

城市道教專輯

編者的話

黎志添、高萬桑、方玲

由蔣經國國際學術交流基金會和法國國家科學研究會資助的「近現代中國城市道士與廟宇研究計劃」(2007-2011)是一項國際性的合作計劃。¹此項研究探討了在近現代中國城市背景下，道教的轉型及演變的獨特性。項目計劃結束後，若干學術論文已在「近現代中國城市道教國際學術研討會」(2010年11月13-14日由南台科技大學於台灣台南舉辦)上宣讀，並且已選定部分論文於本輯以及下一輯期刊出版(2013年第5期)。

首先想說明這個計劃在研究領域如何定位，我們絕不否認對各種形式的宗教和群體生活做一個整體性研究的必要性，更不用說孤立地看待道教也會是一個陷阱。但我們也認為將焦點放在道教上，有助於突出某些形式的社會組織：尤其是土地公、城隍和北帝在地方社會的地位，這兩者都受到城市化過程的深刻影響，只有在道教的體系中研究他們才能理解其意義。這項研究也使我們得以瞭解晚清以來在中國，特別是大城市中，經過政府、社會精英等各方在現代化企圖下強力重新創造宗教，將道教、佛教和民間信仰區分後宗教發生的變化。雖然我們不能忽略道教是在一個更廣泛的文化、宗教背景下運作的事實，但也不能無視在城市中，以上各方試圖將道

¹ 請參考此計劃之網頁：<http://www.gsrl.cnrs.fr/taoist-and-temple/>。即將出版的包括兩冊中文研究材料：王見川、高萬桑編：《近代張天師史料彙編》(臺北：博揚文化事業有限公司，2013年)，及一冊英文專題著作—高萬桑、劉迅撰：《近現代中國歷史與社會中的全真道派》(柏克萊大學東亞研究學院，待刊)。

教重新創造成一獨立宗教的後果。而且現代佛教協會的歷史已有研究，但道教組織機構的歷史還需要大量的研究成果。

「近現代中國城市道士與廟宇研究計劃」主要集中研究道廟，但亦研究的火居道士。我們的理由是，廟宇和道士都為城市社會服務，對他們兩者之間的關係以及在現代的演變還未進行深入的分析。大部分廟宇的運作管理不靠道士，許多道士也不在廟宇中作法事。那麼廟宇和道士在近現代中國宗教上，究竟是兩個獨立的個體，還是它們有牢不可破的聯繫？本計劃試圖以嶄新的目光，通過歷史研究和田野考察相結合的方法和跨學科的方法審視上述的問題。我們主要圍繞三個地點調查：一、杭州；二、廣州及梅州；三、漢水流域一帶（武漢及南陽）。在分別收集歷史和田野資料的同時，我們亦著力於比較三個地點及其他已發表研究成果的城市，希望就近現代中國歷史如何改變城市宗教生活結構和社會組織，得出較宏觀的結論。

項目的研究團隊由歷史和文化人類學學者組成，我們考察了現代中國城市宗教生活的演變，尤其是社區廟宇、市民信眾和專業道士之間的互動方式。我們研究了主要的道教廟宇（全真派和正一派），以及它們在地方宗教系統中的核心組織作用，例如培訓外來道士、組織大規模廟會節慶活動等。我們也研究了道士的活動，作為神職人員，他們有些住在地方廟宇裏，有些則被邀請去做法事。儘管神職人員如道士有被地方廟宇管理者邊緣化的趨勢，但他們仍掌握了重要的文獻資料及象徵性的資源。二十世紀以來的政治變化深入地改變了民間和神職人員組織之間的關係，導致了政府官員、地方領導和道士之間在控制廟宇上的許多衝突。然而有待知道的理論性的問題是，這兩者之間誰「能夠」或「應該」控制廟宇生活呢？

從初步的研究分析可看到，在道教中，不同形式組織管理下的廟宇（包括一些在臺灣及香港創立的廟宇），現在都在中國有所發展，一、以傳統模式運作，由核心廟宇向附近地區下級廟宇遣派道士網絡，並在國家與地方之間斡旋；二、以道教協會形式運作，保存道教文化，並為個體信眾提供服務；三、以企業形式運作，道教

團體通過慈善和儀式服務吸納了大批信眾及志願者；四、亦有個別社區廟宇是通過擁有「道教」身份的認證而建立其合法性的。我們希望通過上述各類廟宇的考察分析，對理解道教的生命力有所貢獻：道士、科儀和這些廟宇組織，不僅抗拒、經受住了二十世紀現代化的進程，代表傳統，而且實際上使道教適應城市背景，並創造了新的運作方式。我們對這個進程中的創新和喪失都同樣重視。²

² 請參閱方玲及高萬桑的初步分析：“Temples and Daoists in Urban China Since 1980,” *China Perspectives*, 4 (2009): 32–41.

