

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SOURCE LANGUAGE TEXTS USED IN THE INDONESIAN TRANSLATIONS OF *TAO TE CHING*

Pauw Budianto

Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, School of Chinese Language and Literature, Wuhan University
Wuhan, Hubei Province, P.R.China 430072
pauwbudianto@foxmail.com

Received: 28th January 2019/**Revised:** 04th April 2019/**Accepted:** 08th April 2019

How to Cite: Budianto, P. (2019). A comparative study of source language texts used in the Indonesian translations of *Tao Te Ching*. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(1), 81-86.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i1.5361>

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to show the Indonesian translation of Tao Te Ching that commonly did not state clearly the source text used as translation base, although some translations put Chinese source text in its translation book. This research tried to use a comparative method to analyze the differences of source texts used in two versions of Indonesian translations of Tao Te Ching, i.e., Lika and Wang, and its impact to translation products, then compared those source texts used with five original versions of Tao Te Ching as base texts references. The results show that (1) the differences between the two source texts occur mainly in four aspects: punctuation marks, pauses, characters, text redundant, and loss. (2) Source texts used by these two Indonesian versions are very close to the most widespread original versions; He Shanggong and WangBi commentary versions, with some changes in some places. Lika source text is quite close to HeShanggong version, Wang source text is quite close to the Wang Bi version. Some intentional changes in source text occur in Lika.

Keywords: comparative translation, source text, Tao Te Ching, Indonesian translation

INTRODUCTION

Tao Te Ching was written by Lao Zi at about 2500 years ago. Through this long history, it has been rewritten for many times. In this process of rewriting, there could be many changes inside the text itself, either with intention or not. After over two thousand years of history, no one knows the first original text anymore. At present the only people know is that the texts have been rewritten by many experts while transliterating its language and explaining its philosophy has been done time by time in history.

Through this long history of treatment and re-treatment, with or no intention, there have been many changes especially in grammar, words, paragraph and chapter sequence, so now-existed *Tao Te Ching* should have had many differences from the first original one that we did not know anymore (李, 2018). It makes *Tao Te Ching* written in the Chinese language has many original versions. Until now, there could be hundreds such kind of book published, so there are many versions of *Tao Te Ching* texts exist.

Among many versions of *Tao Te Ching* existed in history, there are five versions that nowadays researchers recognized as five important versions, i.e., He Shanggong, Wang Bi, Zhujian, Boshu, and FuYi (刘笑敢, 2014). He Shanggong (马, 2016) and Wang Bi (王, 2017) commentary

versions are the most popular and widely spread versions. Besides, there are also *Tao Te Ching* old versions, i.e., Zhujian (bamboo slips) (孙, 2017) and Boshu (silk manuscripts) (赵, 2018). Silk manuscripts (Boshu) of *Tao Te Ching* texts were discovered in 1972-1974 by archaeological research in three Han dynasty tombs in Mawangdui, Hubei Province China. This Han tomb was predicted 168 years BC, so these manuscripts should be written earlier. Boshu version has different chapter sequence with other versions, Te Ching in the front and Tao Ching after it. It is an important old version that most complete (丁, 2014).

While Bamboo slips (Zhujian) of *Tao Te Ching* texts were discovered in 1993 by archaeological research in Hubei province, Jingmen Guodian, China. Experts have predicted that the writing of these slips was about 300 years BC, and becomes the oldest version of *Tao Te Ching* discovered until now. However, it is so regretful that the writings are incomplete. Last but not least, FuYi version is also one of the old versions that reorganized by FuYi (555-639 AD) from Tang dynasty (赵, 2018).

The phenomena of different versions are very important in translating *Tao Te Ching*. The different source of text version will result in different translation product (梁, 2018). Experts in modern time China have paid attention to these phenomena while translating it to modern

Chinese language (郑, 2018). Sometimes they refer to the most recent research on *Tao Te Ching* text versions and make a little change to the base text for their purpose of translation and explanation.

