



教育部人文社会科学重点研究基地重大项目成果丛书

Publication Series: MOE Supported Projects of Key Research Institutes of Humanities and Social Sciences in Universities

历史学类 History

中国道教考古

张勋燎 白彬 著

1

线装书局

张勋 燎
白 彬

著

中国道教考古

1

线装书局

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

中国道教考古/张勋燎, 白彬著. —北京: 线装书局, 2006. 1
ISBN 7—80106—382—1

I. 中 ... II. ①张 ... ②白... III. 道教—宗教考古—
中国 IV. ①B959.2 ②K87

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2005)第 012175 号

书 名 中国道教考古

著作责任者 张勋燎 白 彬 著

责任编辑 任梦强 孙嘉镇

特约编辑 范 勇

出版发行 线装书局

地 址 北京市鼓楼西大街 41 号 邮编 100009

电话传真 010—64045283

排 版 四川大学古籍所微机室

印 刷 四川五洲彩印有限责任公司

889 毫米×1194 毫米 1/16 127 印张

1550 千字 511 图版 8 彩插

2006 年 1 月第 1 版 2006 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

书 号 ISBN 7—80106—382—1

定 价 12000.00 元

序 言

道教是我国土生土长的宗教，有近两千年的历史。作为一种宗教，它的构成包括理论思想和具体活动两个方面。以杂而多端著称的道教，包容了古代知识阶层各种不同哲学流派思想和民众的鬼神观念、生活习俗等许多方面的内容，渗透于各种社会活动之中，既是古代各种不同传统文化的集合物，又给予人们的思想行为以广泛深刻的影响。考古发现的遗迹遗物，是古代人们从事各种不同历史活动保留下来的实物遗存，在考古发现的东汉时期道教形成以后的材料中，与道教活动有关的部分，其种类、数量之多，方面之广，是相当惊人的。

考古学是历史科学的一个组成部分，最终目的是通过实物史料的研究复原古代历史，探索历史发展规律。不同时代、不同地区出土与道教有关的遗迹遗物往往有着不同的特点，不仅需要通过整理研究解决某些考古学文化类型的划分和分期、分区、发展序列问题，同时还要由现象深入本质，弄清它们的性质、用途、意义，并在此基础上帮助我们更好地认识与之伴出或其他相关的考古材料。中国历史考古学东汉以后阶段的许多问题，从道教的角度来加以认识，常常可得到很好的解决。如果忽略了这一点，对那些与道教有关的遗迹遗物缺乏深刻的认识了解，甚至完全抛

开不管，要想真正解决中国历史时期考古汉唐、宋元阶段的体系问题，那是不可能的事。宗教考古是中国考古学不可缺少的重要组成部分，离开道教遗迹遗物的研究谈中国宗教考古，那只能产生出畸形儿，建立在这样基础上的中国历史考古学体系，也不可能是健全和完善的。

从宗教史的角度讲，古代宗教史研究所依据的材料主要是文献记载和考古发现的遗迹遗物两个方面。考古材料和文献记载相比，虽然往往显得零碎、片断，但它是当时留下的实物，具有直观性强的特点，更加真实可信，而且不断有新的材料发现，可以和文献记载互相印证和补充，帮助我们更好地理解文献记载的内容，补充、修正由于各种原因所造成的大量缺漏和错误。考古学本身的任务就在于通过实物史料复原古代历史，完全离开考古材料，单凭文献记载，许多问题——包括道教最初形成的时间和地域，道教的偶像崇拜到底是在什么时候、什么地方、在什么样的情况下出现这样重大的问题在内——是无法解决的。特别是作为以异常复杂的宗教活动为主而很少顾及宗教哲学理论的民众道教，许多内容在文献记载中很难甚至完全找不到记载，它们只能以实物的形式在地下保存下来。按照学界某些人的观点，时代愈晚，文献记载愈详，有关历史情况在文献中大多可以找到记载，考古材料的价值已经不大了，道教史研究自然也是这样。但实际情况并非完全如此。一位对明清史很有研究的朋友承担了撰写明清四川史的任务，考虑到道教发展状况应该是书中不可缺少的一部分，苦于文献不足征，今人有关道教史的论著没有提供多少这方面的成果可以参考，问我考古方面是否有相关的材料。因为当时我刚开始研究道教考古不久，又正在重点研究其他领域的问题，还未来得及研究这一部分内容，知之甚少，愧无以对。后来他的著作出版，对此也就只好暂付阙如了。以后随着自己研究工作的发展，对明代四川道教考古材料稍多关注，发现实际上材料是不少的，打算陆续写几篇东西，也算对这位朋友提出的问题作一个交待。明代距今不过五六百年，在古代史范围内年代是相当

