

ON QUANZHEN DAOISM AND THE LONGMEN LINEAGE: AN INSTITUTIONAL
HISTORY OF MONASTERIES, LINEAGES, AND ORDINATIONS

A Thesis Submitted to the College of
Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts
In the Department Linguistics and Religious Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

YUE WANG

© Copyright Yue Wang, June, 2017. All rights reserved.

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis. Requests for permission to copy or to make other uses of materials in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Linguistics and Religious Studies

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5A5

Canada

OR

Dean

College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

University of Saskatchewan

105 Administration Place

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A2

Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines Quanzhen Daoism, and the Longmen lineage in particular, during the Qing dynasty in China from an institutional perspective. By critically analyzing monasteries, lineages, and texts, this study sheds light on why the notion of lineage is crucial for understanding Qing Daoism. Furthermore, this study challenges the existing understanding of Quanzhen Daoism as a fixed entity that was disconnected from the Chinese society by demonstrating that Quanzhen Daoism was a hybrid tradition that actively interacted with other traditions as well as the imperial state, reinventing itself, and constantly in search of prosperity and posterity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor and also my *guiren* 貴人, Dr. George A. Keyworth III, who has assisted me enormously to pursue my own academic path, yet never forgotten to remind me of how to grow to be a serious scholar and a good person.

I offer my gratitude to all my committee members who carefully and patiently examine my thesis drafts. I am also indebted to the following professors for their help with my research in many ways: Professor Liu Yi at Capital Normal University, Professor Wang Zongyu at Peking University, and Professor Yin Zhihua at the Chinese Daoist Association have kindly walked me through all the local sources related to my research in Beijing; Professor Chen Jinhua at University of British Columbia and Professor Barend ter Haar at Oxford University have given me invaluable insights and feedbacks regarding how to methodologically approach Daoist study. Their guidance has made this thesis far better.

DEDICATION

To my parents and grandparents

ATHORS NOTE

Instances where I have provided Chinese characters for select proper nouns the characters used are in traditional form. The Romanization of Chinese names and terms has been rendered using the Pinyin system. I have provided verbatim the spellings and Romanizations from sources that are directly quoted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION OF USE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
DEDICATION	iv
AUTHOR’S NOTES.....	v
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Case of An Shilin.....	1
1.2 Main Objectives.....	3
1.2.1 First Objective.....	3
1.2.2 Lineage and Transmission Narratives.....	4
1.2.3 Second Objective.....	8
1.3 The Role of the Chinese State in Regulating Religion.....	9
1.4 Terminology Matters.....	11
1.5 Overview of Daoist Studies Today.....	13
1.6 Quanzhen Daoism and Its Longmen Sub-lineage.....	16
1.6.1 Scholarships on Quanzhen Daoism During the Qing Period.....	18
1.6.2 Rethinking Quanzhen.....	23
1.7 Overview of Chapters.....	25
1.8 A Note on Confucianism.....	29
CHAPTER TWO: Baiyun guan, the “Chief Public Monastery Under Heaven”: History, Lineage, and Ordination.....	32
2.1 The Historical Background of Baiyun guan.....	34
2.1.1 Baiyun guan under the Tang Dynasty (618-907): A Family Temple.....	34
2.1.2 Baiyun guan in the Jurchen Jin Dynasty (1115-1234): The Turning Point.....	36
2.1.3 Baiyun guan in the Mongol Yuan Dynasty (1271-1368): The Glorious Time of a Quanzhen Monastery.....	39
2.1.4 Baiyun guan during the Chinese Ming Dynasty (1368-1644): Taken over by the Zhengyi Tradition?	41
2.2 Life at Baiyun guan.....	43
2.2.1 Visualizing the Material Baiyun guan.....	43
2.2.2 Practices at Baiyun guan.....	46
2.2.3 The Abbots of Baiyun guan.....	49
2.2.4 The Ordination Process at Baiyun guan.....	50
2.3 Concluding Remarks.....	55

CHAPTER THREE: The Myth of the Longmen “Orthodox” Lineage in Qing China.....	57
3.1 The Inconsistencies in the Biographies of First Patriarch Zhao Daojian.....	59
3.1.1 Zhao Daojian in the <i>Jin’gai xindeng</i> (early nineteenth century).....	59
3.1.2 Zhao Daojian according to the <i>Baiyun Xianbiao</i> (late nineteenth century).....	61
3.1.3 Zhao Daojian according to the Yuan dynasty Quanzhen Hagiographers.....	62
3.1.4 What Are We to Make of the Contradicting Sources?.....	63
3.2 The Seventh Patriarch Wang Changyue and the Daoist first Public Ordinations.....	66
3.2.1 The Revival of Longmen at the Beginning of Qing.....	66
3.2.2 The Three Stages of Precepts.....	68
3.3 The Longmen Lineage in the South.....	73
3.3.1 The Longmen Branch at Mount Jin’gai.....	74
3.3.2 Connecting Baiyun guan to the South.....	75
3.3.3 Doctrines of Longmen Branch of Mt. Jin’gai.....	78
 CHAPTER FOUR: What is Daoism? The Quanzhen Affiliation to Buddhism.....	 83
4.1 Daoist Allusions to Buddhist Precepts.....	84
4.2 Daoist Allusions to Buddhist “Pure Rules”.....	86
4.3 A Daoist “Lamp” History and Min Yide.....	91
4.3.1 Historical Precedent 1: <i>Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce</i>	94
4.3.2 Historical Precedent 2: <i>Xiuzhen shishu</i>	97
4.4 Concluding Remarks.....	100
 CHAPTER FIVE: Understanding the Daoist Canon and Local Extra-Canonical Daoist Texts..	 103
5.1 The Daoist Canon: History and Categorization.....	105
5.1.1 Overview of the Daoist Canon.....	105
5.1.2 The Only Surviving Copy of the Daoist Canon at Baiyun guan.....	106
5.1.3 The Three Caverns and the Four Supplements.....	112
5.1.4 The Twelve Categories and the Thirty-Six Divisions.....	115
5.2 Extra-Canonical Daoist Texts: Where do they fit?.....	116
5.2.1 <i>Jin’gai xin deng</i>	117
5.2.2 <i>Lüzu sannü yishi shuoshu</i>	118
5.2.3 <i>Longmen xinfu</i>	118
5.2.4 <i>Baiyun xianbiao</i>	120
5.2.5 An Alternative Explanation.....	121
 CHAPTER SIX: Conclusion.....	 124
6.1 Understanding Quanzhen Daoism Through Institutions and State Sponsorship.....	124
6.2 The Present.....	129
6.3 Future Research.....	131
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 133

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

1.1 The Case of An Shilin

On November 11, 1946 (Minguo 民國 35), An Shilin 安世霖 (1903-1946), the abbot of a Daoist temple named Baiyun guan 白雲觀 (White Cloud Abbey) in Beijing, was burned alive.¹

The people who were responsible for his murder consisted of a group of Daoists who lived within various local Daoist temples in Beijing. Thirty-six of these Daoists—eighteen of them were eventually sentenced to prison—quoted a particular text to explain their actions, *Taishang qinggui* 太上清規 (The Most High Pure Rules) of Baiyun guan,² and accused An Shilin of having tampered with monastic regulations, selling monastic property for his own benefit, having eaten meat, drunk alcohol and taken drugs, and even keeping mistresses in subsidiary temples.³

The narrative of An Shilin's murder and the crimes he was accused of seems straightforward because An Shilin almost certainly committed these misbehaviors. However, the religious perspective of this tragic affair indicates a much more complex scenario. As early as

¹ For a brief description of An's murder, see, Vincent Goossaert, *The Taoists of Peking, 1800-1949: A Social History of Urban Clerics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007), 177-181.

² This set of monastic rules is now lost, but it was likely enacted by An himself. See, Goossaert, *Taoists of Peking*, 179.

³ The full list of the condemnation act can be found in Beijing Municipal Archives, file No. J181-29-506.

