HdO

Daoism Handbook

Edited by

Livia Kohn

Brill

DAOISM HANDBOOK

EDITED BY

LIVIA KOHN

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2000

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Daoism handbook / edited by Livia Kohn.
p. cm. — (Handbuch der Orientalistik. Vierte Abteilung, China, ISSN 0169-9520 ; 14. Bd. = Handbook of Oriental studies, China)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004112081 (alk. paper)
1. Taoism—Handbooks, manuals, etc. I. Kohn, Livia, 1956- II. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Vierte Abteilung, China ; 14. Bd.

BL1925 .D36 2000
299'.514—dc21 00-022468
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Daoism handbook / ed. by Livia Kohn. -Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2000
(Handbuch der Orientalistik : Abt. 4., China ; Bd. 14)
ISBN 90-04-11208-1

ISSN 0169-9520
ISBN 90 04 112081

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This book is part of the Handbook of Oriental Studies (Section 4, China), issued by Brill Academic Publishers. It was first conceived in 1996, when the publisher approached me with the suggestion of compiling a volume on Daoism. Rather than a dictionary or alphabetical encyclopedia, I then decided with the advice and suggestions of many colleagues to develop a work that consisted of integrated articles. This proved fortuitous, since almost simultaneously with this volume two other major reference works on the religion will appear, the *A Study of Taoist Literature in the Daozang of the Ming Dynasty* edited by K. M. Schipper and F. Verellen (University of Chicago Press) and the *Encyclopedia of Taoism* edited by F. Pregadio (London: Curzon Press). The first focuses on texts and is based fully on the Daoist canon, while the second consists of over 800 separate entries on specific terms, figures, texts, places, ideas and practices of the religion. The three reference works, including this volume, present comprehensive information on the Daoist religion and will contribute to a better understanding of it and to the progress of Daoist studies.

The specific task of the *Daoism Handbook* in this triad is to present information in context, allowing readers to gain insight into the structure and organization of the religion from an integrated perspective. The twenty-eight papers each treat one specific topic as exhaustively and analytically as is possible at the present stage of research. About half are focused on a given historical period or school, the other half present materials on a specific topic, such as alchemy, immortality, women and art.

To make the information more easily accessible, each contribution follows a set pattern of four parts—history, texts, worldview and practices—with specific figures, texts, practices and other major themes highlighted for quick reference. The scheme was developed to enable the reader to find particular clusters of information as painlessly as possible. For example, while there is no specific contribution on cosmology or the pantheon, the "worldview" section in each paper, especially in those discussing specific schools, contains the relevant information. Similarly, materials on texts from different areas and on various topics can be found quickly. Despite these advantages, the scheme does have two drawbacks. First, it necessitates

a certain degree of repetition—certain texts, for example, may be mentioned in the "history" part, are then discussed in detail under "texts," and may appear yet again in a later section. Second, while the system works well for historical periods and schools and also for most topics, on occasion is has had to be modified to accommodate specific needs, especially in the contributions on art and music.

Regarding Chinese characters, after consultation with the contributors and the publisher, it was decided to put them directly into the text rather than into an extended glossary. However, in the bibliographies only the authors' names are given with their characters, since the titles of books, articles and journals are usually self-explanatory.

The book has been three years in the making and represents the labor of many people to whom I owe a great debt. First, I wish to thank the contributors for their cooperation and unending patience with the editing process. They were thoughtful and reliable and ever ready to change or rewrite, expand or shorten their contributions, always remaining receptive and supportive of each others' work and editorial and readers' suggestions. I am grateful for their continued good work and support of the project.

Deep thanks also go to my wonderful support team of helpers whose dedicated work greatly facilitated the editing process. James Miller (Boston University) set up an email list for the contributors which allowed easy communication with everybody. He also copy-edited the first set of manuscripts and translated the contribution on Daoism in Korea from the Chinese. Fabrizio Pregadio (Technische Universität Berlin) generously offered to share his website for the regular posting of completed papers, enabling the contributors to read each other's work. This greatly helped to avoid conflicting terminology and overlaps in the treatment of specific subjects. David Akin (Ann Arbor, Mich.) served as copy-editor for numerous papers and made many helpful suggestions that improved their style and accessibility. Louis Komjathy (Boston University) helped with the copy-editing process and was invaluable in spotting inconsistencies and character errors, in addition to doing much computer work. Patricia Radder (Brill Academic Publishers), finally, has been ever prompt and ready in answering my many queries; she has made innumerable helpful suggestions regarding both editing and computing and has helped greatly in the copy-editing process. I thank them all. The book would still be unfinished without their generous, selfless help and dedicated support.

Last, but certainly not least, the scholarly community has been very supportive of the project and I have greatly benefited from the suggestions and advice of numerous colleagues. I particularly wish to acknowledge Poul Andersen, Stephen Bokenkamp, Suzanne Cahill, Robert Campany, Edward Davis, Stephen Jackowicz, Paul Kjellberg, Terry Kleeman, Paul Kroll, Michael LaFargue, Lai Chi-tim, Liu Xun, Jeffrey Meyer, Harold D. Roth, Richard Rutt, Nathan Sivin, Stephen F. Teiser, Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis, Ts'ao Pen-yeh, Elena Valussi, Wu Hung and Erik Zürcher. I am very grateful to them all for their advice on overall organization, individual papers and specific problems.

ABBREVATIONS

CT *Concordance du Tao Tsang*. Numbers of texts in the Daoist canon, after K. M. Schipper, *Concordance du Tao Tsang* (Paris, 1975).

T. *Taishô daizôkyô*. Numbers, volume and pages of texts in the Buddhist canon, after the Taishô edition.

INTRODUCTION

RUSSELL KIRKLAND, T. H. BARRETT, LIVIA KOHN

EXPLAINING DAOISM: REALITIES, CULTURAL CONSTRUCTS AND EMERGING PERSPECTIVES (RUSSELL KIRKLAND)

Among the world's religions, Daoism is undoubtedly the most incompletely known and most poorly understood. As the twenty-first century opens, not only are the basic facts of Daoism known to very few, but the very concept of "Daoism" remains unclear to most educated people and educators. The reasons for this are fairly complex, and have surprisingly little to do with Daoism itself. One problem is that scholars were slow to take it seriously. Another is that the **interpretive category "Daoism"** has different contents in different minds, even those of very learned people, including educators at all levels. Also, there has been inordinate debate, among specialists and the educated public alike, about the data that ought, or ought not, to be included in that category. As Fabrizio Pregadio has noted (personal communication), scholars of Buddhism study a tradition at least as multifaceted as Daoism, but have seldom felt a need to address the "issue" of "what Buddhism *is*": the underlying unity of Buddhism is generally taken for granted in modern Buddist studies as it is also in traditional Buddhist sources. Yet, those who write and teach about Daoism have almost always felt pressed to insist that we should see fundamental discrepancies—even inherent contradictions—between several supposedly different "Daoisms." Recent scholars have suggested other conceptualizations (e.g., Kirkland 1993). But by the end of the twentieth century, the majority of specialists in the study of Daoism, at least in Japan and in the West, seemed to begin to reach agreement that such artificial bifurcations as "philosophical Daoism" and "religious Daoism" (*daojia* 道家 and *daojiao* 道教) do not do real justice to the facts and serve little heuristic purpose.

Such interpretive problems do not generally result from real divergences among the beliefs or practices of Chinese Daoists, premodern or modern. Rather, they result from the cultural and intellectual history of the interpretive category "Daoism" in late traditional and modern times. That category has a complex history, a history em-

bedded in the social, intellectual, and political conflicts within Chinese and Western cultures alike. Only recently have scholars begun to try to unravel the cultural history of the concept of "Daoism." The problem has been difficult to resolve, because it requires today's interpreters to reflect critically upon why they believe what they believe about Daoism. Doing so requires a difficult and sometimes painful reexamination of many fundamental assumptions about Chinese social and cultural history, and about the proper interpretive context in which to explain such matters.