晚的了，情况尚且如此，整个道教考古材料对古代道教史研究的重大作用 and 意义，这个例子是颇能说明问题的。

无论是从考古学，还是从宗教学、古代宗教史的角度讲，都需要对考古发现与宗教活动有关的遗迹遗物进行专门的研究。在国家组织编写的《中国大百科全书》之考古学卷和宗教卷中，在讲到两个学科的分支学科时，都提到了“宗教考古学”，也就很好说明了这一问题。中国的宗教考古学，无论从考古学还是从宗教学的角度讲，也都不能不包括道教考古的内容。离开在中国土生土长、影响深远、材料丰富的古代道教活动遗迹遗物的研究，就不可能形成真正系统的中国宗教考古学。道教考古和佛教考古是中国宗教考古学的两大主干，这应当是不争的事实。

纵观考古学和宗教学界过去的情况，对于道教考古材料的研究和利用都是不能令人满意的，存在问题相当不少。从考古学方面讲，过去由于受到单纯器物形态学观点的影响，对于考古材料的研究，往往局限于对遗迹遗物外部形态的考察，分型分式，分期分区，判定年代，排出序列，对于它们的性质、用途、发生发展变化的原因，所产生的影响作用等和社会历史有关本质方面的问题则很少顾及。有时虽然注意到了，又苦于缺乏必要的古代历史知识，缺少深厚的文献功底，不能联系有关的文献记载对考古材料作出历史的解释。道教本身是多种古代传统文化的集合体，是很专门很复杂的东西，掌握起来并不容易。不具备道教专门知识，不能很好地运用道书文献材料，对考古发现与道教有关材料的研究也就无从谈起。在已经发掘出土的考古材料中，到底哪些和道教有关，属于道教考古研究的范围，这一最基本的鉴定工作过去做得不多，大量与道教有关的考古材料还没有被识别出来，甚至因不识其价值而存放于文物库房中不为世人所知，有待那些掌握道教专门知识的人再次去作另一种形式的发掘。被鉴定出来经过深入研究的，那就更少了。近十年来，情况虽有所改变，考古发现与道教有关遗迹遗物的研究逐渐开始引起学界一部分人的注意，这是一种可喜的现象，但总的来说工作仍然做得实在太

少，和考古材料本身的数量相比太不相称。从宗教学界的情况看，古代道教史作为古代历史的一个组成部分，它的研究不能仅仅依靠文献记载，必须同时对有关考古发现的材料加以充分利用，这一根本性的指导思想问题并未引起广泛的重视。不可否认，道教史的研究近二十年来有了很大的发展，取得了不小的成绩。但在有关的著作中使用考古材料不多，大量可以帮助解决古代道教史问题的遗迹遗物材料还没能发挥它们应有的作用，影响到整个古代道教史研究更好地深入发展，这也是应当看到的事实。正如葛兆光教授在 20 世纪 80 年代所指出的那样：“人们在研究宗教时往往只注意到了那些宗教思想家的思想，却忽略了宗教神谱、仪式、方法。”（《道教与中国文化》，上海人民出版社，1987 年，323 页）古代道教史的研究偏重于理论思想，对宗教活动方面的问题重视不够，这种情况的出现有多方面的原因。这里我们需要强调指出的是，如前所说，考古发现与道教有关材料，一般都是古代各阶层人士从事各种具体宗教活动保存下来的实物史料，它们正是文献记载中最薄弱的环节。例如古代不同时期不同地区道士和道教信众们的丧葬仪式活动，道书文献记载不多，存在不少缺环，有的记载极为简略，只能提供一些线索，在考古发掘东汉以来的墓葬中，却有极为丰富的遗迹遗物出土。缺乏专门的考古知识，这些材料是很难利用的。道教史的研究者缺少应有的考古学专门知识，是造成上述偏向的一个重要原因。