Another important thing to note is about how to make pauses in reading unpunctuated ancient writings. *Tao Te Ching* as a classic text also has this problem. Experts in the past sometimes also had some debates in making pauses to some parts of the texts. For examples in Chapter 1 of *Tao Te Ching*, experts have made two kinds of sentence pauses (刘固盛, 2015):

(1) “故常无欲, 以观其妙; 常有欲, 以观其徼” (*Gu chang wu yu, yi guan qi miao; chang you yu, yi guan qi jiao*)

(2) “故常无, 欲以观其妙; 常有, 欲以观其徼” (*Gu chang wu, yu yi guan qi miao; chang you, yu yi guan qi jiao*)

These two pauses actually are just about two pairs of words 无欲 (*wu yu*) and 有欲 (*you yu*) or 无 (*wu*) and 有 (*you*). It has made a long debate in interpreting Lao Zi philosophy.

The oldest English translation of *Tao Te Ching* was found at Yale university library that was written in 1859. However, John Chalmer's translation in 1868 was commonly be seen as the oldest one (姚, 2016). While the complete translation of *Tao Te Ching* has been published in Indonesian since 1937 until now there are at least nine versions of the translated book ever existed.

The researcher chooses two versions as the object of analysis in this research, i.e., Lika (2012) and Wang (2014) versions. Lika (2012) version complete book title is “道德经 DaoDeJing: Kitab Suci Agama Tao” (DaoDeJing: Tao Religion Classic), that was written by Dr. I. D. Lika, M.Sc., published by PT Elexmedia Komputindo Jakarta in 2012, 276 pages. This book is divided into 81 chapters, according to the original version of *Tao Te Ching*. Its written structure in each chapter includes the number of chapters; the title of the chapter in Chinese characters with pinyin and Indonesian; source language text in Chinese characters and pinyin; Indonesian translation text; an explanation. In the beginning, there is a short introduction from the writer, and at the end of the book attached table of references.

Wang (2014) version complete book title is “老子 DaoDeJing: The Wisdom of Lao Zi”, that was written by Andri Wang, published by PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama Jakarta in 2014, the 6th printing (since 2009), 307 pages. This book is also divided into 81 chapters, according to the original version of *Tao Te Ching*. Its written structure in each chapter includes source language text in Chinese characters; the number of chapters; the title of the chapter in Indonesian; Indonesian translation text; an explanation. At the beginning of the book, there is a quite long introduction and explanation of some philosophical terms of Lao Zi. While at the end of the book, there is a short end note from the writer, table of references, and writer's short curriculum vitae.

METHODS

This research mainly uses a comparative method to clarify the differences between source language texts used in the two Indonesian translation of *Tao Te Ching* and its impact to its translation product, then compare those two

texts with five original versions of *Tao Te Ching* as base text references. This research chooses two newest Indonesian translation texts, i.e., Lika (2012) and Wang (2014) as research objects. While the five original versions of the *Tao Te Ching* as comparison references refer to He Shangong, Wang Bi, Boshu, Zhujian, and FuYi texts that had been studied comprehensively by Liu Xiaogan in his book 《老子古今》 (“Lao Zi: Old and New Versions”) (刘笑敢, 2006).

All texts of five original versions *Tao Te Ching* are adapted from this book in this research, there will be no specific annotations. English translation of *Tao Te Ching* used in this research refers to D.C Lau Lao Tzu translation (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012), there will be no specific annotations anymore.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The differences between two source texts of Lika (2012) and Wang (2014) mainly occurred in four aspects. They are different punctuation marks, different pauses, different characters, text loss and text redundant.

The first differences is different punctuation marks. Two versions' source texts are used different punctuation marks. Lika (2012) has used modern style of punctuation marks, while Wang (2014) has used Chinese style full stop in every pause between sentences. The example can be seen in *Tao Te Ching* Chapter 10.

(1) 天门开阖, 能无雌乎? (2012)

Tian men kai he, neng wu ci hu?

(2) 天门开阖。能无雌乎。(2014)

Tian men kai he. neng wu ci hu.

(In English: When the gates of heaven open and shut, are you capable of keeping to the role of the female?) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012)

The difference in punctuation marks used actually do not impact the understanding of the text itself. The difference in translation text is caused more by the understanding of the translator to the content of the text, not by the punctuation marks used. Chinese characters texts in ancient time do not use punctuation marks at all. All the punctuation marks used in Chinese ancient texts nowadays are to make it easier to read by modern people. From the reading point of view, Lika (2012) source text is easier to read by modern people in general, while Wang (2014) will be useful for them who has knowledge in ancient Chinese language deeper.

