuable in the preparation of the present paper.

THE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE *HUA SHU*

The Secular Transmission of the Hua shu through the Fourteenth Century

Examination of the textual aspects of the *Hua shu* and the work's transmission provides evidence crucial to resolving the issue of authorship. The early (Sung-Yüan) transmission of the *Hua shu* followed two paths, the secular and what we might call the Taoist: evidence demonstrates clearly that 1. the *Hua shu* originally was published and transmitted under the authorship of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, but that 2. by the Ming, authorial credit had been transferred universally to

⁷⁷ Others have misinterpreted it, e. g., Li Yüan-kuo, "Shih-lun Ch'en T'uan ti yü-chou sheng-ch'eng lun" 試論陳搏的宇宙生成論, in *Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu* 世界宗教研究 (1985.2), pp. 48–61, esp. p. 48, and Ch'ing, *Chung-kuo Tao-chiao shih*, vol. 2, p. 486.

⁷⁸ Lu, *Nan Tang shu* 17, p. 4a (p. 485). The claim of 150-years-old in Tzu-hsiao's *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* hagiography (*LSCH* 43, p. 9a) is as unreliable as Lu Yu's. The most reliable source on T'an Tzu-hsiao, Ma's *Nan Tang shu* biography, made no estimate of his age.

T'an Ch'iao. Both T'an Ch'iao and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu appear to have been responsible for the *Hua shu* as we possess it in its entirety today, although certainly T'an was the originator and primary author of the work or its ancestral text.

The earliest known reference to the *Hua shu* is Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's own preface to the work, which we know is dated 930. Sung's preface describes the *Hua shu* as consisting of six chapters (*chüan*) containing 110 articles (*p'ien*), the same configurations to which extant editions of the work entitled "*Hua Shu*" seemingly conform. Sung's preface also identifies titles of six chapters that are identical to those of extant editions.

While not until the thirteenth century was the *Hua shu* again identified as containing 110 articles, many secular sources of this period list the work as consisting of six chapters. Furthermore, all that mention an author identify him to have been Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. This is true of the official catalogue of the imperial library completed in 1042, the *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu* 崇文總目,⁷⁹ as well as nine later Sung dynasty catalogues and incidental discussions of the work. The incidental Sung dynasty mentions of the *Hua shu* under Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's authorship include one by Chang Lei (1034-1114) in the late-eleventh century, another by Ma Ling early in the twelfth century in his *Nan Tang shu*, and also one by Huang Chen (ca. 1213-1280) in his thirteenth-century *Huang-shih jih-ch'ao* 黃氏日抄.⁸⁰ Entries in six catalogues of imperial and private li-

⁷⁹ Wang Yao-ch'en 王堯臣 et al., *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu* 崇文總目, most edns. of which cite the *HS* merely as "*Hua shu*, by T'an Ch'iao." Chou Chung-fu 周中字 submitted this as part of the evidence to suggest that T'an Ch'iao, and not Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, was the *HS* author (*Cheng-t'ang tu-shu-chi* 鄭堂讀書記 [Peking: Shang-wu, 1959; rpt. of edn. of 1940], p. 1012). However, Chou's edn. of the *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu* was emended and published only in 1799 by Ch'ien Tung 錢坫 and others and cannot be relied upon. One should use instead the *SKCS* edn. of the *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu*, which reproduces an edn. of 1144, itself a skeleton version and the earliest extant representation of the original text of 1042. In the case of the *HS*, the *SKCS* edn. states only, "*Hua shu*, six chapters" (*SKCS*, vol. 674, p. 66 [*Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu* 5, p. 21b]). Bibliographies in such later catalogs as the *Tung-chih-lueh*, *Wen-hsien-t'ung-k'ao*, and *Sung shih* (on these latter three, see n. 81, below), which were based either wholly or in large part on the 1042 *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu*, give the *HS* author as Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. From this we may surmise that the original *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu* had also done so. On the latter and other Sung catalogs, see van der Loon, *Taoist Books*, pp. 4-25.

⁸⁰ Chang, "Shu Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua shu* hou," p. 807, who considered *HS* as belonging to Huang-Lao thought and who did not mention the number of chapters in his copy. Ma, *Nan Tang shu* 20, p. 7b (p. 341), contains a biography of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu that quotes text of one of the *HS* articles, but does not mention the work by name, identifying the source merely as "Sung's writings." Ma also did not mention the number of chapters or articles. In his review of 1270, Huang Chen identified the *HS* author as Sung Ch'i-ch'iu and reviewed the central message of each of the six chapters, in the process recording several segments of the *HS* text. Huang's copy was titled "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua shu*"; see *Huang-shih jih-ch'ao* 55, pp. 42b-44b (pp. 419-20). In addition, Wang Ying-lin quoted briefly from the *HS* but he did not identify his "*Hua shu*" beyond the title, nor did he mention the author. Wang's text might have belonged to a "Taoist" grouping (Wang, *K'un-hsüeh chi-wen* 20, p. 15b; quoting *HS* VI.xii, "Heaven's Shepherd" ["T'ien-mu" 天牧]).

braries dating from the eleventh through fourteenth centuries also identify the author to have been Sung Ch'i-ch'iu and the text to have consisted of six chapters.⁸¹ Combined, the evidence presented in this section demonstrates that the editions of the *Hua shu* transmitted secularly and available in the imperial and private libraries during the Sung rather consistently were entitled "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua shu*," thereby crediting Sung Ch'i-ch'iu with authorship, and were in six chapters.

Curiously, this line of transmission all but ended with the fourteenth-century entry in the "Bibliographical Monograph" of the *Sung shih*. Only rather late in the Ming, in the posterior half of the sixteenth century, did two literati refer to the text again as the "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua shu*."⁸² But here again this lineage appears to end, for there are no further presently known references in later scholars' library catalogues, or in their notes on or reviews of the *Hua shu*, that denote a work bearing this title-author combination that they had seen and believed to have been published after the Sung dynasty. Only one text of this lineage survives, what I call the K'ang edition, whose value obviously is enormous, and which will be treated further below.

Occurrences through the Fourteenth Century of a Hua Shu by Pan Ch'iao

No later than the middle of the eleventh century began a second series of *Hua shu* texts according to which T'an Ch'iao (or T'an Ching-sheng) wrote the

⁸¹ Ch'ao Kung-wu 晁公武, *Chün-chai tu-shu-chih* 郡齋讀書志 (1131 or before; KHCPTS edn.), 3A, pp. 23a-b; Cheng Ch'iao 鄭樵 (1104-1162) *Tung-chih-lueh* 通志略 (1161; Shanghai: Shanghai ku-chi, 1990), p. 627 (probably drawing information on the *HS* from the 1042 *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu*, suggesting that that source also identified the author as Sung Ch'i-ch'iu; at least it is almost certain that T'an Ch'iao was not identified in either the *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu* or Cheng's other source for Sung bibliography, viz. *Pi-shu-sheng-hsü-pien tao ssu-k'u ch'üeh-shu-mu* 秘書省續編到四庫圖書目 [1145]); Yu Mao 尤袤 (1124-1193), *Sui-ch'u-t'ang shu-mu* 遂初堂書目, in *Shuo fu* 28, p. 23b (identifying only the author as Sung Ch'i-ch'iu); Ch'en Chen-sun 陳振孫, *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'ü* 直齋書錄解題 (ca. 1240; KHCPTS edn., vol. 3) 10, p. 298; Ma Tuan-lin 馬端臨, *Wen-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考 (before 1319), in *Shih-t'ung* 十通 (Taipei: Hsin-hsing ch'u-pan-she, 1962), vol. 14, p. 1751 (Ch'ao Kung-wu's entry on the *HS* in his *Chün-chai tu-shu-chih* is extant only through Ma's copying of it); and the "Bibliographical Monograph" ("I-wen-chih" 藝文志), in *Sung shih* 20, p. 5210, based partly on the 1042 *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu*, which describes a six-chapter *HS* by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, thus supporting the idea that the *HS* text in the *Ch'ung-wen* imperial library also was in six chapters and by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. On this Monograph, see van der Loon, *Taoist Books*, pp. 4-8, 17-23.

⁸² One such was Hu Ying-lin (*Ssu-pu cheng-o*, p. 59), who may, however, have merely followed Sung Lien's account (*Chu-tzu-pien*, p. 25) of a *HS* text entitled *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* and thus credited Sung Ch'i-ch'iu with authorship.

At approximately the same time as Hu, Ch'en Yü-pi 陳于陞 (*I-chien* 意見, in *PYTPC*, collected in *PPTS*, vol. 172, pp. 25a-b) recorded a brief quotation from a "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua shu*." However, since he grossly misrepresented the *HS* when he cited from it, he most likely did not actually see a "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua shu*" text (nor did he mention the number of chapters).

book. Although no evidence suggests that a clear lineage of textual transmission arose among these editions, many miscellaneous mentions or discussions of, or quotations from, such texts attest to their scattered existence. Given that most of these references occur in sources originating in or about the Taoist community, we thus might consider them representative of a Taoist grouping of texts.