研究考古的人不懂道教史，研究道教史的人不懂考古，这种隔膜是造成大量与道教有关的考古材料不受重视，未能发挥作用的关键。我们需要对道教考古材料作全面系统的深入研究，建立宗教考古分支学科——“道教考古学”。这一任务需要考古学界和宗教学界的共同关注，相互呼应，彼此配合，更需要通过研究者同时掌握考古学和道教史两方面的专门知识的途径来完成。

1993 年，中国社会科学院考古研究所叶茂林副研究员在《青城山建福宫遗址试掘收获及其意义》一文中曾经讲到：“研究中国传统文化，不能不涉足道教文化，四川大学教授张勋燎先生早

已提出‘道教考古’的课题，这是很有意义的。”（《成都文物》1993年4期）问题的提出，绝非事出偶然。我在大学本科修的是历史专业，对中国古代历史有浓厚的兴趣。1957年毕业以后，因为工作需要，一直从事秦汉以后阶段的中国历史时期考古研究和教学，又以“中国铁器时代墓葬考古”为主要研究方向，先后招收了几届研究生。在研究东汉以后阶段墓葬考古材料的过程中，遇到许多看来与道教活动有关的遗迹遗物无法解释，使整个墓葬考古材料的系统化综合研究受阻。于是横下心来，决定非搬掉这个拦路虎不可。从八十年代后期开始，在系统学习道教基本知识和道教史的基础之上通读《道藏》文献，摸了摸底，从中了解到与道教活动有关的考古材料远不限于墓葬一个方面，也包括墓葬以外的其他不同方面的遗迹遗物；考古发现大量东汉以后的材料，许多都可通过道书文献记载得到不同程度的解释；这些考古材料的正确理解，反过来又可以帮助解决古代道教发展史上的许多问题。通过反复思考和研究实践，最后确定了“道教考古”的研究方向和建立《道教考古学》的课题，发表了一些有关论文，并先后给考古专业和道教史的研究生讲授了《道教考古学概论》专题课，对这一学科概念作了初步的阐述，得到了国内外一些同行们的鼓励。

一门新学科的创建，是一个十分复杂艰苦的过程。在目标确定之后，必须脚踏实地地从一个又一个的专题研究开始，经过长期的甚至是几代人的努力，有了丰厚的积累，然后才能连点成线，连线成面，连面成体，来不得半点急功近利和浮躁。十多年来，我的研究工作一直主要围绕道教考古这一中心展开，在对以公开发表为主的考古材料进行广泛的识别和收集的基础上，归纳出数十个专题加以研究，从具体材料到研究方法的摸索也都形成了若干看法。本书选辑了有关的专题研究论文二十三篇，文字部分约一百二十万言，图版五百余幅，内容涉及墓葬、宫观建筑、石窟、碑刻、简牍、画像、雕像、印章、铜镜、符牌等不同方面的遗迹和遗物，上起东汉，下迄于明，几乎涵盖了各个不同时段

的材料。书中内容绝大多数皆属新作，一部分过去曾经发表过的，这次收录时也经过了增订修改，有的几乎完全是重写。总之，我们始终坚持无新说不成文的原则，蹈袭抄撮之事，在所不为。

