



HAL
open science

[Review of] Florian C. REITER (ed.), *Affiliation and Transmission in Daoism: A Berlin Symposium*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012. Pp. viii + 300. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 78)

Grégoire Espeset

► To cite this version:

Grégoire Espeset. [Review of] Florian C. REITER (ed.), *Affiliation and Transmission in Daoism: A Berlin Symposium*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012. Pp. viii + 300. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 78). *Journal of Chinese Religions*, 2013, 41 (2), pp.180-185. halshs-00955177

HAL Id: halshs-00955177

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00955177>

Submitted on 4 Mar 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

researched and beautifully written book. It will, in my humble estimation, become a must-read for all scholars of any Buddhist tradition; and it is to inspire the appearance of other works researched with similar care.¹² I eagerly look forward to the author's further publications.

JINHUA CHEN
The University of British Columbia

FLORIAN C. REITER, ed., *Affiliation and Transmission in Daoism: A Berlin Symposium*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 78. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012. viii, 300 pp. €68 (pb). ISBN 978-3-447-06761-4

This is a collection of papers presented at the eponymous “International Symposium on Affiliation and Transmission in Daoism,” hosted by the Humboldt University, Berlin, June 27–29, 2011, and the fifth volume in an informal series of collected conference papers.¹ Only Stephen R. Bokenkamp, John Lagerwey, and Florian C. Reiter have had contributions in all volumes since the first one—*Scriptures, Schools and Forms of Practice in Daoism*—was published in 2005, four years after the first Berlin Symposium was held in 2001. Terry Kleeman has had papers in four consecutive volumes, starting with *Purposes, Means and Convictions in Daoism* (2007), derived from a second symposium (2005). Articles by Hsieh Tsung-Hui 謝聰輝, Lee Fongmao 李豐楙, and Lü Pengzhi 呂鵬志 appear in three volumes, beginning with *Foundations of Daoist Ritual* (2009), based on a third symposium (2007). Contributions by Chang Chaojan 張超然, Hsieh Shu-Wei 謝世維, Lin Wei-Ping 林瑋嬪, and Tam Wai Lun 譚偉倫 are found in the last two volumes, starting with *Exorcism in Daoism* (2011). Only Paul R. Katz has a single paper in the fifth volume. Beyond these twelve scholars, fifteen have had papers published at least once in the first four volumes, out of a total of twenty-seven contributors. In this group, Asian scholars, in the minority for the first volume, have become the majority from the fourth volume onwards,² and there is only one female scholar (Lin).

The acknowledgements in each of the papers from the present volume tend to confirm that these twelve scholars share an “affiliation”—our first theme—

¹² A noteworthy monograph-size study on the Ajātaśatru legend that has been partly inspired by Radich's work is now capably made available by Wu Juan 吳娟, a new doctoral graduate under the guidance of Max Deeg of Cardiff University. See Juan Wu, “From Perdition to Awakening: A Study of Legends of the Salvation of the Patricide Ajātaśatru in Indian Buddhism” (PhD dissertation, 2012, Cardiff University, UK).

¹ The first four volumes are: *Scriptures, Schools and Forms of Practice in Daoism: A Berlin Symposium*, ed. Poul Andersen and Florian C. Reiter (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005); *Purposes, Means and Convictions in Daoism: A Berlin Symposium*, ed. Florian C. Reiter (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007); *Foundations of Daoist Ritual: A Berlin Symposium*, ed. Florian C. Reiter (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009); and *Exorcism in Daoism: A Berlin Symposium*, ed. Florian C. Reiter (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011).

² Proportion of Western/Asian scholars in the five volumes: 8/2 (2005), 8/4 (2007), 8/6 (2009), 6/9 (2011), and 5/7 (2012).

although not necessarily in the institutional sense.³ A bibliographical analysis of the volume would perhaps result in the definition of a cluster of preferred secondary sources, “transmitted”—our second theme—by means of repeated references.⁴ Thus may *Affiliation and Transmission* eventually prove its value as a primary source for the sociological and ideological study of sinology at the turn of the twenty-first century.