As far as we can tell, the tradition of T'an's authorship of the *Hua shu* commenced in 1060 with Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon" to the work. Considering that in his "Colophon" Ch'en Ching-yüan recounted the information privately transmitted to him from his mentor Chang Wu-meng about the involvement of his own teacher, Ch'en T'uan, with T'an Ch'iao and the latter's experiences with Sung Ch'i-ch'iu over the *Hua shu*, then it is likely that Ch'en Ching-yüan, a prolific writer, commentator, and well connected publisher of many Taoist works, published anew the *Hua shu* with T'an Ch'iao's name emblazoned thereon. Thus most probably began the "Taoist transmission" of the text under T'an Ch'iao's authorship.

Thereafter, others of the Taoist community referred to and quoted from a *Hua shu* not by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu but T'an Ch'iao. These include Taoist and/or alchemical adepts such as Liu Lieh 劉烈 (fl. ca. 1137), Po Yü-ch'an, Ch'en Hsü-po 陳虛白, as well as Taoist-tending literati such as Lu Yu and Yü Yen.⁸³

In addition, as noted previously, Tseng Ts'ao and Tung Chin-ch'un included what appear to be selections from T'an Ch'iao's *Hua shu* in their respective compendia, the *Tao shu* of 1136 and the fourteenth-century *Ch'ün-hsien yao-yü tsuan-chi*. Finally, in a preface to the *Hua shu* dated 1330, an unidentified writer who appears to have been a touring censorial inspector (*hsün-an yü-shih* 巡按御史) in the Kiangnan region recounted the story first told in Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon" of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's devilish theft of the *Hua shu* from

⁸³ Liu Lieh's quotations from T'an's *HS* can be found in Chang T'ien-yü 張天雨, *Hsüan-p'in-lu* 玄品錄 (1333; *TT* no. 558) 5, pp. 13b-14a. Po Yü-ch'an quoted liberally from the *HS* and identified its author once as having been "Perfected Man T'an" 譚真人; see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 305-9. Ch'en Hsü-po (attrib.), *Kuei-chung chih-nan* 歸中指南, also demonstrates by quoting from a "*Hua-shu* by T'an Ch'iao" the dissemination of *T'an Ch'iao's HS* during the Sung and Yuan. The *Kuei-chung chih-nan*, an alchemical work, is collected in the *Tao-tsang ching-hua lu* 道藏精華錄 (Shanghai: Shang-hai i-hsieh shu-chü, ca. 1900-1930); see pp. 1a-4a and 7b. Lu Yu 陸友, *Yen-pei tsai-chih* B, pp. 1b-2a, says that T'an Ch'iao's *HS* discussion of the principles of calligraphy (*HS* IV.ix, "Shu-tao" 書道, "The Way of Calligraphy") was on par with the theories of the two greatest calligraphers in history, Chung Yu (鍾繇; 151-230) and Wang Hsi-chih (王羲之; 303-361). Yü Yen discussed T'an Ch'iao, the *HS* and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu in both his *Hsi-shang fu-t'an* (B, p. 19) and his alchemical commentary, the *Chou-i ts'an-t'ung-ch'i fa-hui* (8, pp. 4b-5a; 9, p. 6a). He was convinced that Sung had murdered T'an Ch'iao.

T'an Ch'iao. In this preface the author also lamented that most in his contemporary world ignorantly still considered the *Hua shu* to have been written by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu.⁸⁴ This not only suggests that in the fourteenth century the *Hua shu* was widely known and read, but it also demonstrates that two of what we might call *Hua shu* cultures existed, the secular or external and the Taoist/alchemical or internal.

Further evidence culled from several additional sources originating in these centuries attests to the general availability and popularity of the *Hua shu* at the time. However, as these sources quote from and identify their source only as the "*Hua shu*," providing neither the author's name nor the numbers of chapters and articles, then they do not assist us in identifying any transmission lineages of either the secular or Taoist culture. These sources include Lu Tien's (1042-1102) pharmacopoeia, the *Pi-ya*, and a work by the Taoist alchemical theorist Master Hsiao-yao of Shen-feng.⁸⁵

Despite the general availability of the work in these centuries, we cannot identify a consistent transmission of the *Hua shu* among Taoists. Nor can we ascertain whether or not the work was included in previous printings of the Taoist Canon, since no catalogues or bibliographies identifying their contents have survived. It is even unclear how consistent was the understanding among Taoists that the *Hua shu* was to have been written not by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu but T'an Ch'iao. We saw above how the anonymous writer of the preface of 1330 lamented the fact that most indeed did not "know" this. Furthermore, in the twelfth century, Hou Shan-yüan, a Taoist adept living in the north under the rule of the Chin 金 (1115-1234), quoted from several articles of a "*Hua shu*, by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu" without having mentioned the issue over the authorship of the work.⁸⁶ In addition, in the *Tao-tsang chi-yao* edition of his Collected Works, Po Yü-ch'an, who was so profoundly influenced by the *Hua shu*, quoted a segment of text not from "Perfected Man T'an" (T'an Chen-jen), which he otherwise did, but from "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu."⁸⁷ It is unclear whether this is a copyist's mistake or a holdover from the earliest editions of Po's writings.

⁸⁴ Text in *Shuo fu* 42, pp. 26b-27a, accompanied by one of the two versions of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's "Preface," as well as an emended and unreliable version of Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon."

⁸⁵ For quotations in *Pi-ya* see n. 11, above. Master Hsiao-yao of Shen-feng (Shen-feng Hsiao-yao-tzu 神峰道遠子) quoted the *HS* in his late-13th-c. *Hsi-i chih-mi lun* 析疑指迷論 (*Essay on Destroying Doubts and Indicating Confusions*) (pref. 1295, 1298, and 1299; in *TTCY*, vol. 14, pp. 6188-94; for quotations, see pp. 6190 and 6193).

⁸⁶ Hou, *Shang-ch'ing t'ai-hsüan-chi* 4, p. 12a-b.

⁸⁷ Po, *Po chen-jen chi* (*TTCY*) 5, p. 20a.

Transmission Lineages of the Hua shu from the Fifteenth Century to the Present

Most of the numerous currently available editions of the *Hua shu* belong to one of two families of texts, both of which attribute authorship of the *Hua shu* to T'an Ch'iao (or Ching-sheng or, certainly mistakenly, Tzu-hsiao). The textual ancestor of each of these groups of texts branched off from a central lineage no later than the Yüan or early Ming, or circa 1350-1450, but most likely as early as the Sung (before 1279). By the late-sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries editors appear to have conflated these lineages again when they published the *Hua shu* text as either a monograph or part of a larger compendium. Thus, most extant editions of the *Hua shu* are intimately related, many of their variants being largely traceable, predictable, and relatively unimportant.

However, several factors differing among texts of these lineages point to significant changes that were made to the *Hua shu* since its initial issuance in the tenth century. Further comparison with the K'ang edition and a lineage of texts that, while still attributing authorship to T'an Ch'iao, has been transmitted under the highly suggestive title of *Ch'i-ch'ü-tzu* (*The Master [Sung] Ch'i-ch'ü*), not only confirms suspicions of early corruption but also helps to demonstrate that the presently available *Hua shu* editions stem invariably from the secular, not the Taoist, *Hua shu* transmission. This knowledge assists us in determining the authorship of the *Hua shu*.

Among complete editions, the *Hua shu* text whose date of publication is confirmably earliest is the *Tao-tsang* edition. Elsewhere it has been verified that the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* is one included in the original *Tao-tsang* publication of 1444-46 and not one added later to supply various temples with additional copies or supplement lacunae in the original *Tao-tsang* compendium.⁸⁸ Many remnant Sung and Yüan taboo replacement characters still found in the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* text especially attest to its early date.⁸⁹ Still, as other Ming edi-

⁸⁸ See Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 1050-54. In 1598-99 at least seven sets of the *TT* were printed from the blocks of 1444-46 to supply various temples. In addition, some of the works in the Peking Po-yün-kuan copy of the *TT*, which was the primary source for the 1926 reprint, had deteriorated and in 1845 were replaced with editions maintained in other temples. On these matters see Cheng Yung-hsiang 鄭永祥 and Meng Chih-ts'ai 孟才, "Po-yün kuan ch'ung-hsiu tao-tsang chi" 白雲觀重修道藏記 (1845); included with the 1975 Kuang-wen shu-chü rpt. of a Ch'ing edn. of Li Chieh's 李杰 *Tao-tsang mu-lu hsiang-chu* 道藏目錄詳注, p. 5. See also Ch'en Kuo-fu 陳國符, *Tao-tsang yüan-liu k'ao* 道藏源流考 (Peking: Chung-wen shu-chü, 1963; rpt. of the 1949 edn.), pp. 181, 188.