一门新学科的建立，大都是多种学科知识交叉的结果。我们的研究，以道教、道教史和汉唐考古的交叉结合为中心，同时利用宗教学、考古学、金石学、历史学、古文字学、古文献学等多种学科知识方法，对考古材料进行综合研究。在分析材料的过程中，始终注意在结合文献记载对考古材料作出历史的解释基础之上，尽可能地揭示出考古材料所反映的古代道教史上的问题，对古代道教史上的一些问题提出自己的看法。例如：通过东汉魏晋南北朝墓葬出土的多种我们称之为“解注器”的研究，提出了初期天师道最初是东汉明帝时在以长安、洛阳为中心的中原地区形成的，再先后向西面、西南面和南面三个方向发展。大约在顺帝年间，一支经过汉中进入四川发展成为五斗米道；另一支经过安徽发展到长江下游的江苏等地，为六朝时期江南道教的巨大发展奠定了基础；再有一支则在汉末三国时期沿丝绸之路向西发展到了青海西宁等地，两晋十六国时期在以敦煌为中心的甘肃境内得到较大的发展。而中原地区的道教，至魏晋已大大衰落，到北朝新的教派兴起之后，才又再度兴盛起来。通过对安徽、湖北、江西等地孙吴两晋墓出土墓券、简牍宗教性质的识别，确定了一批墓葬的道教性质和部分墓主的道士身份，对东汉末年中原早期天师道南传和五斗米道由四川沿江东向发展至江南地区的一些活动情况，提出了新的看法。通过北朝碑刻和造像材料的研究，提出新天师道和楼观道两者的更替与它们对待佛教各自不同的态度直接有关，实质上是特殊民族矛盾历史条件下不同民族政策的产物。从隋唐两宋墓葬出土“镇墓真文”砖石刻不同类型和地域分布情况，提出隋唐时期北方上清派和灵宝派彼此界限甚严，各自的活动范围明显不同，上清派主要在以东京洛阳为中心的河南境内，灵宝派主要在以西京长安为中心的陕西地区流行。经过唐末

黄巢起义僖宗入蜀，两派在北方的中心也都转移到了川西的成都地区并呈融合之势，其中一部分融合形成了文献中不见明确记载的“太上真元大道”（很可能是金元时期“上方真元道”的前身）新道派。……凡此种种，多为学界所未道及，或与成说有异。虽未可视为定论，以实物资料为依据，作为问题提出，亦可供研究者之思考。

二十三篇文章，按研究材料所在的地域范围合编为三卷：上卷为以黄河流域为中心的北方地区的材料，可称为“北方卷”；中卷为以长江流域为中心的南方地区的材料，可称为“南方卷”；下卷中的每个项目也都同时涉及了南方和北方两个地区的材料，属于综合性的内容，可称为“综合卷”。我们在1996年曾向国家教委即现在的教育部申报了《中国南方地区道教考古研究》课题，以“国家教委人文社会科学研究‘九五’博士点基金项目”获得资助，本书第二卷的大部分内容即属于这一项目的成果。2002年，我们又获得了四川大学道教与宗教文化研究所申报教育部人文社会科学重点研究基地2002~2003年度重大项目《中国道教考古研究》课题的资助，本书的第一、三两卷和第二卷的部分内容，就是这一项目的成果。三卷中每卷的文章，大体按材料的时代早晚确定先后顺序。这样的划分，既突出了考古学上区系类型学方法的应用，又能反映出古代不同时期道教的起源发生，活动中心的转移，以及不同时期不同教派活动的地域范围和某些活动形式特点等历史发展情况。一个专题一篇文章，每个专题所涉及的材料数量多少不同，涵盖的问题面大小不一，因此篇幅长短差别很大，字数少者不过数千，多者可达数万乃至二十余万字。根据上述具体情况作不同的安排，凡篇幅大者分章分节，篇幅小者则仅标子目，不另分章节。