The contributions—seven of which concern ancient or pre-modern China and the remaining five, modern or contemporary China—are unequal in length, scope, and scientific importance. Some are short, mainly descriptive, with poor annotations and meager bibliographical references; others offer detailed analysis, dense footnotes and up-to-date bibliographies. Most being far beyond the limited expertise of this reviewer, the following remarks can hardly do justice to what is, in its major parts, a laudable effort of collective scholarship.

Reiter’s opening paper on the school of complete integrity (Quanzhen 全真) and the exorcistic Five Thunders rites (Wulei fa 五雷法) in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—a “crucial” period in the development of Taoism—sets fairly decent heuristic standards (pp. 1–18). Reiter first shows early Quanzhen affiliation to be “purely intellectual”—no materials revealed or transmitted, “no secret oath or spells to be memorized, no divinities to be internalized,” “no ritual paces to be learnt,” no distinctive vestment—the sole external signs being celibacy, a new name, and complete withdrawal from public life (pp. 7–8). Reiter then shifts to exorcists sharing the Five Thunders affiliation, who “did not have a hold of all the same materials and did not share the same ritual proficiency” (pp. 11–15). He concludes that Quanzhen members were probably Taoist priests before joining the affiliation, but “kept the freedom of choice concerning [their] professional orientation,” whereas “a firm standing” in liturgical Taoism was “mandatory” to join the Five Thunders affiliation (p. 17).

Kleeman’s paper deals with the “parish” (*zhi* 治) system and “the parish priest or libationer (*jijiu* 祭酒)” in early Heavenly Master (Tianshi 天師) communities (pp. 19–39).⁵ Nearly deprived of references to existing scholarship, it unfolds as a series of translations from twelve sources, paraphrasing and commenting, to conclude that “the priest’s role changed considerably over time” (p. 38)—a reformulation of an opening warning that the object of study has “a protean, ever-transforming nature” (p. 19). Kleeman’s point is that, after the fall of Hanzhong 漢中 and the relocation of its population, the promotion of a priest “no longer

³ With the exception of Bokenkamp, Kleeman, Reiter, and Tam, whose papers are devoid of formal acknowledgements, and Lee, who thanks the persons he has interviewed, each contributor to this volume thanks at least one of the other eleven contributors.

⁴ With the exception of Bokenkamp, Lee, and Lü, each contributor to this volume refers to publications by at least one of the other eleven contributors. Remarkably, Lü and Reiter mostly refer to their own publications, which are mentioned in thirty-one out of seventy-four footnotes (Lü) and in thirty-four out of sixty footnotes (Reiter). With five items only, Kleeman has the shortest bibliography of the volume.

⁵ Readers could have been reminded of the existence of the title of libationer prior to and outside of its Heavenly Master use; for dated evidence, see Rafe de Crespigny, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Later Han to the Three Kingdoms (23–220 AD)* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 141, 910, and 1019.

meant a transfer between parishes,” but rather a promotion of the parish itself within a hierarchy of parishes (p. 38).

Lagerwey offers a minute study of Lu Xiujing’s 陸修靜 (406–477) “canonical” list of Taoist rites, including a deconstruction of the logic of the list plus a description of five Numinous Treasure (Lingbao 靈寶) fasts, the Fast of the Three Sovereigns (*sanhuang zhai* 三皇齋), and three Orthodox Unity (Zhengyi 正一) fasts, with a special focus on the *tutan zhai* 塗炭齋 or “Mud Fast” (pp. 41–79). The latter is “a perfect example of the construction of the new Lingbao liturgy on a Zhengyi foundation [. . .] without [real modification of] the basic [ritual] structure” of the latter (p. 76). To conclude, Lagerwey audaciously proposes that Lu’s “resolute ignorance” of the perhaps contemporary movement behind the apocalyptic *Scripture of Divine Spells* (*Shenzhou jing* 神咒經) is a “clear affirmation of the elitist, literati-oriented nature of his community” (p. 78).⁶