⁸⁹ A sampling of such Sung taboos includes: *shu* 豎 for *shu* 豎 (*TT*6, p. 4a); This character was tabooed after the year 1064 (Huang Pen-chi 黃本冀, *Pi-hui lu* 避諱錄, in vol. 18 of his *San-ch'ang-wu-chai ts'ung-shu* 三長物齋叢書 [1846 edn.] 4, p. 1b); *chiu* 究 for *wan* 完 (*TT*4, p. 2a); tabooed after 1126 (*ibid.* 4, p. 4a); *hsiang* 饗 for *hsiang* 享 (*TT*4, p. 2b); tabooed after 1190 (*ibid.*

ditions also are printed with many of these same remnant taboos, it is not possible to declare categorically that the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* is truly the earliest edition, but only that which was published confirmably earliest among physically existing *Hua shu* texts.⁹⁰

A second lineage of transmission of the *Hua shu* under the authorship of T'an Ch'iao developed during the Ming. The majority of extant *Hua shu* editions can be confirmed through textual comparison to have arisen primarily from this lineage. This lineage began with the publication of a *Hua shu* text between the years of 1457 and 1464 by the government of the city of Tai-wang 代王 (in Hupei). Through two subsequent printings in 1504 and 1538 the heritage of the Tai-wang edition was preserved, whereafter it served as one of the base texts from which later editions were printed:⁹¹ in their bibliographic entries for the 1504 texts that they catalogued, bibliophiles Shen Te-shou, Ch'ü Yung, Ting Ping, and Yeh Te-hui all stated that, included with the *Hua shu* were Li Shen's 1504 preface and Ch'en Ching-yüan's "Colophon" of 1060. Since these two appendages are found in three Ming and Ch'ing editions of the *Hua shu*, and, further, since, through textual comparison, we find these editions sharing with several other editions of the *Hua shu* (which do not transmit Li's preface and Ch'en's "Colophon") many telling variants from the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* edition, then we can identify a large group of texts that certainly derived primarily from the Tai-wang edition of 1457-1464 through the two

4, p. 6b); *chün* 均 for *chün* 均 (*TT*4, p. 1b); tabooed after 1225 (*ibid.* 4, p. 7a); and *pen* 本 for *mu* 木 in the word for "puppet" 木偶 (*TT*3, p. 6a). Elsewhere in the *TT Hua shu*, *mu* occurs not replaced by *pen*. The character *mu* formed part of the names of two Yüan emperors, T'ai-ting-ti (r. 1324-1327) and Shun-ti (r. 1333-1367). Although Huang Pen-chi stated that Yüan emperors' names often were not tabooed, still, there seems to be no other explanation for the appearance of *pen* in place of *mu*. Because the *Tao-shu ch'üan-chi*, *Tzu-hui*, *Erh-shih-tzu*, *Yen-i-chih-lin*, *Hsü tao-tsang*, and Wan-wei-shan-t'ang *Shuo-fu* editions all have *pen*, it appears that they were derived from a common Yüan-era edition.

⁹⁰ For instance, although the Ming Ch'ung-chen-era (1628-1644) *Tao-shu ch'üan-chi* collection was printed after the *TT*, this does not mean that the *HS* text contained therein was not based on a text that was earlier than that from which the *TT Hua shu* was drawn.

⁹¹ The 1504 edition was published through the combined efforts of vice-minister of Court of Entertainment (*kuang-lu-ssu shao-ch'ing* 光祿寺少卿; Hucker, *Dictionary*, pp. 288, 414) Li Shen 李紳, plus Cheng Ch'ang-ch'ing 鄭常清 and Liu Ta 劉達. We know this only through Li Shen's preface, attached to four editions of the *HS* (see below).

According to Yeh Te-hui 葉德輝, the 1504 Liu/Cheng/Li edition was republished in 1538 by a Chou Fan 周藩 (see Yeh, *Hsi-yüan tu-shu-chih* 鄖陽讀書志 [Shanghai: Shang-hai tan-yüan 上海滄園, 1928] 5, p. 25a). The *Su-k'u t'i-yao* (23, p. 2464) suggests that, in addition to the 1504 edition published by Liu Ta (*Liu-shih-pen* 劉氏本), there was a republication by a certain Shen (*Shen-shih* 申氏). Because there is no other mention anywhere of such an edition and, further, since the editors of the *Su-k'u t'i-yao* used Li Shen's preface as their source, likely they were confused by Li Shen's name and misconstrued his preface, which accompanied Liu Ta's 1504 edition, to represent his republication of the Liu edition.

new engravings of 1504 and 1538.⁹² These relationships are displayed in the chart, below, and will not be repeated here. Neither will the textual variants by which the relationships have been determined be described here, for, in all cases, such variants number at least over fifty and, in some, over one-hundred. At a certain point, due to conflicting comparisons across editions caused by their obvious inter-borrowings, one becomes unable to make absolute conclusions about these relationships. Thus, there is no clearly definable singular transmission lineage among any of these editions, but only a set of rough probabilities.

At some point there were added to the *Hua shu* text some few miscellaneous textual notes which indicate either a character's pronunciation or a variant character that appeared in another edition. As these textual notes are present in both the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and the texts of the Tai-wang lineage, then they must have been added to some edition published prior to 1444-46 from which both lineages originally derived. While the notes could have been added to the texts of either lineage at any time, copying from one or the other, still if this were so, then there should not be so many distinctive differences in the texts of the two lineages. (On the dating of the emended notes, see below.)

A third line of transmission is represented by the text of the *Hua Shu hsin sheng* 化書新聲 (in *Tao-tsang chi-yao*), which is a *Hua shu* edition to which Wang Yi-ch'ing added extensive commentary in the 1590s. The *Hua shu hsin sheng*, although its basic text of the *Hua shu* is fundamentally identical with the texts belonging to the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and Tai-wang-fu traditions, still must be recognized as constituting a separate lineage, since its variants from the text of the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* largely are distinct as well from those of the Tai-wang lineage and, furthermore, it hasn't the miscellaneous textual notes described above. Likely, then, the *Hua shu* text on which the *Hua shu hsin sheng* was based derived from an edition published prior to the pre-1444-1446 edition on which the other two lineages were based.

⁹² See Shen Te-shou 沈德壽, *Pao-ching-lou ts'ang-shu-chih liu-shih-ssu chuan* 抱經樓藏書志六十四卷 (Mei-ta, 1924) 41, pp. 14b-15b; Ch'ü Yung 顧鏞, *Tieh-ch'in-t'ung-chien-lou ts'ang-shu mu-tu* 鐵琴銅劍樓藏書目錄 (Tung-shih sung-fen-shih edn. 董氏誦芬室刊本, 1897) 16, p. 8a; Ting Ping 丁丙, *Shan-pen shu-shih ts'ang-shu chih* 善本書室藏書志 (1908 edn.) 18, p. 21a; Yeh, *Hsi-yüan tu-shu-chih* 5, pp. 24b-25a. See also *Pei-ching t'u-shu-kuan shan-pen shu-mu* 北京圖書館善本書目 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1959) 4, p. 54a. Several copies of the 1504 edition survive, two of which are housed in the Peking Library. The editions to which are attached Li's preface and Ch'en's "Colophon" include the *Tao-shu ch'üan-chi*, *PTTPC*, *Cheng-chüeh-lou ts'ung-k'an*, and, originally, the *SKCS* (both items were included with the Kiangsi government edition on which the *SKCS* edition was based, but the *SKCS* editors discarded them; see *Ssu-k'u t'i-yao* 23, pp. 14-15 [p. 2464]). The "Colophon" in its latest modified form is transmitted only in these three editions (other than the *SKCS*).

The Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu Texts and the K'ang Text of the "Hua Shu, by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu"

An additional lineage of *Hua shu* texts exists whereby the work is entitled *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* 齊丘子, or *The Master Ch'i-ch'iu*. Two editions of the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* exist, in texts included in the *Pai-chia lei-tsuian* 百家類纂 and *Tzu-hui* 子彙 compendia, published in 1567 and 1576, respectively. While some seemingly have considered the name *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* to represent the original – that is, Sung dynasty – title of the work,⁹³ in fact the earliest known mention of this title is in a notice written by the renowned man of letters, Sung Lien, in his *Chu-tzu-pien* of 1358.⁹⁴ Still, as the Sung dynasty collapsed only eighty years prior to when Sung Lien made this entry for a *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* text, and since Sung Lien's description of the text and its complex authorial history treats the title as one to be challenged, then we may reasonably assume that it was long established at the time and thus indeed was in use on texts as early as the Sung dynasty.

From Sung Lien's description of his *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* text and also his defense of T'an Ch'iao's authorship we know as well that this text was in six chapters (*chüan*) and named Sung Ch'i-ch'iu as the author. Was Sung Lien's *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* text therefore representative of one of the earliest – or the earliest – traceable lineages of *Hua shu* texts? And do extant *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts then also continue this heritage relatively unmolested and thus emblemize the earliest form of *Hua shu* text? Bibliophile Fu Tseng-hsiang's 傅增湘 catalogue entry of 1929-30 for a *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* in his possession wherein he identified the text as being a "Ming reprint of a Sung edition" suggests that the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts indeed might be the earliest known *Hua shu* texts. But according to Fu, his was in one chapter, like the extant *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts, whereas we know that the one catalogued by Sung Lien in 1358 was in six chapters.⁹⁵ Could it be that the *Hua shu* originally was transmitted as a single-chapter work and was embellished to eventually comprise six chapters? If so, then this seriously attenuates the reliability of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's "Preface" of 930, in which he identified the *Hua shu* as consisting of 110 articles divided among six chapters. Moreover, we note that the *Pai-chia* edition contains only ninety-five and a half of the 110 articles found in all other extant editions, further casting doubt on the integrity of both Sung Ch'i-ch'iu's "Preface" and the *Hua shu* itself. In turn, our recon-

⁹³ *Ssu-k'u t'i-yao* 23, p. 14 (p. 2464), whose editors remarked on the "*Hua shu*, in six chapters" that, "the title on old editions was '*Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*,' and Sung Ch'i-ch'iu was named as the author."

