Review of *Celestial Masters: History and Ritual in Early Daoist Communities*

CELESTIAL MASTERS: HISTORY AND RITUAL IN EARLY DAOIST COMMUNITIES

By Terry F. Kleeman
Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series, 102
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2016
Pp. xiii + 425. Maps, illustrations. $49.95.

REVIEWER: *Grégoire Espesset*
Centre de recherche sur les civilisations de l'Asie orientale
Paris, France, 75005

Kleeman's latest book is a noteworthy attempt at constructing a consistent picture of the Way of the Celestial Master (*tianshi dao* 天師道) as a major East Asian religion that, just as some medieval Chinese hagiographers imagined it, would have existed as early as the mid-second century CE, and of its main features up to the sixth century. Its bulk consists of translations, with paraphrase and discussions, of generous excerpts from mainly religious texts (nearly all found in the mid-fifteenth century authoritative bibliotheca known to Westerners as the "Daoist Canon") and a handful of historiographical sources. Combining authorial conjecture with conflicting historical accounts, fragments of normative exposés sometimes difficult to contextualize, and hagiographical stories, it succeeds in bringing between two covers versatile data hitherto dispersed and not always available in English. But the classic Sinological approach harking back to the heyday of Daoist studies in the 1970s–1980s (on page 3, Kleeman's narrow understanding of the word "Daoism" relies on a paper published forty years ago), some knowledge of the Chinese language as sole method, and the fact that no new document or anything like a fresh theoretical paradigm is put forth, position the book as a conservative synthesis. Its first half, as argued below, will not convince exigent historians and attentive readers; but its second half, more descriptive and nearly free from historical ambition, will prove helpful as a sourcebook on daily life in some Daoist communities of medieval China. The volume should find a place on classroom shelves, but it will not supersede many of the earlier important publications on the subject—to which Kleeman twice admits a heavy debt ("Acknowledgements," xi–xiii; 1, n. 2)—while a range of defects discourage its use as reliable reference tool.

The introduction (1–17), with a short section on "Religion in the Eastern Han" (10–15), elicits a feeling of *déjà vu* and will be of some use to uninformed readers only. Two parts with four chapters each unfold, "History" (Part I) and "Ritual and Community" (Part II). Part I tackles "The Founding of the Celestial Master Church," examining "External Evidence" (chapter 1, 21–62) then "Internal Documents" (chapter 2, 63–110), before moving on to its situation in the third century (the long chapter 3, 111–89) and up to the sixth century, with surveys of the reformer Kou Qianzhi 寇謙之 (no dates given) in Northern China and the rebel Sun En 孫恩 (d. 402) in the South (the short chapter 4, 190–218, an abridgement of earlier scholarship). In Part II, the short chapter 5 ("Ritual Life," 221–39) describes the "oratory," the "parish," and the Daoist dress code. Chapter 6 ("The Daoist Citizen," 240–72) covers daily observances, assemblies, and communal banquets known as "kitchens" (*chu* 廚). The long chapter 7 ("The Novice," 273–324) examines issues related to the early religious career, "gender, class, and ethnicity," with a focus on somewhat repetitive formulaic documents and an appended translation of a "list of thirty-six rules for serving the master" (320–24). Chapter 8 ("The Libationer," 325–87), with more formulaic documents, expounds the duties of "the primary religious professional within the Celestial Master church" (325), including such procedures as divine petitioning, the drawing of "talismans," "pledge offerings," and "rituals for the dead." The actual contents only loosely espouse this structure: a mere few pages are of historical relevance in chapters 2–3, the bulk of which rather comes under Part II. Many translations and discussions are scattered across chapters, resulting in cases of inconsistency, self-contradiction, and redundancy.[1] A meager "epilogue" with minimalist notes swiftly bridges the gap between the chronological focus of the book and the next millennium and a half (five pages, 388–93). Bibliographical references (395–415) and an index by the author (417–25),[2] both selective, close the volume. The page layout is readable, with footnotes and abundant Chinese text, but copy-editing and proofreading could have been more careful.[3]