1940, the Daoist Association (*Daojiaohui* 道教會), which had been established by the Bureau of Social Affairs (*Shehui ju* 社會局), issued a decree against An Shilin and named a replacement abbot. In 1941, condemnation of Daoists from other monasteries and the Bureau of Social Affairs followed suit by dismissing An and convening a committee to examine the monastery's property. In reality, neither the replacement abbot nor the committee ever managed to physically enter Baiyun guan because of the close political connections An Shilin enjoyed with the local police. Under the leadership of An's trusted aide Bai Quanyi 白全一 (1918-1946), who submitted a report praising An's management in 1944, An's supporters soon set up their own committee. From then on, the conflict between the Daoist Association and expelled Daoists, on the one hand, and An Shilin and his supporters in Baiyun guan, on the other, turned public and violent. Specifically, An claimed that the association had been plotting to turn Baiyun guan, a Quanzhen 全真 (Complete Perfection) Daoist monastery, over to Daoists from a rival lineage, Zhengyi 正一 (Orthodox Unity). Indeed, the leader of the Daoist association, Tian Cunxu 田存緒 (1898-1943), was a Zhengyi Daoist who often publicly accused the Daoists at Baiyun guan of refusing supervision by the association between 1929 and 1943, and other Zhengyi clerics

from the nearby port city of Tianjin 天津 continued to support his claims after he passed away in 1943.⁴

1.2 Main Objectives

1.2.1 First Objective

The conflict between An Shilin and his opponents raises several significant and interconnected issues about this history of institutional Daoism regarding monasteries, lineages, texts, state regulations and patronage, and the overall role Daoism played within Chinese culture and society. While a thorough study of these issues is certainly beyond the scope of this short thesis, my first objective here is to pay attention to the Longmen lineage, which was strongly associated with Baiyun guan during the Qing dynasty (1644-1911). The reason why the above narrative in the early twentieth-century is related to this study is because it contextualizes the significance of the Longmen lineage to Daoists by showing comparatively recent competition among different Daoist groups at Baiyun guan. While some Daoists from local monasteries might not necessarily have had a clear sectarian awareness, for most larger Daoist monasteries

⁴ Zhang Xiuhua 張修華, “Wo he Tianhou gong” 我和天后宮. *Tianjin wenshi ziliao xuanji* 天津文史資料選輯 19, 158-207, 196-201.

(e.g., Baiyun guan), which Daoist lineage is in charge matters. Not only it is considered to be a great achievement, but also it determines who gets to receive state patronage and, consequently, establishes its own legitimacy. This study, therefore, seeks to examine why the notion of lineage competition (or construction) appears to have been especially relevant to the history of Quanzhen Daoism, both past—as early as the Yuan (1271-1386), and Ming Dynasties (1368-1644)—and more recently emphasized during the Qing dynasty to the present, which eventually shows why lineage is still a vital issue for Daoists in China today.

1.2.2 Lineage and Transmission Narratives

To fully understand the rationale behind the first objective, it is necessary to address the significance of the term “lineage” in a Daoist context. In Daoism a lineage refers to a line of transmission of teachings that were theoretically revealed—or produced—by someone who holds the “truth of Dao”. The general idea is to pass down authentic teachings generation by generation so that the Dao will never be lost. Thus, lineages are fundamental to the institutional life of Daoism and for the identify of Daoists. During the Qing dynasty, all Daoist clerics were identified first and foremost by their lineages, which determined their ordination names (*faming* 法名 or *daohao* 道號). This name consisted of a character in common with all members of the

same generation in the lineage and another that was specific for each cleric. The generation characters were taken from a lineage poem (*paishi* 派詩). A cleric entered a lineage by being accepted as a novice by his first master (*dushi* 度師). In the case of Quanzhen Daoism, this step was preceded by an ordination (*chuanjie* 傳戒) process, which did not affect lineage affiliation and one's ordination name. Some Daoists later entered other lineages (and were sometimes given additional ordination names) by receiving the teachings of other masters. Lineage affiliation had to be properly recorded, since it granted rights and duties, notably concerning inheritance of rights and property. In principle, a lineage does not produce texts other than genealogies; therefore, a lineage should not be misconceived as a “school” in English. Religious masters devoted much effort to compiling and occasionally publishing genealogies, or lineage charts, for both ritual and practical uses.⁵

For Quanzhen Daoists, in theory, joining a lineage implied adopting a celibate life. Just as with Chinese Buddhists, those who entered the lineage line were known as having “left the family” (*chujia* 出家); a more accurate description would be that they had decided to change their families. In fact, the term “family” characterizes all relationships within the lineage.

⁵ Susan Naquin, *Peking: Temples and City Life, 1400-1900* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 53-54.

Quanzhen Daoists sometimes designated their lineage as a “root family” (*benjia* 本家), and the abbot of a monastery, or temple manager, or sometimes a patriarch, as the person in charge of managing household affairs (*dangjia* 當家). This is not a case of mere linguistic convenience: The Codes of Ming and Qing dynasties strictly equate Daoist master-disciple relationships with those of parent and child and impose upon disciples the same obligations toward their master as those of children toward their parents.⁶

The lineage system can also be quite adaptive. There is no limit to the number of recognized lineages. Existing lineages can split, and new ones can appear, founded by a venerated master (e.g., Qiu Chuji 丘處機 (1148-1227)) or in some cases, through a revelation (e.g., Wang Chongyang 王重陽 (1113-1170)).⁷ One of the major function of this lineage system is to separate lay people from Daoists as hereditary specialists. It did not exclude select lay adepts from obtaining access to teachings and initiations; throughout the late Qing period one can find many cases of lay disciples of both Buddhist and Daoist masters obtaining a place in a particular lineage. Some late imperial Quanzhen movements tried to incorporate large numbers of lay

⁶ *Da Qing huidian shili* 大清會典事例 [Examples of the Record of Laws and Systems of the Qing Dynasty] (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1908), j. 747.

⁷ I will further elaborate on these two figures in section 1.6.

adepts among initiates.⁸ We know that Buddhists, for example, conferred precepts through ordination (the Bodhisattva precepts, *pusa jie* 菩薩戒) to lay people. But, by and large, there remained boundaries between Buddhists and Daoists, on the one hand, and the laity on the other. Moreover, precepts, ordination, and this lineage system contributed to justifying the delegation of largely ritual relations with the sacred to specialists.

Because lineage transmission is central to the Longmen Lineage, the secret of “Natural Spontaneous [experience of] Pure Emptiness” (*qingxu ziran* 清虛自然) is said to have been transmitted from one patriarch to the next, only to be finally revealed by the seventh Longmen patriarch in form of the “Most Ultimate Preceptor Treasure of Pure Tranquility” (*Taishang qingjing lübao* 太上清靜律寶).⁹ Each Longmen patriarch was, moreover, required to transmit to each successor through a process known as “transmitting the precepts using oral formulae” (*jiefa koujue* 戒法口訣) to ensure an unbroken transmission line from the Most Ultimate Lord Lao. The date of each transmission by a patriarch and the time lapse from the previous

⁸ Vincent Gossaert, “Quanzhen Clergy, 1700-1950”. In John Lagerwey, ed., *Religion and Chinese Society: The Transformation of a Field* (Paris: Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient; and Hongkong: Chinese University Press, 2004), 741-47.

⁹ Yin Zhihua 尹志華, “Beijing Baiyun guan cang Longmen chuanjie puxi chutan 北京白雲觀藏龍門傳戒譜系初探”, *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究, 2009, 72-82.

transmission are both recorded with great precision: the first patriarch performed the transmission to his successor on the fifteenth day 望日 of the tenth lunar month of 1312, precisely thirty-three years after Qiu Chuji's first transmission at Baiyun guan had taken place on the fifteenth day of the first lunar month of 1280. In turn, the second patriarch transmitted the secrets to the third on the fifteenth day of the first lunar month of 1367 after fifty-six years, and the entire transmission narrative culminates on the fifteenth day of the first lunar month of 1656 with the public transmission of precepts at Baiyun guan by the seventh patriarch, Wang Changyue 王常月 (1522-1680).¹⁰

In practice, what has been passed on from generation to generation through the lineage transmission was the abbotship or, to simply put, the right to run the monastery. In other words, what lineages actually produced were ordained, celibate Daoists who controlled access to Daoist monasteries, ritual ceremonies, and texts.