The second differences is different pauses. Punctuation marks are used in modern time, and have no real impact to understanding the ancient text itself. In ancient text, there are only pauses that mark with small circle as modern Chinese full stop. The different pauses between sentences often cause different meaning of the sentence. The example can be seen in *Tao Te Ching* Chapter 1.

(1) 故常无, 欲以观其妙。常有, 欲以观其徼。(2012)

Gu chang wu, yu yi guan qi miao. Chang you, yu yi guan qi jiao.

(2) 故常无欲。以观其妙。常有欲。以观其徼。(2014)

Gu chang wu yu. Yi guan qi miao. Chang you yu. Yi guan qi jiao.

(English: Hence always rid yourself of desires in order

to observe its secrets; But always allow yourself to have desires in order to observe its manifestations.) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This translation conforms with Wang (2014) source text.

Sentence pauses is one of the typical problems in ancient Chinese texts. In the example, the problem is Lika (2012) source text puts punctuation mark after the character “无wu”, while Wang (2014) source text puts punctuation mark after the characters “无欲wuyu”. This problem could happen because of ancient Chinese language nearly one word one character, so every character frequently could be seen as a word.

In this case, the central problem is between two different words “无wu” (nothing) and “无欲wu yu” (no desire), and this pauses cause two totally different interpretations of this text. Lika (2012) and Wang (2014) translation of this sentence are under the influence of these two different pauses.

(1) Oleh karena itu, seharusnya dengan konsep “Tiada”/ Tanpa Batas/ Tanpa embel-embel/ Tanpa tendensius/ Tanpa beban kita bisa mengamati keagungan dan kemuliaan Dao (diistilahkan sebagai sifat 妙 miao dari Dao); Sebaliknya harus dengan konsep “Ada”/ Adanya batasan-batasan/ Adanya Peraturan/ Adanya hukum/Adanya bentuk/ Adanya tujuan untuk mempelajari semua yang berwujud secara objektif dan realistis (diistilahkan dengan 徼 jiao--batasan-batasan nyata dari wujud benda di dunia ini) (Lika, 2012).

(Therefore, it is agreed with the concept of “No” (Nothingness)/ No borders/ No frills/ Without tendencies/ Without burdens that can regulate the glory of the Dao (termed the character of miao 妙 of Dao); otherwise it must be with the concept of “There”/ Presence of boundaries/ Presence of regulations/ Presence of law/ Presence of forms/ Presence of all purposes which are objective and realistic (termed – jiao 徼 real boundaries of things in this world) (Lika, 2012))

(2) Bila orang “terbebas dari nafsu keinginan” (wu) baru mampu memahami misteri dan keajaibannya Dao; Jika pikirannya “dipenuhi nafsu keinginan”, Dao hanya bisa dipahami terbatas pada kulitnya saja.(Wang, 2014)

(If people are free from craving (wu), they are only able to understand the mysteries and wonders of the Dao; If their mind is filled with craving, Dao could only be understood to be limited to its skin (Wang, 2014))

From these two translations, it can be seen that Lika (2012) has translated “无wu” with “konsep tiada” (nothingness), has translated “有you” with “konsep ada” (being). While Wang (2014) has translated “无欲wu yu” with “terbebas dari nafsu keinginan/wu” (having no desires), has translated “有欲you yu” with “dipenuhi dengan nafsu keinginan” (full of desires). Wang (2014) translation actually is not as simple as this, because translator also uses the concept of “无wu” in his translation text beside “无欲wu yu”. The text before this sentence is in chapter one of *Tao Te Ching*, as follows:

(1) 无，名天地之始。有，名万物之母。(2012) *Wu, ming tian di zhi shi. You, ming wan wu zhi mu.*
 (2) 无。名天地之始。有。名万物之母。(2014) *Wu, ming tian di zhi shi. You, ming wan wu zhi mu.*

(English: The nameless was the beginning of heaven and earth; the named was the mother of the myriad creatures.) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation is not according to above pauses, it is according to “无名wu ming, 天地之始 tian di zhi shi; 有名you ming, 万物之母 wan wu zhi mu.”