Methodology, summarily evoked (9, n. 16), is the book's most serious limitation, especially in Part I. Distinguishing between "external" and "internal" sources was probably inspired by the categories of "texts in general

and internal circulation" used by Schipper and Verellen in their *Companion* (2004). Not only has that artificial dichotomy been criticized (Boltz 2006; Kirkland 2007, 36–39), but Kleeman does not really apply it and refers to Daoist sources right from the first pages of the first chapter. In theory, that chapter relies on "four historical sources"—though the different authors, texts, and commentaries rather point to seven layers—compiled at various dates between the mid-third and late seventh century, and a Zhang Ling 張陵 "biography" perhaps compiled by Ge Hong 葛洪 in the early fourth century, known only from later quotations. Unable to decide if that biography should be treated as "external" or "internal," Kleeman splits it up between his first two chapters. (This is only one of the sources disorderedly dealt with: at 68–70, passages from a Daoist text are examined in the sequence of folios 20b, 14a–b, and 14a.) Repeatedly dismissing Ge Hong as "late as well as physically remote from Sichuan" (22), hence "not credible" (64), Kleeman rejects most of that biography as either a textual manipulation or blatant invention; but, when a fragment of it happens to fit his agenda, he accepts it as "an authentic piece of church lore" (67). In Part II, because the same Ge Hong noted the Daoist banquets, Kleeman suddenly praises him as a "great occultist" and "interested outsider" (258). This unsystematic and tendentious approach, characterized by temperamental volte-face and value judgments, not only confuses the reader, it results in self-contradiction and mistakes. For example, one of Kleeman's historical sources (chapter 1) does mention Zhang Ling, but contrary to what he claims at the beginning of chapter 2, it gives no date: the sentence—note the past tense—"We learned that [Zhang Ling] had come to Sichuan during the reign of Emperor Shun" (64) actually refers to an excerpt, only translated further on (72), from a religious—not historical—source postdating 420.

Kleeman rightly stresses that the well-known stele inscription dated 173 CE is "important" (32) and constitutes the "earliest concrete" evidence (74) that there existed a Celestial Master group in the Chengdu area before the "confusing" events of the late second century, but he overstates his case. True, the inscription antedates these events, but by a mere dozen years, not "several decades" (104), and its date actually matches an affirmation in the second earliest of Kleeman's "external" sources that, "during the Xiping reign period (172–78) wicked demonic bandits arose in great numbers" (28, Kleeman's picturesque translation; the term *yao* 妖 means "deviant," an epithet conventionally applied by historiographers of the era to virtually anyone disrupting social order [see Espesset 2014]; *yao* returns as "ghoulish" at 258). The inscription proves nothing as to when the movement was founded—it may have been young when the stele was carved, contrary to Kleeman's claim—or about the identity of the founder, nor does it nullify the possibility that Zhang Ling was an immortality seeker unrelated to the early group (see 66, n. 5, for an ungrounded criticism of Robinet, who was not "speculating" but merely commenting upon the sources). Nor does it confirm the Zhang Ling-Zhang Heng 張衡-Zhang Lu 張魯 patriarchal filiation given canonical status in later Daoist hagiography, whose historicity Kleeman is determined to prove—this is the second limitation of the book. This filiation cannot accommodate Zhang Xiu 張脩, even though the earliest (mid-third century) two testimonies—fragments of Liu Ai's 劉艾 *Xiandi ji* 獻帝紀 and Yu Huan's 魚豢 *Dianlüe* 典略 (translated at 28–30)—both present him as leader of the group before Zhang Lu had him killed and appropriated his followers. Later accounts diverge, generating a confusion over which many scholars have tumbled since Pei Songzhi 裴松之 in the early fifth century. To dodge the difficulty, Kleeman gives preference to later accounts over the earliest ones, discarded as being the product of people not "native of Sichuan," "based on official reports" or "on the account of a hostile outsider" (35–36). It seems naïve to assume that proximity must guarantee the reliability and objectivity of witnesses who, given the complex tangle of rivalry, alliance shifting, betrayal, and mutual killing among local clans painted in chapter 1, may well have had family or confessional interests to defend (Kleeman himself ingenuously notes that Chang Qu 常璩 "had served under the Daoist rulers of the Han-Cheng state," 31). Official historiography is no less trustworthy than local testimonies, once its pro-social order bias is accepted (Espesset 2014) and each historiographer's allegiance known (Chen Shou 陳壽 has been criticized for giving a generally positive image of the Caos 曹 and the Simas 司馬 in his *Sanguo zhi* 三國志). It seems likely that Ge Hong's Zhang Ling legendarium conflates diachronic traditions: an earlier one depicting him as a lore-master among others, and a later one reflecting his consecration as founding grandfather as part of Zhang Lu's legitimization strategy after Lu's recuperation of the group. This hypothesis is both closer to the earliest sources and less conjectural than Kleeman's suspicion that Zhang Xiu may have been "a follower of the Yellow Turbans" (35). (Why would the second earliest testimony—Yu Huan's—contrast him precisely with the Yellow Turban leader Zhang Jue?) To trace how narrative motifs evolved during the third and fourth centuries is methodologically sounder than to claim that any data failing to espouse later religious constructs is somehow vitiated. To make things worse, the argument is hampered by anachronisms ("religious fanatic" and "religious deviants," 35–36, would better read "rebels"), references to persons without date, name in Chinese, textual reference or background

