

DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-9391.2018.02.006

葛维汉西南宗教视野下的羌民宗教研究

卞思梅

[摘要]20世纪上半叶葛维汉对中国西南及羌民宗教研究的论述,体现了葛维汉从传教士转变为人类学家后其宗教研究的学术理念。同时,葛维汉对羌民宗教的研究是他对西南甚至中国宗教研究的图景里的一部分,羌民宗教与中国宗教之间是类似“中国宗教之树”一样的互为根叶,互相影响的关系;应该注意葛维汉羌民宗教研究中三个重要概念“马纳”“神”“鬼”,这些概念体现了葛维汉在当时东方主义话语下的“西南视野”宗教研究倾向。

[关键词]葛维汉;羌民宗教;西南宗教;西南视野

中图分类号:C912.4

文献标识码:A

文章编号:1674-9391(2018)02-0045-07

作者简介:卞思梅,女,四川大学国际关系学院/边疆中心专职博士后,挪威奥斯陆大学社会人类学博士,研究方向:生态、宗教、社会韧性、西南研究等。四川成都 610064

20世纪上半叶,中国经历了从晚清帝国转变为民族-国家的阵痛。在转变初期,是否将“四夷”纳入中国受到了前所未有的关注和讨论。当时,不同的学术视角相遇在西南诸多未被识别的少数民族上,其中一派认为西南少数民族是西来之人,而另一派则认为西南自古以来就是中国的边疆领土,其民族也是在中国历史上一直存在。这两种思想正是“帝国殖民化的东南亚视野”与“中国化的西南视野”在西南的对话与碰撞的过程。^[1]持前一派观点的多为西方学者与传教士,后一派则多为中国知识分子。但此区分也非绝对,当时在华西大学任教的美国传教士、人类学家兼考古学家葛维汉(David Crockett Graham)便是持有“中国化的西南视野”的西方学者,他的学术观点集中体现在他与英国传教士陶然士(Thomas Torrance)对羌民族源的辩论之上。陶然士认为羌民是古以色列人的后裔,而葛维汉通过科学的人类学研究,认为羌民是东来而非西来之人。“陶葛”分别从羌民的体质种属、习俗、宗教等方面论证了自己的观点。^[2]不仅如此,葛维汉还对四川的汉人及

汉藏边境少数民族宗教做了详细的比较研究,著有《中国四川省的宗教》^[3]与《中国西南的民间宗教》^[4]两书。本文将把葛维汉对羌民宗教的研究放在其对中国西南宗教研究的图景下,展现他在从传教士转型为人类学家后宗教研究的学术理念,并通过“中国宗教之树”来展现葛维汉如何看待羌民宗教与中国其它宗教之间的关系,以此展现葛维汉提出的三个关于羌族宗教研究的重要概念。

目前国内对葛维汉的研究相对更集中于他对三星堆等地的考古发掘,他对羌、藏、苗、彝等少数民族研究进行深入再研究的作品相对较少。随着西南成为一个学术区域,葛维汉的作品越来越受到重视,他对藏羌等少数民族研究的作品成为规范性学术研究的“开山之作”。对他关于西南宗教及羌民宗教的再研究与解读能更好地帮助我们了解目前羌族与汉族及其他少数民族之文化异同及处境。

一、葛维汉眼里的宗教

葛维汉早期受过自由主义神学、比较宗教学、原始宗教、宗教心理学和人文主义等学科教

育,他一直倡导用一种客观科学的方法研究宗教,这致使他对其它宗教和信仰持更加宽容的态度。对于葛维汉来说,“宗教”在他眼里俨然已经成为了一种科学和学科意识,已超乎陶然士等传教士所理解的宗教概念。葛维汉曾在给韦特莫尔的信中写道“在1919-1920年休假期间,我在芝大学习了课程,这使得亚洲宗教研究成为可能。其后在中国的六年里,我无论到哪里都带着笔记本,记录下我对当地宗教的观察。”^[5]这足以见得他早期便已具有宽容尊重外来宗教和计划对外来宗教进行详细的科学研究的学术打算。此看法正如宗教学开山之人缪勒(Friedrich Max Muller)所言“在科学的宗教研究中,一切宗教都是平等的研究对象,都没有权利谋求高于其他宗教的特殊地位,基督教也不例外。凡是在宗教的比较研究中抬高基督教的地位而贬低其他宗教,或者反过来贬低基督教而抬高其他宗教,都是宗派主义而不是科学的态度。”^[6]葛维汉的科学态度加之人类学田野调查及民族志书写,使他的研究呈现出“尽量准确全面客观地描述宗教”的特征。他不赞成研究中国宗教的两个偏见,他说“有些东方学者意识到中国主导宗教是建立在大众之上的信仰和实践,他们将之称为‘万物有灵论’。相异于这样的定义,我将会把我认为在我观察中最为重要的特征和习俗描述出来。对华西的研究,我的中心一向都是汉人民间宗教。我的目的总是持客观的态度去发现什么是人们自己所相信和思考的。”^{[4]109-110}在研究当地宗教时,他提出应尽量小心以避免冒犯当地人的感情,研究者也不应该视自己不熟悉的当地风俗为可笑或荒谬的现象。