Japanese interpreters may, overall, be the most balanced in their assessment of Daoism, for their society has usually respected most elements of Chinese culture, and has escaped many of the effects of the persecutions that wracked Daoism in late imperial and modern China. There remains one problem: the Japanese recognize in their own culture a set of phenomena that they label *dôkyô*, a term derived from the Chinese term *daojiao*, and generally assumed to constitute "Daoism" in Japan. This problem has never been fully analyzed, but a simple equation of Japan's *dôkyô* with China's *daojiao* would be erroneous, for the contents of the two categories do not really coincide (see Kirkland 1986).

Chinese interpreters, for their part, have often had difficulty explaining Daoism without succumbing to a variety of biases engendered by the social and political marginalization of Daoism in late imperial and modern China. Centuries of Confucians, and decades of Communists, asserted that most of Daoism is, and always has been, "superstition"—a hodgepodge of specious products of scoundrels and fools. Even non-Marxist interpreters have often succumbed to that bias. Wing-tsit Chan (1963), for instance, sought respect for Neo-Confucian perspectives, and his depiction of Daoism was respectful in tone but narrow in coverage and tendentious in interpretation. Similarly, Fung Yu-lan (1952) labored to convince Westerners that traditional Chinese thought deserved respectful attention. His presentation of Daoism was consciously or subconsciously designed to make modern minds see it as bizarre, and as far less worthy of intellectual consideration than Confucianism. Neither Chan nor Fung presented any analysis of "Daoist thought" after the fourth century C.E.. In their works (and in deBary's influential *Sources of Chinese Tradition* [1960]), Ge Hong was quite falsely presented as the prototypical exemplar of "religious Daoism." The fallacy of such a representation has been clearly demonstrated by Nathan Sivin (1978), whose analysis all should still ponder today.

Also, like many modern intellectuals, both Fung and Chan were

uncomfortable with the very concept of "religion." Here is a fundamental point where Chinese and Western interpreters still struggle with the ideological conflicts at work in their own cultural traditions. For instance, both the Confucians of modern China and the secularized academics of the West have generally been embarrassed to acknowledge—and thereby implicitly legitimize—the *religious* activities of Daoists *or* Confucians. The fact that many Neo-Confucians of Ming and Qing times practiced meditation—and some even professed to have undergone "enlightenment" experiences—were suppressed by most modern expositors of China's heritage, as were the presence of Confucian temples, priests and liturgies. Such elements of "religion" are at odds with the modern Confucians' conception of their own tradition. Because such attitudes were deeply engrained in virtually all educated minds—the Cheng-Zhu 程朱 perspective of Neo-Confucianism having been a cornerstone of the Chinese educational system from the time of the Mongols to final years of the Qing—most educated Chinese have looked askance at all such phenomena, especially in regard to Daoism. Even the new elite consciousness of the Republican era, which consciously divorced itself from Confucianism, remained inimical to religion, and Communist rule greatly aggravated such biases.

The overlapping sensibilities among the educated elite of nineteenth- and twentieth-century China and the scholars who gave birth to Western sinology led to a productive relationship, and to a deeply distorted picture of Daoism. The first such scholars lived in an age when **Western protestants** were actively missionizing in China. Some Chinese sought to "package" their culture to win approval of missionaries and converts, and in doing so disparaged the "superstitious" religious activities of contemporary Daoists. Meanwhile, scholars like James Legge began resisting the pressures of their missionary sponsors, and worked toward a more accurate understanding of Chinese culture by seeking guidance from educated native informants. Of course, virtually none of those informants was trained in Daoism, and most, educated in the Cheng-Zhu Confucian curriculum, were contemptuous of all of Daoism except the sainted classics, *Laozi (Daode jing)* and *Zhuangzi* (see Lagerwey 1987, ix-xiii; Robinet 1997, x-xii, "Translator's Foreword;" Girardot 1999).

The picture of Daoism that emerged from Victorian sinology was also tainted by the egregious charge that "Daoists today"—reifying the Zhengyi Tianshi 正一天師 (Orthodox Unity Celestial Masters) of Mount Longhu as "popes" of "the Daoist Church"—were guilty of the lowest form of "papacy" (Penny 1998). So while Western sinolo-

gists, like twentieth-century Confucians, continued to write respectfully of *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi*, they generally continued to caricature the Daoism of modern times in the way that Protestants had long caricatured Catholicism in polemical attacks, i.e., as dangerous nonsense that has corrupted the tradition's original purity, and must be condemned in favor of a return to its original truth, as embodied in ancient texts that can be correctly understood by the individual, with no need for ecclesiastical intermediaries. In this way, Western sinology gave birth to an ultra-Protestant construct of Daoism that appealed greatly to many Westerners, from poets and professors to romanticists and reformers (Bradbury 1992; Kirkland 1992, 1997a).

In fact, so popular did that Orientalist construct become that many Westerners, particularly in North America, became persuaded that Daoism was actually *not* a tradition rooted in Chinese history and society, but rather a set of idealized attitudes (like naturalness) that the "enlightened person" *already* embraces. Western textbooks, and non-specialist educators, not only validated the idea that "you, too, can become a Daoist" (merely by feeling such attitudes), but also legitimized the insidious delusion that one who does so "has the Dao" and is therefore entitled to ridicule all elements of Daoism that seem to conflict with it—most specifically, anything that is clearly embedded in Chinese society or culture. Such "spiritual imperialism" has further hampered efforts to understand Daoism accurately (cf. Kirkland 2000a).

The efflorescence of Daoist studies among Western scholars in recent decades has given rise to a **different set of interpretive perspectives**, which consciously repudiate such Orientalist constructs. These new perspectives insist that we (1) recognize the *Chinese-ness* of Daoism; (2) privilege the factual *data* of Daoism itself, in social, historical, and textual terms; and (3) acknowledge the importance of the *living forms* of Daoism that survive among Chinese communities today.

These new perspectives, too, have discernible roots in modern history. They were stimulated primarily by a momentous event in the 1920s, of which many educated people, and many educators, remain wholly unaware. That event was the publication of the *Daozang* 道藏 (Daoist canon)—the vast library of premodern Daoist texts that were unknown to the Victorian scholars who had established the "mainstream" view of who Daoists were and what they believed. During Legge's day, the *Daozang*—and much of the cognate literature produced by centuries of Daoists of every stripe—had remained cloistered in monastic libraries, which were hardly ever visited by scholars, Chinese or foreign.

Consequently, twentieth-century scholarship developed two divergent frameworks: (1) that of "mainstream" scholars, trained to understand Daoism in terms of the deeply distorted Victorian/Confucian construct; and (2) that of scholars who accepted the importance of the *Daozang*, such as Chen Guofu and Henri Maspero as well as various Japanese scholars who had been less directly affected by the Orientalist perspectives that dominated Western sinology. These two scholarly frameworks endure today, with the result that knowledgeable scholars sometimes talk past each other, or criticize each other's scholarship for the failure to follow mainstream sinology—as Creel castigated Maspero (1970)—or for the failure to repudiate it.

As more Western scholars were able to train in Japan, and as China itself slowly began "opening" from the political and ideological strictures of the Maoist era, more and more scholars have begun to recognize serious flaws in the mainstream construct of Daoism. Moreover, critical analysts like Michel Strickmann (1980) began to win converts to a new perspective, which privileged the Zhengyi order and its presumptive origins in the Tianshi organization of late antiquity. Such scholars supported their perspective by rigorous analysis of texts from the *Daozang*, and by fieldwork among living Daoists, mostly in Taiwan. As scholars like Michael Saso (1972) and Kristofer Schipper (1994), who underwent Zhengyi ordination, began publishing what they learned from such experiences, the educated public came to believe that Daoism had all but died completely in the mainland, and that Taiwan's Zhengyi tradition was all that remained today. This situation resulted from the fact that through most of the late twentieth century, Daoists in mainland China suffered from various degrees of political, economic and ideological oppression and had no opportunity to present their tradition to the outside world. Foreign scholars, meanwhile, were seldom allowed to enter mainland China, and could generally only guess as to whether Daoism was still being practiced there at all. In the 1980s and 1990s, China gradually began to open to foreign visitors, and students of Chinese culture began to learn firsthand about the Daoism that lives there today.