Extending his masterful analysis of medieval Taoist liturgy, Lü Pengzhi deplors oversimplifications and errors in the sinological understanding and taxonomy of Taoist rites and shows how the hierarchy of “ordination ranks” (*fawei* 法位 or *faci* 法次) was “closely related” to the contemporaneous classification of rites (pp. 81–107). However, when Lü states that “appellations like ‘Taiping [太平] Daoists’ or ‘Taiqing [太清] Daoists’ are not found in any Daoist texts” (pp. 82–83), he could have devoted a footnote to the title *taiping fashi* 太平法師, conferred upon a Taoist priest named Zhou Zhixiang 周智響 by Emperor Xuan 宣帝 (r. 569–582) of the Chen 陳 dynasty (557–589).⁷ Furthermore, we may agree with Chen Guofu 陳國符 (1914–2000) and Lü that the *Taiping jing* 太平經 has “no place in the history of Daoist ritual” (p. 82, n. 5)—at least in the present state of our still limited understanding of this document—but if this text really “ceased to be important since the Liang dynasty,” why would the number of *Taiping jing* quotations in Taoist and third-party sources peak during the Tang and Song eras, with highest concentration rates in the seventh and eighth centuries?⁸

Bokenkamp addresses the conference theme in hagiographical context (pp. 109–121), having found Robert Ford Campany’s study of “transcendents” (*xian* 仙) inspirational.⁹ His focus is on tales about a neglected Sichuanese female figure of the mid-Tang dynasty, Xie Ziran 謝自然 (767–795), and on “the men and women who surrounded her and made her story possible” (p. 110). Xie swallowed “potent drugs” leading to her ascension to heaven in broad daylight in a public exposition of transcendence gained. Her life was soon “mythologized” (p. 115) and prompted the formation of an active group of female Taoist imitators. In this witty sequel to Campany’s work, Bokenkamp points to gender biases in Taoist hagiography,

⁶ This point would be more persuasive if it were not based on negative evidence.

⁷ See *Taiping jing fuwen xu* 太平經複文序 (appended to DZ 1101), 2b; *Daojiao yishu* 道教義樞, DZ 1129, 2.10b; and *Yunji qiqian* 雲笈七籤, DZ 1032, 6.16b.

⁸ See Grégoire Espeset, “Le corpus des citations du *Livre de la Grande paix* (*Taiping jing*) du V^e au XV^e siècle,” *Annuaire de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses: Résumé des Conférences et Travaux* 118 (2009–2010): 35–43.

⁹ Robert F. Campany, *Making Transcendents: Ascetics and Social Memory in Early Medieval China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009), which I reviewed (in French) in *Études chinoises* 28 (2009): 279–284.

discusses the secrecy of transmission, and ultimately reminds the reader “where the real power lies”—not in the celestial realm (p. 121).

Hsieh Shu-Wei’s paper is the only one in the volume to take directly as its object of study the thematic guidelines themselves (pp. 123–158). Having reminded the reader that “transmission,” “lineage,” and “affiliation” are “strategies used in religious context for the establishment of authority,” Hsieh engages in a criticism of the scholarly use of these concepts as epistemological tools to “categorize and recognize the object of their research,” resulting in publications “hopelessly” mixing history and hagiography, the latter being “not necessarily congruent with historical facts” (pp. 123–24).¹⁰ Focusing on the “so-called School of Eastern Florescence [Donghua 東華]” of the Song and Yuan eras, Hsieh deconstructs how sinologists “establish the conceptual entity of that school” (p. 126) and concludes: “a reassessment of ‘schools’ does not mean one should invalidate the concept [. . .] but the idea of a direct homology between scripture and school should inspire caution” (p. 152).

Chang Chaojan’s paper is the first of three papers in Chinese with English abstracts (pp. 159–172). Chang reflects on the “Nocturnal Invocation” (*suqi* 宿啟) rite performed during the night preceding a purification rite in the Numinous Treasure liturgy, giving special attention to the “Installation of Officiants” (*shuzhi* 署職) ritual sequence within it. During this sequence, Taoist personnel define the “division of labor,” including the “assessment” of each officiant’s “merits” and the fixation of their “salary,” for the entire duration of the forthcoming rite. Chang surveys the historical evolution (reorganization and adaptation to various constraints) of this ritual sequence from the Liu-Song to the Song dynasty, until a consensual “fusion of old and new ceremonial rites” prevailed (quoting the English abstract, pp. 159–160).