葛氏拥有这种看法除了他宗教学上的专业学习外,还因为他也是一名传教士和自然科学家。当时伴随着现代化的脚步,自然科学日渐发展,葛维汉对科学知识的掌握让他看到一些不科学的宗教现象其实只是一种迷信。如华西的汉人不相信细菌引起发炎和生病却转而求神拜佛的现象便是当地人未受到科学教育的直接结果,这些情况在更不发达的少数民族地区则更加普遍。从自然科学的发展而逐渐发展出来的学术科学是葛维汉所乐于接受的,他在回忆录中提到“关于我的另一件事便是我热爱科学

与宗教……科学与宗教之间并非是互不相容的……只有当宗教是迷信的时候,科学才需要反对宗教,而宗教并不必然是迷信……人类一般都是信教的,并且应该是这样。”^[7]在将宗教和科学结合的看法中,他自然认为除了基督教以外的其他宗教也是“可以解释”的,并且人类是应该具有自己的宗教信仰的。

“宗教”在葛维汉的眼里是一种复杂的现象,理解和研究它绝非是一个简单或轻松的任务,忽视一些方面或者过分强调某一方面都可能获得一个被歪曲的图景。葛维汉认为在研究西南宗教时,我们应广泛涉及地理、历史、物理和社会环境,因为它们都可能投射在宗教上。其它还包括:灵魂、鬼(demons)的概念、它们的行为及它们是怎样被控制和驱除的、祖先崇拜、来世等;及与出生、婚姻、死亡、丧葬相关的概念及实践活动;一些基础的概念如阴阳和风水,马纳(Mana);咒语、巫术和辟邪物;宗教崇拜和仪式中的圣物;宗教仪式及节日;占卜、吉日、许愿、祈祷、符咒、牺牲及礼拜;寺庙、圣所、神山、和神木;巫师、萨满以及众神。^{[8]xi-xii}对于像羌民这样的边民宗教研究则更加困难。一方面研究者要面临羌民与周边民族混杂多样的宗教和习俗现象,另一方面研究者还要随时提防搜集到错误信息。除了以上葛维汉列举出的概念外,“要正确地理解和解释这个民族,就要像学生一样,尽可能地学习汉族、藏族和其他中亚民族的历史文化,同时还应具有原始宗教和原始人群方面的知识。他还要学习其他人写的有关羌民方面的文章,并能直接深入地调查,掌握到羌民的知识。”^{[9]123-124}

二、葛维汉眼中的中国宗教之树

相较于以往“只述不立”的风格,在《中国西南的民间宗教》中,葛维汉较为清晰地表述了他的研究立场。他首先强调西南区域居住着汉人和各少数民族,他将这些少数民族归并于中华民族的大范围内。他的研究包括了汉人和少数民族宗教,这些宗教处于一种混合的互相影响的状态,所以他将西南宗教视为一个整体来阐述,并认为这些宗教中,汉人宗教的影响力最大。他说“华西的社会和宗教习俗呈现出汉人文化和其他文化及少数民族文化的混融状态,

如印度、西藏、苗、傣、羌、掸或傣等等。而他们之间的文化又难以确定到底是谁借用了谁的,但最主要和影响最大的是汉人的文化。”^{[4]32}葛维汉当时已经接受了实地调查的方法,主张研究现存民族的状态,但他注意到,像西南这样一个民族杂居的地方,研究单独的族群时,对历史的引进是必须的。葛氏在文中大量引用汉文经典以佐证羌民确实是由东部迁来,原属于中国,在此论证过程中,他将汉文记载当成“事实”使用,此种将中国传统学术引入到人类学民族学研究里在当时就已被广泛接受。

葛维汉在文中追溯了中国早期的宗教现象,将中国宗教归纳为一个“树形图”,刻画了一棵包含根、干、枝和叶的“中国宗教之树”:

中国宗教或许可以被比作一棵大树,这棵树有一个主干、三大分枝、一些小的树枝并且还有很多更小的枝条依附在主干和分枝上。从地面到树顶的主干是中国的流行宗教(popular religion),三大分枝是佛教、道教和儒教。从唐朝开始,伊斯兰教已经占据了一定地位,近年来基督教也开始发展。小树枝是儒坛、巫教和同善社。更小的枝叶便是佛教、道教的各个宗派及次宗教。同样,中国的宗教还有一个主根及一些大的侧根,侧根上还有很多须根。主根便是中国流行宗教的前身,它的历史可以追溯至周代和商代,甚至到新石器时代。一个大的侧根便是来自印度佛教的影响。另一些更小的根便是中国和西亚、欧洲及中国四周的少数民族的接触。^{[4]45}

通过对这棵“树”的描述,他将中国宗教的历史发展描述为大树由根到茎的关系。这个“历史之根”究竟是什么?他将其归结为以家庭为中心的祖先崇拜和商周人敬天的习俗。

中国人自古便是农业民族,家庭是社会的基础。家庭的发展逐渐发展成宗族或家族,最终形成一个民族。家庭的利益是一切出发点,个人利益涵盖在家族利益之下。孝道是中国文化所提倡的,这也最终影响到了中国的社会及宗教领域,于是宗教便是一个家庭和社区共同的事件,而道德伦理便是全社会的。在以家庭为中心的背景下,子孙必须孝敬老人及祖先;在阴阳观念下,阴性的女人必须遵从阳性的男人,即自己的父亲、丈夫和儿子。葛氏认为,这种家