The interpretive ramifications of these facts have only just begun to be felt. The Chinese public, like most in the outside world, generally knows little about the Daoist tradition, though some are curious about whether it might have something to contribute to their lives. And many Westerners imperialistically assume that the primary reason for studying the religions of other cultures is to identify elements that can be appropriated into their own lives, or to find new religious

identities that can be assumed. A proper understanding and representation of Daoism requires that one recognize all such motivations to ensure that they do not interfere with one's interpretive efforts, e.g., by causing one to discount elements of Daoism that do not suit one's own taste, further one's own goals or re-inforce the biasses of one's own age or culture.

As the new century opens, the educated public needs to be made aware of these various **new perspectives** and learn about the many aspects of Daoist history, thought, and practice that have heretofore been ignored or misinterpreted (see Kirkland 1998a). First, the simplistic dichotomy of "philosophical" and "religious" Daoism must be abandoned and replaced with an accurate and properly nuanced understanding of the diverse but interrelated forms of Daoism that evolved over the long history of China (Kirkland 1997b). It should also be noted that many of today's specialists privilege the subtraditions that evolved during the Han to Tang dynasties, and give scant consideration to the quite different subtraditions that emerged throughout the second millennium.

Another important point is that the modern forms of Daoism deserve much greater attention, for a variety of reasons: (1) they have survived, more or less intact, into the twentieth century, which is not true of such well-studied Six Dynasties subtraditions as Shangqing; (2) they often feature prominent roles for women practitioners and even women leaders (see Kirkland 1999); (3) they maintain ancient Daoist practices of self-cultivation, thereby revealing vital continuities between classical Daoism and the Daoism practiced from the Tang period onward; (4) they compare favorably with other Chinese and non-Chinese traditions in terms of both religious thought and models of personal practice, which is not true of most pre-Tang subtraditions.

Then again, today's specialists often ignore a helpful distinction that modern Daoists continue to make between "Northern Daoism" (i.e., Quanzhen 全眞 [Complete Perfection]) and "Southern Daoism" (i.e., Zhengyi). Northern Daoism displays more of the charactistics listed above than Southern Daoism, and as members of the educated public become more aware of it, they may develop the same intense interest and respect that they currently show toward other major traditions, like Buddhism.

Perhaps the most important emphasis that today's educators and interpreters should give to their presentations of Daoism would be to emphasize those historical and living realities of Daoism that belie the misconceptions that have dominated so far. For instance, the misconception that religious Daoism was the province of the illiterate masses

can be corrected by directing attention to the hundreds of Daoist texts preserved in the *Daozang* and elsewhere, some of which have begun to be translated into Western languages. Similarly, giving due attention to the models of personal practice articulated by Chinese intellectuals easily disproves the misconception that Daoism degenerated into superstition after *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi*. Above all, the many versions of inner alchemical theory and practice—a fundamental element of Daoism for the last thousand years—demonstrate the absurdity of the lingering "anti-Catholic" charge that later Daoism was ritualistic nonsense that ignored the spiritual needs and aspirations of individual practitioners. Moreover, increasing sophistication in ritual theory helps us understand and explain the depth and richness of all forms of Daoist liturgy.

Further attention is also due to the rich diversity of Daoist conceptions of the religious life. Virtually no one outside the immediate field today knows, for instance, that Tang Daoists wrote extensively about the "Dao-nature" (*daoxing* 道性)—the true reality of all things, including ourselves (see Kirkland 1997-98). Nor do most realize that much of Quanzhen thought actually parallels, and interacted historically with, the thought of Chan Buddhism and with many elements of Neo-Confucian thought and practice (see Berling 1979; 1980; 1993). To explain that Daoist practice was often taught and practiced in terms of "cultivating the heart/mind," or in terms of "integrating our inherent nature 性 with our destined lives 命," will correct and greatly expand the very narrow and misleading depictions of Daoist thought or Daoist practice that characterized most modern presentations.

It is also important to draw attention to the historical facts that demonstrate that Daoism was not, as has often been taught, a tradition practiced by people who stood outside the normal social order and attacked it, philosophically or politically. At no point in Chinese history were the majority of Daoists actually hermits, misfits, members of rebel movements or critics of conventional values. The newly discovered Guodian 郭店 manuscripts contain passages of *Laozi* which seem to show that that text did *not* originally critique Confucian values (see Kirkland 2000b; see also Kirkland 2000c on teaching the *Daode jing*). During most periods, Daoists came from all segments of society, supported—and often helped legitimize—the imperial government, and were often well-known and respected by other members of China's social and cultural elite. For these reaons, some scholars today have begun identifying elements of premodern and modern Daoism that could be called "literati Daoism" (Kirkland

1998b) or "gentry Daoism" (Barrett 1996).

Finally, the public needs to know much more about the living realities of Daoism in China today. Today's Daoists still maintain many elements of premodern Daoism, including personal self-cultivation, a monastic life for men and women alike and a rich panoply of traditional practices. It should be noted that the liturgical traditions of Daoism—which had already been socially and politically marginalized in late-imperial China—survive not only in the Southern Daoism of Taiwan and the southeast coast, but also in temples throughout mainland China, even at those identified as Quanzhen. But it should also be noted that decades of Communist rule and secularistic trends seem to have left Daoist practice marginalized in new ways. Among the general public, practices that had become loosely associated with Daoism—like Taiji quan and Qigong—remain popular, but often without the practitioners knowing their full historical background or religious implications—though in some circles, medieval texts continue to inform Qigong practice. And in temples and monasteries, Daoist clerics continue to keep a relatively low profile, and sometimes teach outsiders a quite modernized understanding of Daoist meditative and ritual traditions (Kohn 1997). As China's economy and society evolves away from the Communist restrictions, observers should remain alert to the possible redomestication of Daoist elements among the expanding Chinese middle class, especially reformulations of the more intellectualized traditions of literati Daoism.

Daoism: A Historical Narrative (T. H. Barrett)

When, a generation ago, the first international conference on Daoist studies was organized, historians, and particularly historians of science, were prominent among the participants. The reason was simple: an urgent need existed at that time for some narrative account of Daoism that made it more than an "element" in Chinese culture. For Daoism, like Confucianism and Chinese Buddhism, was presumably a tradition that changed and developed over the course of time. Then, in 1968, there was very little that could be said on this topic. It was baffling enough to try to make sense of what Daoism was in early China, let alone to trace its development through imperial history.

True, by 1968 one self-declared "History of Daoism" had already existed in Chinese for over thirty years, and a substantial volume with the same title was to appear in Japanese in 1977. But what is con-

spicuous in these works, and even in Isabelle Robinet's history of Daoism up to the fourteenth century (1991; 1997), is the way in which a clear narrative of development is constantly subordinated to the need to describe different types of Daoism, and sometimes concurrently different types, at that. This *Handbook*, too, despite the unprecedented wealth of scholarship that it incorporates, follows the same pattern, mixing chronological and topical surveys in its separate essays. Given, however, that a broader synthesis of current knowledge is available here than in any recent Chinese "History of Daoism"—since these were not afforded the opportunity to consult much non-Chinese research—can we now point to a tacit complete narrative of Daoism contained here for the first time in English, or are there still problems?

To ask the question is to answer it, in the sense that as our interpretative perspectives grow more sophisticated, our problems as historians do not dispappear so much as change in character as the historiography of the study of Daoism itself unfolds. But now is certainly a good time to reconsider the unprecedented chronological scope of this volume and to point up the current difficulties that appear to stand in the way of converting this sequence of essays into a coherent narrative.

The term **"coherent narrative"** of course presupposes a degree of coherence in the phenomena described. Yet it must be admitted that one of the prime lessons of the last thirty years has been that while it is possible to point to principles of coherence that broadly define Daoism, these principles cannot be stretched to cover everything that was called "Daoist" in 1968. And that is precisely why we have to reconsider the history of Daoism, because although it is possible to discuss such problems in the abstract, their significance is best exemplified by a historical narrative. In doing so we are certainly not obliged to adhere to any "single thread": Isabelle Robinet's description of Daoism as essentially a cumulative tradition, gathering in quite heterogeneous elements over the course of time, is just one important perception that points us away from a "single thread" narrative towards a more flexible approach.