⁹⁴ See n. 11, above.

⁹⁵ Fu Tseng-hsiang, *Shuang-chien-lou shan-pen shu-mu* 雙鏡樓善本書目 (Taipei: Kuang-wen, 1969; rpt. of original edn. of 1929-30) 3, pp. 19b-20a (pp. 108-9), and Fu, *T'ang-yüan ch'ün-shu ching-yen lu* 藏園群書經眼錄 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1980), p. 671.

structed biography of T'an Ch'iao, which depended in part on the "Preface," threatens to unravel.

Despite the revolutionary appeal of such evidence, in fact the theory that the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* title and texts predate all others does not hold water. First, no such text or title can be attested prior to 1144, in which year, as we know from our tracing above of the secular transmission of the *Hua shu*, a "*Hua Shu*, in six chapters" was catalogued in the *Ch'ung-wen tsung-mu*. In addition, nine of the fifteen and a half articles missing from the *Pai-chia* edition occur at points at which in all other editions of the *Hua shu* one finds definite chapter divisions, and five of the articles are attested in eleventh- through fourteenth-century sources.⁹⁶ Quite apparently, the articles were lost due to decrepitude of the source text of the *Pai-chia Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*, which signifies that this text also originally was divided into six chapters or sections and at some point, perhaps due to his confusion over the correct structure of the work (please see the following section) or simply because he wished to save paper and/or money, an editor condensed the work into one continuous text, without chapter divisions. It should be noted also that the *Tzu-hui* edition of the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* still retains topical divisions between the six sections of text that in non-*Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts are separated to become six individual chapters. It is only that the *Tzu-hui* neither identifies these divisions as "chapters" (*chüan*) nor begins such divisions on new leaves of paper. Thus, despite its technically consisting of only one "chapter," in fact, like all other *Hua shu* texts, including Sung Lien's six-chapter *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*, the *Tzu-hui* – and, now we know, ancestrally the *Pai-chia* – text retains the six textual or topical divisions of its contents of 110 articles.⁹⁷ This arrangement is reflected also in collector and bibliophile Chang Chün-heng's catalogue entry of 1916 for a *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* in his possession. Therein he asserted that, "[On this text] the title has been changed [from "*Hua shu*" to "*Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*"] and, moreover, six chapters (*chüan*) have been combined into one..." Chang further declared that, "This [*Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* text] is the *Tao-tsang* edition, but it has been changed again to be the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*."⁹⁸

⁹⁶ The nine articles are II.xix, II.xx, II.xxi, III.i, III.xvi, IV.i, IV.ii, IV.iii (whose title differs in other edns.), and IV.iv. Text of the five articles was cited by Po Yü-ch'an (II.v), Huang Chen (III.i, IV.i, IV.ii), and crucially Lu Tien, in whose direct quotation from *HS* II.xxi he identified the *HS* as his source.

⁹⁷ The confusion over the nature of the textual divisions of the various editions of the *HS* is compounded by the dual use of the character *chüan* 卷 to refer to both chapters and fascicles. On this and the mess it has caused in cataloging *HS* editions, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 1062–64, n. 86, and pp. 1098–99, n. 1.

⁹⁸ Chang Chün-heng 張鈞衡, *Shih-yüan ts'ang-shu-chih shih-liu-chüan* 適園藏書志十六卷 (Taipei: 1968, Kuang-wen shu-chü; rpt. of the 1916 edn. published by Chang and held in the National Central Library in Taipei) 8, pp. 2b–3a.

Chang's observation of the intimate relationship shared by his *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* and the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* is noteworthy, for close comparison of the texts of the *Tzu-hui* edition of the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* and the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* reveals that they are the most similar among all known extant *Hua shu* editions. The same holds true for the *Pai-chia* edition as well, except of course for its lost fifteen and a half articles. Indeed, the *Tzu-hui* differs from the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* in only forty-some variants, while those counted in all other texts number at least over 100 and, in one case, over 300. Identity suggests textual and temporal proximity, and indeed if Sung Lien's fourteenth-century quotations from his *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* are any measure, then once again the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts appear overall to be very close to the *Tao-tsang Hua shu*.⁹⁹

We already have reasoned that Sung Lien's *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* must have represented one state of the *Hua shu* during the Sung dynasty. The close relationship shared by the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts and the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* – the confirmably earliest of all complete *Hua shu* texts – substantiates this postulation. Furthermore, Fu Tseng-hsiang's identification of his single-chapter *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* as a reprint of a Sung dynasty edition not only supports this view, but also, and very significantly, suggests that the condensation of a *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* text – which must have served as a mother text to all later *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts – occurred in the Sung dynasty. Thus, Chang Chün-heng's *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* likely was not a descendant of the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* but rather a close relative of the ancestral lineage of six-chapter texts from which the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* sprang. That is, the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts, which of course identified Sung Ch'i-ch'iu to be the author,¹⁰⁰ must have splintered off from an early Sung dynasty secular lineage of six-chapter "*Hua Shu*, by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu" texts, which original lineage then went on to supply the editors of the *Cheng-t'ung Tao-tsang* with their *Tao-tsang Hua shu* mother text.

Additional considerations substantiate this view of the texts. First, the *Pai-chia Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* text lacks the miscellaneous textual notes. In this it resembles only Wang I-ch'ing's *Hua shu hsün sheng* and the K'ang edition of the

⁹⁹ Sung Lien quoted from *HS* I.iv, I.viii, and VI.x. These segments are reproduced, translated, and analyzed against the texts in the *TT*, *Tzu-hui*, and *Pai-chia* editions in Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 1071–72.

¹⁰⁰ From contextual statements made by both Sung Lien and Chang Chün-heng we know that the author's name on their *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts was Sung Ch'i-ch'iu. See *Chu-tzu-pien*, p. 25, and *Shih-yüan ts'ang-shu-chih shih-liu-chüan* 8, p. 3a. Although both the *Tzu-hui* and *Pai-chia* editions of the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* name T'an Ch'iao to be the author, however, in that each of these texts is published preceded by a verbatim reproduction of Sung Lien's entire notice on the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu*, then it is obvious that the editors were convinced by Sung Lien's defense of T'an's authorship and accordingly changed the author's name from Sung Ch'i-ch'iu.

six-chapter "*Hua Shu*, by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu." Recall that, as texts of both the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and Tai-wang government lineages possess these textual notes, then it was apparent that the notes were added sometime before the publication of both lineages, or prior to the 1440s. Texts without these notes thus must represent relatively early lineages. We remember also that the *Hua shu hsin sheng* betrays that it is a singular and likely early text in its very distinct variants from the *Tao-tsang Hua shu*. Furthermore, despite the fact that it certainly is not a Sung-dynasty edition, by the very nature of its being the only surviving representative of the earliest known lineage of *Hua shu* texts, the K'ang edition of course must be recognized as likely preserving the earliest of all complete extant *Hua shu* texts.¹⁰¹ And its variants from the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* indeed are, among all editions, by far most numerous, most unique, most drastic, and usually most appropriate.¹⁰² This suggests the greatest distance

¹⁰¹ Contrary to most descriptions, it is not a Sung edition. This text originally was collected by the 19th-c. Chiang I-p'ing and later kept by the Han-fen lou Library in Shanghai, which was destroyed in the bombing of the city in 1932. The text survived the fire and is now in the Peking Library (Chang Yüan-chi 張元濟, *Han-fen-lou chin-yü shu-lu* 涵芬樓藏書錄 [Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1951], "Tzu" 子, p. 41a; *Pei-ching t'u-shu-kuan shan-pen shu-mu* 4, p. 54a). Fu Tseng-hsiang believed this to be a "Sung edition" (Fu, "Chiang Meng-p'ing ts'ang Sung-k'an-pen pa" 蔣孟蘋藏宋刊本跋, in Ting and Li, *Hua shu*, p. 78). For their 1996 punctuated edn. Ting and Li did not access the K'ang text but rather collated Fu's notes on it that he wrote onto a PYPIC edition. Like the K'ang, the latter survives in the Peking Library. Chang Yüan-chi also looked at this "Sung Ch'i-ch'iu *Hua-shu*" and, like Fu, considered it to be a Sung edition (Chang, *Han-fen-lou chin-yü-shu-lu*, p. 42a).