庭模式在政治中同样存在,君主便是臣民的父母,他们之间互相依靠犹如父母和子女间的依赖,中国的地方官员是统治者和被统治者之间的关键联系。君主应为人民树立榜样,他的成功可以为民带来福利;而为民者应像遵从自己的父母一样遵从君王的命令。他还强调,中国人是一种社会性思考的民族,他们的道德伦理是社会性的,在判断好坏时,通常是以是否能为人类特别是自己的家庭带来利益作为参考,于是祖先崇拜应运而生。从商周的考古及记载中可以得知,当时祖先死去后会有大量陪葬,后代子孙也会利用占卜祭拜等问求祖先,寻其保佑。

葛维汉认为在周代有一次大的道德发展和改革极大地影响了后来的宗教与习俗。周人开始相信神灵具有惩恶扬善的功能。商周人以敬天为主,称天为“帝”或者“上帝”。但他认为这并不能说明早期的中国是一神教,同样的情况存在于非汉人的东部、南部和中亚的各少数民族中。商代并非只崇拜天,同时还崇拜其他神,如:龙女、西王母、风王等。在周代还有次级神灵,如战争之父、农神、灶神等,同时,天地间的自然物如日月山水都是中国人崇拜的对象。他认为,虽然周以后中国人开始交替使用“天”和“上帝”的概念,但这并不意味着早期社会的中国人是一神教,因为他们还信奉次级神灵,且这些神灵的数字在历史进程中不断增长,以至无法统计。商周的“天”或者“上帝”指意相同:他是最高神,是一个最初参与到人类及人类社会公正之中的神,他惩恶扬善。^{[4]8}在羌民研究中,他认为,羌民的敬天习俗便是直传于周人。^{[9]47}

除了对宗教来源的追溯,在对西南混融的宗教研究中,葛维汉受到海顿的影响,在区分中国宗教时基于很强的文本基础——他将儒教、道教、佛教、伊斯兰教及基督教这些拥有经典的宗教称为“主要宗教”,将大众的无文本的宗教称为“流行或民间宗教”,附着在这两种之上的还有“次级宗教”。和葛兰言典型的中国宗教研究一样,葛维汉将民间宗教奉为主干,主要宗教为其分枝,而次级宗教是其枝叶。中国宗教的主根是商周以来的以崇拜天和祖先为主并附带崇拜各种次级神灵及自然万物的“小传统”,而儒教、道教等是从小传统上生发出来的主干,周边各少数民族群作为枝叶当然要吸收主根和主干

的“营养”,受其影响;但同时中国宗教的须根又是来自西亚、欧洲及与周边少数民族的接触。也就是说,羌民这样的少数民族宗教在葛氏看来既是中国宗教的“因”又是其“果”,整体上是一种交融的互相影响的状态。

葛维汉对中国早期宗教的描述和看法直接影响到他对其他周边民族的研究。他将西南少数民族宗教归为中国的“次级宗教”,将其分为非汉人宗教:川苗、傛傛或诺苏(今彝族)、羌民、藏民或喇嘛教;汉人宗教:儒坛、巫教、同善社、妈教(mother religion)。关于羌民研究,葛维汉十分赞同羌民民族是周人之后代的建构。他提到周武王的祖母便是一名羌女^{[9]8},羌人联合周人灭掉商的历史印记也为他所接受,并指出西南几个支系很可能都是古羌人的后裔。早先被封侯的羌人在历史的发展中慢慢融入汉人。虽然他在对羌民的研究中并未对羌民的社会组织结构进行描述,但他注意到羌民对祭祖的重视,并认为他们可能是从汉人那里借用过来的。^{[9]144}羌人祭天更是周人的直传,在祭天的同时也祭拜各种次级神灵及天地自然万物。他也注意到现存羌民的祭祀仪式有两种,一种是公共的祭天仪式,一种是在自家屋顶的较小的祭祀仪式,这样二分的仪式似乎在暗示社区和家庭之间的关系,或羌民社会的组成结构与古之商周之人相类似。对于苗、彝的研究,他也抱着类似的观点,如对川苗的祭祖及多神崇拜的叙述。如此,西南少数民族宗教尤其是羌民的宗教和汉人在一定程度上可说是同源,但是又因少数民族向西部的迁徙,从而保留了最初期的文化,是早期文化衰落的表征;而留在汉人地区的羌人则受到汉人文化与宗教的影响从而被汉人所吸收。

葛维汉也注意到羌民西部强大的藏民,他说:虽然羌民被藏民的喇嘛教或者汉人的文化和宗教所吸收,但羌民有他们自己的习俗和宗教,只不过受到汉藏的影响很大。^{[3]90}他们是靠共同的语言、信仰及实践组合在一起的一个少数民族。虽然葛维汉多次强调研究羌民的困难,因为他们的语言多样,并且有一些羌民说汉语,习汉俗但又自称为羌,羌民和汉人、嘉戎及其他少数民族群的接触已经存在很多世纪。羌民与嘉戎、瓦寺的接触让他们拥有藏民的一些特征,比如服饰和歌舞。文化传播是最好的解释