But even cumulation has to start somewhere, and here I would suggest that the tendency of many scholars—and notaby the late Anna Seidel (1938-1991)—to start in the second century C.E. has much to recommend it (see Welch and Seidel 1979; Seidel 1990). This does not preclude a discussion of earlier phenomena: indeed, it demands it. What goes before, however, may be regarded from this standpoint as a heritage to be shaped rather than as an established

tradition itself shaping the future. It was very much to Anna Seidel's credit that she was the first to articulate clearly the bureaucratic and imperial elements in Daoism, and to locate their origin in the traumatic collapse of imperial authority in the second century C.E. (Seidel 1983) As her later work explored how the advance of a bureaucratic and imperial conception of the spirit world concomitant with, or even ahead of, the spread of bureaucracy in early China paved the way for religion to move into the gap created by political failure, so it became possible to see how the work of Rolf A. Stein (1979) and Michel Strickmann (1980) emphasizing the tensions between China's "higher religion" and the chthonic, even subversive world of the local cult could fit into a single frame. Through historical study, the earlier scholarly confusion between Daoism and "folk religion"—understandable enough in view of subsequent developments—was thus in principle eliminated.

At the same time, once the bureaucratic structure of priesthood, pantheon and communication between the two was seen as something that potentially could give coherence to a religious tradition, it became possible to see the earlier elements labelled "Daoist" by most scholars as in fact part of a contestable heritage. The very word "Daoist" itself, first used by doxographers of the second century B.C.E. to bring together texts as diverse as the *Daode jing* and the *Zhuangzi*, was for a while the site of protracted struggles, involving not only proponents of various views of the Chinese heritage but also Chinese Buddhists as well. Clearly the new, imperial form of religion could not do without a sage and teacher—now Laozi rather than Confucius—and could not do without some heritage of classical texts, even if new texts were revealed. Ancient practices, too, concerning meditation and techniques for achieving immortality also needed to be integrated into the structured tradition.

But this did not mean that alternative views of Laozi, or the text under his name, or the cult of immortality were not still available in the third and fourth centuries C.E. It is possible therefore to construe much of the related literature of this period not as a two-sided conflict between "religious" and "philosophical" conceptions of Daoism, as earlier scholarship unsuccessfully tried to read the evidence, but as ideologically tinged competition between various groups reacting to the near-extinction of imperial government at the hands of a religious alternative (the Yellow Turbans) in the late **second century C.E.** Neither a simple progression, nor a simple dichotomy, is enough to explain the Way of the Celestial Master, Wang Bi and Ge Hong, but once the issues at stake are understood, their different ideological po-

sitions do become intelligible. And, once again, we have Anna Seidel to thank for demonstrating that the link between Daoism and politics (see Seidel 1981), dismissed by the Confucian tradition as due to a sporadic autocratic weakness for the promises of wizards, was actually a structural element at the heart of the religion.

But religion it was, and if Daoism makes no sense without considering the overall political environment, it is equally necessary to consider the overall religious environment, not simply "folk religion," but also the "higher religion" of Buddhism as well. Even so, we should not automatically assume that Buddhism and Daoism contested the religious high ground from the start. For while it is undeniable that the Buddha's message in South Asia, as entrusted to his followers, the sangha, was in some ways "higher" than religion itself, since it was dedicated to the transcendence of this world, religion and all, we would do well not to assume that this was how it was generally perceived in China at first. Rather, as late as the second half of the fourth century C.E., when the Shangqing 上清 (Highest Clarity) and Lingbao 靈寶 (Numinous Treasure) textual revelations started to appear, there is no reason to suppose that supporters of these revelations saw Buddhism as anything other than a recent addition to the cultural heritage perfectly susceptible to being cumulated into a fresh synthesis.

This "free market" in religion, however, seems to have succumbed to increasing state intervention from early in the **fifth century C.E.** In the north of China, the Toba Wei regime was confronted with the task of rebuilding society after almost a century of instability, and particularly of reintegrating scattered remnants of groups adhering to the Celestial Master tradition who may well have lived in independent communities isolated from any religious or secular supervision. In the south, the new Song regime of Liu Yu 劉裕 came to power in the wake of the rebellion of Sun En 孫恩, an adventurer who again had taken advantage of the lack of an enforced orthodoxy in the Celestial Master tradition to build an organization of his own. In both north and south the issue for the state was one of quality control: left unsupervised, religious groups had proved capable of mutating in dangerous ways; supervision, on the other hand, implied some degree of recognition of religious traditions, and of their orthodox boundaries.

It is at this point that we find the emergence of codified ritual, of organized cononical literature, and above all, of a religion called "Daoism" that embraced a number of distinct sub-traditions composing a unified whole. The model here was clearly Buddhism, which accommodated within the overarching definition of "Buddha's word"

an array of distinct doctrines representing different stages in the development of the religion. We should note, however, that to the extent that Buddhism, too, started to be shaped by the state (accepting, for example, the official appointment of monk-overseers to direct its affairs on behalf of the government) it ceased to be in China quite the religion it had been in South Asia.

But now that Daoism had started to become an **officially delimited religion** (or rather a self-delimited broad religious tradition, thanks to official encouragement), the puzzle for the historian is how to trace its development of increasing complexity—particularly, in the face of Buddhism, at the doctrinal level—at a time when China was politically divided between north and south. We know that in the sixth century, the creation of a state based on the ideological use of Buddhism by Emperor Wu of the Liang probably forced some southern Daoist leaders to try their luck at northern courts. But was this the first era of contact? It is noteworthy, for example, that earlier Liu Yu's "northern expedition" temporarily reconquered the area of Mount Song, the very religious center that was to produce the religious reformer of Daoism, Kou Qianzhi 寇謙之.

Simultaneously, the sharp institutional divide between Buddhism and Daoism in both societies probably increased rather than decreased interaction between the two religions as both competed for patronage. Now that in Buddhist studies the traditional picture of a Daoism so intellectually impoverished as to be obliged to borrow from Buddhism at every turn has been replaced by one in which many Buddhist texts turn out not to have been translated, but to have been composed inChina to address a Daoist environment, it seems much better to talk of dialogue rather than plagiarism, but again the details remain obscure. At first sight, too, the polemics between the two religions seem to focus on quite trivial issues, until we see once more that worldviews were often connected with ideologically sensitive areas—that a discussion of cosmology, for example, could impinge on the role of the emperor, or on questions of public morality. So again, although the sequence of events may be clear already, the logic of events awaits further study.

One indirect testimony to the importance of Daoism as ideology during this period is the degree to which a reunited China under the Sui and especially the **Tang** took up the task of binding Daoism to the state, even if the disruption caused by the openly anti-Buddhist policies of their immediate predecessors, the Northern Zhou, appear to have resulted in a degree of caution and gradualism in pursuing this path. A number of texts evidently designed (or promoted) in or-

der to establish empire-wide norms for Daoism allow us to see to what extent a Buddhist pattern had been imposed on the religion in the state's interest. The fiscally and politically convenient institution of monasticism, for example, is promoted at the expense of Celestial Master Daoism, with its hereditary priesthood and community base. The constant display of state-promoted norms, however, should not blind us to the probable existence of more complex realities. The co-optation of Daoist messianism, for instance, by the Tang emperors via their claim of descent from Laozi would have been neither necessary nor advantageous had it not related to what must have been a fairly widespread belief in Chinese society, untouched by state intervention.

But Daoism beyond the purview of the state, and of the aristocracy that supported it, is much harder to discern. All that we can be sure of is that as Chinese society developed, so did religious groups, and that among them the imperial status of Daoism offered a prize worth competing for. Thus the group whose name in modern times has been the Jingming 淨明 (Pure Brightness) school seems to have been before the Tang no more than a local cult, but in the late seventh century a brief spell of imperial patronage from the Empress Wu for a reformer of the cult seems to have brought it into Daoist circles, a position it sought to maintain without further court contacts by modelling its practices on those of the Celestial Masters. With the decline of the dynasty from 756 onward, state patronage became less important compared with local standing, so that we find the Celestial Masters consolidating their influence once more from a new base in Jiangsu under a new (or renewed) hereditary family leadership based on claims of descent from Han times.