However, this is not a Sung edition. From both the presence of certain taboo characters and the absence of others it is apparent that this text was printed sometime between 1279 and 1621. In the K'ang (Article Liii, "The Old Maple"), there occurs the character *chen* 陳, which was tabooed after 1023, until the Southern Sung collapsed in 1279 (see Ch'en Yüan 陳垣, *Shih-hui chü-hi* 史證舉例 [Peking: Chung-hua, 1962], p. 154). In addition, this text's Article VI.x, "Superintending the One" ("Yü-i" 御一), uses *hsüan* 玄, demonstrating further that this edition could not have been printed during the Sung after 976, when the character became tabooed (ibid., p. 169). Thus, unless this edition was published prior to 976, which is extremely unlikely, then it could not have been published in the Sung. Furthermore, from the same occurrence of the character *hsüan* we know that the text could not have been published during or after 1612, since in this year the character again became taboo, until the collapse of the Ch'ing in 1911. Actually, the text could not have been published after 1621, since an unsigned colophon written in calligraphy and dated in that year is attached to the text. However, as discussed above, this K'ang edition almost certainly represents quite directly the state of the *HS* during the Sung dynasty. As a convenience only, I label this text the K'ang, following the surname of K'ang Lun-chün 康綸鈞, who calligraphed a brief announcement on the frontispiece, dated 1812.

¹⁰² Variants number over 300, which exceeds by nearly 200 the number of any other edition's variants. In many cases we can understand the true meaning of sundry statements made in the *HS* only with the benefit of the variants found in the K'ang. Even in the cases of some variant article titles, the K'ang tends to evoke more purely the philosophy otherwise propounded in the *HS*. In one instance in particular, the K'ang transposes the latter halves of two articles (*HS* I.x and I.xiv) and thereby reveals the true meanings of each article. On these matters, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 1078-82.

from all other editions, which of course also implies that the K'ang can boast the earliest publication date among all editions.

On the other hand, the K'ang shares with only the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and *Hsü-tao-tsang* editions a very singular title of the first article of Chapter I of the *Hua shu*. This title is "Epigraph of the Palace of the Azure Ultimate" *Tzu-chi-hung pei* 紫極宮碑. In other editions Article I.i is entitled either "Way Transformation" (*Tao-hua* 道化, the same as the title of the first chapter), "Numen Transformation" (*shen-hua* 神化, in *Jung-yüan ts'ung-shu*), or left untitled. The shared title then represents that a unique connection exists between the K'ang, *Tao-tsang Hua shu*, and *Hsü-tao-tsang*, which fact only further confirms that the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and related texts derive from the secular lineage of *Hua shu* transmission.

Finally in support of this theory of the transmission of these texts, we may note first that the *Tzu-hui Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* is directly the source text for the *Mo-hai chin-hu* and *Chu-ts'ung pieh-lu* editions of the single-chapter "*Hua Shu*" and "*Tan-tzu Hua Shu*" by T'an Ch'iao.¹⁰³ In addition, from distinct variants shared by the *Tzu-hui Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* and the *Yen-i chih-lin* edition of the "*Hua Shu*," we know that the *Tzu-hui* is as well this text's source. The importance of this intelligence becomes apparent when we observe that the *Tzu-hui*, *Mo-hai*, *Chu-ts'ung*, and *Yen-i* texts share with the various *Hua shu* texts derived from the Tai-wang government edition (those of the *Erh-shih-tzu*, Wan-wei-shan-t'ang *Shuo-fu*, Pao-yen-t'ang *pi-chi*, *Tao-shu ch'üan-chi*, *Cheng-chüeh-lou ts'ung-k'an*, and *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu*) many variant characters. Thus it becomes apparent that the *Tzu-hui* and *Pai-chia Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts constitute the link that ties together all extant editions of the *Hua shu*, fitting centrally between the two other primary Ming lineages of the work's transmission (the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and Tai-wang). Once again this suggests that the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts represent an earlier lineage from which the two major Ming lineages derived, which, in turn, supports the contention that the extant *Hua shu* texts issued not from a Taoist but, instead, the secular transmission of the text. The textual variants that occur between the *Tao-tsang Hua shu* and the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts on the one hand, and between the *Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* texts and those descended from the Tai-wang government edition on the other, can be understood to have arisen from the branching off of

¹⁰³ The *Mo-hai chin-hu* was published in 1809; its *Tan-tzu Hua shu* was copied directly from the *Tzu-hui Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu* (I have consulted an original 1809 edn. housed in Gest Oriental Library, Princeton University). The *Chu-ts'ung pieh-lu* compendium was published between 1821 and 1850. Its *HS* text was drawn from the *Mo-hai* text and is absolutely identical with it (I have collated the edn. of 1851-1861 held at the Harvard-Yenching Library). The *Yen-i chih-lin* was published in 1623 (rpt. Shanghai: Shang-hai shang-wu, 1937). Recall that the *Tzu-hui* was published in 1576 and the *Pai-chia* in 1567.

each of these sub-lineages at different times from an original text, one that derived ultimately from the Sung dynasty lineage of the six-chapter “*Hua Shu*, by Sung Ch’i-ch’iu.” The latter-mentioned lineage survives today in the K’ang edition, while its descendant text and the most direct ancestor of all other current editions is the *Pai-chia Ch’i-ch’iu-tzu*. In turn the *Tzu-hui Ch’i-ch’iu-tzu*, which must be later since it possesses the miscellaneous textual notes, must also have derived from the *Pai-chia*.

STRUCTURAL QUESTIONS AND THE ISSUE OF AUTHORSHIP

In an earlier section it was remarked that whereas Sung Ch’i-ch’iu in his “Preface” to the *Hua shu* (as well as all others who subsequently have written on the work) afforded equal weight to the six chapters of the work, originally the text was not intended to be read in this way. While the difference in interpretation that results in such disparate treatments of the text involves both structural and philosophical concerns, spatial limitations allow for only the former type of evidence to be addressed here. This evidence in conjunction with other textual and circumstantial considerations indicates that Ch’en T’uan’s old story of Sung’s acquisition of the work from T’an Ch’iao is true.

Inconsistencies in the structure of the *Hua shu* surface when we collate the many received editions. First, we have noted previously how the first article of the book is entitled variously “Way Transformation,” “Numen Transformation” (*Jung-yüan ts’ung-shu*), or “Epigraph of the Palace of the Azure Ultimate” (K’ang, *Tao-tsang Hua shu*, *Hsü-tao-tsang*), or it has been left untitled (*Chu-ts’ung pieh-lu*, *Mo-hai chin-hu*, *Tzu-hui*, and Wan-wei-shan-t’ang *Shuo-fu*). Even more significantly, this same article is treated variably as the first article of chapter 1 (*Pai-chia*, *Hua shu hsün sheng*, *Pao-yen-t’ang pi-chi*, Han-fen-lou *Shuo-fu* ed. table of contents [no text surviving], *Tao-tsang Hua shu*) or a preface to either chapter 1 or the entire book (*Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu*, *Chu-ts’ung pieh-lu*, *Mo-hai chin-hu*, *Tzu-hui*, *Tao-shu ch’üan-chi*, *Yen-i chih-lin*, Wan-wei-shan-t’ang *Shuo-fu*, *Cheng-chüeh-lou ts’ung-k’an*, *T’ang-sung ts’ung-shu*). Furthermore, in several cases this article has been treated inconsistently within one edition: included in the text fully as either a preface or the first article of the first chapter, it nevertheless remains unlisted in the table of contents that precedes the text and includes all other 109 articles of the *Hua shu* (K’ang, *Tao-shu ch’üan-chi*, *Hsü-tao-tsang*, *Tao-tsung liu-shu*, *Erh-shih-tzu*, *Pao-yen-t’ang pi-chi*, Wan-wei-shan-t’ang *Shuo-fu*, *Cheng-chüeh-lou ts’ung-k’an*, *T’ang-sung ts’ung-shu*).

The fact that such inconsistencies exist in so many editions suggests that the first article originally was not an article but in reality a preface. This then brings us to question again the legitimacy of Sung Ch’i-ch’iu’s “Preface” to the

Hua shu, for, if the first article is truly a preface, then there are only 109 articles to the *Hua shu*, making highly suspicious the claim made in Sung’s “Preface” that the work consists of 110 articles.¹⁰⁴ This means that either 1. Sung’s “Preface” is spurious; 2. Sung indeed stole the work from T’an Ch’iao and edited/published it under his own name with 110 articles, while T’an otherwise transmitted a copy of his pre-Sung Ch’i-ch’iu work to others, whereafter someone conflated the two editions – though not thoroughly successfully – and thereby created the structural confusion in *Hua shu* editions transmitted to the present under either Sung’s or T’an’s name; or, veritably impossibly, 3. the structural instabilities across *Hua shu* editions are purely coincidental.

