

The Organon of the Twelve Hundred Officials and Its Gods

Ursula-Angelika Cedzich

Abstract

The *Qianerbai guan yi* or *Organon of the Twelve Hundred Officials* provided lists of Daoist deities whose help against demonic evil could be implored in written petitions ritually submitted to an otherworldly judiciary. The tradition can be traced to the beginnings of the Way of the Heavenly Master in second/third-century Sichuan and thus holds important clues concerning the ideology and practice of the early Daoist religion. A good deal of material pertaining to these lists has in fact been transmitted, but its apparent deficiencies have left scholars speculating about the original text. The first part of this article reasons,

Ursula-Angelika Cedzich is associate professor at DePaul University in Chicago. She was a collaborator in the European Tao-tsang Project between 1980 and 1986, and obtained her Ph.D. in East Asian Studies in 1987 from the University of Würzburg (Germany) with a dissertation on early Heavenly Master liturgy (“Das Ritual der Himmelsmeister im Spiegel früher Quellen”). She is the author of “The Cult of the Wu-t’ung/Wu-hsien in History and Fiction: The Religious Roots of the Journey to the South,” in *Ritual and Scripture in Chinese Popular Religion*, ed. David Johnson (Berkeley: Publications of the Chinese Popular Culture Project, 1995) and “Corpse Deliverance, Substitute Bodies, Name Change, and Feigned Death: Aspects of Metamorphosis and Immortality in Early Medieval China,” *Journal of Chinese Religions*, 2001. Her research focuses on medieval and late imperial Daoist ritual, particularly with regard to the divinities functioning there as symbols, and more generally on the interrelationships between popular, Daoist, and Buddhist ritual practice.

conversely, that a definite original of the *Qianerbai guan yi* never existed but that the material circulated from the beginning in multiple, considerably overlapping yet varying, manuscript versions, just as the form in which it has been transmitted suggests. The text-scholar's urge to trace textual versions to unified and presumably uncorrupted originals is of little help in the case of the *Qianerbai guan yi*, whose origin and transmission are better approached contextually with reference to the peculiar view the Heavenly Master Daoists had concerning the renewed and continual dispensation of the pneumata (*qi*) of the Dao through the structures of their liturgical work. The second part of the article deals with the gods listed in the *Qianerbai guan yi* registers, whose names and descriptions don't sit snugly with the fundamental Daoist definition of divinity as abstract cosmic *qi*. Quite a few of the *Qianerbai guan yi* deities rather reflect images of the "demonic," popular gods supposed to be averted by them. This agrees with Rolf A. Stein's observations about overlaps between Daoism and popular religion. But the use of originally alien spirits in Heavenly Master rituals against the evils purportedly wrought by precisely such outsiders begs the question of how this fits with Daoism's oft-proclaimed intent to transform the landscape of Chinese religion according to Daoist parameters. To gain a better understanding of this issue and its ramifications, I recapitulate the constraints imposed on popular religious worship in China's classical literature, which impacted the more wide-ranging Daoist demonization of all gods receiving sacrifices. The following section elaborates Daoism's contrasting theology of "non-eating," purely cosmic divinities, but also points out that the very insistence on transformation precluded a stringent definition of the Daoist pantheon in these terms, which is evident, for example, in Tao Hongjing's difficulties in trying to present the realms of the divine according to an unequivocal scheme. The ambiguities necessarily adhering to the politics of inclusion and transformation are considered in more detail in the succeeding segment on other relevant Daoist sources of the fourth and fifth centuries. In conclusion I show the amazing consistency of Daoist attitudes vis-à-vis popular cults and their objects by tracing a double-strategy of categorizing spirits as aliens and containing them in symbolic layouts known as Five Prison Camps from the early days of the Heavenly Master movement through much later Daoist rituals aimed at subjugating non-Daoist practitioners and their gods to the structures informing contemporary local Chinese religion. Yet, despite the undeniable effects of its liturgy, the interactions with China's lived religion have also transformed Daoism itself. The incorporation of extraneous gods into its system has erased neither sacrifice nor the shamans and spirit mediums associated with their cults, but instead necessitated accommodations of these in

The Organon of the Twelve Hundred Officials and Its Gods

3

principle still rejected aspects of “ordinary” religion.¹

《千二百官儀》及其神祇

蔡霧溪 (Ursula-Angelika Cedzich)

摘要

《千二百官儀》提供了一份道教神祇的名單，在道教儀式中通過向另一個世界的司法部門呈上書寫形式的章文，祈求這些神祇幫助驅邪。這個傳統可以追溯到二至三世紀活動於四川地區的天師道，因此它保留有早期道教的思想體系及其實踐活動的重要痕跡。事實上，雖然許多與此名單相關的文獻得以流傳下來，但其明顯的資料缺失使得學者們試圖推想其原來的文本。本論文的第一部分即顛覆性地提出從未存在過一份明確的《千二百官儀》原本，最初開始流傳的文本反而是內容互有交疊卻又互不相同的多種稿本，就如同它現在流傳下來的形式所展示的一樣。文本學者試圖追尋一個統一的、可能未被破壞的稿本之努力，並無助於《千二百官儀》研究。我認為對其源流與流傳的研究應該放在不同的歷史處境中，並參照貫穿於儀式架構中的天師道士關於道炁的更新與持續流布的獨特理念。

論文的第二部分處理的是出現於《千二百官儀》的神祇，他們的名字與描述並不完全符合道教對神祇的基本定義，即抽象的宇宙之炁。相反，其中相當多的神祇反映的是原本應是被道士避開的「惡魔型」民間神祇形象，這一點證實了斯坦因 (Rolf A. Stein) 關於道教與民間宗教之間存在相互交疊的觀點。然而，天師道儀式使用原本異己的力量來對抗據稱恰恰由這些外道所製造的邪惡力量，由此產生這樣一個問題：它如何與道教常常宣稱的根據其自身標準來改造中國宗教圖景的意圖相契合？為了對這個議題及其後果有更好的認識，我將首先再現中國古典文學中強加於民間宗教崇拜上的約束，這影響了道教對接受祭祀的所有神靈更為廣泛的妖魔化行為。

本文接著的部份將詳細闡述道教反差極大的「非血食」神（即純粹的天文神祇）之神學，同時指出正是道教對改革的堅持妨礙了一個建基於此神學之上的嚴格的道教神譜定義的產生，最明顯的例子莫過於陶弘景意欲根據一個明確的框架以呈現神祇世界的過程中所遭遇的困難。另外，我還將涉及四至五世紀的相關道教文獻，以細緻地探討在堅持包容與改革時必然相伴隨的意義模糊性。

在最後的綜述中，我將展現相對於民間宗教信仰而言，令人驚奇的道

教態度的一貫性及其目標。道教的雙重策略將在這裡被追述，從早期的天師道運動直至晚期的道教儀式，道教一方面將一些神祇歸為異己力量，另一方面，又將這些神祇包容進像「五營」這樣一個象徵性佈局中。這個策略目的在於降服非道教的宗教從業者以及他們的神祇並進行結構性收編，其影響是構成當代中國地方宗教面貌。這一運動除了對道教崇拜儀式產生無庸置疑的影響，其與中國實存的宗教之間的互動亦改變了道教自身。對外來神祇的吸收，並未清除與之相關的祭祀或靈媒，反之，對這些要素所必須進行的調試在原則上也仍舊排斥著「常規的」宗教。