The **Tang-Song transition**, then, saw a relative decline in the importance of court Daoism and the rise of regional groups and popular practices, often in conjunction. Some of these innovations, such as Thunder Magic (*leifa* 雷法), have been tentatively linked to the expansion of Chinese culture into new areas in the south where hostile non-Chinese religious influences were still strong. The same may be said of other religious trends, too, such as the emergence of new tutelary deities, "city gods," again in accordance with population shifts into areas where spiritual protection was a priority. But the city gods at this point were no more Daoist than most of the new deities we hear of in Song times who had evidently been brought to prominence by changes in the composition of Chinese society. It would seem that though the old aristocracy that had supported Daoism and Buddhism had disappeared, a new elite that emphasized learning

more than lineage still continued the role of patrons of monastic religion.

But other patrons of religion had now emerged, while improved communications and media (the printed icon, for example) made it possible for cults with a local base to spread across wide areas, sometimes jumping dialect and other cultural boundaries in the process. Some of these cults were able to emulate the Jingming school and achieve recognition as part of Daoism. But in the Southern Song especially, when government recognition of deities not sanctioned by Buddhism or Daoism seems to have become more easily obtained, the hegemony of Daoism as a legitimating, "imperial" organization was undermined. Paul Katz has shown (1993) how in time a cult could acquire some recognition by Daoism yet still maintain an independent existence. The simple dichotomy between Daoism and folk religion earlier noted by Stein (1979) thus becomes a more complex, nuanced affair. Of particular interest is the ability of some non-Daoist groups to define themselves in relation to Daoism as what might be termed "ancillary" forms of religion, subordinate yet in the service of higher powers than those of a mere folk practitioner. The priests of Xu Jia 徐甲, the legendary servant of Laozi, play just such a role, mediating between different levels of religion.

All this trend towards further complexity would doubtless be easier to chronicle were it not for the events of the thirteenth century, which were to see the debates between Buddhism and Daoism climax in the **Mongol** destruction of the Daoist canon, eliminating vital resources for the study of Song Daoism. For example, "popular" forms of Daoism, like Thunder Magic, may easily be traced through references in non-Daoist literature, but what of court Daoism? At some point the elaborate system built up by the mid-Tang, with its complex hierarchy of levels of ordination, seems to have collapsed, though manuscript remains from Dunhuang show that it was for a while at least more than merely notional. But what took its place at the center?

Disaster under the Mongols has had one other consequence for our studies also in that it has drawn attention to the North Chinese schools of Daoism like Quanzhen which the Mongols encountered first, and which played a large role in their religious policies, in their thirteenth century forms, whereas contemporary Jin sources on their origins are much more difficult to come by. There are signs, however, that the collapse of Song power in the north after 1127 at first engendered truly radical religious movements which by the thirteenth century had succumbed to a process of institutionalization. The Bud-

dhist Dhuta Sect appears to have been one such group, though like the southern White Cloud and other similar movements, it seems to have been less successful in shedding its sectarian image or compromising with the religious establishment in Mongol times, and so failed to manage the transition to respectability achieved by Quanzhen. Some elements affected by this transition, such as the early importance of female leadership, though lost to offical hagiography, were not so successfully purged from collective memory, as we shall see.

But first Daoism had to undergo, with the founding of the **Ming** administrative reforms instigated by virtually the only Chinese emperor to grow up with a firsthand knowledge of religion at the popular level. Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 was clearly aware that the established religious traditions brought with them a considerable penumbra of less qualified religious practititoners, and his main aim appears to have been to make sure that all were subject to stringent controls —not only the existence, but even the travels of Daoist priests were now duly reported and recorded. The city gods were also incorporated into Daoism at this time, and in general the balance between recognition and regulation that went back to the fifth century was now shifted decisively in favor of the state.

The results of this were twofold. First, at the popular level, limiting the official clergy seems to have created a gap in the market for religious leadership, especially as the overall population increased, so that the Ming and the Qing dynasties were plagued with sporadic sectarian uprisings headed by religious adventurers unconstrained by membership of a regulated clergy. Secondly, educated persons took religious life increasingly into their own hands. Organized Daoism had never exercised a monopoly over the techniques used to seek immortality, and with the rise in the late Tang of inner alchemy requiring no special materials we can be sure that these techniques spread yet more freely. The late Ming, however, saw a rapid expansion of the publishing industry which promoted an unprecedentedly broad dissemination of many kinds of technical knowledge, including Daoist knowledge, on the open market.

The Daoist canon remained out of reach of any private citizen, but **Qing** Daoist (and Buddhist) publishing, at any rate, saw the appearance of larger or smaller sets of "essential" works to suit any pocket, and of course most of the literature included was geared to a demand for religious self-help. Interestingly, those who were now ready to seek this help included women educated and independent enough to delimit their own religious needs, and to revive the names of female authors like Sun Bu'er 孫不二 whom Quanzhen hagiogra-

phy had, as we noted, long suppressed. To an elite now well accustomed to receiving revelations from the spirit world through automatic writing of the planchette type, any historical hiatus in communication with past spiritual figures presented no problems.

But there is yet a third factor which may perhaps be associated with the intensified climate of control. When Buddhists and Daoists had competed freely for state patronage, it was in the interests of both to maintain their distinctiveness. Yet open religious polemics between the two were now a thing of the past, so that we find in the supplement to the Ming Daoist canon a handbook of religious knowledge, the *Soushen ji* 搜神記 (In Search of the Supernatural, CT 1476), by Luo Maodeng (fl. 1593-98), which describes Buddhist and other cults just as in the extra-canonical editions of the same work, with no attempt at modifying them to suit a Daoist context. The incorporation of Buddhist language into inner alchemical literature of the Qing also reaches new levels of complexity, and provides indirect evidence (amply confirmed by other sources) for a lay readership well informed about both Buddhism and Daoism yet not particularly concerned with an exclusive approach to either.

In some ways, however, this may have proved an excellent preparation for the **twentieth century**, since Daoism within this context (leaving aside, that is, its continuing role in local society) has been cut back to what is quite irreducibly non-Buddhist, that is, its distinctively Chinese view of the materiality of the cosmos and the individual in terms of *qi*. The rise of modern Qigong in this century has thus produced a further level of "somatization," and of the configuring of a "Daoist body" as the locus of practice which requires the understanding of such a minimum of distinctive concepts (such as *qi*) that it can cut loose from its cultural context and compete successfully in a global marketplace. Thus Daoism as popularly understood throughout the world today is far less burdened than Buddhism with a voluminous but necessary doctrinal literature, even if on the other hand it lacks the organizational strength preserved by the Buddhist tradition.

The future alone will tell whether it is able to maintain its identity internationally; history so far can only say that as a religious tradition it has been subject to constant change. Yet, looking back, it becomes clear that no phase in its existence can be described in isolation. It is, of course, possible to speak of the periodization of Daoism, but only by involving a number of other elements that have been subject to simultaneous historic change: the Chinese state, Chinese society, Buddhism and even folk religion—and this last is frankly a residual category which, as has been suggested above, was itself capable of

evolving a high degree of differentiation over time. To search for patterns of development in such a situation is a dangerous task, since hypotheses are all too easily falsified by new information arriving from a number of different directions.

If the history of Daoism looked highly unsatisfactory a generation ago, then it is certainly not free from problems now. It is reasonable to suppose that an essay on this topic written thirty years hence should in turn be capable of showing up glaring errors of fact and judgment in the foregoing remarks. But the entire aim of this *Handbook* is to provide a baseline from which others will be able to make and measure progress. When this particular marker has been left well behind—a process which one might hope to measure in years rather than decades—then it will have served its purpose.

Research on Daoism (Livia Kohn)

Traditionally the main centers of Daoist research have been France and Japan, where the first copies of the Daoist canon became available to the scholarly community in the beginning of this century and study began to flourish, rising to great heights in the following decades. Major scholars and works of this early period (some in later reprints and translations) are Edouard Chavannes (1910; 1919), Henri Maspero (1981), Rolf A. Stein (1990) and Maxime Kaltenmark (1969), as well as Yoshioka Yoshitoyo (1955; 1959; 1970; 1976), Fukui Kôjun (1952), Ôfuchi Ninji (1964), Fukunaga Mitsuji (1956; 1987) and Miyakawa Hisayuki (1974).