羌民习俗的路径。但是葛维汉还是肯定地说羌民本身是一个少数民族,因为他们认为拥有很多自己的社会和宗教习俗,比如他们的着装和语言就将他们和其他民族区分开来。^{[3]93}

三、葛维汉提出的羌民宗教的三个重要概念

人类学传入中国,在西南的发展过程中遇到了研究的困难,但也经历了一系列转变。在研究西南宗教的过程中,葛维汉花了数十年来寻找中国社会中的“马纳”概念。在《中国四川的宗教》中,他说“研究四川的民间宗教,马纳概念,这种渗透于所有惊人的、强大的、神奇的和神秘的力量是理解和解释民间宗教的关键。民间对这种神秘力量的反应多是和人们对未知的、充满危险的或有助于他们的环境相联系。”^{[3]79}他花了很多时间寻找中国对这种贯穿所有,并在风水和其他巫术实践中的神秘的力量本土语言后,沮丧地说“如果谁想要在中国找出对于现在学术界定义的“马纳”概念的对应术语,那么他将会非常失望,因为中国没有这样一个术语。”^{[4]118}通过研究,他认为可能中国所谓的“灵”“神”“气”与“马纳”概念相同。但他又说中国人认为“阴阳”和“风水”的概念才和“马纳”等同。他最终还是倾向于采取中国人自己的解释,认为“马纳”可能是“阴阳”和“风水”的观念。“风水”是“阴阳”在自然界的外在表现。这种神秘的力量既可以对家庭、城市或者更大的区域产生裨益也可能产生坏处。他认为西南的很多风俗都可以用存在这种神奇的、神秘的、超人的力量来解释。

其次是“鬼(demon)”的观念。葛维汉在对羌民的研究中并没有专门解释“鬼”的含义,但他在解释巫师作法时认为他们是为了驱魔赶鬼。葛维汉认为“鬼”这个观念和祖先崇拜不可分割。人们崇拜死去的先祖,如果后人不孝,祖先可能会报复伤害后人及其他人;其次,那些死于非命的人的灵魂也是鬼,比如吊颈鬼和抹颈鬼就是吊死和被割喉而死的人的灵魂,他们会设法让其他人以相同的方法死去;再次,鬼生前也可能是某种凶猛的动物。由此而派生出来一个庞大的鬼的系统,掺杂着各种精灵、妖怪等类似的概念。^{[4]123}

第三,羌民的信仰中非常重要的另一个观

念便是“神”。葛维汉强调中国人信仰多神,说:“多神教,即崇拜许多神灵的宗教,在川西所有人中都非常普遍。在汉人、藏人和其他少数民族中还存在偶像崇拜。这些信仰和实践对这个区域的人来说非常自然,就如犹太人、基督徒和伊斯兰教徒对一神教感到很正常一样。”^{[4]172}但与汉藏宗教不同的是,羌民的宗教几乎没有偶像。羌民崇拜白石,但是白石到底是神本身还是神的表征抑或是神灵寄居的场所是他非常关注的一个问题。在关于汉人神灵究竟是居住在万物之中,还是万物本身就是神灵也是葛维汉讨论的另一个重点。由于华西宗教的混融性,葛维汉只得将各族的宗教相互比较,以此发现,一方面羌民对神灵的崇拜没有树立偶像;另一方面羌民将万物当成“活神(living god)”崇拜,同样的情况存在于西南各民族之中。羌民崇拜天神、五个次神和十二个小神,出现在神灵及祭坛上的神圣白石在葛维汉看来并不是神灵,而只是代表这个地方是祭祀的神圣之地。倒是其他一些非白色的石头或者出现在其他地方的石头被当做活神供奉。如前所提的一些石头被当成山神、仓颉神、石王等来崇拜。与此类似,自然万物,包括山、树、道路等都被当成活的神灵崇拜,也就是说,这个物体并非被当成神灵寄居的地方,而是这个物体本身就是神。葛维汉在《四川的树神》里讨论了关于物体就是神灵的說法,一些参天老树,在经过很长的成长历史后,便被当成树神供奉。他说“中国西部质朴无华的人民把许多无生命的东西认为是活着的和有理智的,如太阳、月亮、星辰、山脉、河流、湍滩、岩石和树木。照此观点,可信几乎任何活着的東西都可能是或者可以成为一种神,以至有时树木被当做神,便不足为奇了。”“经过多年仔细调查,并蒙僧人和其他最权威人士告知,在四川的古老信仰中,有时老树自然发展为神。”^[10]这种物体崇拜在整个西南地区都很普遍。

如此一来,“马纳”“鬼”“神”三个概念是葛维汉羌民宗教研究的中心概念,只是“马纳”这个概念和汉人宗教一样,葛维汉并未找到一个相应的羌语的术语,他只称其为“神秘强大的力量”。神灵和巫师被相信拥有掌控这种力量的能力,而法器则拥有超自然的力量,可以增加巫师掌控该力量的能力。鬼则是病痛和不幸产生