白彬博士是一个脚踏实地、刻苦好学、轻名重实、事业心极强的青年学者，在四川大学历史系考古专业本科毕业后，先后做我的硕士、博士研究生和助手，长时间和我一起致力于道教考古的学习和研究，对道教考古有浓厚的兴趣和很好的基础。书中所

收《吴晋南朝买地券、名刺和衣物疏的道教考古研究》是他的博士学位论文；《隋唐五代宋元墓葬出土神怪俑与道教》是在他的硕士学位论文基础上修改而成的；《重庆云阳云安盐场明代玄天宫遗址和四川地区与盐业有关的道教遗迹》也是他一手撰写的。其余部分虽然是我执笔，但在收集材料、讨论意见、编制图表等方面他都做了不少工作，实际上也是我们共同创造的成果。总的说来，全书大约三分之一的成果应当算在他的账上，此书用我们两人合著的方式出版，以申循名责实之意，这也是我要说明的。

我1953年进入四川大学历史系学习，1957年毕业留系任教，追随已故著名考古学家冯汉骥先生从事考古教学、科研工作，聆受教诲。先生生前虽未涉及道教考古的问题，但这个命题却是在继承他和他的挚友徐中舒先生共同的学术传统，按照他们强调考古研究不能脱离历史、历史时期考古必须和古文献记载相结合的思想指引下发展出来的。饮水不忘挖井人，谨以此书献给两位恩师以为纪念。

本书是我们创建“道教考古学”工作的部分阶段性成果，是计划中道教考古系列著作的第一部，在学术界像这样的专门著作过去似乎也还不曾有过。因为是初创，涉及面又较广，错误不当之处肯定不少，敬请学界的同志们批评指正。

张勋燎

2004年9月15日于四川大学桃林村宿舍

Preface

Daoism is China's native religion, with nearly two thousand years of history. As a religion, its structure is composed of two aspects: theories and concrete practices. It is well-known that Daoism had multiple origins. It blends many things, including various schools of thought from the ancient intellectual class, and ideas of ghosts and spirits and customs of daily life from the common people, and has permeated many different sorts of social activity. Daoism is the combination of many different types of traditional culture, and has broadly and deeply influenced people's thought and behavior. The artifacts and traces found through archaeology are the vestiges of ancient people's various and diverse historical activities. Among the archaeological discoveries dating from after Daoism's formation in the Eastern Han dynasty, the variety, breadth, and amount of material discovered relating to Daoism is quite amazing.

Archaeology is one of the historical sciences, and its final goal is to reconstruct ancient history and explore the principles of historical development through studying of stuff materials. Artifacts and traces related to Daoism from different eras and regions have different distinctive features. Thus we should not only organize the data in order to solve various problems related to the type, periodization, regional division, and cultural series of some archae-

ological cultures, but we must also look at the essences beneath the phenomena, and clarify the phenomena's qualities, uses, and meanings. And this will help us to better understand other archaeological materials from the same site or which are otherwise related to the Daoist materials. Many problems in the historical archaeology of the period from the Eastern Han on can often receive good solutions when viewed in terms of Daoism. If we neglect this point, and lack a deep understanding of artifacts and traces related to Daoism, or even pay no attention at all to the Daoist aspect, it will be impossible to truly solve the problems of the archaeological systematicity of the Han to Tang and Song to Yuan periods. Archaeology of religion is an indispensable branch of Chinese archaeology. To discuss the archaeology of Chinese religion without research into Daoist artifacts and traces would be to give birth to a deformed creature: historical archaeology of China built on such a foundation could never be healthy and whole.