1.2.3 Second Objective

My second objective is to examine the complexities of Daoism during the Qing dynasty from a more nuanced perspective by considering Daoism as a constantly changing tradition.

¹⁰ *Rujie yaogui* 入戒要規 [Important Instructions on Ordination], 38a-46b, in *Chuzhen jielü* 初真戒律.

More specifically, a significant portion of this study is devoted to understanding how, why, and to what extent institutional Daoism¹¹ responded and adjusted to the late imperial Chinese state as well as other institutional religious traditions in China.¹²

1.3 The Role of the Chinese State in Regulating Religion

Because institutional Daoism has always been intertwined with political connections and patronage by the imperial clan(s), it is necessary to address the relationship between the state and religion in China. Even though most regimes in China were established through martial prowess and violence, the legitimacy of rulers in imperial China (ca. 202 BCE-1911) was almost solely based upon their self-proclaimed “mandate of heaven” (*tianming* 天命), and the title of all Chinese emperors was, consequently, always the “son of heaven” (*tianzi* 天子). To many rulers, Chinese religions, and especially Daoism, were often seen as curious, double-edged swords with

¹¹ Here I use the term “institutional Daoism” to refer to a type of Daoism that is primarily based on its monasteries (*miao* 廟, *guan* 觀, *gong* 宮, and so on), which were recognized and sponsored by the imperial state on par with Buddhist temples (the most common term is *si* 寺). They should not be confused with other less confined Daoist clerical organizations, such as *hui* 會 (literally means assembly or community), for these organizations might also recruit lay adepts.

¹² In use of the term “religious traditions”, I follow Adam Yuet Chau’s suggestion to interpret a religious tradition as *always* in the process of being made and remade by the society in response to local changes. See Adam Yuet Chau, ed., *Religion in Contemporary China: Revitalization and Innovation* (New York: Routledge Press, 2011), 2-3.

which to explore and bolster the imperial role of managing harmony between heaven, earth, and human beings. In some cases, religion could serve as a means to consolidate political legitimacy. For example, during the infamous Tang (618-907) dynasty, Empress Wu Zhao 武曩 (Wu Zetian 武則天, r. 690-705) successfully manipulated various religious traditions to legitimate her extraordinary rule over China, even though in later periods her reign was seen by nearly all civil servants as one of the most shameful times because she was the sole female Chinese emperor.¹³ Yet religion could also exert an opposite effect. A Daoist uprising called the Yellow Turbans (*huangjin jun* 黃巾軍), for example, occurred during the Eastern Han 東漢 (25 BCE-220 CE) dynasty, claiming that the emperor had already lost his mandate of heaven. Arguably, the dynasty that suffered the most rebellions is the Qing, ranging from Ming loyalists to the opposition of Manchurian (*manren* 滿人) rulers by the majority Chinese society, and from the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom (*Taiping tianguo* 太平天國) movement beginning in the 1850s—whose leader, Hong Xiuquan 洪秀全 (1814-1864), claimed to be the younger brother of Jesus Christ and thus challenged the legitimacy of the son of Heaven—to the Boxer rebellion in 1900.

¹³ See the recent study by Timothy Hugh Barrett, *The Woman Who Discovered Printing* (New Haven, Conn. And London: Yale University Press, 2008).

Not surprisingly, the Qing imperial court exerted considerable control over Chinese religions. As the great indigenous institutional Chinese religion with a long history of challenging imperial authority, Daoism was no exception.

1.4 Terminology Matters

Before I address the current state of scholarship in the sub-field of Daoist studies, I need to clarify what I mean by the term “Daoism” and why this thesis proposes a novel way to approach the study of the history of Daoism in China. First, I do not think that Daoism is or ever was a coherent entity: Daoism never had the continuity that we might be able to ascribe to the Christian church, in which religious beliefs and practices are *always* centered around a sacred origin.¹⁴ If we were to attempt to find a unifying sacred origin within the history of Chinese Daoism, this would produce a teleological fallacy that would, in turn, lead to defining Daoism as something that complements and/or bonds to notions of religion we in the west are comfortable with discussing primarily in European languages. Laozi, for example, is often depicted as the founder of Daoism simply because the “earliest” record of Daoism, namely the *Daode jing* 道德經 (The

¹⁴ See for example, Mircea Eliade, *Symbolism, the Sacred, and the Ars*, edited by Diane Apostolos-Cappadona (New York: NY Crossroad Publishing Company, 1988).

Classic of the Way and Its Power), was attributed to him, whereas Laozi in classical Chinese (i.e., 老子) might just mean “an old man”. Second, I do not think that we know enough about Daoism to define Daoism in any consistent or specific way. Unlike Buddhism, Islam, or Christianity, for example, because Daoism is an indigenous Chinese religion, it was not produced by the deliberate efforts of any single community—or interconnected communities—to practice the teachings of any one so-called great figure. Therefore, it is my contention that Daoism can only be defined according to how Daoists in China have understood and used the term, Daoism. In other words, when defining the term “Daoism” one should always begin by asking this question: Who is a Daoist? This is not to suggest that we should necessarily define Daoism by seeking out actual Daoists and subjectively asking them to guide us toward a learned understanding of Daoism. Instead, we should pay specific attention to what Daoists care about and what kinds of identities Daoists have presented and articulated. Only by situating these data within a range of historical contexts can one obtain a more nuanced, working understanding of the term “Daoism” or “Daoisms”¹⁵ in a specific time and location. Religious discourse, as

¹⁵ Robert Ford Campany. “On the Very Idea of Religions (In the Modern West and in Early Medieval China)”, *History of Religions* 42.4 (2003), 287-319.

Robert Campany suggests, has been and remains predominantly “a linguistic affair”.¹⁶Therefore, the primary focus of this thesis is about what Daoists do, rather than what they think.

Despite the fact that scholars often address different Daoist traditions and refer to these as “sects”, “orders” or “schools”, such as the Lingbao 靈寶 (Numinous Treasure), Shangqing 上清 (Supreme Clarity), Quanzhen, or Zhengyi sects, orders, schools, and so forth, throughout this thesis I regard each of these terms as convenient expressions of groups of individuals whose identities were determined by a particular scriptural corpus classified within the Daoist Canon (*Daozang* 道藏), and not necessarily representative of actual groups of Daoists. In the case of Quanzhen Daoism, the Daoist canon also falls short on guiding us to seeing lineage construction because the identity of a Daoist of a certain lineage (e.g., the Longmen lineage) was almost entirely based on genealogical transmissions. Therefore, I choose to use the term lineage to refer to groups of Daoists who speak on behalf of affiliated Daoist traditions; the identity of these Daoists’ is defined, propagated, and assured by their own historical heritage.

1.5 Overview of Daoist Studies Today

¹⁶ Ibid, 288.

Contemporary scholarship on Daoist studies pays considerable attention to two areas of inquiry. One began right after the publication of the Hanfen lou 涵芬樓 edition of the Daoist Canon by the Shanghai Commercial Press (Shanghai shangwu yinshu guan 上海商務印書館) during the 1920s.¹⁷ The previously mysterious Daoist canon was accessible by the public, as opposed to being restricted to clergy and their scholar associate, for the first time. Because very few Daoists and very few scholars could have had access to the canon before the 1920s, and the only surviving Daoist canon today was kept at Baiyun guan,¹⁸ one might ask if the Daoist canon, as a general collection of “Daoist texts”, was in fact embraced by Daoists over the centuries as a valid representation of their own values, beliefs, or practices? My research shows that other, apparently extra-canonical texts constitute authoritative transmission of texts—not the canon—for Quanzhen Daoists, much as is the case for Chan Buddhism (*chanzong* 禪宗, Zen, in

¹⁷ For studies on the Daoist canon, see Chen Guofu 陳國符, *Daozang yuanliu kao* 道藏源流考 [The Study of the Origin and Transmission of the Daoist Canon] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014); Boltz, Judith M. “Taoism: Taoist Literature.” In Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, first edition, 14: 317-29; Lindsay Jones, ed., second edition, 4: 2202-12 (New York and London: Macmillan, 1987 and 2005); Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen, eds. *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Zhu Yueli 朱越利, *Daojing zonglun* 道經總論 (Shenyang: Liaoning Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 1992).