的根本原因。羌民的整个宗教从祭祀到驱鬼再到生活的各个方面都和这三个概念紧密相关。

四、葛维汉对羌民宗教观念的解释

葛维汉认为要理解和解释羌民的宗教必须从羌民的世界观着手。羌民居住在高山、半高山和峡谷之中,那里气候凉爽少雨。并且与嘉戎、芦花、黑水和播倮子为邻,主要的城镇居住着汉族,这些少数民族在不同历史时间都是羌民危险的敌人,野生动物袭击人群、家畜和庄稼,由于条件恶劣,人们经常摔下山崖并被各种不同的自然灾害袭击。羌民相信各种灾害都是由鬼怪引起的,并认为自然具有一种神秘力量,此力量既可以对人们有所裨益也可以伤害人们。^{[9]45}同时,羌区几乎毫无科学的普及,他们不懂得用科学的方法解释疾病或灾祸,所以只能用宗教来对其进行理解和治疗防御。此现象在整个川西都很普遍,他说:他们对环境卫生的观念特别差,也根本不懂细菌的理论,随地吐痰的现象非常普遍。在手术中,除了现代的大医院,其他的手术刀、剪刀等都不进行消毒,感染随时都会发生并且多数都是致命的。传染病经常得不到控制而造成大量人员死亡,人们也不懂得天花和牛痘的预防,这样一来,所有的疾病都归因于鬼。^{[4]37}在书中,他记录了妇女生产时候所用的剪刀并未经过消毒,相反,却是在牛粪中清洗,引起产妇和婴儿的死亡。羌民碉楼的一层是猪圈和厕所,里面常常布满蛆虫,屋内窗户很小,烟雾弥漫,空气不流通,猫狗羊等动物随意在屋内行走,这些都造成了细菌、跳蚤、苍蝇、蚊子、虱子等对疾病的传播。^{[9]40}

因恶劣的环境和落后的科学,人们普遍将自己的希望寄托在神灵之上。按照葛维汉的想法,他认为他们求神及驱魔仪式主要是为了满足人们自身的基本需求。而羌民的宗教仪式基本上集中于以巫师为中心的祭神和驱鬼仪式,葛维汉认为巫师可以掌握神秘的力量,他可以在各方面帮助人们。

和敬神有关的各种献祭仪式在葛维汉看来也是有其社会根源的。为什么人们在敬神的时候一定要供奉祭品?他认为,从祭祖方面看,是因为人们认为死去的祖先和活人一样生活在另一个世界,需要钱、食物、衣物等东西。而对于

神灵的供奉则是因为中国的社会习俗的文化根基。如中国的官员是靠收税来取得自己的收入而不是从政府拿薪酬,官员们的另一收入便是在办案的过程中百姓缴纳的“礼”,通常这个“礼”是钱。其次,中国人普遍存在送礼的习俗,无论在节日、生日、婚礼、葬礼及各种场合都流行送礼,送礼的初衷一方面是表达敬意和爱意,另一方面则是期望得到他人的帮助。这种意识被他们转嫁到宗教仪式里面,所以形成了贡献祭品的宗教礼仪。^{[4]160}汉人的这种想法也影响到周边各少数民族,抑或本来他们就是同源的原因及功能。

除了祭神,羌民另一个重要的宗教内容是驱鬼。他们认为所有的不幸和疾病都是鬼带来的,所以将鬼驱赶走,或引导他们进入阴间太平生活便可解除不幸与疾病。巫师在做法的过程中常利用能驾驭神秘力量的法器来帮助他,并口念咒语。葛维汉在书中详实地记录了巫师为一名腹痛妇女治病和用九头鸟驱赶邪魔的过程。他认为,这种因疾病和其他灾难导致人们信奉和害怕邪魔并以简单或复杂的方法来驱魔避邪在中亚地区很普遍。^{[9]104}

葛维汉在对西南宗教的研究中得出了一个类似于马林诺夫斯基的功能主义的结论,他认为中国人的宗教是非常实际的,“他们期待从宗教实践中得到一些对他们日常生活有实际作用的效果。”^{[9]184}虽然他们相信了前世来生,天堂和地狱,但是他们的民间宗教还是最关注此生以及人们在这个世界的基本需求。每一个仪式、每一个祈祷及每一个神都被认为在人们的日常生活中有一些实际的用处,生活各个方面都有相应的神,甚至连小偷都有相应的保护神。葛维汉的这种类功能主义的看法也渗透到了羌民研究中,他说“人们认为通过巫师、神灵的仪式可以消除疾患,带来好收成,让家畜肥壮和繁殖,并免遭敌人和自然灾害的侵袭,使人们在衣、食、住、行和生育诸方面得到快乐与满足,人丁兴旺、长寿,在社会上有体面。”“羌民是个比较原始的民族。在他们的宗教仪式中,人们寻找食物、祈雨、求好收成、愿长生、求子孙繁衍、家畜兴旺、保平安、社会地位与荣誉,以及盼望过富足的生活。”^{[9]45,123}他的这种看法在另一篇

介绍华西调查方法的文章中得到了更好的总结:

在研究当地宗教时,应尽量小心避免冒犯当地人的感情。研究者不应该视不熟悉的当地风俗为可笑的或者荒谬的。所有的本土宗教都试图获得与无法看见的力量合作来解决现实生活中的问题或满足人类的需求,比如治病、获得食物、防止敌人的侵袭、保护子嗣及获得开心满足的生活。如果毫无偏见地调查便可发现,每一个本土习俗在当地人的头脑中都是帮助人们满足这种人类的这些需要的……一个人应该倾其所能地学习他所研究的族群的生活、环境和历史。这常常能让他看到,这些貌似奇怪的风俗对实践它们的人来说是非常自然和合理的。^{[8]xi}