Since the 1970s, and following the reprint of the Daoist canon in various reduced editions by publishing houses in Taiwan, the study of Daoism has become more widespread. Still, France and Japan are the greatest centers, but there are now also serious Daoist scholars in other European countries (Great Britain, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Italy) as well as in the United States, Canada and Australia. In addition, after the end of the Cultural Revolution and with the increased religious revival in mainland China, the field has also picked up momentum in Daoism's original homeland (see Leung 1991; "The Study of Daoism in China Today").

In **Japan**, the main research organizations in the past few decades have been the Nihon dôkyô gakkai 日本道教學會 (Japanese Daoist Society)—with its journal *Tôhô shûkyô* 東方宗教 (Eastern Religions)—and the recent Dôkyô bunka kenkyûkai 道教文化研究會 (Study Group of Daoist Culture), which so far has published one book containing articles by its members (1994) and participated in two joint

conferences with American scholars, in Tokyo in 1995 and in Maine in 1998 (for their proceedings, see Yamada and Tanaka 1998; Kohn and Roth forthcoming). A comprehensive English description of the development of Daoist studies in Japan is given by Sakai Tadao and Noguchi Tetsurô (1979) and, more recently, by Fukui Fumimasa (1995).

In **France**, three major institutions promote Daoist studies. There is first the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, with representatives in Japan, Hong Kong and Taiwan. It publishes two journals, *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient* and *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*. The latter, in particular, has several issues dedicated to Daoism and contains an excellent description of the development of Daoist studies in the West from 1950 to 1990 (Seidel 1990b). In addition, there are the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, a section of the University of Paris, and the Collège de France. The former is a major training center of scholars, while the latter has an extensive publication series that contains many important studies in the field.

As the field grew, leading scholars of both France and Japan were responsible for organizing three international conferences on Daoism, which took place in Bellagio (Italy) in 1968, Tateshina (Japan) in 1973 and Unterägeri (Switzerland) in 1979, and also included scholars and students from various other countries. The proceedings of the first two were published (*History of Religions*, vol. 17.3-4 [1969]; Welch and Seidel 1979).

It is also largely—but not exclusively—due to their effort that we today have a number of important **indexes and concordances** to the Daoist canon and certain specific texts. On the Daoist canon, aside from the two standards indexes (Weng 1935; Schipper 1975a), there are a comprehensive description of all its texts (Ren and Zhong 1991) and an index to all texts cited in its major encyclopedias and collections (Ôfuchi and Ishii 1988). In addition, there is an index to the *Daozang jiyao* 道藏輯要, a seventeenth-century collection which supplements the canon (Chen 1987).

Studies on Daoism are listed in a variety of bibliographies, beginning with Michel Soymié's early work (1968; 1969) and continuing with the collections made by Knut Walf (1989) and Julian Pas (1997; see also Dragan 1989). In addition, large sections dealing with Daoism are contained in Laurence Thompson's *Chinese Religion in Western Languages* (1985; 1993a; see also Kardos 1998). The most current and most complete listing of works on Daoism in various languages is contained in the fall issue of the Japanese journal *Tôhô shûkyô*.

Daoist studies as a field has been multifaceted and incorporated

many different areas and approaches, matching the variegated nature of the Daoist religion itself. Neither clearly an ethnic nor a universal religion (see Kubo 1974), Daoism shares many ideas and practices with Chinese culture in general—including cosmology, divination and longevity techniques—yet uses them in a uniquely Daoist way and relies on them to a large extent, so that they can also be called Daoist. This multiplicity of ideas and practices, together with the division into "philosophical" and "religious Daoism" and the large number of schools and sects within the religion, makes the definition of what truly is "Daoist" a very difficult endeavor. The term "Daoist" has accordingly been described as giving rise to "perplexity" (Sivin 1969), and to the present day scholars are debating the questions of what exactly makes an idea, practice or person Daoist as opposed to Buddhist, popular or merely Chinese (see Creel 1970; Strickmann 1980; Thompson 1993b).

Two Japanese dictionaries on the religion offer the suggestion to divide Daoism into **three different strands**: philosophy, organized religion (*kyôkai dôkyô* 教會道教, lit. church Daoism) and popular practice (*minshû dôkyô* 民族道教, lit. folk Daoism). Although these different aspects were dominant at different times in the religion's development, Sakade says (1994), there is an essential continuity between them that furnishes the variety and richness of Daoism as a whole. Fukui Fumimasa, too, proposes a tripartite division into philosophical, religious, and new Daoism. He makes an argument in favor of a continuity especially between the first two, giving three reasons: (1) the identity of the terminology and application of terms among Daoist thinkers and religious practitioners; (2) the fact that Lao-Zhuang thinkers of the Wei-Jin were not only theorists but also engaged in longevity techniques and the use of immortality drugs; (3) the divinization of Laozi under the Han and recitation of the *Daode jing* among the Celestial Masters, which would not have been possible without active recourse to the earlier tradition (Noguchi et al. 1994, 441-43; see Kohn 1996).

Following their guidance, Russell Kirkland has recently suggested a more complex, yet further integrated view of the religion. He distinguishes two major phases, classical Daoism and later Daoism, with the dividing line in the Han dynasty, then subdivides the latter into an early and a later phase (traditional Daoism and new Daoism), with the twelfth century as a cut-off point. Traditional Daoism, moreover, is further divided into two kinds: incipient organized and organized. This separation occurs in the fifth century, when the various schools are already established separately and begin to integrate. In other

words, he has four periods:

1. classical (-Han)
2. traditional: incipient organized (-5th c.)
3. traditional: organized (-Tang)
4. new (-present)

Expanding further on this scheme and inspired by research on the development of the deified Laozi, I have suggested that two further stages be added: (1) a transitional stage between classical and incipient organized Daoism that emphasizes the cataclysmic changes of the Han dynasty, such as the rise of immortality practitioners, the installation of Daoist politics through the Huang-Lao school, the increased imperial worship of the Dao, and the first messianic movements and (2) a subdivision of new Daoism into a structuring stage during the Song and Yuan and a stage of the increasingly popularization of Daoism lasting from the Ming to today (Kohn 1998, 164).

This volume supports the more detailed periodization and authors on both the Han and Ming emphasize the degree to which these periods, despite their importance, have been neglected by scholars. Thus Mark Csikszentmihalyi notes that "the four hundred year Han Dynasty has attracted relatively less attention from historians of Daoism. This situation is to a large degree a product of the scholarly debate over the relationship between the pre- and post-Han situation, eras associated with what were once called 'philosophical' and 'religious' Daoism." And Pierre-Henry de Bruyn says that "scholars tend to see the Ming dynasty as a time when the Daoist religion went into somewhat of a decline .... In contrast, it should be regarded as a time of prosperity and can even be considered to be one of Daoism's most powerful" (see below).

Regardless of period and working definition, the study of Daoism so far can be described as having been approached from **four major angles:**

1. Philosophy—the study of the ancient texts *Laozi* and *Zhuangzi* and their commentaires as well as the analysis of later Daoist texts from the viewpoint of philosophy or comparative mysticism.
2. History and literature—the study of the different Daoist schools, their development, scriptures and practices as well as the impact Daoism had on Chinese literature, notably of the Tang dynasty.
3. Ritual—the study of the communal practice of Daoism today and its historical precedents from the middle ages through the Tang and Song in relation to ritual theory and in comparative

perspective.

4. Practices and techniques—the study of technical activities of individual Daoists, such as alchemy, longevity techniques, and divination, both in their modern and traditional forms, often in comparison with their Western or Indian counterparts and in an effort to understand the actual procedures and their concrete effects on the human body and in daily life.

Each of these angles and approaches, while useful and fascinating in its own way, brings its own presuppositions and methods, concerns and focal points. They all make valuable contributions to the understanding of Daoism, yet it would be erroneous to claim that any one of them can stand for the religion in its entirety. They are all represented in this volume, in the chapters on the early philosophers, on the various schools, on the different methods, as well as on ritual and ordination.