¹⁸ For a short introduction to the Daoist canon at Baiyun guan, see Kubo Noritada 窪德忠, “Pekin Hakuunkan no genjō ni tsuite 2 北京白雲觀の現状について [The Current Situation of Baiyun guan in Peking, Part 2]”, *Shina Bukkyō Shigaku* 支那佛教史學 7, no. 2 (1943): 32-36.

Japanese). The other focus for a significant portion of Daoist studies research in recent decades was stimulated by the discovery of a cache of manuscripts in Cave No. 17—the so-called the Library Cave found at the Mogao caves 莫高石窟, near Dunhuang 敦煌, in 1900.¹⁹ Although Daoist manuscripts found at Dunhuang were almost certainly discarded documents due to Buddhist predominance in Chinese central Asia, they are nevertheless invaluable to scholars who study the history of medieval Daoism in China. For example, Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen managed to use these manuscripts to define the liturgical system of Daoist ordinations and hierarchy during the Tang dynasty, and suggested that the Daoist canon was compiled according to an associated hierarchical categorization.²⁰ Since most of the Daoist scriptures found at Dunhuang are associated with revelations—a theme that appears repeatedly in many Dunhuang Daoist scriptures in which the Dao may appear under the guise of deities or immortals

¹⁹ For some examples on Daoist studies of Dunhuang, see Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豊, *Dōkyō no kenkyū* 道教の研究 [Research on Daoism]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1952; Liu Yi 刘屹, “Lun 20 shiji Dunhuang daojiao wenxian yanjiu 论 20 世纪敦煌道教文献研究 [A Survey of Dunhuang Textual Studies on Daoism in the Twentieth Century]”, *Dunhuang tulufan yanjiu* 敦煌吐鲁番研究, 7 卷, (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004); Lai Chi-tim, “Daoism and Political Rebellion during the Eastern Jin Dynasty”, in *Politics and Religion in Ancient and Medieval Europe and China* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1999); James Robson, “Brushes with Some “Dirty Truths”: Handwritten Manuscripts and Religion in China,” *History of Religions* 51, no. 4 (2012): 324-26;

²⁰ See Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 5-40.

and can be further transmitted to adepts—Daoism is increasingly deemed by many scholars to be primarily a ritual tradition that may or may not depend upon transmission of rituals and ritual texts by codified clergy. Yet my research shows that Quanzhen Daoism²¹, which is the focus of this study, is about neither the canon nor scriptural revelations therein; it was, and still is, primarily a monastic tradition, which depended upon institutions controlled—or ruled—by clergy.

1.6 Quanzhen Daoism and Its Longmen Sub-lineage

Quanzhen Daoism, founded by Wang Zhe 王嘉 (also known as Wang Chongyang) in North China during the Jurchen (Nüzhen 女真) Jin 金 dynasty (1115-1234), quickly rose to prominence during the Mongol Yuan dynasty. The person who this rapid spread of Quanzhen Daoism is attributed to is one of Wang Zhe's seven disciples, Qiu Chuji, who established his own sub-lineage of Quanzhen Daoism called the Longmen *pai* 龍門派 (Dragon gate lineage),²² with Qiu Chuji as the head patriarch. In 1223, the Mongol emperor Genghis Khan (c. 1162-1227)

²¹ For the new interpretation of this term, see Vincent Goossaert and Paul R. Katz, “Special Issue: New Perspectives on Quanzhen Taoism. The Formation of Religious Identity”, *Journal of Chinese Religions*, 2001, Vol 29, 91., and Fabrizio Pregadio, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Taoism*. London: Routledge, 2007, 814.

²² The name Longmen derives from the name of the place in Shaanxi where Qiu Chuji spent seven years there practicing self-cultivation.

summoned Qiu for an audience and granted him extensive privileges and a leading role in supervising Daoist affairs in North China. Qiu Chuji was thereafter celebrated for his successful plea to the terrifying Mongol emperor to “stop the alleged slaughter of millions of Chinese”²³ living in Mongol controlled lands; Qiu’s disciples were also hailed for “attenuating the impact of the Mongol invasion and safeguarding Chinese culture during the traumatic decades of the Mongol conquest of North China in the early thirteenth century”.²⁴ Under the leadership of Qiu Chuji and his successors, Quanzhen Daoism built up a large network composed of major monasteries that served as training centers and thousands of smaller temples throughout the region. Yet we see no evidence of an actual history of these Daoists at a separate network of temples that resembles Quanzhen Daoism during the Qing era.

During the Ming dynasty, Quanzhen institutions suffered grave setbacks because of the native Chinese court’s political biases against so-called alien regimes and containment policy toward steppe “barbarians”, and most Quanzhen Daoist temples were largely under supervision of other Daoist traditions, chief among these were the Zhengyi Daoists, a tradition active in south

²³ Xun Liu and Vincent Goossaert (ed.), *Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500-2010* (Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley), 2.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 2.

China. Or, it may be that Quanzhen Daoism was not as powerful as later Quanzhen Daoists needed it to be have been during earlier periods. At the beginning of the Manchurian Qing dynasty, the Quanzhen school once again underwent a process of revival with special attention to the Longmen lineage, which became the primary Daoist school during the Qing.²⁵ Yet the reason for this revival is still not fully understood today. Perhaps this revival was no revival at all. Instead, following John R. McRae on the history of Chan Buddhism, in which he argues that the so-called “golden age” of Chan Buddhism began with the creation of the “golden age” narrative itself through a constructed patriarchal system,²⁶ the revival of the Longmen lineage might just be another narrative of legitimacy for a late imperial Daoist tradition.

1.6.1 Scholarship on Quanzhen Daoism During the Qing

The history of Quanzhen Daoism remains poorly understood for a variety of reasons. First, Daoism has been considered by many Chinese intellectuals and an earlier generation of western historians (until the 1980s in English, for example) to be a hodgepodge of meaningless

²⁵ For a more comprehensive description of the history of Quanzhen Daoism, see Qing Xitai 卿希泰 et al., eds. *Zhongguo daojiao* 中國道教 [Daoism in China] (Shanghai: Zhishi chubanshe, 1994), 100-103, 126-127, 151-153.

²⁶ John R. McRae, *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

superstition. Historically, that reputation had two main sources. One was the devaluation of Daoism by so-called Confucian-trained scholars (or civil servants) and Buddhist intellectuals, many of whom were monastics who clashed with lay and monastic Daoists at various times over the centuries. Another source is disparagement by early western observers who responded to Chinese religion with a presumption of cultural and religious superiority. It is evident that most early Christian missionaries to all parts of the globe belittled native beliefs and practices as superstition or idolatry. But in China, such sentiments were reinforced by the prejudices of a native intelligentsia and of a political agenda which had long feared the subversive potential of religious movements—or “cults”, in English.²⁷ Such cults, which could be heavily based on Daoist or Buddhist teachings, were often labeled as either “heterodoxy” (*xiejiao* 邪教) or “lascivious temples” (*yinci* 淫祠), serving as political means to subjugate popular religious practices.

²⁷ Barend ter Haar. *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992; paperback edition: Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999), contends that many Chinese religious groups were rendered as either dangerous or superstitious in imperial China, and such accusations were often associated with political discourses rather than facts.