Additional evidence of structural inconsistency among *Hua shu* editions strongly supports the second scenario while simultaneously demonstrating the inadequacy of propositions 1. and 3. First, the very existence of single-chapter *Hua shu* texts evinces at least the existence of confusion over the meaning of the contents of the *Hua shu*. This is true especially of the *Pai-chia Ch’i-ch’iu-tzu*, in which, aside from article titles, no textual divisions whatsoever exist. Although the *Pai-chia* descended from a six-chapter text, this structural instability suggests that conflicting versions of the book existed during the Sung. Second, in two early texts that appear to have enjoyed an unique and separate transmission, the early-eleventh-century “Five Transformations” (discussed below) and the abridged “T’an Ching-sheng *Hua Shu*” collected in Tung Chin-ch’un’s fourteenth-century *Ch’ün-hsien yao-yü tsuan-chi*, text is divided into neither arti-

¹⁰⁴ Further evidence dating from as early as the Sung attests to inconsistency in both article titles and numbers, although Ch’en Ching-yüan’s mention of “The Child” (*Chih-tzu* 稚子, Article I.xviii in all complete editions) in his “Colophon” of 1060 confirms at least that titles existed at that time. But the nature of the titles of articles in the *HS* is itself inconsistent: while most derive from characters found in the first phrase or two of the article (following in modified form ancient practice), twenty-nine are topical and descriptive. Moreover, in all but what is most likely the earliest complete *HS* edition, the K’ang, two distinct articles, II.xv and IV.vi, both are entitled “Ocean Fish” (“*Hai-yü*” 海魚). In the K’ang, the title of IV.vi is “The Loligo” (“*Mo-yü*” 墨魚). Moreover, the titles of several other articles are unique in the K’ang edition (*HS* II.iii, III.iv, IV.vi, IV.x, IV.xi, and V.x), and the *Pai-chia Ch’i-ch’iu-tzu*, another text that likely is among our earliest, also contains one unique article title (*HS* IV.iii). Additionally, in part of what survives of the *HS* text originally included in the Han-fen-lou recension of the fourteenth-century *Shuo fu*, i.e. the table of contents thereto, two articles that in all extant editions are placed in the positions of *HS* IV.viii and IV.ix (“Rescuing Things” [“*Chiu-wu*” 救物] and “The Way of Calligraphy” [“*Shu-tao*” 書道], respectively) are identified as having occurred in this lost edition at the end of chap. 3. The meaning of this rearrangement likely is insignificant, since (1) no other *HS* edition, early or late, follows this arrangement, and (2) even in the early-eleventh-century “Five Transformations” the text correlative to the *HS* article “Rescuing Things” is found in sequence according to its normal placement in the *HS* in chap. 4. In fact, one might employ this example to bolster the argument that one should not, on the basis of such evidence, question the legitimacy of Sung’s “Preface.” For a chart showing all known textual inconsistencies among *HS* editions of the sort reviewed in this note, see Didier, “Way Transformation,” pp. 1091–97.

cles nor chapters. Furthermore, the inconsistent nature of *Hua shu* article titles, as reviewed in the immediately preceding note, suggests again some degree of editorial confusion. Such evidence also helps us to resist overburdening Sung's "Preface" with undue suspicion of its integrity, for if article titles can change across editions seemingly randomly, and clearly without precedent in ancestral texts, then such evidence cannot be used to impugn Sung's claim of 110 articles existing in 930.

But much more significantly, five *Hua shu* editions dating from the late sixteenth to mid-seventeenth centuries, though appearing to consist of the usual six chapters, in fact contain only five. In the *Hua shu hsün sheng*, *Pao-yen-t'ang pi-chi*, *Tao-tsung liu-shu*, *Erh-shih-tzu*, and *Tao-shu ch'üan-chi* editions the first chapter is treated as a prefatory body to the remaining five chapters. In these editions it is not the first chapter but only the first *article* (or preface, that is, *Hua shu* I.1) that is entitled "Way Transformation" (*tao-hua*), while the entire contents of what in other editions is treated as the first chapter of the work remains untitled and therefore acts as a prefatory body to the five chapters that follow.¹⁰⁵

The importance of this observation surfaces when we turn our attention to what is confirmably the earliest *Hua shu*-related text, datable to the decade of 1023-1033. It is brief, about one-eighth the length of the full *Hua shu*, and differs in many other ways from the *Hua shu*. It is 1. entitled "Five Transformations" (*Wu-hua* 五化); 2. credited to "T'an-tzu" (that is, Master T'an) or "*The T'an-tzu*" 譚子; 3. has no textual divisions whatsoever (neither chapters nor articles are separated out or entitled); and, most significant, 4. nonetheless consists of one prefatory section and five sections subsequent to and philosophically subsumed under it, all of whose rubrics furthermore correspond to the chapter titles of the *Hua shu* and all of whose content, though abridged, comports with and proceeds in a sequence identical to the articles of the *Hua shu*.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ In these editions, chapter titles (starting with chapter 2) begin in the second space from the top of the page, while article titles begin on the subsequent vertical line in the third space from the top of the page. In all five of these editions, only the first chapter lacks the initial chapter title and begins with the article title of "Tao-hua," the characters for which disyllabic compound are placed in the second and third spaces from the top of the page. In each case, therefore, the title represents the contents of the article only, and not what in other editions are the contents of the entire first chapter.

¹⁰⁶ For detailed treatments of this text and its dating, see Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 378-81, 432-40, 1041-43. See also the commentary to the translation of the *HS* in *ibid.*, pp. 603-844, where all differences between the "Five Transformations" and *HS* editions are noted and explained. Still, it should be stressed here that the "Five Transformations" certainly is an abridged form of a more replete *HS*-like text that no longer exists. But this does not mean that Tseng Ts'ao, editor of the *Tao shu* (*TT* no. 641-48), actively intervened in the text of the "Five Transformations." While he apparently did so elsewhere (in the case of the "Li Wa chuan" in his *Lei shuo* 類說; Glen Dudbridge, *The Tale of Li Wa: Study and Critical Edition of a Chinese Story from the Ninth Century* [London: Ithaca Press, 1983], pp. 1-14), in the *Tao shu* Tseng often identified

This structure, then, is identical to the actual quinary framework of those *Hua shu* editions named above.

Because it preserves an *unadulterated* quinary structure, the entire approach of the "Five Transformations" differs from that of the *Hua shu*. Its text begins thusly: "T'an-tzu says, 'The Utmost Way has five transformations therein. What is Way Transformation?...' " Subsequent to this rhetorical question we read text correlative to the chapter "Way Transformation" of the *Hua shu*. After several pages of continuous text that reproduces contiguously several *Hua shu* articles either partially or fully (and often differing from *Hua shu* text in philosophically momentous ways), we are asked, "What is Arts Transformation?" Hereafter we read text correlative with that of chapter 2 of the *Hua shu*, "Arts Transformation." Similarly, the "Five Transformations" subsequently introduces text correlative with chapters 3 through 6 of the *Hua shu* by employing the same rhetorical question but substituting the appropriate "transformation" in place of the "Way" and "Arts" of the first two sections. Thus, while the "Five Transformations" and *Hua shu* share the same essential divisions, these textual divisions are weighted differently: whereas the *Hua shu* as we have received it in most editions weighs the six divisions evenly, the "Five Transformations" subsumes the five transformations of Arts, Potency, Humaneness, Food, and Frugality under the umbrella universal principle of Way Transformation. This is apparent in the introductory phrase of the text, "The Utmost Way has five transformations therein," which no *Hua shu* edition reproduces.

The general structural instability across editions that pivots both on the first article and first chapter and on the variable structural divisions of five and six demonstrates that at least two distinct textual traditions existed and that they interfered with one another during the Sung dynasty. As we will continue to witness below, the quinary was the original structure of the *Hua shu*, whose five sections were prefaced by what has come to be misconstrued to be the first of six chapters that mistakenly have been afforded equal weight.

Although there is not the space here to present such arguments, philosophical evidence very strongly supports this conclusion. Most importantly, the six-chapter apparatus is philosophically untenable. Careful analysis of the content and text of not only the illuminating "Five Transformations" but also the six-chapter *Hua shu* reveals clearly how it was transformed philosophically

himself as a commentator when he intervened in a text, using his sobriquet, Master Ultimate Drifter (Chih-yu-tzu 至辭子). There thus is no reason to doubt that, aside from abridgements, Tseng's only intervention into the "Five Transformations" text is the introductory phrase, "[The] T'an-tzu says ..." (T'an-tzu yüeh 譚子曰).

from a quinary to a sexpartite text.¹⁰⁷ But even glossing over the philosophical question very perfunctorily and only circumstantially, considering the context of Chinese intellectual history we can of course see that philosophically only the one-and-five structure of the “Five Transformations” is feasible: 1. The Way always is the ultimate and unique principle, whether it is umbellate and immanent, primordial and transcendent, or both; 2. throughout Chinese intellectual history and across traditions, the One always serves as both the primordial originator and inevitable destination of all; 3. the number five is far more likely than six to serve as the foundational numeral of a Chinese philosophy – consider the ubiquitous groups of five correlative with that most basic set that throughout Chinese culture accounts for the existence of the palpable universe and its functions, the Five Processes (*wu-hsing* 五行).

Weighing the recurrence of the pivotal number five in the structure and philosophy of this early lineage of *Hua shu* texts, then eleventh-century historian Lung Kun’s description of Sung Ch’i-ch’iu’s “*Hua Shu*” as consisting of “fifty sections” (*wu-shih-yü-p’ien* 五十餘篇)¹⁰⁸ seems not to threaten the authenticity of Sung’s “Preface”¹⁰⁹ as much as it implies once more the shadow of the presence of the original quinary division. It very well could be that Lung did not actually see a text but only passed on what he had heard or read of the work, in the process misreporting with the addition of the ten-multiplier “*shih-yü*” the number of sections to be fifty when in fact there were only five.