Special Issue on Urban Daoism

Editors' Note

Lai Chi Tim, Vincent Goossaert and Fang Ling

The present special section on the transformation of Daoism in urban contexts during the modern period is a partial result of an international collaborative project entitled “Temples, Urban Society and Taoists,” funded during the period 2007–2011 by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for international scholarly exchange (Taiwan) and the Agence nationale de la Recherche (France).¹ Some of the papers given during the project's closing conference, held at Southern Taiwan Southern University 南台科技大學, Tainan (Taiwan) on November 13–14, 2010, have been selected for publication in this section as well as a continued section in next issue of our journal (no. 5, 2013).

We would like to say a few words about how this project positions itself in the field. Our idea is in no way to deny how a comprehensive approach taking together all forms of religion and communal life is necessary and how looking at Daoism in isolation can be a trap. Yet, we also think that a focus on Daoism is useful for highlighting certain forms of social organization: the place of Earth Gods, City Gods and the

¹ See the project website at <http://www.gsrl.cnrs.fr/taoist-and-temple/>. Other forthcoming results include two volumes of materials in Chinese; one English-language monograph; Vincent Goossaert & Liu Xun, eds., *Quanzhen Daoism in Modern Chinese History and Society* (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, forthcoming); and Wang Chien-ch'uan 王見川 & Vincent Goossaert 高萬桑, eds., *Jindai Zhang tianshi shiliao huibian* 近代張天師史料彙編 (Taipei: Boyang, 2013).

Northern Emperor in local society, in particular, does not quite make sense until studied in the framework of Daoism, and both are deeply affected by processes of urbanization. Such a focus can also shed new light on processes at work in modern China (since the late Qing), most especially in large cities, where modern attempts to reinvent religions and clearly separate Daoism, Buddhism, and “Popular faith” (*minjian xinyang* 民間信仰) have been pursued most vigorously. While we cannot overlook that Daoism works in a larger cultural-religious context, we cannot by the same token, ignore the many attempts that are/have been made in Chinese cities to reinvent Daoism as an independent religion. While the history of modern Buddhist associations has been studied, the story of Daoist institution-building still largely remains to be written.

The “Temples, Urban Society and Taoists” project included studies on at-home Daoists in cities, but focused mostly on temples. Our rationale was that while both temples and Daoists serve urban society, the relationship between the two, and its transformation during the modern period, has yet to be thoroughly analyzed. Most temples operate without a Daoist, and many Daoists do not work in temples. So, are temples and Daoists two independent aspects of modern Chinese religion, or are they indissolubly linked? Our project attempted to shed new light on this issue through an interdisciplinary approach combining historical research and fieldwork. The research project was organized around three clusters of field sites: Hangzhou, Guangzhou and Meizhou, and the Han River valley area (Wuhan and Nanyang). While historical and field data was collected separately, a major aim of the project was comparison between our three sites, as well as with published evidence and research on other Chinese cities, in order to reach larger conclusions as to how modern history has changed the structure and social organization of religious life in Chinese cities.

Our research team was made up of both historians and anthropologists, who examined the evolution of urban religious life in

modern China, particularly the ways in which temple communities, lay urbanites, and professional Daoists interact. We looked at major Daoist sacred sites (both Quanzhen monasteries and Zhengyi temples) and their function as central institutions structuring local religious systems (training other clerics, organizing the large-scale festivals, etc.), but also at clerics working for neighborhood temples either as resident specialists or as occasional guests. While there is a trend among lay temple leaders to marginalize religious professionals such as Daoists, the latter still manage to retain control over important material and symbolical resources. The political changes during the 20th century have deeply changed relationships between lay institutions and clerics, and led to much conflict between state agents, local leaders, and Daoists for the control of temples; yet, the more theoretical question remains of whether lay people or Daoist clerics can or should control temple life.

Preliminary results suggest that, among Daoists, various models for operating temples (some of which were first developed in Taiwan and Hong Kong) are now at work in the Chinese world: the classical model of the central temple ordering networks of lower-order neighborhood temples, and negotiating with the state and local elites; the Daoist association model of the temple as a conservatory of Daoist culture providing services to individuals; the entrepreneurial temple ran by closed groups of devotees expanding through charity and ritual services; and the community temple that builds up legitimacy by identifying itself as Daoist. This line of analysis will hopefully contribute to understanding how Daoist clerics, rituals, and communal forms of organization not only resisted or weathered the twentieth-century modernization processes and embodied tradition, but actually, in an urban context, adapted and invented new ways of operating; we have been as attentive to innovation as to loss in that process.²

² See a preliminary analysis in Fang Ling & Goossaert, "Temples and Daoists in Urban China since 1980," *China Perspectives*, 4 (2009): 32–41.