Second, the obscurity of Quanzhen Daoist studies can be explained by more than just mere historical misinterpretations: this area of research suffers from insufficient scholarly attention. Part of the reason is that, unlike in the case of investigating Buddhists in China, for example, most living Quanzhen masters have seldom been anxious to divulge anything about their religion to outsiders. They have rarely come forth to participate in academic conferences that can serve as intellectual bridges by promoting a more full and accurate appreciation of their own religious tradition. Yet one more reason may be that many scholars see Quanzhen Daoism as a separate entity, and therefore fail to realize that the study of Quanzhen Daoism is important not only for Daoist studies, but also for the study of Chinese culture and society in general. Of those who can recognize this problem, none of them, unfortunately, has yet turned their focused attention to Quanzhen Daoism.²⁸

Among the specialists who have written in any European language about Quanzhen Daoism, Vincent Goossaert's pioneering monograph, *The Taoists of Peking, 1800-1949: A Social History of Urban Clerics*, presents findings that challenge several conventional views of Quanzhen

²⁸ For works on how Daoism responds to other religions, see Kristofer Schipper, "Purity and Strangers: Shifting Boundaries in Medieval Taoism," *T'oung-pao*, 80, 1994: 61-81; Stephen R. Bokenkamp, *Ancestors and Anxiety: Daoism and the Birth of Rebirth in China*, 11.

Daoists and the history of Daoism. He demonstrates that while Quanzhen Daoist clerics had a clear and distinct sense of self-identity based upon their rites of initiation and monasticism, and were a fairly clearly defined clerical minority in the eyes of the imperial state, the general lay community or public appears to have held a much looser and imprecise sense of their identity, which is primarily based upon their appearance in public, social status, sexual abstinence (celibacy), and apparent adherence to a defined set of self-denying precepts.²⁹ In an earlier work, Goossaert also points out that Quanzhen Daoism was more of a religious movement consisting of multiple independent lineages than any singular or unified religious group.³⁰ These are two foundational notions of Quanzhen Daoism for my research.

The theme of textual production as a means to define the identity of Daoists is well defined in Mori Yuria's 森由利亞 works on the *Daozang jiyao* 道藏輯要 (Essentials of the Daoist Canon), in which he explores how Quanzhen Daoist clerics and their lay associates reshaped and expanded the *Daozang jiyao* by actively preserving and integrating several major local Daoist religious texts in the republished canon in 1906. The extra-canonical texts I explore in this study

²⁹ Vincent Goossaert. *The Taoists of Peking, 1800-1949: A Social History of Urban Clerics*.

³⁰ Vincent Goossaert, "The Invention of an Order: Collective Identity in Thirteenth-Century Quanzhen Taoism," *Journal of Chinese Religions* 29 (2001): 111- 138.

bolster Mori's approach. What emerges in Mori's study is a fascinating portrayal of how Quanzhen Daoist clerics at the famed Erxian Cloister 二仙庵 in Sichuan province 四川省 attempted to reinvigorate their Quanzhen Daoist legacy by incorporating an earlier Lingbao Daoist liturgical tradition and other ritual texts from this region of southwest China. Mori's study shows that the Erxian Cloister clerics' editorial inclusion of local scriptures not only fundamentally reshaped the textual configuration and ideological orientations of early nineteenth-century Daoist compendia, but also demonstrates how important continuous integration of local traditions was for the reproduction and transmission of Quanzhen Daoist identity across history.³¹

Monica Esposito, on the other hand, challenged these claims of fundamental continuity throughout Quanzhen history. She argued that the presumption of any established notions of continuity conceals discontinuities and ruptures, which are equally important features of the history of Quanzhen Daoism. She argued that post-Ming era (fourteenth-seventeenth century) developments within Quanzhen Daoism represent a fundamental reinvention that she considered

³¹ Mori Yuria 森由利亞. "Beijing Local through Ritual: Quanzhen Appropriation of Zhengyi Liturgy in the *Chongkan Daozang jiyao*", in *Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500-2010*, 171-207.

were so extensive and different from earlier Quanzhen Daoism that it created a new religious movement altogether.³² Esposito's approach guides my view that texts to transmit the Longmen lineage almost certainly invented a new Daoist tradition, following the core of Chinese Chan Buddhism discussed by McRae during the Song and Wu Jiang during the Ming.

1.6.2 Rethinking Quanzhen: A New Methodological Approach

Taking these studies of Quanzhen Daoism into consideration, it seems to me that the core of most scholarly debates about Quanzhen Daoism focuses on the question of whether we can speak of any continuity within the history of the Quanzhen lineage from the Jin-Yuan period to the modern era (twelfth – twentieth centuries). Bearing in mind that this is a primary concern within the field of Daoist studies of the Quanzhen tradition, as well as consistent and evolving interactions between Chinese society, the state, and Quanzhen Daoists, this project takes another look at Quanzhen Daoism to rethink Quanzhen Daoism within its historical and practical contexts. Both Quanzhen Daoists and scholars of Daoism have tended to focus on normative

³² Monica Esposito, "The Longmen School and Its Controversial History during the Qing Dynasty," in John Lagerwey, ed., *Religion and Chinese Society*, vol 2: Taoism and Local Religion in Modern China, 633, 640, and 660.

sources to produce definitions which quite clearly distinguish between Quanzhen and non-Quanzhen Daoism.

The methodological approach I propose subjects to criticism pre-established definitions of what Quanzhen Daoism is and who Quanzhen Daoists are, to instead approach Daoism during the Qing dynasty carefully and without confining it within any pre-existing frameworks. More specifically, first, it is important to be aware of what scholars label as Daoist and Quanzhen. Then, one must identify whatever self-described clerics do or propose in the texts they write, bearing in mind that the Daoists in question may not necessarily describe themselves using these terms. It is also possible that there are people and institutions (such as public, ten-directions [*shifang* 十方] monasteries) that explicitly seek to transmit Quanzhen Daoism and articulate Quanzhen identity. There is a corpus of texts that expounds a single Quanzhen ideology with a specific version—and vision—of Daoism which is grounded in disciplinary purity and self-cultivation. Interestingly, some of these ideological texts were produced by lay spirit-writing (*fujū* 扶乩) groups whose members were not necessarily ordained in any Quanzhen lineage or even connected to a Quanzhen institution. While some Daoists may put forward adherence to the Longmen (lineage) as a key identity marker, others might not. Nevertheless, the authoritative

status of the Longmen lineage produced by extra-canonical texts at least demonstrates how this group of Daoists came to flourish in Qing China and challenges the traditional approach to Quanzhen Daoism using canonical or normative texts. Individuals, institutions, and texts are, therefore, the three main elements of this study. They are, I argue, where we might best find the clues to uncover where the nature of Quanzhen Daoism lies.

1.7 Overview of Chapters

Chapter Two presents a comprehensive overview of the history of Baiyun guan with strong ties to the Longmen lineage, a sub-lineage of Quanzhen Daoism. Then I introduce the transmission narratives presented at Baiyun guan, followed by a description of the life of Daoists at this important monastery in Beijing. The history of the monastery and the life of the Daoists together dramatically shaped the institutional history of Quanzhen Daoism during the Qing period. What I hope to demonstrate is that there is a recurring theme of non-Han Chinese (or so-called barbarian) state support for Quanzhen Daoism. While the much earlier Tang dynasty imperial court seems to have condoned virtually every type of religious tradition, the one Tang emperors and members of the royal clan formed the most intimate relationships with was Daoism, especially during the Emperor Xuanzong's 玄宗 reign (712-756). It is often suggested

that the main reason why Tang royal patronage for Daoism was so ambitious is because the Tang imperial family claimed descent from the legendary figure of Laozi 老子 (Lord Lao). During the Mongol Yuan and Manchurian Qing dynasties, the last two dynasties when China was ruled by foreigners—which were perceived by Chinese people as periods of infamy—Quanzhen Daoism was also well-known for receiving imperial patronage. It is also noteworthy that although the institutional history of Quanzhen Daoism shares many similar features with Chan Buddhism, and many terms used in this chapter seem Buddhist (i.e. Sanskrit), I do not intend to suggest that these two religious traditions developed in parallel with one another; physically, the central role of Baiyun guan was always the Longmen patriarchs, not the Buddha or any Buddhist deities. Daoists incorporated Sanskrit—or pseudo-Sanskrit—terms not to highlight any sense of Indic origins, but instead to simply utilize these fashionable terms to meet their own agenda.³³

Following a key truism from McRae’s “Rules of Zen studies,” that “lineage assertions are as wrong as they are strong”,³⁴ chapter three examines three inconsistencies about the lineage

³³ Michel Strickmann, *Chinese Magical Medicine*. Bernard Faure, ed (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), 236-241.