More recently, **four new perspectives** on the religion have come to the foreground, presenting areas of study and approaches that are not yet well documented and are only partially represented here. The first among these is the examination of Daoist art and music, i.e., the study of the artistic expression of the Daoist religion. Although Daoists engaged in both since the middle ages, their work has been largely left unstudied; it is only now coming to the fore, with the exhibition of Daoist art prepared by Stephen Little (Chicago, 2000) and the Chinese Ritual Music Project under the guidance of Ts'ao Pen-yeh in Hong Kong (see "The Study of Daoism in China Today"). Two contributions in this volume present an initial foray into these newly growing areas of study.

Second, there is the study of Daoism beyond China, in other East Asia countries, such as Korea, Japan and Vietnam, but also among non-Chinese ethnic groups (such as the Yao in northern Thailand) and in newly arising groups in the West (such as Orthodox Daoism of America). Concerns here are the question of how Chinese or non-Chinese followers of Daoism would have to be to be proper Daoists or, vice versa, how much influence of Chinese culture (such as the yin-yang, five-phases system) can be properly called "Daoist." This leads into the overarching question whether Daoism is ultimately an ethnic or a universal religion, a religion that sets out to make converts independent of culture, or a specifically Chinese phenomenon that can only be transmitted as part of Chinese culture. The cases of Korea and Japan, among the better studied to date and described in this volume, suggest a rather more ethnic inclination of the religion, as

most Daoism entered the two countries as part of an overall integration of Chinese culture and hardly any formal ordination and monastic or ritual organizations came to flourish there.

The issue is made more complex by the fact that Chinese cultural impact on other East Asian cultures is often seen with a rather displeased eye, and the study of Daoism—especially if it is understood as a major factor that shaped the country's culture—accordingly tends to conflict with nationalistic visions and interpretations. This holds true for both Korea and Japan, and is evident in the papers here. In the case of Korea, the proposition that there was an "indigenous" form of Daoism before the introduction of the organized religion in the seventh century is a way to lay claim to an established higher religion of another country on one's own grounds and without foreign influence. In the case of Japan, the polite overlooking of much of Fukunaga's iconoclastic studies—and especially his (quite supported) contention that the ancient Tennô system was largely shaped by Tang Daoism—serves to present a picture of Daoism as part of a benevolent cultural influence that had yet little impact on the fundamental identity of the Japanese. Cross-cultural and political issues must therefore not be overlooked; they complicate the picture of what Daoism is and what roles it plays.

A third new perspective is the analysis of Daoism in relation to popular and ethnic religion, that is, the relationship and interaction Daoism had with various regional beliefs and practices. This, of course, is not a new issue, and scholars have found both a rather contrary attitude of Daoists towards popular cults (e.g., Stein 1979) and a rather benevolent or integrative one (e.g., Schipper 1985). What is new in recent years is the detail of analysis and the more intense focus on specific locations and ethnic groups. A conference on local and regional cults held in Paris in 1995 brought to light many interesting glimpses of Daoist and popular/regional interaction (see *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 10 [1998]) and several contributions to the second American-Japanese conference on Daoist identity focus on the same issue (Kohn and Roth 2000). In this new perspective Daoism is no longer seen as an isolated or even special phenomenon, but understood in its active interchange with the culture and practices of local and ethnic cults. A more critical awareness of which cults should or could be called Daoist on what grounds is gradually emerging. The present *Handbook* does not contain a specific chapter on this issue, but both popular cults and deities appear in various sections and their relation to Daoism is examined.

The fourth new perspective is somewhat similar to the third in

that it, too, looks in more detail at details rather than at the larger picture. It focuses on specific lineages and groups and examines the structure of Daoist transmission patterns and group organization both within and without the established schools. Here the more recent traditions of Daoism come to the fore, such as the Longmen 龍門 lineage of the Quanzhen school and the various lay Daoist organizations of Hong Kong and Taiwan (*daotan* 道壇). Studies undertaken in this perspective fruitfully combine the two fields of history and anthropology and present a new and newly vivid image of Daoism. They are reflected in this volume especially in the contributions on Daoism in the Qing and modern Daoist ritual.

Yet largely unexplored areas include, as Russell Kirkland also notes above, the modern practice of Daoism outside the Zhengyi tradition (the various forms of Quanzhen, the new Qigong movements); the history, organization and present state of Daoist monasteries (described as un-Daoist by Schipper [1984], yet important institutions); and the political forms of Daoism (as state religion and as shaping ideals of Great Peace). The Daoist pantheon needs to be examined in a coherent fashion, both in a succinct historical survey and in a wider comparative perspective; the same holds true for Daoist cosmology and mythology—areas that are well recognized aspects of all major religions and about which yet so little is known in the case of Daoism.

References

Barrett, T. H. 1996. *Taoism under the T'ang*. London: Wellsweep Press.

Berling, Judith A. 1979. "Paths of Convergence: Interactions of Inner Alchemy Taoism and Neo-Confucianism." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 6: 123-48.

Berling, Judith A. 1980. *The Syncretic Religion of Lin Chao-en*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Berling, Judith A. 1993. "Channels of Connection in Sung Religion: The Case of Pai Yü-chan." In *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, edited by Patricia Ebrey and Peter Gregory, 307-33. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Boltz, Judith M. 1987. *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries*. Berkeley: University of California, China Research Monograph 32.

Bradbury, Steve. 1992. "The American Conquest of Philosophical Taoism." In *Translation East and West: A Cross-Cultural Approach*, edited by Cornelia N. Moore and Lucy Lower, 29-41. Honolulu:

University of Hawaii, College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature and the East-West Center.
Chavannes, Edouard. 1910. *Le T'ai Chan: Essai démonographie d'un culte chinois*. Paris: Annales du Musée Guimet.
Chavannes, Edouard. 1919. "Le jet des dragons." *Mémoires concernant l'Asie Orientale* 1919, 55-214.
Chan, Wing-tsit. 1963. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Chen William Y. 1987. *A Guide to Tao Tsang chi yao*. Stony Brook, NY: Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions.
Creel, Herlee. 1970. *What is Taoism?* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
DeBary, Wm. Th. 1960. *Sources of Chinese Tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Dôkyo bunka kenkyûkai 道教文化研究會, ed. 1994. *Dôkyô bunka e no tembô*. Tokyo: Hirakawa.
Dragan, Raymond. 1989. "Ways to the Way: A Review of Bibliographies on Taoism." *Taoist Resources* 1.2: 21-27.
Fukui Fumimasa. 1995. "The History of Taoist Studies in Japan and Some Related Issues." *Acta Asiatica* 68: 1-18.
Fukui Kôjun 福井康順. 1952. *Dôkyô no kisoteki kenkyû*. Tokyo: Risôsha.
Fukunaga Mitsuji 福永光司. 1956. *Sôshi*. 6 vols. Tokyo: Asahi.
Fukunaga Mitsuji 1987. *Dôkyô shisôshi kenkyû*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
Fung Yu-lan. 1952. *A History of Chinese Philosophy*. Translated by Derk Bodde. 2 vols. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
Girardot, Norman J. 1999. *"The Whole Duty of Man": James Legge (1815-1897) and the Victorian Translation of China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Kaltenmark, Maxime. 1969. *Lao-tzu and Taoism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Kardos, Michael A. 1998. "Western Language Publications on Religions in China, 1990-1994." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 26: 67-134.
Katz, Paul R. 1993. *Demon Hordes and Burning Boats: The Cult of Marshal Wen in Late Imperial Chekiang*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Kirkland, Russell. 1986. "Review of Felicia G. Bock, *Classical Learning and Taoist Practices in Early Japan*." *Asian Folklore Studies* 45: 129-31.
Kirkland, Russell. 1992. "Person and Culture in the Taoist Tradition." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 20: 77-90.
Kirkland, Russell. 1997a. "The Taoism of the Western Imagination

and the Taoism of China: De-Colonializing the Exotic Teachings of the East." Paper Presented at the University of Tennessee.

Kirkland, Russell. 1997b. "The Historical Contours of Taoism in China: Thoughts on Issues of Classification and Terminology." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 25: 57-82.

Kirkland, Russell. 1997-98. "Dimensions of Tang Taoism: The State of the Field at the End of the Millennium." *T'ang Studies* 15-16.

Kirkland, Russell. 1998a. "Teaching Taoism in the 1990s." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 1.2: 121-29.