It can be seen that the pauses of this sentence are exactly the same for those two versions. It seems that Wang (2014) also realize the problem of pauses in chapter 1 of *Tao Te Ching* that has made a long debate among researchers on Lao Zi, so he chooses the middle way to combine those two arguments. This opinion although seems to be not consistent, but it could be alternatives for interpreting *Tao Te Ching*.

The third differences are different characters. It is used in different versions of ancient Chinese classics that is also one of the important problems beside sentence pauses. In the process of frequent rewriting, differences in characters used in ancient texts become a normal case (杜, 2018).

There are many different characters used between source texts of the two versions. The differences exist in chapter 2, 22, 27, 29, 34, 36, 53, 55, 65, and 67. These differences in characters used are closely related to the characters in different original versions of *Tao Te Ching*. The researcher analyzes some sentences in some chapters to explain this problem. First, it can be seen in Chapter 2 of *Tao Te Ching*.

(1) 故有无相生。难易相成。长短相形。高下相倾。音声相和。前后相随---恒也。(2012)

Gu you wu xiang sheng. Nan yi xiang cheng. Chang duan xiang xing. Gao xia xiang qing. Yin sheng xiang he. Qian hou xiang sui---heng ye.

(2) 故有无相生。难易相成。长短相较。高下相倾。音声相和。前后相随。(2014)

Gu you wu xiang sheng. Nan yi xiang cheng. Chang duan xiang jiao. Gao xia xiang qing. Yin sheng xiang he. Qian hou xiang sui.

(English translation: Thus something and nothing produce each other; the difficult and the easy complement each other; the long and the short offset each other; the high and the low incline towards each other; note and sounds harmonize with each other; before and after follow each other) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation conforms with the source text in Wang (2014).

Lika (2012) source text uses “长短相形” *chang duan xiang xing*, while Wang (2014) source text version uses “长短相较” *chang duan xiang jiao*, it has differed one character “形xing” and “较jiao”. Among the five original versions, He Shanggong, Zhujian, Boshu, and FuYi versions all use “形xing” in this sentence, but these original versions have more complex structures (see results and discussions point 4: example of *Tao Te Ching* Chapter 2). Only Wang Bi version uses “较jiao”. Experts have predicted the first original version of *Tao Te Ching* should use “形xing” because it rhymes with 生sheng, 成cheng, and 倾qing (党 & 陈, 2018).

The fourth differences is text loss and text redundant phenomena that exists in the source text used in Lika (2012). It starts from text redundant phenomena in last sentence in Chapter 19.

(1)...见素抱朴，少私寡欲，绝学无忧*。
(2012)

jian su bao pu, shao si gua yu, jue xue wu you.

(2)...见素抱朴。少私寡欲。(2014)

jian su bao pu, shao si gua yu.

(English: Have little thought of self and as few desires as possible) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation conforms with the source text in Wang (2014).

Lika (2012) translation; ...*mempertahankan sikap mental yang sederhana dalam kehidupan, mengurangi egoisme/nafsu kepentingan pribadi, mengurangi nafsu keserakahan, dan mengurangi nafsu menggunakan sisi negatif ilmu pengetahuan. Bila bisa melakukan semua itu, tidak akan ada lagi rasa cemas/kemasygulan di hati manusia* (Lika, 2012). “绝学无忧 *Jue xue wu you*” exists in Lika (2012) translation in chapter 19 as “*mengurangi nafsu menggunakan sisi negatif ilmu pengetahuan*” (reduce the desires to use bad side of knowledge and science). It seems that translator puts this sentence here intentionally.

This sentence in Wang (2014) is at the beginning sentence of Chapter 20.

(1) (text loss) 唯之与阿，相去几何? ... (2012)
wei zhi yu e, xiang qu ji he.

(2) 绝学无忧。唯之与阿。相去几何。... (2014)
Jue xue wu you. wei zhi yu e, xiang qu ji he.

(English: Exterminate learning and there will no longer be worries. Between yea and nay. How much difference is there?) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation conforms with the source text in Wang (2014).