From the point of view of religious history, the study of ancient religions is mainly based on two things: documentary records, and the artifacts and traces discovered through archaeology. Compared with documentary records, archaeological materials often appear fragmentary, yet because they are concrete objects left from a previous time, they give us a direct perception of that time, and are more reliable. Furthermore, since new archaeological discoveries are ever and again coming to light, they can be used to authenticate and supplement documentary records, and can help us to better understand documentary records or rectify the great number of omissions and errors which have occurred for various reasons. The task of archaeology is to restore ancient history by using historical artifacts. If we were to completely ignore archaeological material, and rely merely on documentary records, then many problems would be insoluble—such as the key problems of the original time and place of the formation of Daoism, and the place, time, and circumstances of the appearance of Daoist icon worship. Popular Daoism, which consists mostly of peculiar and complex religious activities, and rarely deals with the theories of religious philosophy, is a case in point: much of popular Daoism is barely mentioned or completely unmentioned in documentary records, and

has only been preserved in the form of material objects, underground. Some scholars are of the opinion that the later the period being studied is, the more detailed the documentary record is, and because the historical circumstances can mostly be found in the documentary record, archaeology becomes of little value. Naturally, this is the case in the historiography of Daoism. But the real situation is not always being so. In the early 1990s, a friend of mine who has done much work on the history of the Ming and Qing dynasties took on the task of writing a history of Sichuan Province during the Ming and Qing periods. Realizing that his book must touch on Daoism and its state of development, and hampered by the lack of documentary evidence and by the fact that contemporary scholars have offered little research on this topic, he asked if archaeology could supply any relevant material. Because I had just begun to study the archaeology of Daoism, and because I was mainly studying problems of another field, I was not able to produce any research on this topic in time, and knew too little about it, so I was sorry I had nothing to offer him. When his book came out, he could only leave the Daoist question as a temporary lacuna. Later, as my work progressed, I paid a bit more attention to the archaeological material on Daoism in Sichuan, and discovered that indeed there was quite a lot of this material, so I planned to write up a few articles on this topic, picking up where my friend had left off. The Ming dynasty is only five or six hundred years removed from the present, and as far as ancient history goes the Ming period is considered relatively recent—since the archaeology of Daoism was so important for a period as recent as the Ming Dynasty, we can use this example to see the great value and significance of the archaeology of Daoism for the historiography of Daoism as a whole.

The fields of archaeology, the religious studies, and the history of ancient religion all need to carry out specialized research on archaeological discoveries related to religious activity. This fact can be seen in the layout of the volumes on archaeology and religion in the *Encyclopedia of China*: when the *Encyclopedia of China* discusses the branches of these two fields, each field is given a branch called “archaeology of religion”. Chinese archaeology of religion, whether it falls within the field of archaeology or the field of the

religious studies, must include the archaeology of Daoism. Daoism is the native religion of China, with wide-reaching influence and rich material remains, so a systematic archaeology of Chinese religion can never be established without the study of the artifacts and traces of ancient Daoist activity. It is an indisputable fact that the archaeology of Daoism and the archaeology of Buddhism are two mainstays of the archaeology of Chinese religion.

If we take a broad look at the past situation of the fields of archaeology and religious studies, the study and application of Daoist archaeological materials have been dissatisfying, and many problems can be found. As for archaeology, because in the past the focus was on the typology, study has usually been limited to the inspection of the outer forms of the artifacts and their type, variety, periodization, and regional division, as well as their dating and cultural series. Too little attention has been paid to the sociohistorical questions about artifacts' qualities, uses, causes of development and transformation, and the resulting influence and purpose. Sometimes scholars have paid attention to such questions, but they have been hampered by their lack of the necessary multifaceted knowledge of ancient history, and lack of a deep grounding in the use of historical documents, and were unable to use the relevant documentary records in order to interpret the archaeological finds. Now, Daoism is an aggregate of many forms of ancient traditional culture, and is a very specialized and complex entity, so it is difficult to gain a good command of Daoism. Without specialized knowledge about Daoism and the ability to utilize Daoist texts and documents, a scholar would be completely unable to study Daoism-related materials discovered through archaeology. The most basic job of judging which of the already excavated archaeological materials are related to Daoism (and thus fall within the purview of the archaeology of Daoism) has not been done enough in the past, and a great amount of Daoism-related archaeological material has not yet been recognized for what it is, and has been shelved in storerooms, its value unknown, awaiting a second sort of "excavation" by scholars such as us, equipped with specialized knowledge of Daoism. The amount of material which has been recognized for what it is and studied in detail is even less. In the past decade the situation has