One point to draw from the above is that no evidence reliably suggests that Sung’s “Preface” is spurious, which indicates further and very significantly that Sung was neither the original author of the *Hua shu* nor the creator of what we might call the “Tao-and-five-transformation” philosophy that both the “Five Transformations” and, despite the attempt to conceal it, the *Hua shu* express. This is because in his “Preface” Sung, who certainly appears to have been responsible for transforming the quinary “Five Transformations” into the sexpartite *Hua shu*, demonstrated through his promotion of a six-chapter approach his ignorance of the umbellate nature of the Way of the quinary philosophy of the original work.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ See Didier, “Way Transformation,” pp. 347–481.

¹⁰⁸ Or, less likely, “fifty-and-some articles,” the difference turning on the interpretation of the character *yü* 餘 to mean either “zero” or “and more.” See *CNYS*, p. 90.

¹⁰⁹ If nothing else, the *HS* text to which Lung referred might have been abridged, but in both number and name *HS* articles can change seemingly randomly across editions (see n. 104, above). Consider also the speciously misleading state of the *Pai-chia Ch’i-ch’iu-tzu* text, whose lack of fifteen-and-a-half articles might cause one to believe mistakenly that the *HS* was emended after this edn. was published. Therefore, the number of articles in or reported to have been in a given edition cannot be allowed to undermine an otherwise solid piece of evidence.

¹¹⁰ As was pointed out previously in the brief introductory overview of the philosophy of the

Under such considerations, the presence of two authorial hands is unmistakable. Now, given that the “Five Transformations” is attributed to “T’an-tzu” (or *The T’an-tzu*) and that all early *Hua shu* texts – including the original 110-article text of 930 – were known to have credited authorship to Sung Ch’i-ch’iu, it is natural to deduce both that T’an Ch’iao authored the former and Sung the latter and also that Ch’en T’uan’s story of the transference from T’an to Sung of the work that came to be the *Hua shu* is true. Further evidence supports this view.

First, that Sung Ch’i-ch’iu would both involve himself in editing/publishing a work of metaphysical, epistemological, and alchemical theory such as the *Hua shu* and also misunderstand it is unremarkable. He was after all well known as both a patron of “extramundane” magicians, prognosticators, and priests and a follower of their “arts” such as numerology, alchemy, physiognomy, geomancy, astrology, and sorcery. Indeed, he maintained many such men in a park with pavilions that he had built especially to accommodate them.¹¹¹ As Ma Ling wrote in or before 1105, “He (Sung) lavished emoluments on them so that they would provide him with [the means of] disseminating his name [in fame throughout the world]...”¹¹² T’an Ch’iao very well could have been the one among these men who succeeded in providing Sung with his means of achieving fame. After all, Sung, a self-educated man insecure over his lack of classical training, could not have written the *Hua shu*, which is a work full of classical allusions and written in a refined classical hand.¹¹³ This would explain as well why and how Sung would have misunderstood or lacked the ability to appreciate the subtle philosophy of the pre-sexpartite or quinary

HS the “Preface” promotes employing the *HS* via a defensive approach to an inevitably degenerative political circumstance, whereas the *HS* itself clearly teaches just the opposite, i.e. that, since inevitably one will encounter only a state already fully degenerated, then he should begin with the humblest tack of “Frugality Transformation” in order to rebuild the pristine unity of the world represented fully in “Way Transformation.”

¹¹¹ *CNYS* 4, p. 5a; Ma, *Nan Tang shu* 20, p. 5b (p. 340); Wu, *Shih-kuo ch’un-ch’iu* 20, p. 296; *Chiang-nan yü-tsai* 江南餘載 (*SKCS*, vol. 464), p. 6a (p. 143). Several songs, poems, and essays dedicated to such men in Sung’s *Yü-kuan chao-shen chü* 玉管照神局 also attest to his interest in and close associations with them (Lu Hsin-yüan 陸心源, ed., *Shih-wan-chüan-lou ts’ung-shu* 十萬卷樓叢書 [1882 edn.], ts’e 105, ch. 1).

¹¹² Ma, *Nan Tang shu* 20, p. 5b (p. 340).

¹¹³ As noted previously, Sung was orphaned at a young age and spent much of his youth wandering the south until he was able to attract the attention of Hsü Chih-kao, the future founding emperor of the Southern T’ang state. Sung therefore had neither the resources nor the time to acquire a classical education, and often felt the sting of his literary inferiority when in official functions he came into contact with classically trained scholars. It is also well known that Sung employed others to do his official writing for him. See *CNYS* 4; Ma, *Nan Tang shu* 20; Lu, *Nan Tang shu* 4.

original *Hua shu* text. It also accounts for Sung's "Preface" having been written in a style far inferior to but mimicking of the *Hua shu*.¹¹⁴

By the same token, we know from his biography in the *Hsü-hsien-chuan* that T'an Ch'iao, the son of a director of education in the capital, was well schooled in both the classics and unorthodox works, and was trained in respiratory exercises (the basis of internal alchemical theories so prominent in the *Hua shu*) by Taoist priests on Mount Sung and elsewhere. Thus, in terms of both content and written style, T'an Ch'iao should have been able to meet the demands that writing the *Hua shu* must have made on the author.

Further regarding style, reading the *Hua shu* one often encounters a form of humble self-address commonly employed by a government official when speaking to his king or emperor. This is the term *hsiao-jen* 小人, which can be understood here to mean "small (or 'inferior') man." Now, whereas a chancellor of the Southern T'ang kingdom certainly would have addressed the monarch of that state, and also would have used at such times this or another similarly self-effacing first-person pronominal, an unemployed, unfettered, wandering, and unimpressed Taoist adept likely would not have done either.¹¹⁵ It could not be mere happenstance that many points of likely corruption of the text occur precisely in conjunction with this usage. Therefore, here we see the imprint of Sung Ch'i-ch'iu on a text he could not have written.

Additional considerations supportive of the theory of dual authorship of the *Hua shu* by T'an and Sung include the fact that the classically trained thinker and writer who originated the basic text and philosophy of the *Hua shu* would have to have had access to the wealth and textual resources that only a well connected and rewarded man could have provided. Specifically, the article *Hua shu* I.x describes the author's use of four lenses to alter the perceived appearances of things. Now, this is apparently the first known systematic account in world literature of the properties of these four basic lenses.¹¹⁶ In the early tenth century these might have been the only such lenses in existence; at least they were extremely rare and expensive – far too expensive for anyone but the wealthiest of individuals, or perhaps religious institutions, to afford. It

¹¹⁴ See Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 387–90, 1084–85.

¹¹⁵ Wang Shih-chen 王世貞 made this point about the usage *hsiao-jen* in a brief essay on the *IS* found in his *Yen-chou shan-jen hsü-kao* 兗州山人續稿 (rpt. of an edn. dated 1628–44; in *Ming-jen wen-chi ts'ung-k'an* 明人文集叢刊 [Taipei: Wen-hai ch'u-pan-she, 1970], ch. 157, p. 22a [p. 721]). Instances of this term's appearance in corrupted sections of text are noted in the commentary to the translation in Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 603–844.

¹¹⁶ The four basic lenses identified in I.x include the convex, concave, biconvex, and biconcave. See Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China* 4.1, p. 117, as well as the translation of I.x in Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 635–37.

seems unlikely that an untrammelled and itinerant recluse such as T'an Ch'iao would have had access to them but for the opportunity provided by a wealthy and well connected individual – one such as Sung Ch'i-ch'iu, who at the time was one among the most wealthy, powerful, and influential people in China and, therefore, also the world.

Additionally with regard to Sung Ch'i-ch'iu and his activities, if he had written the *Hua shu*, then one would expect his other major work, the *Yü-kuan chao-shen chü*, to express a similar philosophy or at least be expressed in a consonant vocabulary and phraseology.¹¹⁷ But this work of physiognomy does not display any sign that its author was the same as that of the *Hua shu*. In its first of three chapters are several miscellaneous essays, prose-poems (*fu*), and other writings that provide ample opportunity for an expression of thought commensurate with the unique *Hua shu* philosophy, but this we do not find therein. Furthermore, in that one of the final thrusts of the *Hua shu* is that "arts" (*shu*) are self-delusory, it is questionable that the author of the *Hua shu* would have engaged in a study and exposition of such "arts" as physiognomy.

Finally, in the first chapter of Sung's *Yü-kuan chao-shen chü* we find three short pieces dedicated to none other than T'an Ch'iao's student, Ch'en T'uan. In that they demonstrate that Sung knew Ch'en, then as much as their presence strengthens claims for Sung's authorship of the *Yü-kuan chao-shen chü* they also prove that Sung was involved with Ch'en's circle, which circle of course included T'an Ch'iao. At least, it appears that Ch'en was among Sung's stipendiaries and therefore would have known intimately the affairs of not only T'an, but Sung, as well. Hence, while there is no reason to doubt the verity of Ch'en's claims as to Sung's appropriation of the *Hua shu* from T'an Ch'iao, there is a large and persuasive body of evidence to support it. For these reasons one reasonably can conclude only that while T'an Ch'iao wrote the essence of the *Hua shu* text, Sung edited and also emended it, and in the process corrupted both the structure of and the *apparent* philosophy expressed through the work.