Lika (2012) translation of the beginning sentence in chapter 20: “*Setuju dan menolak, apakah ada jarak perbedaan yang sesungguhnya di antara keduanya itu?*” (Lika, 2012). This translation refers to the sentence “唯之与阿，相去几何? *wei zhi yu e, xiang qu ji he*”. There is no word “绝学无忧 *Jue xue wu you*”.

Compare to Wang (2014), Lika (2012) in chapter 20 misses one sentence that has been existed as the last sentence in the previous chapter. The same phenomena also happens in Chapter 22 and 23.

Tao Te Ching Chapter 22

(1) ...古之所谓“曲则全”者，岂虚言哉，诚全而归之，希言自然*。(2012)

gu zhi suo wei “qu ze quan” zhe, qi xu yan zai, cheng quan er gui zhi, xi yan zi ran.

(2) ...古之所谓曲则全者。岂虚言哉。诚全而归之。(2014)

Gu zhi suo wei qu ze quan zhe. Qi xu yan zai. Cheng quan er gui zhi.

(English: The way the ancients had it, “Bowed down then preserved, is no empty saying. Truly it enables one to be preserved to the end) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation of the last sentence of

Chapter 22 conforms with the source text in Wang (2014).

Lika (2012) translation: “...*Pepatah kuno yang berbunyi “Siapa yang berani mengalah dialah yang selamat!” bukanlah pepatah kosong belaka. Hanya orang yang dengan jujur, tulus, dan teliti dalam memahami kaidah Dao yang bisa memahami semua itu. Inilah salah satu maksud hukum alam semesta yang sesungguhnya, yang disebut alamiah*” (ziran/自然) (Lika, 2012).

In this translation, the sentence “希言自然 *Xi yan zi ran*” has translated into “*Inilah salah satu maksud hukum alam semesta yang sesungguhnya, yang disebut alamiah* (ziran/自然)” (This is one of what natural law means by “natural/ziran 自然”). It seems that the translator arranges this change with intention.

Tao Te Ching Chapter 23

(1) (text loss), 飘风不终朝，暴雨不终日。... (2012)

Piao feng bu zhong zhao, bao yu bu zhong ri

(2) 希言自然。故飘风不终朝。骤雨不终日。... (2014)

Xi yan zi ran. Gu piao feng bu zhong zhao. Zhou yu bu zhong ri.

(English: To use words but rarely, is to be natural. Hence a gusty wind cannot last all morning, and a sudden downpour cannot last all day) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation of beginning sentence in Chapter 23 is the same meaning with the source text in Wang (2014).

Lika (2012) translation: “... *Angin yang kencang tidak akan bertiup sepanjang pagi. Hujan yang lebat tidak akan turun sepanjang hari.*” (Lika, 2012). Or in English, “A strong wind will not blow all morning. Heavy rain will not go down all day.” This translation does not include the sentence “希言自然 *Xi yan zi ran*”. It seems that the translator arranges it intentionally.

These texts are redundant, and text loss phenomena in the source text of Lika (2012) is a special case. The five original versions also do not have these texts redundant and loss phenomena as in Lika (2012) chapter 19, 20, 22, 23. By comparing with his own translation, it can be seen that every translation conforms to its source text. It means these phenomena are not by chance or a human mistake, but it can be predicted that the translator does it on purpose.

Besides this, there are another text redundant phenomena that exist in the source text of Lika (2012) in Chapter 2, compared with the source text in Wang (2014). There is one redundant sentence presented; 恒也 *heng ye*. This redundant text conforms with the original text of the Boshu version, but there are differences in whole sentence structures.

Tao Te Ching Chapter 2:

(1) 故有无相生。难易相成。长短相形。高下相倾。音声相和。前后相随---恒也*。(2012)

(Gu you wu xiang sheng. Nan yi xiang cheng. Chang duan xiang xing. Gao xia xiang qing. Yin sheng xiang he. Qian hou xiang sui---heng ye.)

(2) 故有无相生。难易相成。长短相较。高下相倾。音声相和。前后相随。(2014)

(Gu you wu xiang sheng. Nan yi xiang cheng. Chang

duan xiang jiao. Gao xia xiang qing. Yin sheng xiang he. Qian hou xiang sui.)