葛维汉不仅认为中国的宗教具有如此的功能,他甚至认为基督教的存在也是为了满足人们的基本需要,只是所满足的程度不尽相同。此种看法可被视为一种模糊的进化论观,即原始宗教为了满足人们最基本的需求,而高级宗教则为了满足人们更高级的需求,具体而言就是个人的道德和精神上的需求。基督教也并不是最高级的宗教,每个宗教都有其好的道德方面的提倡,宗教在未来的发展方面也会因为一系列的原因进行调整和进步。

综上,葛维汉认为对宗教的研究应持一种科学和宽容的态度,而科学与宗教并不矛盾。在对羌民宗教进行研究时,他以西南宗教的视野,认为羌民宗教与中国宗教之间犹如根叶,交互影响。同时也指出,在研究西南少数民族宗教时必须代入历史维度,只有在广泛了解周边各民族情况后才能准确定位单独族群的宗教。在比较了汉藏宗教后,葛维汉在不同地方提出研究羌民宗教需要注意的三个概念,即“马纳”“鬼”“神”;这三个概念与羌族的居住环境及世界观结合起来便可以准确地理解羌民的宗教。正是他这种在当时来讲较为先进的和科学的人类学研究方法造成了他与别的西方学者及传教士之间的分歧,在与中西方学者接触并广泛阅读史料及田野调查后,葛维汉的“西南视野”也正体现了当时东方主义话语的内部的分化。而葛维汉从传教士到人类学家的转变也体现出了中国人类学早期发展的境况,即从业余到专业,

从宗教热情到科学严谨的路径。

参考文献:

[1] 彭文斌. 中西之间的西南视野: 西南民族志分类图示 [J]. 西南民族大学学报, 2007 (10): 8.

[2] 卞思梅. “羌为何人”——20世纪前期西方学者的羌民研究 [J]. 云南师范大学学报, 2013(5): 9-16.

[3] Graham, D. C.. *Religion in Szechuan Province, China* [J]. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, 1928, 80(4).

[4] Graham, D. C.. *Folk Religion in Southwest China* [J]. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1961, 142(2).

[5] 苏珊·R·布朗. 在中国的文化人类学家和教士——大卫·克罗克特·葛维汉 [J]. 饶锦译, 李绍明审校. 中华文化论坛, 2002 (1): 115-123.

[6] 麦克斯·缪勒. 宗教学导论 [M]. 陈观

胜, 李培荣译. 上海: 上海人民出版社, 1989: 3.

[7] Charles F. McKhann and Alan Waxman: *David Crockett Graham: American Missionary and Scientist in Sichuan, 1911-1948* [C]. Denise M. Glover, Stevan Harrell, and Charles F. McKhann, ed. *Explorers and Scientists in China's Borderlands, 1880-1950* [A]. Seattle: University of Washington Press 2011.

[8] Graham, D. C.. *Methods and Equipment for Research on the China Tibetan Border* [J]. *Journal of the West China Border Research Society*, 1934(6).

[9] 葛维汉. 耿静译. 羌族的习俗与宗教 [C]//李绍明, 周蜀蓉. 葛维汉民族学考古学论著. 成都: 巴蜀书社, 2004.

[10] 戴维·克罗克特·格雷厄姆(即葛维汉). 四川的树神 [J]. 江玉祥译. 文史杂志, 1990(2): 41.

收稿日期: 2018-02-02 责任编辑: 许瑶丽

David Crockett Graham's Study of Qiang Religion From the Religious Perspective of Southwest China

Bian Simei

(Sichuan University, Chengdu, 610064, Sichuan, China)

JOURNAL OF ETHNOLOGY, VOL. 9, NO. 2, 45-51, 2018 (CN51-1731/C, in Chinese)

DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-9391.2018.02.06

Abstract: This article reflects David Crockett Graham's academic view on religion after he transformed from missionary to anthropologist. It does so by analyzing Graham's research on the religions of southwest China and the Qiang during the first half of the 20th century. In addition, this article puts Graham's study on Qiang religion within the context of his research not only on the religions of the southwest, but also on the whole of China. It furthermore untangles the intertwined relationship between the Qiang religion and Chinese religion by drawing upon a discussion of Graham's concept of "The Tree of the Chinese Religion". It then generalizes three important concepts to which we should pay attention when drawing upon Graham's research on Qiang religion, namely, "Mana", "Gods(*Shen*)" and "Demons", and indicates that the tendency of Graham's research on religion reflects the perspective of "Southwest China" within the context of the "orientalism" of the time.

In the first half of the 20th century, China experienced the pain of transforming from an empire in late-Qing dynasty to a modern nation-state. The question of whether or not the state should incorporate the "Siyi" (Four Barbarians) into the state gained unprecedented attention during the early stage of this transformation. At the time, different academic perspectives were encountered regarding the un-identified minority ethnic groups in Southwest China. One group took the southwestern minorities as people who came from the west; while the other took Southwest China as China's frontier

from ancient times to the present, and that the ethnic groups had existed there throughout its history. The encounter implicated both the collision and conversation between "the imperialist colonization view of Southeast Asia" and "the Sinicized view of Southwest China." (Peng, 2007) People who held the former view were mostly western scholars and missionaries, and the latter were Chinese scholars.