³⁴ McRae, *Seeing Through Zen*, xix; see also Bernard Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, trans. Phyllis Brooks (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997).

assertions of the Longmen lineage. First, different biographies of Zhao Daojian 趙道堅 (1163-1221), the first Longmen patriarch—following the founding patriarch Qiu Chuji—indicate that there were two possible Zhaos. Second, the procedures for the ordination of precepts that were supposedly used to further continue the Longmen lineage predate the history of Quanzhen Daoism. Third, the genealogy of the Northern Longmen Quanzhen lineage that we know of today was, in reality, elaborated among Southern lineage groups. Because of a strong emphasis upon ordinations and lineages, from the Qing onward, Daoists in China were largely divided into two groups: Quanzhen Daoists who mandated a celibate life and ordination (*chujia* 出家) and those who lived a secular life (*zaijia* 在家). The role of Daoists greatly changed because of Quanzhen Daoism.

Daoism cannot be fully apprehended without taking into consideration other religious traditions in China, especially Chinese Buddhism. Chapter Four first shows possible Buddhist affiliation between the “great ordination precepts of Triple altar” (*santan dajie* 三壇大戒) performed by Wang Changyue, followed by a brief discussion of the Daoist monastic rules, which were first widely adopted in large, public Buddhist monasteries during the Northern Song dynasty (960-1127). Next, I analyze the emergence of a Chan Buddhist genre, *denglu* 燈錄,

(“lamp”, or “flame” histories), as a new Daoist genre to further trace the historical precedents of Daoist textual borrowing from [Chan] Buddhism during the Ming period to demonstrate that Quanzhen Daoist borrowings and connections with Chinese Buddhism cannot be restricted to only the Qing dynasty. I also investigate if the idea that state support for Quanzhen Daoism discontinued during the Ming period—the Ming was ruled by Chinese and Quanzhen was notoriously tied with alien regimes—might be essentially a myth. While clearly mirroring—and not copying—Buddhist genres (and terms), the relationship between Quanzhen Daoism and Chinese [Chan] Buddhism during the Ming and Qing periods was, therefore, definitely not one of socio-political competition. Rather, it appears that these traditions thrived in different socio-cultural realms.

Chapter Five shows that the only surviving copy of the Daoist canon at Baiyun guan was never actually complete. By showing that the received way of categorizing the canon is merely a scholarly construct, this chapter closely examines the historical sources—especially the extra-canonical texts—that are cited in previous chapters. This critical analysis is designed to show that, even though the Daoist canon—and Baiyun guan, which kept the only surviving copy—was highly praised, extra-canonical sources are also fundamental for understanding institutional

Daoism or Daoists. This is yet one more reason why Quanzhen Daoism, though in many ways similar, should not be seen as anything like a copy of Chan Buddhism, for which nearly all texts are canonical.

1.8 A Note On Confucianism

In the last section I claimed that Daoism simply cannot be fully apprehended without taking into consideration other religious traditions in China. It is, therefore, important to address another tradition in China besides Chinese Buddhism: Confucianism. I choose not to describe Confucianism as a “religious” tradition because there is a hotly debated question about whether Confucianism can be seen as a religion or “an elite phenomenon that is very different in the Chinese past”³⁵ from the misconceptions of today. The latter seems more plausible because many so-called “Daoists” in this study, such as Qiu Chuji, Wang Changyue, An Shilin, and especially Min Yide 閔一得 (1758-1836)—who was the main compiler and advocate of the genealogy of the Longmen lineage and who served as a government official at Yunnan province before he became a Daoist—can all be classified as “Confucians”. If we assume that reading

³⁵ Barend J. ter Haar. Workshop on Asian Studies and Religion “The Invention of Confucianism in the Nineteenth Century”, on 22 September, 2014, Leiden.

Confucian texts and learning Confucian values are determining factors for who can be called a “Confucian”, then we ought to consider the general education curriculum and the history of imperial examinations (*keju* 科舉).

The figure who created the list of Confucian readings during the Ming and Qing periods is, of course, Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200). Zhu claimed to inherit a “transmission of the Way” (*daotong* 道統) that originated with Confucius (551-479 BCE) and Mencius (ca. 372-289 BCE) and then jumped over a millennium to the eleventh-century teacher Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033-1107), and then, of course, to Zhu himself. As a matter of fact, the notion of correct transmission was already widely accepted by Chinese intellectuals since the fourteenth century. The ideologues of the “Cheng Zhu school” essentially gained political control of the mechanisms for expression of ideas in late imperial China, and, from their hostility toward all other religious, intellectual, and cultural systems, it is easy to gain the false impression that Daoism should be understood *through* Confucianism. However, if there was anything that Daoists of imperial times feared, it was not “Confucianism”, or even Buddhism. Rather, Daoists of several periods feared—often with good reason—that the rulers of their day would perceive their activities as disreputable “cults”, which had little appeal to rulers or to aristocrats. For this reason, I do not

refer to Confucianism as a religious tradition which interacted with Daoism in the same way as Chinese Buddhism did. While Confucianism might still exist in the imperial China as a social-political factor, exerting its influence among the Chinese intellectual groups, the history of Daoism in China can be properly researched only by placing it within a more confined framework of the organization of Chinese religion. The socio-political aspect of the Chinese society—especially in the case of the so-called “Confucian state” pivoting on imperial examinations—mingles with all religious traditions in China and does not stand alone.³⁶ The role of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism within Chinese religion, then, was not to exist as separate institutions providing their members with an exclusive way to salvation, as the nineteenth-century Western concept of religion would imply, but to transmit their tradition of practice and make it available to all, either as individual spiritual techniques or in our case, as liturgical services for families or whole communities.

³⁶ Several scholars have shown that civil servants in the imperial China sometimes served as powerful arbitrators of institutional control over various religious traditions. See for example, Ben Elman, *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000); Frederick W. Mote, *Imperial China, 900-1800* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1999); John W. Dardess, *Conquerors and Confucians: Aspects Political Change in Late Yuan China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973).

Chapter Two: Baiyun guan, the “Chief Public Monastery Under Heaven”: History,

Lineage, and Ordination

Compared to other Daoist traditions in China, such as Shangqing, Lingbao, or Tianshi 天師 (alt. Zhengyi), which can be traced back to as early as the Han dynasty (206 BCE-220 CE), it is probably not an exaggeration to say that Quanzhen Daoism was never considered ancient. Contemporary Daoists in China, regardless of their possible historical affiliations to other Daoist traditions, all claim that they belong to the Longmen lineage. The figure who founded this tradition was only a late medieval Daoist named Wang Zhe (1113-1170), who was mostly active during the Jin Dynasty (1115-1234), and his works were revealed by his disciples even later. Yet the Longmen lineage (*Longmen pai*)—a sub-lineage of Quanzhen Daoism established by Wang’s disciple, Qiu Chuji (1148-1227), during the Yuan dynasty (1271-1368)—began to spread rapidly from the beginning of the Qing dynasty (1644-1911), and has remained by far the most dominant Daoist lineage in China today.³⁷

To many who study Chinese history and religion, the fact that a Jin, Yuan or Qing tradition supersedes other ancient traditions seems counterintuitive, if not outright bizarre. This

³⁷ See Esposito, *Qing Daoism*, 55-56; Esposito, *Creative Daoism*, 2.

counterintuitive sense is reinforced by the fact that the Jin, Yuan and the Qing dynasties are all notorious periods when China were conquered by foreigners or “barbarians (*huren* 胡人)”; specifically, the Jin conquest is attributed to the Jurchens, the Yuan the Mongols (*Menggu* 蒙古), and Qing the Manchurians (Jurchens who used another name, *Man* 滿). In other words, in principle, these three periods are not only considered by many Chinese people as chaotic, but also perhaps even humiliating. Mote explains that the appearance of these alien regimes in China fosters a sense of “Chineseness” shared among all the “Han” Chinese, which “transcended the many local and regional variations.”³⁸ How do we, therefore, justify the prominence of the Longmen lineage, which rose to fame precisely during these three periods of foreign rule? What are we to make, furthermore, of Baiyun guan, where the orthodox Longmen lineage (*Longmen zhengzong* 龍門正宗) was established during the early Qing, as one of the most important Daoist temples in China today, which is indicated by its entrance plaque: Chief Public Monastery Under Heaven 天下第一叢林³⁹?