information that would shed light on their relevance ("Sima Guang," 31; later "Zhuge Liang," 139), and *argumentum ad ignorantiam* ("It is significant that Chen Shou never refers to Zhang Xiu as a member of the Celestial Masters," 34).[4]

Still in chapter 1, Kleeman inserts a "map of the original twenty-four parishes established by Zhang Daoling" (33; same claim at 36) for geographical corroboration. And yet, as Verellen's minute study (2003) showed, no source firmly dated attests the existence of a regional network of "parishes" as early as the second century. That map should appear in chapter 3, together with an acknowledgement that Verellen published a cartography nearly identical thirteen years ago (2003, 21–23). Also chapter 3 rather than chapter 2 should have treated the *Xiang'er* 想爾 commentary to the *Laozi*, since it is not mentioned before the mid-third century, even if Kleeman—as others before him—assumes that it documents the Celestial Master group "before 215" (81–82). An entirely new translation could have improved our understanding of that commentary, instead of generally following Bokenkamp's one, published twenty years ago (1997), to the point of quoting incomprehensible passages (as conceded at 85). The transcriptions provided do not even reproduce the sixth-century manuscript, but edited versions thereof: only checking photographic reproductions (or Bokenkamp 1997, 145, n. 36) shows that an occurrence of "可得" regarded as superfluous has been deleted at 85.

The inscription dated 173 is silent about the founding of the group, but later "internal" sources point to a religious experience undergone by Zhang Ling in 142, even though they disagree as to the identity of the divine agency involved (see 67–73). Divine communication to a human being immediately suggests what historians of religions call "revelation," more or less in line with Kleeman's use of the term in a section on "The Revelation to Zhang Ling" (64–74). To this unindexed term, however, Kleeman soon prefers various formulae such as "spirit revelation" (indexed at 423), "oracular pronouncements" (76, n. 27), "oracular revelations" (112), "spirit mediums" (134), "spirit messages" (189), and "spirit communication" (341, n. 29). The sole substantiation offered comes from a perhaps sixth-century source (hence late, considering the book's chronological coverage) that suggests some human utterance induced by supernatural influence (76, n. 27; 121–22; 335), perhaps what historians of religions call "spirit possession." The fascinating premise that "China's first national religion" (111) originated in a séance or shamanistic trance would perhaps serve to put into perspective the eminently Western notion of religious revelation. But in light of several passages such as the following, it seems rather that Kleeman confounds revelation and spirit possession: "We see already in [the stele] inscription that heavenly spirits are communicating directly with the group, probably through some form of spirit possession, and that this sort of direct revelation" and so forth (78). In order to give force to this wrongful *idée fixe*, probably inspired by contemporary field research but lacking evidence in his material, Kleeman resorts to dubious arrangements. One of them is to retranslate as "speaking to you *through* the Determiner of Pneumas" (345, my emphasis) the very same phrase ("決氣相語") that, in a preceding chapter, he rendered simply as "the Determiner of Pneumas spoke to you" (131). Another arrangement is to venture that, in some texts' titles or as an opening word, the unremarkable term *jiao* 教 ("teaching") "seems to have been a technical term for spirit revelations from an authoritative source" (113). The term in this imagined special sense is capitalized (117, n. 5; 346), yet inconsistently (155); and, illogically, some texts introduced by the banal formula *tianshi yue* 天師曰 ("the Celestial Master says")—not at all by *jiao*—are treated wholesale as "Teachings" (155–56; 160–61). Indeed *jiao* appears so commonly in Daoist writings that one wonders how the Chinese of the time would make any difference between both uses (capitalization is possible in most alphabetic languages but not in Chinese).[5] Opportunely, the "spirit revelation" prism also serves to explain the intrinsic difficulties of some translated excerpts (156).