However, this distinction is not absolute. For instance, the American missionary, anthropologist and archaeologist, David Crockett Graham, who taught at West China Union University, is a western scholar who held "the Sinicized" view of Southwest China. His academic point of view is mainly reflected in his debate with the British missionary Thomas Torrance with regard to the ethnic origin of the Qiang. Torrance considered the Qiang the descendants of the ancient Israelites, while Graham, through scientific, anthropological studies, took the Qiang as people from the east, and not the west. Both sought to prove their points by analyzing the Qiang's physical characteristics, customs, religion, and so on (for more, see Bian 2013). Furthermore, Graham conducted detailed comparative research on the Han in Sichuan and the ethnic minorities living in the Sino-Tibetan borderland. He also published two books: *Religion in Szechuan Province, and China* and *Folk Religion in Southwest China*. The following discussion will put Graham's research on the Qiang within the context of his research on folk religion in Southwest China in order to explore his academic views after he

transformed from missionary to anthropologist. It will also examine how Graham saw the relationship between the Qiang religion and China's other religions via "The Tree of the Chinese Religions", and, eventually will scrutinize the three important concepts for studying Qiang religion that were suggested by Graham.

I. Religion in Graham's Eyes

Graham previously had received an education in liberal theology, comparative religions, primitive religions, religious psychology and humanism. He had always advocated studying religion in an objective and scientific way, which made him more tolerant of other religions and beliefs. "Religion" in his eyes seemed to have become a kind of scientific and disciplinary consciousness. Graham was also both a missionary and a natural scientist. At that time, with the gradual development of the natural sciences which accompanied modernization, and Graham's mastery of the scientific knowledge, he observed that some unscientific religious phenomena were only superstitions. Religion and science could coexist, and science needed to reject religion only when religion was superstition. Graham believed that religion was a complex phenomenon. One would only get a distorted picture if one ignored one aspect or overemphasized another aspect of religion. He also suggested that we extensively touch upon geography, history, physics and social context when studying religions in Southwest China, because they are all cast within religion. When situating religion within this context, all religions are understandable and, in Graham's words (1961: 109), can be "described comprehensively and objectively".

II. The Tree of Chinese Religion

In his book *Folk Religion in Southwest China*, Graham pointed out that not only the Han, but also other minorities, lived in Southwest China, and these minorities should be taken into the Chinese nation on a large scale. The religions of the Han and ethnic minorities are also mixed together and mutually influential. If we take southwestern

religions as a whole, the Han religion is the most influential among them. He also suggested that it was necessary to introduce a historical dimension when dealing with a single ethnic group living in Southwest China where many ethnic groups lived together. Graham traced early Chinese religious phenomena, and generalized Chinese religion as a "tree" which contains roots, branches and leaves:

"The tree has a main trunk, three large branches, several smaller branches and many twigs attached to the trunk and branches. The main trunk from the ground to the top of the tree is the popular religion of China and the three main branches are Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism. Since the Tang dynasty, Islam has had a place, and in recent years the Christian religion. Smaller branches are the Ru Tan, the Wu Chiao, and the Tung Shan She. The twigs are the numerous sects of Buddhism and Taoism and of the lesser religions. There is also main root and several large branch roots, besides many smaller ones. The main root is the ancestor of the popular religion of China, which can be traced back more and more dimly through the Chou into the Shang dynasty, and into the late Neolithic times. One large branch root represents influences from India, chiefly through Buddhism. Other smaller roots have given China contacts with western Asia and Europe and with ethnic groups north, east, south and west of China." (Graham 1961: 45)

From this Graham described the development of the Chinese religion as the relationship of a tree's roots to its stems. Its "historical root" is the tradition of family-centered ancestor worship and the worship of Heaven found among the Shang and Zhou people. The concept of family-centered relationships is also reflected in the relationship between the emperor and his subjects as well as the relationship between officials and their people. The Qiang lived in Southwest China area where the Han and other minorities lived together. In Graham's perspective, Qiang religion was both a "cause" as well as a "result" of Chinese religion. The Qiang and Chinese religion were closely intertwined and

mutually influenced each other. To a certain degree, they can be considered closely related. As for the studies on the other ethnic minorities in the other parts of Southwest China, such as the Miao and Yi, Graham held similar opinions.

III. Three Important Concepts of Qiang Religion

Graham regarded three significant concepts as ones to which we should pay attention when studying Qiang religion. They are "Mana", "Demon" and "gods (*Shen*)". Mana is "that of a strange and mysterious potency permeating all striking, powerful, strange, and mysterious things, and is a primary key for the understanding and interpreting of religion" (Graham 1928: 79). The frequent response of people to this mysterious power is to relate it to an unknown, dangerous or helpful environment. Anthropologists have found similar concepts of "mana" among various peoples. Graham did not exactly find "mana", but considered some Chinese concepts very similar, for example, "ling", "shen" and "qi". Yet many Chinese told Graham that "yinyang" and "fengshui" should be called "mana". Many folk customs can be interpreted by this mysterious, magical and superhuman power.