One goal of this essay has been to bring to light and settle some basic problems surrounding a work both prominent in its own now-obscure period and also central in bringing about the momentous transformations in Chinese intellectual history that occurred in subsequent centuries. It is hoped further that this study has demonstrated some ways in which we may work toward maximizing the usefulness of the few sources available for students of tenth-century Chinese history.

¹¹⁷ I have consulted the 3-chap. text originally extracted from the *Yung-lo ta-tien* and published in the *Shih-wan-chüan-lou ts'ung-shu*. One-, 2-, and 10-chap. edns. transmitted independently are less likely to represent the original work. See Ting, *Shan-pen shu-shih ts'ang-shu chih* 17,

APPENDIX: Extant Complete Editions of the Hua shu

This is not a complete catalog, and the descriptions cover only very basic information (see further Didier, "Way Transformation," pp. 1098–1114). I list only the most salient editions – those held in Taiwan and mainland Chinese libraries. Neither do I include the numerous reproductions of the 1926 Han-fen-lou rpt. of the *TT* edn.

Ch'i-ch'iu-tzu 齊丘子

Ming monograph, printed, *Ming-k'an pai-k'ou shih-hang shih-chiu-tzu* 明刊白口十行十九字, 1 chapter.¹¹⁸

Pai-chia lei-tsu'an 百家類纂, 1 chapter (no divisions), Shen Chin 沈津, compiler, 1567.

Tzu-hui 子集, 1 chapter (no divisions), 1576, 1937 (Shanghai: Shang-wu) reprint.

Hua shu 化書

Chu-ts'ung pieh-lu 珠叢別錄, 1 chapter (no divisions), Ch'ien Hsi-tso 錢熙祚, compiler, 1851–61.

Fan-yüeh p'ien 反約篇, 6 chapters, Li Kuang-t'ing 李光廷 (1812–1880), compiler, 1862–74 (this title appears to be an alternate title of the *Shou-yüeh-p'ien ts'ung-shu* 守約篇叢書, that is, the *Jung-yüan ts'ung-shu*).

Jung-yüan ts'ung-shu 榕園叢書, 6 chapters, Li Kuang-t'ing, compiler, 1862–74.

Ku-chin i-shih 古今逸史, Wu Kuan-chiao 吳琯校 (Ming), ed., 6 chapters.

Ko-chih ts'ung-shu 格致叢書, Hu Wen-huan 胡文煥 (Ming), ed., 6 chapters, ca. 1573–1619.

Lan-ko chiu-ch'ao-pen 藍格舊鈔本, 1 chapter, in *Shuo-fu*, Ch. 42.

Mo-hai chin-hu 墨海金壺, Chang Hai-p'eng 張海鵬, ed., 1 chapter, 1809.

Monographs in Peking Library: [1] Yüan dynasty (6 *chüan* [chapters], four *ts'e* [fascicles 冊]), published by the family school of Ch'in Sheng 秦昇家塾; [2] 1504 Cheng Ch'ang-ch'ing 鄭常清 / Liu Ta 劉達 (6 *chüan*, 1 *ts'e*, with another 1 *chüan* of annotations on character pronunciation and meaning) edn. based on the 1447–64 Tai-wang government edn.

Pai-ming chia shu 百家名書, 6 chapters.

Tao-tsang 道藏 (*Tao-tsang Hua shu* 道藏化書), 6 chapters, in *Cheng-t'ung Tao-tsang* 724.

Tao-tsung liu-shu 道宗六書, 6 chapters, Li Shih 李拭, compiler, ca. 1573–1619.¹¹⁹

Ting Chen-yen 丁禎彥 and Li Ssu-chen 李似珍, eds., *Hua Shu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1996).

Wen-yüan-ko Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu 文淵閣四庫全書, 6 chapters, 1782.

Hua shu, by Sung Ch'i-ch'iu 宋齊丘化書

K'ang 康 edition: Monograph, 6 chapters (*chüan*), two fascicles (*ts'e* 冊), with a preliminary notice (*t'i-k'uan* 題款) by K'ang Lun-chün 康綸鈞 dated 1812. Text datable to 1279–1621.¹²⁰

Hua shu hsin sheng 化書新聲

Tao-tsang chi-yao 道藏輯要 (*TTCY*), 1 chapter (no divisions), Wang I-ch'ing 王一新, annotator, 1594–7.

Ssu-ching 四經, 7 chapters, Wang I-ch'ing, compiler, 1573–1619.

Tan-tzu 譚子

Chu-tzu hui-han 諸子彙函, selections with commentaries, Kuei Yu-kuang 歸有光 (1507–1571), compiler.

Tan-tzu Hua shu 譚子化書 Editions

Cheng-chüeh-lou ts'ung-shu 正覺樓叢書, 6 chapters, 19th c., Wu-ch'ang, Hupei Ch'ung-wen shu-chü.

Chu-tzu pao-i 諸子褒異, 3 *chüan* 卷 (here likely fascicles, not chapters), compiler unknown, ca. 1621–44.

Erh-shih-tzu 二十子, 6 chapters, Wu Mien-hsüeh 吳勉學, compiler, 1621–27.

Ho chu-ming chia p'i-tien chu-tzu ch'üan-shu 合諸名家批點諸子全書, 6 chapters, 1621–27, Hangkow.

Ho-k'o Chou-Ch'in ching-shu shih-chung 合刻周秦經書十種, 6 chapters, Yang Shen, commentator (*p'ing* 評), Ming, Hsi-fan Bookstore 奚番書屋.

characters to a line. See Fu Tseng-hsiang, *Ts'ang-yüan ch'ün-shu ching-yen lu*, p. 671, and Fu Tseng-hsiang, *Shuang-chien-lou shan-pen shu-mu*, p. 108.

¹¹⁹ I would like to thank Dr. Chi Wang, Director, and Dr. Mi Chu Wiens, Area Specialist, of the Chinese Section of the Asian Division, Library of Congress, for their expert assistance in providing access to this rare compendium, acquired by the Library of Congress in 1920.

¹²⁰ This is the text collected by Chiang Meng-p'ing 蔣孟蘋 and collated by Fu Tseng-hsiang 傅增湘. On these matters see Chang Yüan-chi, *Han-fen-lou chin-yü-shu-lu*, p. 41a; Fu Tseng-hsiang, *Ts'ang-yüan ch'ün-shu ching-yen lu*, p. 671; and "Chiang Meng-p'ing ts'ang Sung-k'an-pen pa," in Ting and Li, *Hua shu*, p. 78. For the dating of this text, see n. 101, above.

p. 12a. The editors of the *Ssu-k'u t'i-yao* ("Shu-shu lei" 術數類, pp. 2263–64) considered that the *Yü-kuan chao-shen chü* was a product of Sung's stipendiaries, much as I argue concerning the *HS*.

¹¹⁸ This text now is in the National Central Library, Taipei, and most likely is the one cataloged by Fu Tseng-hsiang and described by him as being a reprint of a Sung edition: Both this and Fu's are Ming monograph printed texts and have ten lines of text to a page and nineteen

- Pao-yen-t'ang pi-chi* 寶顏堂秘笈 (*PYTTC*), 6 chapters, Ch'en Chi-ju 陳繼儒, compiler, 1615.
- Pi-ts'e ts'ung-shuo* 祕冊叢說, 1 chapter, manuscript.
- Tang-Sung ts'ung-shu* 唐宋叢書, 6 chapters, Chung Jen-chieh 鍾人傑, ed., ca. 1628-44.
- Tao-shu ch'üan-chi* 道書全集, 6 chapters, ca. 1573-1619 (ed. of 1628-44; rpt. Peking: Chung-kuo shu-tien, 1990), pp. 644-663.
- [*Wan-li*] *Hsü Tao-tsang* 續道藏, 6 chapters, in *Cheng-t'ung Tao-tsang* 1107.
- Wan-wei shan-t'ang* 宛委山堂 (120-chapter) *Shuo-fu*, 6 chapters, 1647.
- Yen-i chih-lin* 鹽邑志林, 1 chapter (no divisions), 1621-1627.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>CNYS</i>	<i>Chiang-nan yeh-shih</i> 江南野史
<i>CTW</i>	<i>Ch'üan Tang wen</i> 全唐文
<i>HHC</i>	<i>Hsü-hsien-chuan</i> 續仙傳
<i>HS</i>	<i>Hua shu</i> 化書
<i>LSCH</i>	<i>Li-shih chen-hsien t'i-tao t'ung-chien</i> 歷世真仙體道通鑑
<i>NYTSC</i>	<i>Nan-yüeh tsung-sheng chi</i> 南嶽總勝集
<i>PPTS</i>	<i>Pai-pu ts'ung-shu chi-ch'eng</i> 百部叢書集成
<i>PYTTC</i>	<i>Pao-yen-t'ang pi-chi</i> 寶顏堂秘笈
<i>SKCS</i>	<i>Wen-yüan-ko Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu</i> 文淵閣四庫全書
<i>TT</i>	<i>Cheng-t'ung tao-tsang</i> 正統道藏
<i>TTCY</i>	<i>Tao-tsang chi-yao</i> 道藏輯要