The description of the "charity hut" (*yishe* 義舍), an institution established by the early group, gives another insight into Kleeman's over-interpretative tendency. He first notes that Chen Shou likened this institution to the imperial relay stations (*tingzhuan* 亭傳, misspelled "亭專" at 56) of his time (*ru jin zhi tingzhuan* 如今之亭傳, 52)—the late third century—but then he suddenly states that it was "intended to replace" the relay stations. Where does this idea of replacement stem from? Not the source. Another example of overemphasis is the near-automatic use of "pure" to render *qing* 清 ("clear"). Purity may be a central concern in many religions, but Kleeman's justification is nonetheless unconvincing: his "pure criticism" for *qingyi* 清議 and "pure talk" for *qingtan* 清談 (88, n. 51) risk being misunderstood as pejorative (like "pure speculation"), unlike "clear criticism" and "clear talk." The phrase *qingming* 清明 ("clear and luminous") confirms the visual, esthetic quality conveyed by the term; Kleeman's "pure and illuminated" (89) does not really make sense, nor does "pure" as a writing requirement for drafting petitions (361). Despite the existence of known better candidates for purity (*chun* 淳, 181), "pure" returns for *bai* 白 (309) in the context of visualization practices. Also typical of Kleeman's methodological nonchalance is the swift process leading from a cryptic occurrence suspected of "[representing] a textual corruption" to "it seems safe to

assume what is intended is some reference to the divinized Laozi" only a few lines further on (69). (The problematic phrase—"漢始皇帝王神氣"—is translated as "divine pneuma of the August Thearch-King of the beginning of the Han" on page 68, then as "royal divine pneuma of the First Emperor of the Han" on 114.) Elsewhere, within a single sentence, the remark that "No member of the Zhang family is mentioned in connection with [a given military] expedition" suggests to Kleeman the exact opposite hypothesis that "the Zhangs may actually have been behind the campaign from the beginning" (139).

When will scholars challenge the commonplaces of twentieth-century Sinology instead of complacently reasserting them? The term *fu* 符 has several other attested meanings beside "talisman" and, as an excerpt translated on page 175 shows, some talismanic artifacts were not called *fu* (see also Espesset 2015, 494–97). But perhaps the most enduring cliché is that Zhang Lu's Hanzhong was a "theocracy." Based on excerpts deprived of any allusion to a polity ruled by a god, Kleeman's section boldly titled "The Hanzhong Theocracy" (37–51) actually recounts regional warfare in the years 194–216. Surely the Chinese of that time, as subjects of what "royal theocracy" best describes, would be puzzled that a given locality in the empire be singled out as "theocratic." Like those who have called Hanzhong "theocratic" before him, perhaps what Kleeman has in mind with his obsessive "true theocracy" (55, as opposed to what—false theocracy?) is, to quote the *Encyclopedia of Religion*, "[a society] where the clergy or priests rule, but this is not the exact denotation of the word, and another word, hierocracy, is available for such situations" (Jones 2005, 9109). The "theocratic" prism returns (200–201) in the early fifth century with Kou Qianzhi, again improperly, inasmuch as to support a religion and undergo an ordination ritual does not imply that Wei rulers saw themselves as Daoists before emperors, nor that the imperial administration was replaced by a religious one. Besides, it contradicts Kleeman's convincing definition of Kou's program as "a thoroughgoing plan to destroy communal Daoism at its roots and replace it with a state-sponsored system that closely resembles the pattern of patronage of northern Buddhism" (206).