The second important concept is "demon". Graham gives no exact definition of this concept, but considered that it was closely related to ancestor worship. The purpose of the magic from the sorcerer is often for exorcism. Demons are also connected with people dying from unnatural deaths, such as the "hanging by the neck demon" (*diao-jinggui*). Demons constitute a vast system, which is filled with concepts like ghosts and monsters.

The third significant concept is "gods". Graham emphasized that Chinese were polytheistic. Polytheism is also common among the Han, Tibetan and other minorities in western China. Compared with the Han, the Qiang do not have images for their gods. The Qiang worship white stones, and consider almost everything as "living gods", for instance, a very tall tree that reaches toward

the heavens, the sun and some mountains.

These three concepts reflect the Qiang's cosmology. The Qiang lived in alpine canyons, and every day they were surrounded by wild animals and a difficult environment. With a harsh natural environment, various natural disasters, and attacks from surrounding peoples, the Qiang often considered that these disasters were caused by mysterious powers, from which people could benefit or be harmed. In addition, science had not yet penetrated into the mountainous villages. People, thus, often pinned their hope on the gods. As a result, Graham drew a conclusion similar to Malinowski's functionalism. He suggested that Chinese religions were very practical. The Qiang offered sacrifices to the gods, exorcised demons, worshipped ancestors, and through these religious practices, they hoped to gain practical effects on their everyday life. People thought that the rituals carried out by sorcerers and offerings to the gods could eliminate diseases, guarantee a sound harvest, fatten their livestock, improve reproduction, avoid attacks from enemies and nature, and obtain happiness and have satisfactory clothing, food, shelter and means of travelling. Even Christianity, which claimed to be higher than the other religions, is practiced for fulfilling the basic necessities of life of human beings.

To sum up, Graham advocated a tolerant attitude towards the study of religions, and believed that science and religion are not necessarily in conflict with each other. As for the study of Qiang religion, he took "the view of Southwest China", and considered that the relationship between the Qiang religion and Chinese religion were interconnected just like tree roots and leaves. Graham also noted that we had to bring historical dimension into the research of the religions of the minorities in Southwest China. Only when we have a general understanding of the surrounding peoples can we position the religion of a single minority group more accurately. After comparing the religions of the Han and Tibetans, Graham advocated three signifi-

cant concepts for studying Qiang religion: “Ma-na”, “demon” and “gods”. Based on these three concepts, and combined with the Qiang’s natural living environment and cosmology, only then, can one comprehend Qiang religion more precisely. It is exactly because of his more advanced and scientific anthropological research methods that led to a split between him and the other western scholars and missionaries. Graham’s view of Southwest China derives from substantial contacts with both Chinese and western scholars, extensive reading of historical materials, and fieldwork. His “view of the Southwest” reflects the internal differentiation of the temporal context of orientalism. The transformation of Graham from missionary to anthropologist also reflects the developing approach of the Chinese anthropology in its early stage, which was shifting from amateur to professional and from religious passion to precise science.

Key Words: David Crockett Graham; Qiang religion; religions of Southwest China; perspective of Southwest China

References:

Bian Simei. *qiang wei heren—20 shiji qianqi xifang xuezhe de qiangmin yanjiu* (Who are the Qiang—The Study of the Qiang People by the Western Scholars in the Early 20th Century). In *Journal of Yunnan Normal University* (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2013, 45(13): 9–16.

Charles F. McKhann and Alan Waxman. *David Crockett Graham: American Missionary and Scientist in Sichuan, 1911–1948*. In Denise M. Glover, Stevan Harrell, and Charles F. McKhann, ed. *Explorers and Scientists in China’s Borderlands, 1880–1950*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011.

David Crockett Graham. *qiangzu de xisu yu zongjiao* (The Customs and Religion of the Ch’iang). Geng Jing transl. In *Geweihan minzuxue kaoguxue lunzhu* (Works of Graham’s Ethnology and Archaeology), Li Shaoming and Zhou Shurong ed. Chengdu: bashu shushe, 2004.

David Crockett Graham. *sichuan de shushen* (Sacred Trees in Sichuan), Jiang Yuxiang, transl. In *Journal of Literature and History*, 1990(2): 41–42.

David Crockett Graham. *Methods and Equipment for Research on the China Tibetan Border*. In *Journal of the West China Border Research Society*, 1934, 6.

David Crockett Graham. *Religion in Szechuan Province, China*. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections; Smithsonian Institution; Washington, D. C. 1928, v. 80, no. 4.

David Crockett Graham. *Folk Religion in Southwest China*, Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1961.

F. Max Muller. *zongjiaoxue daolun* (Introduction to the Science of Religion). Chen Guansheng, Li Peizhu transl. Shanghai: shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1989.

Peng Wenbin. *zhongxi zhijian de xinan shiye: xinan minzuzhi fenlei tushi* (Southwestern perspectives between China and West: Classification and Ethnographic Mapping in Southwest China). In *Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities*, 2007, 28(10): 6–14.

Susan R. Brown. *zai zhongguo de wenhua renleixue jia* (David C. Graham: A Cultural Anthropologist and Missionary in China). Rao Jin transl. Li Shaoming proofread. In *Forum on Chinese Culture* 2001(3).