English translation: Thus something and nothing produce each other; the difficult and the easy complement each other; the long and the short offset each other; the high and the low incline towards each other; note and sounds harmonize with each other; before and after follow each other (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation conforms with the source text in Wang (2014).

The Zhujian version:

有无之相生也，难易之相成也，长短之相形也，高下之相盈也，音声之相和也，先后之相随也。

(You wu zhi xiang sheng ye, nan yi zhi xiang cheng ye, chang duan zhi xiang xing ye, gao xia zhi xiang ying ye, yin sheng zhi xiang he ye, xian hou zhi xiang sui ye.)

The Boshu version:

有无之相生也，难易之相成也，长短之相形也，高下之相盈也，音声之相和也，先后之相随，恒也。

(You wu zhi xiang sheng ye, nan yi zhi xiang cheng ye, chang duan zhi xiang xing ye, gao xia zhi xiang ying ye, yin sheng zhi xiang he ye, xian hou zhi xiang sui, heng ye.)

The FuYi version:

有无之相生，难易之相成，长短之相形，高下之相盈，音声之相和，前后之相随。

(You wu zhi xiang sheng, nan yi zhi xiang cheng, chang duan zhi xiang xing, gao xia zhi xiang ying, yin sheng zhi xiang he, qian hou zhi xiang sui.)

From these versions, it can be seen that the sentence structures of the texts in Zhujian and Boshu versions, there is “之zhi” in the middle of sentences and “也ye” at the end of each sentence. “之zhi” structure here is used as a mark to change “SP (Subject-Predicate)” structure to be “Phrase” structure (吴 & 吴, 2018). It is one of the ancient Chinese language unique structure. While “也ye” at the end of the sentence is a pause mark in each clause in ancient Chinese language (白, 2017). While if comparing them with FuYi version, it will be found that each sentence of FuYi version basically similar to Zhujian and Boshu versions in structures, but it does not have pauses mark “也ye” anymore. It seems to be a little bit shorter and simpler. It also reflects the evolution of Chinese language grammar (刘利 & 李, 2013).

Zhujian, Boshu, and FuYi versions sentence structures do not exist in nowadays most-spread versions; He Shanggong and Wang Bi commentary versions. The language structures in these two versions sentences seem to be simpler and shorter (刘笑敢, 2006). Wang (2014) and Lika (2012) without the last sentence “恒也 *heng ye*” source text sentences structures both conform to He Shanggong and Wang Bi commentary versions. In characters using, Wang (2014) and Lika (2012) are not exactly the same.

Tao Te Ching Chapter 46

*罪莫大于可欲。祸莫大于不知足。咎莫大于欲得。故知足之足常足矣。(2012)

(Zui mo da yu ke yu. Huo mo da yu bu zhi zu. Jiu mo da yu yu de. Gu zhi zu zhi zu chang zu yi.)

祸莫大于不知足。咎莫大于欲得。故知足之足。常足矣。(2014)

(Huo mo da yu bu zhi zu. Jiu mo da yu yu de. Gu zhi zu zhi zu. Chang zu yi.)

(English: There is no crime greater than having to many desires; there is no disaster greater than not being content; there is no misfortune greater than being covetous. Hence, in being content, one will always have enough) (刘殿爵 & 章, 2012). This English translation is the same meaning with the source text in Lika (2012).

Compared to the source text in Wang (2014), the source text of Lika (2012) also presents the redundant sentence “罪莫大于可欲 *zui mo da yu ke yu*”. After comparing it with the five original of *Tao Te Ching*, it is found that this sentence of source text used by Lika (2012) conforms with He Shanggong version, while the sentence of source text used by Wang (2014) conforms with Wang Bi version.

CONCLUSIONS

This research limited its scope on two Indonesian translations of *Tao Te Ching* by Lika and Wang, as the newest and complete versions of 81 chapters *Tao Te Ching* translations, that can still be found in book stores today. Through a comprehensive comparative study between source language texts used in Lika and Wang, the researcher finds out four conclusions.