Naturally, all the above are self-authoritative strategies designed to compensate for the lack of evidence and methodology. As a side effect, however, they increase the diachronic, linguistic, and cultural remove between ancient Sinitic texts and modern Western readership, in turn paving the way for essentialism, exoticism, and other misapprehensions. Crucial in this respect are the translations from Chinese that occupy most of the book's space. In his footnotes, Kleeman often disagrees with concurrent interpretations and is prompt to blame others for mistakes. Sometimes he alludes to the "grammar" of his Chinese sources (71, n. 14; 88, n. 52; 122, n. 10; 135, n. 33), but when—rarely—he gets specific, he actually means categories of Western grammar applied to ancient Chinese ("verbal phrase," 122, n. 10; "conditional clause," 141, n. 46). His own translations read well but are not impervious to criticism. When adapting the stereotyped documents forming the bulk of Part II, he frequently adds to his English text, without signaling them as additions, a number of words deprived of source equivalents, thereby creating a range of semantic and logical distortions such as causality and temporality. Square brackets are rarely and erratically used (see 291 and 294 for two identical sections from parallel texts translated with variants and brackets inserted differently; and 335, for square brackets around English text with corresponding original Chinese). The full stops and commas inserted in Chinese quotations (either by him or modern editors) often mismatch the syntax of English renderings (for example, "靖, 廬" for "quiet huts," 181–82, correctly punctuated at 230 but translated differently). Some repeated translation passages differ from their first appearance (compare 29 and 225; 69 and 76, n. 27; 120 and 334), including variant punctuation in both languages (compare 345 with 115–16 and 131–32). Since he does not hesitate to correct his sources, Kleeman could as well have read "去臺十二丈, 近南門" (better supporting his translation at 229) for "去臺十二, 又近南門" (his punctuation). Many translation blocks contain omissions, discrepancies, and errors.[6] In-text translations sometimes come with the original Chinese, sometimes without (example on page 92).

Kleeman's commitment to translate "every Daoist technical term and conception" encountered in his sources (15) is commendable, as opposed to the recondite strings of transliterated syllables favored by some authors. But he should have applied this rule to the logograph "道" too, instead of alternating conventional English renderings, sometimes capitalized ("Way"), sometimes not ("way," "path," "to say"), unusual ones ("Daoists," 213; 234; 348), and a transliterated syllable usually preceded by a definite article ("the Dao"), sometimes not ("Dao"), at times within single translation blocks ("the way of longevity [. . .] books of the Dao," 64–65; "the Dao [. . .] false ways," 106). The phraseology resulting from this mixture cannot adequately convey how the Chinese audience of the time perceived those texts. Translated sentences like "the Dao created the Way" (69) not only contain a word that is a transliteration, not a translation, but also misrepresent the fact that "Way" and the essentialist "Dao" correspond to the same signifier. Kleeman's hesitation between "demonic way" and "demonic Dao" for *guidao* 鬼道 (52, n. 76; 60–61) and

his explanation that "What I translate here as 'keep to their own path' also implies 'keeping the Dao'" (109) shows the unnecessary layer of interpretation thus artificially added. Inasmuch as early medieval Chinese Buddhists also used *daoren* 道人 self-referentially, the translations "Daoists" (90), "a man of the Dao" (150, n. 59), and "people of the Dao" (188) all seem too functionalist, hence inadequate in Kleeman's own terms (24, n. 8). Indexed as "Daoist priest" (418), *daoshi* 道士 appears at least once as "Daoist officers" (156), while "rules of the Dao" (92), "Daoist rites" (374), and "Daoist religion" (386) changeably cover *daofa* 道法. "The teachings of Daoism" for *daojiao* 道教 (140) borders on the absurd.