Tam Wai Lun’s paper deals with the liturgy of Lüshan 閩山 Taoism as observed during fieldwork in northern Guangdong Province from 2000 to 2004, with a focus on two of its “master-disciple lines of transmission” (pp. 173–192). The zone of influence of Lüshan Taoism, also found in parts of Fujian and Jiangxi, covers no less than “112,000” square kilometers, and coincides with “the area of Hakka settlement”—hence the qualification of Lüshan Taoism as “a Hakka religion” by J. Lagerwey (p. 173). In practice, however, Lüshan Taoism appears to have undergone a number of local adaptations. Tam’s study of two Lüshan transmission rites in Yongfu 永福, Fujian, and Wanzai 萬載, Jiangxi, shows that, in both cases, the master-disciple transmission “consists mainly of launching, paying, recruiting or dispatching the spiritual troops”—“groups of fierce and unrestrained spiritual forces” including, with variants according to historical eras and traditions, heavenly commanders and soldiers, ferocious animals, wondrous beasts, and ghosts of various deceased beings (pp. 176–178). Not only the officiating Taoists, Tam concludes, but “the whole community [participates in the rite, sharing] the merit and the cost” of the liturgical performance (p. 192).

Dedicated to the late Monica Esposito (1962–2011), Katz’s paper analyzes the development of Longmen 龍門 Taoist networks in Southern Zhejiang from the late

¹⁰ Hsieh names as not falling for hagiography R. F. Campany, A. Cole, B. Faure, Gong Jun, J. Kieschnick, Lu Yang, J. R. McRae, and M. Schlütter (p. 124, n. 2).

Qing dynasty to the late twentieth century (pp. 193–224). Katz’s main source is a “neglected” genealogy—the *Longmen Genealogy of Patriarch Qiu* [Chuji 邱處機 (1148–1227)] at the [Mount] Weiyu Grotto-Heaven (*Weiyu dongtian Qiu zu Longmen zongpu* 委羽洞天邱祖龍門宗譜)—“compiled in 1909 and revised plus expanded in 1940 and 1991” (p. 194), three years which all were “heady and transformative moments for a wide range of Chinese religious institutions” (p. 209). Keeping in mind the thematic guidelines, Katz shows how “affiliation [serves] as a basis for transmission,” but stresses important variations in network extension, ranging from local to regional, and occasionally provincial to national levels (pp. 207–208).

Lee Fongmao’s paper (in Chinese) is devoted to the life of the sixty-third Heavenly Master Zhang Enpu 張恩溥 (1904–1969), from Mount Longhu 龍虎山 (Jiangxi) Orthodox Unity Taoism, after he reached Taiwan in December 1949 (pp. 225–247). Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Zhang had to overcome many obstacles, especially in northern and central Taiwan, in order to adapt Taoism to the political regime of the Kuomintang (國民黨, KMT) government in exile and the new civil society, to integrate the preexisting local Taoist altars (*tan* 壇), lineages, and practitioners into Orthodox Unity, and thus to establish himself as the official head of reorganized Taoism in Taiwan. In the course of his research, Lee personally conducted interviews with several key witnesses, thus gaining access to crucial and otherwise undisclosed church material. Beyond the specific case of Taoism in Taiwan, Lee’s study sheds light on the institutionalization process and adaptability of religion in the contemporary world.

Lin Wei-Ping’s paper, which is not primarily concerned with Taoism, deals with the “spirit medium” (*tongji* 童乩) figure in “Chinese popular religion” (pp. 249–275). Lin proposes contrasting some of the features of the spirit medium, including social functions and religious aspects, with “Daoism, Buddhism, or other transcendental religions such as Christianity” (p. 251). She starts by stressing that, whereas the position of a Taoist priest is “hereditary,” spirit mediums must undergo a long ritual process of selection, the various stages of which she then proceeds to describe, including a “symbolic death” and a final rebirth, during confinement, as “the son of the deity” (p. 254). Her fieldwork being restricted to an agricultural village in Southern Taiwan whose name has been changed to ensure the privacy of the villagers, Lin is cautious enough to avoid generalizing her conclusions—that the spirit medium “is the deity personified” (not the “son” any more, as she previously stated) as well as an “omnipresent” and “localized” god, and that at least part of the deity’s power is believed by the locals to come from him (pp. 273–275).