The first is the source texts used in both Indonesian translation versions of *Tao Te Ching* have differences in four aspects: sentence punctuation marks, pauses, characters, and text redundancy or text loss. Text redundancy and text loss especially occur in Lika Chapter 2, 19, 20, 22, and 23. Moreover, these redundancy or losses seem to be on purpose. The translator has re-arranged the *Tao Te Ching* source text according to his purpose (Chapter 19, 20, 22, and 23). No original versions conform with these phenomena.

The second is the source text used by Lika are close to He Shanggong version, with some changes in several chapters, especially Chapter 2, 19, 20, 22, and 23. Chapter 2 changes refer to Boshu version, and changes in other chapters do not conform to any five original versions. It seems to be the translator's own idea. While source text used by Wang conforms with Wang Bi version.

The third is a comparative study on *Tao Te Ching*'s original versions needs to be conducted first before making the decision of which version to be used as the source text. Moreover, the last is because of the complexity of *Tao Te Ching* original versions, Indonesian translation of *Tao Te Ching* needs to give more concern to the source text to be used, and state clearly in translation book, include the changes that have made with a special purpose.

Future research needs to be conducted to investigate the source texts used in all Indonesian translations of *Tao Te Ching* from the past to present, to get a comprehensive understanding of base text versions used in translations.

REFERENCES

白水. (2017). 上古汉语口语没有语气词吗?——《之乎者也非口语论》. 中国图书评论, (10), 59–64.

- 党圣元, & 陈民镇. (2018). 王弼本《老子》“经注相”现象探论. 中国哲学史, (4), 50–63.
- 丁四新. (2014). 早期《老子》文本的演变、成型与定型——以出土简帛本为依据. 中州学刊, (10), 103–115.
- 杜泽逊. (2018). 谈谈文献学的方法、理论和学科建设. 文献双月刊, (1), 3–13.
- 李胜眉. (2018). 传播视角下印本对抄本的媒介取代问题. 传播与版权, (9), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.16852/j.cnki.45-1390/g2.2018.09.002>
- 梁斯迪. (2018). 浅谈《道德经》英译文本多样化原因探析. 科教文汇(下旬刊), (10), 180–181. <https://doi.org/10.16871/j.cnki.kjwha.2018.10.077>
- 刘殿爵, & 章婉凝. (2012). 《道德经》英汉双语. 北京: 中译出版社.
- 刘固盛. (2015). 《老子》首章无欲、有欲问题辨析. 中国哲学史, (4), 11–15.
- 刘利, & 李小军. (2013). 汉语语气词历时演变的几个特点. 北京师范大学学报(社会科学版), (6), 49–56.
- 刘笑敢. (2006). 《老子古今: 五种对勘与析评引论》. 北京: 中国社会科学出版社.
- 刘笑敢. (2014). 简帛本《老子》的思想與學術價值——以北大漢簡為契機的新考察. 《国学学刊》, (2), 34–45.
- 马莲. (2016). 《老子河上公章句》研究概述. 保定学院学报, (3), 79–83. <https://doi.org/10.13747/j.cnki.bdxxyb.2016.03.012>
- 孙要良. (2017). 《竹简〈老子〉文本校注》出版. 哲学动态, (12), 27.
- 王岩. (2017). 《老子》郭店简本与王弼注本第三十章异文对比研究. 哈尔滨师范大学社会科学学报, (4), 91–93.
- 吴会灵, & 吴玲玲. (2018). “之”字的用法解析. 吉林广播电视大学学报, (7), 141–142.
- 姚达兑. (2016). 译玄: 最早英译《道德经》(1859)译文初探+. 中国文化研究, (冬), 126–136.
- 赵争. (2018). 从出土文献看汉代《老子》文本及流传. 史林, (6), 20–27.
- 郑吉雄. (2018). 论先秦思想史中的语言方法——义理与训诂一体性新议. 文史哲, (5), 38–67. <https://doi.org/10.16346/j.cnki.37-1101/c.2018.05.04>
- Lika, I. D. (2012). *DaoDeJing: Kitab suci utama agama Tao*. Jakarta: P.T. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Wang, A. (2014). *DaoDeJing: The wisdom of Lao Zi*. Jakarta: P.T. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.