Indeed, despite passing allusions in footnotes (83–84), consistency in translation may not have been among Kleeman's objectives. A few cases deserve special mention, in addition to those already mentioned. Kleeman announces that he will translate *xin* 信 as "believe in" (83, n. 38), but renders it variously as "proof" (84), "pledge offering" (114), "faith" (148), "pledges" (171), "faithful" (175), "integrity" (275), "credibility" (306), "reliable" (323), and "sincerity" (384). *Fa* 法 appears diversely as "ritual system" (76, also for *lizhi* 禮制 on page 335), "religion" (150), "faith" (150, n. 60), "ritual mastery" (312), "teachings" (330), and "rules" (335). Within a few lines, *fashi* 法師 first means (and is indexed as) "ritual master" then, without any explanation, "the exorcistic" (391–92). The triad *xuan* 玄, *yuan* 元, and *shi* 始, fluctuates, among other wordings, between "Mystic," "Inaugurating," and "Primordial" (129), and "Mysterious, Primordial, and Beginning" (244). The basic administrative unit *zhi* 治 is consistently rendered as "parish" until the awkward "diocese/parish" (315), followed by a late parenthetical admission that "perhaps dioceses is a better term for such institutions" (337). *Beizhi* 備治, "supplementary parishes," and *biezhi* 別治, "alternate parishes" (127), become "Completing Parishes" (231, n. 23) and "Separate Parishes" (340), respectively, while "roving parish" (123–24) is not given any Chinese equivalent until a late translation block (328). The phrase *zhuzhe* 主者 is translated as the substantive "leaders" (114) or "leaders [of parishes]" (262), once as the epithet "who administer a parish" (223), before inexplicably becoming "leader of households [i.e., itinerant master]" (331).

Phrases and entire sentences receive different translations within a few pages. For instance, both "Circulating Pneumas of the Four Sectors" (114) and "Circulators of Pneumas for the Four Sections" (119) render the same occurrence of "四部行氣." "Genuine" (131, translation) becomes "true, correct" (133, text) for the same occurrence of *zhenzheng* 真正. In two passages from a given source, *zhishi* 直使 means "on-duty," then "assigned for deployment" (286). A similar case is with "凡百無善," first understood as meaning "with not a single matter going right," then "committing one of the many evils" (382). Translated book titles are not spared, including "*Summary of the Archives*" (22) and "*Summary of Institutions*" (225) for *Dianlüe*; "*Scripture of Divine Spells Piercing the Abyss*" (165), "*Dongyuan Scripture of Divine Spells*" (183), and "*Scripture of Divine Invocations*" (301) for *Taishang dongyuan shenzhou jing* 太上洞淵神咒經; "*Master Lu's Abridgement of the Daoist Code*" (181) and "Lu Xiujing's *Abbreviation of the Daoist Code*" (388–89) for *Lu xiansheng daomen kelüe* 陸先生道門科略; and "*Scripture of Solemn Deportment*" (246), "*Scripture of Solemn Rites*" (250), and finally "*Correct Unity Scripture of Solemn Deportment*" (283) for *Zhengyi weiyi jing* 正一威儀經.[7]

Arguably, the book is already voluminous, but something could have been said of the interesting fact that "Celestial Master" (*tianshi* 天師), the traditional title—nowhere explained in the book—of the movement's leader, is also the designation of the authority speaker in the dialogic stratum forming the bulk of the received *Great Peace Scripture* (*Taiping jing* 太平經), a problematic text more or less contemporaneous with the early "Daoist Church." In addition to their simplistic introduction, basic but important features of ancient Chinese culture—Yin/Yang, the Five Agents, and physiological correlations (81–82), numerology (124–25), or the "field allocation" (*fenye* 分野) mantic system (232)—would have benefited from references to existing scholarship. The Yao 瑤, a modern ethnic group whose rites supposedly illustrate the permanence of some early Celestial Master practices, surface four times in the book (index, 425) without ever being dealt with in detail, but the topic allows visual material (photographs at 241–42), though only distantly related to the context, to enliven what remains a conventional textual study.

To conclude, we should be grateful to Kleeman for offering workable translations of a rich selection of excerpts from ancient sources relevant to religion in premodern China, especially in Part II. But recent developments in social and religious history cannot support any longer the teleological discourse underpinning the whole book, that treats religions as isolated cultural units with such neat demarcations as incipience date and historical patriarchal lineage. Would it not be more rewarding to contest the current fabrication of a catechetical Daoism that espouses the Western idea of "world religion" (63) instead of contributing to it? Kleeman's momentary realization that it is "hard to imagine that the system [of twenty-four parishes] was more than notional" in Zhang Ling's time (126), and that "no doubt it took some time to actually bring [it] into being" (70), can be applied to the whole religious movement, which must have developed

only progressively from an early gathering of disciples around a master—among an unknown number of multifariously interplaying and competing communities—to a fully organized religion with tradition and authority claims, priestly hierarchy, comprehensive doctrine, sacred literature, liturgical program, community rules, and like features. From this viewpoint, *Celestial Masters* stands in sharp contrast to recent, more sophisticated books on historical religious processes during the early imperial and early medieval eras, in particular Campany's exploration of the social, rhetorical, and narrative construction of ascetic types in *Making Transcendents* (2009), and Raz's thought-provoking attempted reconstruction of the *Emergence of Daoism* (2012). Surprising, to say the least, is the absence of the latter in Kleeman's bibliography.