Closing the volume, Hsieh Tsung-Hui’s contribution (in Chinese) deals with a “transcript” known as *The Origin and Development of Taoism* (*Daojiao yuanliu* 道教源流), a sort of Taoist encyclopedia “conserved at Daoist altars of the [Orthodox Unity] School” in Tainan 臺南, southern Taiwan (pp. 277–292). The earliest edition located by Hsieh dates back to the pontificate (1435–1472) of the forty-sixth Heavenly Master, Zhang Yuanji 張元吉. Hsieh offers a comparative description of all extant editions (see also the appended tables on pp. 290–292), plus a comprehensive study of the transmission of the text in the Orthodox Unity lineages of Fengshan 鳳山 and Tainan, an account of its mainland origin in Quanzhou 泉州 (Fujian), and a discussion of its relationship with other Taoist liturgical traditions.

The overall page layout of the book is fairly readable, despite missing and supernumerary spaces, paragraphs deprived of opening indentation, a variable

format for bibliographical references, and other minor defects. Several footnotes seem to have been hurriedly copy-edited or distractedly proofread.¹¹ A key to eight abbreviations (p. 293) precedes a list of contributors from which Hsieh Tsung-Hui is absent (p. 295). Finally, in lieu of a much-needed index, only a glossary of Taoist sources is provided (pp. 297–300).

GRÉGOIRE ESPESSET

Centre de recherche sur les civilisations de l'Asie orientale (CRCAO), Paris

RICHARD G. WANG, *The Ming Prince and Daoism: Institutional Patronage of an Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. xxx, 301 pp. US\$74 (hb). ISBN 978-0-19-967768-7

In addition to being an excellent contribution to the social and cultural history of Daoism, this book clearly is a labor of love. Having been underway for some ten years, the underlying historical research is astonishing in its sheer magnitude and meticulousness. Its account of the Ming princely institution in its relation to the Daoism of this seriously understudied period in the history of Chinese religion is exceptional in its approach and truly impressive. Anybody interested in the social history of Daoism will find the reading extremely rewarding, and the book without question will find a permanent place as a reference work on the shelves of scholars in the field of Daoist studies.

The style and method of the book are those of the social historian, and the presentation of the materials is extremely systematic and exhaustive. However, the paucity of standard historical documents concerning princely institutions has dictated the use of a much wider range of sources for this topic. In the words of the author: “once we have exhausted conventional historical sources, we then must make thorough use of epigraphy, collected literary works, local gazetteers, archaeological reports, Daoist canonical texts, anecdotal literature, and critical bibliography in order to understand local societies and Daoism” (p. xxix). The distinct quality of Wang’s research is his mastery of this wide range of sources which helps to explain the high quality of the work.

After an expert overview of the changing social and political roles of Ming princes in chapter 1, the book offers six chapters on different aspects of the engagement with Daoism by these princes and their relatives and by descendants in branch princely establishments throughout the dynasty (often delving also into sources concerning the continuation of these cultural patterns in the subsequent Qing dynasty). The themes are the following:

¹¹ For instance: “See the discussion below, p. ??” [*sic.*] (p. 25, n. 8); “a type of document which identifies and [*sic.*] individual [...] then sets our [*sic.*] a record of their [*sic.*] accomplishments” (p. 25, n. 9); footnotes 13 (p. 28) and 19 (p. 233) not set in reduced-size font as observed elsewhere; a doubled “Lü Pengzhi” (p. 56, n. 47); an interpolated “Song.” (p. 70, n. 89); “the prominent ritualist of XXX’s [*sic.*] court” (p. 115, n. 15); numerical reference marks 19–21 not in superscript (p. 117); English paper with footnotes 9–12 (pp. 195–96), 22–24, and 26–27 (pp. 205–206) entirely in Chinese, etc.