Kirkland, Russell. 1998b. "'Literati Taoism': Re-Imagining the Social and Intellectual Matrices of Premodern Taoism." Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Taoism and Culture, Mt. Luofu, China.

Kirkland, Russell. 1999. "Taoism." In *Encyclopedia of Women and World Religion*, II: 959-64. New York: Macmillan.

Kirkland, Russell. 2000a. "Responsible Non-Action in a Natural World." In *Taoism and Ecology*, edited by Norman J. Girardot, Liu Xiaogan, and James Miller. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Kirkland, Russell. 2000b. "Self-Fulfillment through Selflessness: The Moral Teachings of the *Daode jing*." In *Varieties of Ethical Reflection: New Directions for Ethics in a Global Context*, edited by Michael Barnhart. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kirkland, Russell. 2000c. "Hermeneutics and Pedagogy: Methodological Issues in Teaching the *Tao te ching*." In *Essays in Teaching the Tao te ching*, edited by Warren Frisina and Gary DeAngelis. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Kohn, Livia. 1996. "New Perspectives on Taoist Culture." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 24: 159-67.

Kohn, Livia. 1997. "Review of Michael Saso, *The Gold Pavilion*." *Taoist Resources* 7.1: 69-73.

Kohn, Livia. 1998. *God of the Dao: Lord Lao in History and Myth*. University of Michgan, Center for Chinese Studies.

Kohn, Livia, and Harold D. Roth, eds. forthcoming. *Daoist Identity: Cosmology, Lineage, and Ritual*.

Kubo, Noritada. 1974. "Taoist Belief in Okinawa." *Acta Asiatica* 27: 100-15.

Lagerwey, John. 1987. *Taoist Ritual in Chinese Society and History*. New York: Macmillan.

Leung, Man-Kam. 1991. "The Study of Religious Taoism in the People's Republic of China (1949-1990): A Bibliographical Survey." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 19: 113-26.

Maspero, Henri. 1981. *Taoism and Chinese Religion*. Translated by Frank Kierman. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Miyakawa Hisayuki 宮川尚志. 1964. *Rikuchôshi kenkyû: Shûkyôhen*. Kyoto: Heirakuji.

Mugitani Kunio 麥谷邦夫. 1985. *Rôshi sôjichu sakuin*. Kyoto: Hôyû shoten.

Mugitani Kunio. 1991. *Shinkô sakuin*. Kyoto: Dôhôsha.

Nakajima Ryûzô 中島隆藏. 1984. *Dôkyô gishu sakuin*. Manuscript, private distribution.

Noguchi Tetsurô 野口鐵郎 , Sakade Yoshinobu 阪出祥伸, Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅, and Yamada Toshiaki 山田利明, eds. 1994. *Dôkyô jiten*. Tokyo: Hirakawa.

Ôfuchi Ninji 大淵忍爾. 1964. *Dôkyôshi no kenkyû*. Okayama: Chûgoku insatsu.

Ôfuchi Ninji and Ishii Masako 石井昌子. 1988. *Dôkyô tenseki mokuroku, sakuin*. Tokyo: Kokusho kankôkai.

Pas, Julian F. 1997. *A Select Bibliography on Taoism*. Saskatoon: Saskatoon China Pavilion.

Penny, Benjamin. 1998. "The Celestial Master, Pope Pius IX, and Italy's 1848 Revolution." Paper Presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Asian Studies Association of Australia, Sydney.

Ren Jiyu 任繼愈 and Zhong Zhaopeng 鐘肇鵬, eds. 1991. *Daozang tiyao*. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.

Robinet, Isabelle. 1991. *Histoire du taoïsme: Dés origins au XIVe siècle*. Paris: Editions Cerf.

Robinet, Isabelle. 1997. *Taoism: Growth of a Religion*. Translated by Phyllis Brooks. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sakade Yoshinobu 出祥伸, ed. 1994. *Dôkyô no daijiten*. Tokyo: Shin jimbutsu ôrai sha.

Sakai Tadao and Noguchi Tetsurô. 1979. "Taoist Studies in Japan." In *Facets of Taoism*, edited by Holmes Welch and Anna Seidel, 269-88. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Saso, Michael. 1972. *Taoism and the Rite of Cosmic Renewal*. Seattle: Washington University Press.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1975a. *Concordance du Tao Tsang: Titres des ouvrages*. Paris: Publications de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1975b. *Concordance du Houang-t'ing king*. Paris: Publications de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1975c. *Concordance du Pao-p'u-tzu nei/wai-p'ien*. Paris: Publications de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1980. *Concordance du Yun ki ki kiai*. 2 vols. Paris: Publications de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1984. "Le monachisme taoïste." In *Incontro di religioni in Asia tra il terzo e il decimo secolo d. C.*, edited by Lionello Lanciotti, 199-215. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1985. "Vernacular and Classical Ritual in Taoism." *Journal of Asian Studies* 65: 21-51.

Schipper, Kristofer. 1994. *The Taoist Body*. Translated by Karen C. Duval. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schipper, Kristofer, and Franciscus Verellen eds. 2000. *The Taoist Canon: A Study of Taoist Literature in the Daozang of the Ming Dynasty*. Chigago: University of Chigago Press.

Seidel, Anna. 1981. "*Kokuhô*—Note à propos du terme 'tésor nationale' en Chine et au Japon." *Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient* 69: 229-61.

Seidel, Anna. 1983. "Imperial Treasures and Taoist Sacraments: Taoist Roots in the Apocrypha." In *Tantric and Taoist Studies*, edited by Michel Strickmann, 291-371. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises.

Seidel, Anna. 1990a. *Taoismus: Die inoffizielle Hochreligion Chinas*. Tokyo: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens.

Seidel, Anna. 1990b. "Chronicle of Taoist Studies in the West 1950-1990." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 5: 223-347. W 9227.4/178

Sivin, Nathan. 1978. "On the Word 'Taoist' as a Source of Perplexity." *History of Religions* 17: 303-30.

Soymié, Michel. 1968/69. "Bibliographie du taoisme: études dans les langues occidentales." *Dôkyô kenkyû* 3: 246-317; 4: 225-87.

Stein, Rolf A. 1979. "Religious Taoism and Popular Religion from the Second to Seventh Centuries." In *Facets of Taoism*, edited by Holmes Welch and Anna Seidel, 53-81. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Stein, Rolf A. 1990. *The World in Miniature: Container Gardens and Dwellings in Far Eastern Religious Thought*. Translated by Phyllis Brooks. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Strickmann, Michel. 1980. "History, Anthropology, and Chinese Religion." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 40: 201-48.

Thompson, Laurence. 1985. *Chinese Religion in Western Languages: A Comprehensive and Classified Bibliography through 1980*. Phoenix: The University of Arizona Press.

Thompson, Laurence. 1993a. *Chinese Religions: Publications in Western Languages 1981 through 1990*, edited by Gary Seaman. Ann Arbor, Association for Asian Studies Monographs, no. 47.

Thompson, Laurence. 1993b. "What Is Taoism?" *Taoist Resources* 4.2:

9-22. Welch, Holmes, and Anna Seidel, eds. 1979. *Facets of Taoism: Essays in Chinese Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Welch, Holmes, and Anna Seidel, eds. 1979. *Facets of Taoism: Essays in Chinese Religion*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Weng Dujian. 1935. *Combined Indices to the Authors and Titles of Books in Two Collections of Taoist Literature*. Beijing: Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series no. 25. Reprinted by Chinese Materials Center, 1966.

Yamada Toshiaki 山田利明 and Yûsa Noboru 遊左昇, eds. 1984. *Taijô dôgen shinshukyô goi sakuin*. Tokyo: Sôundô.

Yamada Toshiaki and Tanaka Fumio 田中文雄, eds. 1998. *Dôkyô no rekishi to bunka*. Tokyo: Hirakawa.

Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豐. 1955. *Dôkyô kyôten shiron*. Tokyo: Dôkyô kankôkai.

Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 1959. *Dôkyô to bukkyô*, vol 1. Tokyo: Kokusho kankôkai.

Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 1970. *Dôkyô to bukkyô*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Kokusho kankôkai.

Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 1976. *Dôkyô to bukkyô*, vol. 3. Tokyo: Kokusho kankôkai.