NOTES

1. The *Dianlüe*, first dated to the mid-third century ("between 239 and 265," 22, n. 2), is later dated to "the first half of the third century" (225). Ge Hong's attitude toward the Way of the Celestial Master is discussed twice, in passages partly redundant and contradictory (22, n. 3; 258). The title "Pastor" is explained twice (23–24, n. 8; 26, n. 15), the Chinese term appearing only in the latter note. The phrase *yueling* 月令 is explained twice (30, n. 24; 61) and translated twice differently at 30 ("Monthly Commands," then "Monthly Ordinances"). The two characters missing in the stele inscription are discussed twice (75, n. 23; 77). "Mystic dispensation" (*xuanshi* 玄施) is discussed twice (75, n. 25; 78). The eightfold mantic system known as *wangxiang* 王相 is briefly commented upon twice (81, n. 37; 86, n. 46), then said to be "described in greater detail below" (92, n. 60), a promise never delivered. The date of the *Xuandu lüwen* 玄都律文 is discussed three times (123, n. 12; 255, n. 26; 360). The replacement of the "kitchen" with *zhai* 齋 and *jiao* 醮 is introduced three times with variant translations ("purificatory feasts" and "offerings" at 217, "Fasts and Offerings" at 272, "Fast" and "Offering or Rite of Cosmic Renewal" at 390); the former is also rendered as "fête" (238; 265–71) and "feast" (270), the latter as "*jiao*-sacrifice" (309). A list of four additional "parishes" is given twice with variants: "鍾" and "Ganggeng 岡亙" (231, n. 23) become "種" and "Ganghu 岡互" (340–41, n. 26). The term *qi* 契 ("contract") is explained twice (283, n. 25; 363, n. 73).
2. A subheading states that "Page numbers in italics refer to a definition or a primary discussion of a term" (417), but not a single pagination is italicized in the index. Some Chinese characters are missing in the entries "offerings" (421) and "Xie Piao" (424).
3. In addition to the problems discussed in the review, a number of mistakes should be noted. The term *zhen* 真 surely meant "real, true" *before* denoting "a class of divine beings," not "later" (16). Emperor Ming 明帝 (58–75) of the Han dynasty (22, n. 2) is mistaken for the homonymous Emperor Ming (226–39) of Wei, mentioned at 49. Zhang Jue 張角 (13; 129–32) is inexplicably called "Zhang Jiao" throughout 29–31. The misspelling "不可肚數" (177) for "不可勝數" suggests that Chinese quotations were copied/pasted from electronic or online versions, known to contain a number of errors. The parenthetical "*guidao* 鬼道" is inappropriate for "spirit armies" (191). The second "Precepts" (197) in the title of the text revealed to Kou Qianzhi should read "Code" (for *ke* 科), consistent with the next translation block. The phrase "upon receiving the manuscript" (274, n. 3) should read "upon receiving the register." There is no Chinese equivalent for "Thunder Rites" (391–93). Self-evident typos include: "*Han Han shu*" (53, n. 77); "On the one had *[sic]*" (102); "so we many *[sic]* never" (103); "a women *[sic]*" (212, n. 50); and the surname of the second general, "He," instead of "Ge" (374). The numbering of n. 14 seems misplaced (25).
4. In another case of *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, Kleeman blames the "eliding of Daoist elements in mainstream Chinese historical sources" (194) for the frustrating lack of evidence that Cheng-Han leaders were Daoists. His "speculative" and "imaginative" approach to the topic in an earlier book had been noted by Verellen (2000).
5. Another example of overemphatic capitalization, Kleeman opens chapter 4 with a noncommittal mention of "the great diaspora of Daoist believers in 215" (190), then returns to the event in a dramatically altered tone: "the forced relocation of Daoist households by Cao Cao in 215, which I refer to as the Great Diaspora" (209). The emphasis is nowhere else applied in the book (compare 7, 190, 326, and 341).
6. Chinese text omitted from translation includes: "而故謂道欺人" (131–32); "張道陵" (179–80); "修勤不懈, 依勞復遷" (198–99); "還中宮" (289–90); and "魂不得仙" (315, n. 89). English text without correspondence in Chinese quotations includes: "attacking the temples of others, seeking the sacrifices offered to them" (181); "First, face east and say," "Next, facing north," "Next, facing west," and "Next, facing south" (248–49); "township" (287); "Recommended by the male/female novice" and "Household belonging to the parish of the male officer, the libationer" (294); "generals" (297). Further discrepancies and errors include: "元年" first untranslated (68; 69), then rendered as "first year" (73) or "inaugural year" (114); "Inaugural year" again, now for "元" alone (131–32); the redundant "Ten Perverted Evil Paths" for "十邪道" (150, n. 60); "success" and "merit" for "功" within a few lines (168); "Heavenly Most Treasured" for "天中" (198–99); "altar" for "治壇" (228); ". . ." *[sic]* for "具如本經. 當依法制服, 具依下卷" (238); "the Way of the Dao" *[sic]* for "道法" (271; 308); "Gengling Register" and "Renewed Mandate Register" for "更令" also within a few lines (276); "mountains" for "山林" (297); "Those I evangelize will convert, those I transform will be transformed, those I cure will be healed" for "所化者化, 所治者差" (300–301); "Celestial Master" for "正一" (340). On page 288, the Chinese "候君" (for "Marquis Lords," 287) should read "侯君," unless the translation is erroneous. The translation "to