³⁸ Mote, *Imperial China*, 266.

³⁹ The date and author of this plaque are unclear to me. It was first recorded by Yoshioka Yoshitoyo, who visited Baiyun guan in 1941. See Yoshioka Yoshitoyo, *Dōkyō no kenkyū*, 216.

In this chapter I first introduce the historical background of Baiyun guan, with attention to its close association with Qiu Chuji, the founder of the Longmen lineage. Next, I examine the transmission narratives of the Longmen lineage portrayed at Baiyun guan to explain why the notion of lineage is so important for us to be able to understand Quanzhen Daoism during the Qing dynasty. To further demonstrate the significance of Baiyun guan to the rise of Longmen lineage, I end this chapter by discussing the life of monastic Daoists and the ordination rituals performed at Baiyun guan.

2.1 The Historical Background of Baiyun guan

2.1.1 Baiyun guan under the Tang Dynasty (618-907): A Family Temple

The history of Baiyun guan reaches back to the eighth century, when Liu Jiuxiao 劉九霄, an Deputy Surveillance Judiciary to the Military Commissioner (*jiedu yutui* 節度御推), founded a small temple there in order to commemorate Zhang Yunshen 張允伸, who was appointed Military Commissioner (*jiedu shi* 節度使) in 850⁴⁰. The name of this temple was Tianchang

⁴⁰ The biography of Zhang Yunshen can be founded in *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書: benji 本紀 19/Yi zong 懿宗李漼, 655-679. On official titles, see Charles Hucker, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1985), nos. 772 and 777.

guan 天長觀 (Heavenly Longevity Abbey), as recorded in a stele inscription *Stele of*

Reconstruction of Tianchang guan by Liu Jiuxiao of the Tang (Tang Liu Jiuxiao zaixiu

Tianchang guan bei 唐劉九霄再修天長觀碑).⁴¹ It states:

[Since] Kaiyuan Emperor of Sagely Culture, the Divine Prowess and the Ultimate Dao fasted his mind and respected the Dao, Tianchang guan [is built] to venerate the Great Sagely Ancestor of the Mysterious Origin.⁴²

天長觀，開元聖文神武至道皇帝齋心敬道，以奉玄元大聖祖。

The inscription basically tells us about two main activities attributed to Emperor Xuanzong (r.

712-756). First, Emperor Xuanzong was enshrined as the Great Sagely Ancestor of Mysterious

Origin. It is almost certain that here the “Ancestor” refers to Lord Lao or Laozi, who was

regarded as the progenitor of the Tang imperial Li family. Because Li Yuan 李淵 (566-635),

who founded the Tang dynasty owing to the secret transmission of the Heavenly Mandate from

Li Er 李耳—Laozi’s real name—became the emperor, Laozi was formally given the title

⁴¹ According to Yu Minzhong 于敏中, *Qinding Rixia jiuwenkao* 欽定日下舊聞攷, 1785 (Beijing: Beijing guji chubanshe, 1985), 94, 1581, it was allegedly copied by a Daoist named Li Zhiren 李知仁 in 866 and later cited in the the *Yuan yitong zhi* 元一統志 (*Comprehensive Gazetteer of the Yuan Dynasty*). However, both the 866 and Yuan accounts are lost.

⁴² *Xin Tang shu* 新唐書: *benji* 本紀 5/Xuanzong huangdi Li Longji 李隆基, 143, indicates that the title of “Great Sagely Ancestor of the Mysterious Origin” was bestowed on Lord Lao (Laozi) in 743.

“Sagely Ancestor” (*shengzu* 聖祖).⁴³ To bolster the legitimacy of this claim, Xuanzong issued an edict in 737 to establish a temple dedicated to Lord Lao in all major cities, and the name of the temple was the Imperial Temple to honor Mysterious Origin (Xuanzong huangdi miao 玄元皇帝廟). Second, although not directly stated, one can interpret from the title “Tianchang” (Heavenly Longevity) that Tianchang guan was not a unique name during the Tang. We know this because in 739, Xuanzong ordered all the state temples to celebrate his birthday—also known as the “Festival of a Thousand Autumns” (*qianqiu jie* 千秋節). In 748, possibly to conform to the title of Xuanzong’s birthday, the titles of all state temples in the capital Chang’an 長安 were changed to Tianchang, and the name of the festival for celebrating Xuanzong’s birthday was also changed from Qianqiu to Tianchang.⁴⁴ Perhaps there was no Tang history of Baiyun guan because it was in a far Northern site.

2.1.2 Baiyun guan in the Jurchen Jin Dynasty: The Turning Point

⁴³ Livia Kohn and Russel Kirkland, “Daoism in the Tang (618-907)”, in *Daoism Handbook*, ed. Livia Kohn. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 340-341.

⁴⁴ See Wang Mingqing 王明清, *Huichen lu* 揮塵錄, c.13th century (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1934), 1, 106; Wang Pu 王溥, *Tang huiyao* 唐會要, c. 10th century (Taipei: Shijie shuju, 1963), 50, 879; Charles Benn, “Taoism as Ideology in the Reign of Emperor Hsuan-Tsung (712-755)” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1977), 97-106.

Because Tianchang guan in present-day Beijing was located on the geographical periphery far to the northeast of the Tang capitals in Chang'an, Luoyang 洛陽, or the Song capital in Kaifeng 開封, it is not surprising to observe that there are few records about this temple during the Northern Song dynasty (960-1126). It is also possible that the temple was constructed during the Zhenglong 正隆 era (1156-1161) of the Jin dynasty,⁴⁵ even though the last recorded damage to the temple dates all the way back to the An Lushan 安祿山 Rebellion of 755-763.⁴⁶ It appears that the temple served as an archives for several years, and was then destroyed by a fire. In 1174, Tianchang guan finally received funding from the Jin imperial court and was rebuilt using only the most precious materials and the most auspicious color of vermilion. Emperor Shizong 世宗 (1161-1188) attended the opening ceremonies at the Daoist ritual platform (*Daochang* 道場), which lasted for three days.⁴⁷ This shows that ordination was either

⁴⁵ *Zhongdu shifang da Tianchang guan chongxiu bei* 中都十方大天長觀重修碑 [Stele of the Restoration of the Great Tianchang guan of the Ten Directions in the Central Capital], in Chen Yuan 陳垣, ed., *Daojia jinsh lue* 道家金石略 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1988), 1024-1025.

⁴⁶ See Denis Twitchett, ed., *Sui and T'ang China, 589-906 Part I*, vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of China* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 474-486.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

a cornerstone of the early Quanzhen ritual corpus or it needed to have been so for later authors discussed in this thesis.