changed somewhat, and research of Daoism-related material discovered through archaeology has little by little begun to attract the attention of some scholars (which is a welcome development), but in general this sort of work has really not been done enough, and when compared with the amount of archaeological material available, is greatly inadequate. In terms of religious studies, the history of ancient Daoism is a component part of ancient history; the study of ancient Daoism cannot simply rely on documentary records, but must also make full use of relevant archaeological finds. This basic guiding principle has not yet received broad attention. Admittedly, the historiography of Daoism has developed greatly in the past twenty years, and has had no small success. Yet the books on this topic have made little use of archaeological materials, and much archaeological material which should be able to solve problems in the history of ancient Daoism has not yet received its full and proper use, or been able to contribute to the better and deeper development of historiography of Daoism—this fact must be recognized. As Prof. Ge Zhaoguang of Tsinghua University pointed out in the 1980s, “in studying religion, Chinese scholars more often than not have only paid attention to the thought of religious thinkers, and have overlooked pantheons, ritual, and occult practices” (Ge Zhaoguang, *Taoism and Chinese Culture*. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Press, 1987, P. 323). The study of ancient Daoism has been biased toward the study of thought and theory, and has paid insufficient attention to religious activity. There are many reasons for this state of affairs. What we must emphasize here is that, as stated above, Daoism-related archaeological discoveries generally are the concretely objectified historical record of the specific religious activities of persons from all social classes, the very segment which is so poorly preserved in the documentary record. Take for example the funerary ritual activities of the Daoist priests and masses of various periods and regions—Daoist texts and documents do not record much of this, and much of the records are fragmentary, some extremely sketchy, providing no more than a few clues. Yet in the graves excavated from the Eastern Han period on, an extremely rich collection of archaeological materials has been unearthed. Without specialized archaeological knowledge, these materials are difficult to utilize. Scholars of Daoist history lack the necessary

specialized archaeological knowledge, and this is an important reason for their bias, as stated above.

Archaeologists don't understand Daoist history, and historians of Daoism don't understand archaeology—this lack of mutual understanding is the key reason why so many Daoism-related archaeological materials have been under appreciated and never received their proper use. We must make a complete and systematic in-depth study of Daoist archaeological materials, and establish “archaeology of Daoism” as a branch science of the archaeology of religion. The fields of both archaeology and religious studies must both turn a common focus to this task, and work in concert. It is even more necessary that this task be accomplished through scholars' gaining command of the two specialized forms of knowledge, archaeology and the history of Daoism.

In 1993, Ye Maolin, an associate professor in the Institute of Archaeology of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, in his article “Preliminary Excavation of the Site of Jianfu Hall at Mt. Qingcheng and Its True Significance”, wrote, “in the study of Chinese traditional culture, one must study Daoist culture. Prof. Zhang Xunliao of Sichuan University has long proposed ‘archaeology of Daoism’ as a topic for study; this is of great significance” (Chengdu wenwu, 1993, no. 4). This proposal of mine by no means came as an accident. I majored in history in college, and I have a strong interest in ancient Chinese history. Ever since I graduated in 1957, due to job requirements, I have been involved in the research and teaching of the Chinese historical archaeology of the post-Qin-Han period. “archaeology of Iron-age Chinese tombs” has been my major research focus, and I have supervised several generations of graduate students. In the process of studying the archaeological material from graves of the Eastern Han period on, I came across many artifacts and traces which seem to be related to Daoist activity, and was unable to interpret them, which has hampered my systematic and synthetic study of the grave materials. I steeled myself to push aside this obstacle blocking my path. From the late 1980s, I made a systematic study of basic Daoist knowledge and history, and on this basis read through the Daoist Canon. I