protect" does not reflect the correction "Reading *rang* 讓 for *hu* 護" (312, n. 82).

7. Unfixed translations include the legal terms *kao* 考, alternatively "torture" (166), "interrogation" (168), "investigation" (287), and "examination" (300); and *cha* 察, "to investigate" and "investigator" in a first list of parish offices (332–37), then "inspector" and "inspection" in a second list (338–39). Does *jian* 簡 mean "audience tablet," simply "tablet," or "plaque of office" (320–22)—the latter being also used for *ban* 板 (386)? *Ziran* 自然 appears as "self-so" (90) or "the spontaneous" (197), in either case without any elucidation. *Jibing* 疾病 covers such variously nuanced situations as "epidemic diseases" (140), "illness and disease" (297), "to remain unhealthy" (301), "acute illness" (365), "acute ailment" (371), "to suffer illness" (382), and "serious illnesses" (384).

REFERENCES

Bokenkamp, Stephen R. (with a contribution by Peter Nickerson)
1997 *Early Daoist Scriptures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boltz, Judith Magee
2006 Review of *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*, edited by Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen. *T'oung Pao*, 92(4/5), 495–511.

Campany, Robert Ford
2009 *Making Transcendents: Ascetics and Social Memory in Early Medieval China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Espesset, Grégoire
2014 "Local Resistance in Early Medieval Chinese Historiography and the Problem of Religious Over-Interpretation." *The Medieval History Journal* 17(2), 379–406.
2015 "A Case Study on the Evolution of Chinese Religious Symbols from Talismanic Paraphernalia to Taoist Liturgy." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 78(3), 493–514.

Jones, Lindsay (ed.)
2005 *Encyclopedia of Religion: Second Edition*. Vol. 13. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference USA.

Kirkland, Russell
2007 "Resources for Textual Research on Premodern Taoism: *The Taoist Canon* and the State of the Field in the Early 21st Century." *China Review International* 14(1), 33–60.

Raz, Gil
2012 *The Emergence of Daoism: Creation of Tradition*. London: Routledge.

Schipper, Kristofer, and Franciscus Verellen (eds.)
2004 *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Verellen, Franciscus
2000 Review of Terry Kleeman, *Great Perfection: Religion and Ethnicity in a Chinese Millennial Kingdom*. *T'oung Pao*, 86(4/5), 414–17.
2003 "The Twenty-four Dioceses and Zhang Daoling: The Spatio-Liturgical Organization of Early Heavenly Master Taoism." In Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (eds.), *Pilgrims, Patrons, and Place: Localizing Sanctity in Asian Religion*, 15–67. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.