In 1190, when Emperor Zhangzong's 章宗 (r. 1188-1208) mother was sick, the Great Offering of Universal Heaven (*putian dajiao* 普天大醮) was performed at Tianchang guan.⁴⁸ Yet within a short time, in 1202, Tianchang guan was again burnt down. Emperor Zhangzong ordered that it be rebuilt with the name changed to Taiji gong 太極宮, the Palace of Supreme Ultimate, to honor a blessing for his mother's health.⁴⁹ Arguably the most important event in the history of Baiyun guan prior to the Mongol Yuan dynasty occurred at the very end of the Jin dynasty when Qiu Chuji, the founder of the Longmen lineage, moved to Taiji gong. After Mongol armies invaded the Jin capital, which resulted in a move south to Kaifeng, Qiu's reputation as a living immortal quickly spread even to Genghis Khan. As a result, Qiu was summoned to meet Genghis Khan at Bailuwan 八魯灣 in Central Asia (in today's Afghanistan)

⁴⁸ *Shifang da Tianchang guan putian dajiao ruiying ji* 十方天長觀普天大醮瑞應記 [Record of the Auspicious Manifestation of the Great Offering of the Universal Heaven at the Great Tianchang guan of the Ten Directions], in Chen Yuan, *Daojia jinshi lüe*, 1042-1043.

⁴⁹ *Chongxiu Tianchang guan beaming* 重修天長觀碑銘 [Stele of Restoration of Tianchang guan], in *Rixia jiuwen kao*, 94, 1581.

in 1219.⁵⁰ After an arduous and dangerous journey, at the cost of a disciple who died on the road,⁵¹ Qiu finally met the great Mongol Khan, and impressed him with his wisdom and honesty. Because of this meeting, Qiu was appointed to oversee all religious affairs in north China and Quanzhen monasteries were consequently exempted from paying taxes. In the first month of 1224, Qiu returned to Taiji gong, which had already been renamed Changchun gong 長春宮 to honor Qiu, whose alternative name was Changchun.⁵² This legendary connection to Genghis Khan speaks volume about the socio-political narrative of this Daoist tradition.

2.1.3 Baiyun guan in the Mongol Yuan Dynasty: The Glorious Time of a Quanzhen Monastery

⁵⁰ It is noteworthy that Qiu was also once summoned by Emperor Zhangzong in 1188 and imperial gifts as well as privileges were bestowed to him. See *Zhongnan shan Chongyang zushi xianji ji* 終南山重陽祖師仙跡集 [Record of Immortal Traces of the Patriarch Chongyang in Mount Zhongnan], in *Daojia jinshi lue*, 460-461.

⁵¹ I will further address this disciple, Zhao Daojian 趙道堅, in Chapter Two.

⁵² Li Zhichang 李志常. *Changchun zhenren xiyou ji* 長春真人西遊記 [Record of the Perfected Changchun's Journey to the West] (DZ 1429). DZ here refers to the *Zhengtong daoze*, edited in 1445, reimpression in Shanghai in 1923-1926. Numbered here according to Kristofer Schipper, ed., *Concordance du Tao-tsang: Titres des ouvrages* (Paris: Publications de EFEO, 1975), in Fabrizio Pregadio, e.d., *Index of Zhengtong Daoze* (Mountain View, CA: Golden Elixir Press, 2008). For an English translation, see also Arther Waley, trans., *The Travels of an Alchemist: The Journey of the Taoist Ch'ang-Ch'un from China to the Hindu Kush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1931). Note the biography of Qiu Chuji is very like to be a legendary story, rather than a historical fact, for he was later venerated by many different Daoist traditions. Nevertheless, his biography, or rather hagiography, ensures the prosperity of Quanzhen Daoism at Baiyun guan.

Qiu Chuji passed away in the same year he returned to Beijing. His body was buried at Baiyun guan, which at the time was only a small Daoist memorial shrine built next to Changchun gong.⁵³ Now Baiyun guan had a relic to venerate to allow it to become a pilgrimage center. Due to Qiu's great achievements and fame, Quanzhen Daoism, along with Qiu's Longmen lineage, quickly flourished. While Changchun gong assumed the role of a center for Qiu's teachings, Baiyun guan gradually became the headquarters of Quanzhen Daoism.

Changchun gong and Baiyun guan were also consistently patronized by the Mongol imperial court throughout the Yuan period. Many Daoist rituals, which might not otherwise have been performed elsewhere due to the extremely high costs, were commonly observed at Changchun gong. For example, in 1244, 1246, and 1248, the Offering of Universal Heaven 普天大醮 was carried out repeatedly by Qiu's disciples.⁵⁴ Under Emperor Shizu's 世祖 (r. 1260-1294) order, the Pure Offering of the Canopy Heaven 羅天清醮 occurred in 1260; and the Offering of the Golden Register of Complete Celestial 金錄周天醮 was carried out in both

⁵³ *Yanjing Baiyun guan Chushun tang huizang ji* 燕京白雲觀處順堂會齋記 [Record of Burial at Hall of Chushun in Baiyun guan, Yanjing], in *Daojia jinshi lue*, 458-459.

⁵⁴ See *Xuanmen zhangjiao dazongshi Zhenchang zhenren daoxing bei* 玄門掌教大宗師真常真人道行碑 [Stele of Meritorious Acts of the Leader of Mysterious Gate and the Great Ancestral Master, Perfected Zhenchang], in *Daojiao jinshi lue*, 578-580.

1262 and 1268. Towards the end of Yuan period, the Offering of Universal Heaven was performed again in 1332.⁵⁵

2.1.4 Baiyun guan during the Chinese Ming Dynasty: Taken over by the Zhengyi Tradition?

Unfortunately, only Baiyun guan seems to have survived the Ming dynasty. Changchun gong apparently received sufficiently less patronage and fell into an apparently sudden decline.

Meanwhile, Daoists at Baiyun guan undertook great changes after the Mongols were gone and China was again ruled by a native imperial clan. Possibly due to affiliation with the Mongol court, Baiyun guan now fell under the supervision of the Celestial Masters of the Zhengyi Daoist tradition. Zhengyi Daoists actively rebuilt Baiyun guan at the beginning of the Ming dynasty.

However, it appears that Baiyun guan survived independently of its original Quanzhen affiliation. This might suggest that the relationship between Quanzhen and Zhengyi was not necessarily one of sectarian competition, or the perhaps the distinction was not as definitive as we think it ought to have been.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ *Yuan shi* 元史: *benji* 本紀 35/Wenzong Tutie Muer 文宗圖帖睦爾, 780.

⁵⁶ Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen, eds., *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 32-39; Goossaert, *Taoist of Peking*, 28-32.

Following Ming Emperor Taizu's 太祖 (1328-1398) visit to Qiu's grave on the occasion of Qiu's birthday, Baiyun guan was restored under the supervision of Zhengyi masters.⁵⁷ After completion, yet Baiyun guan became or remained the training and ordination center of Daoism. Under a Zhengyi-supervised reorganization, Liu Yuanran 劉淵然 (1351-1432), who was a Clarified Tenuity (Qingwei 清微) master and patriarch of the Jingming zhognxiao Daoism 淨明忠孝道, received the Daoist name of Changchun in honor of Qiu Chuji,⁵⁸ thus propagating the connection to ordination, and a patriarchal lineage with Baiyun guan at the center. These Daoist traditions can be traced to the late Northern Song dynasty, when Song Emperor Huizong 徽宗 (r. 1101-1125) sponsored the Divine Empyrean (Shenxiao 神霄) tradition as specified in the sixty-one fascicle *Duren jing* 度人經 (Book of Salvation) dated to 1112.⁵⁹ Older texts from the Tang-era were supplemented with newer revelations as in the case of the Clarified Tenuity

⁵⁷ *Baiyun guan chongxiu ji* 白雲觀重修記 [Record of the Restoration of Baiyun guan], in Oyanagi Shigeta 小柳司氣太, *Hakuunkan shi* 白雲觀志 (Tokyo: Tōhō bunka gakuin Tokyo kenkyūjo, 1934) (abbreviated as BYGZ hereafter), 124-28.

⁵⁸ Esposito, *Qing Daoism*, 11.

⁵⁹ Michel Strickmann, "The Longest Taoist Scripture," *History of Religions* 17, no. 3-4 (1978): 335. This text is the *Tai shangdongxuan Lingbao wuliang duren shangpin miao jing* 太上洞玄靈寶無量度人上品妙經 [Wondrous Book of the Transcendent Treasure, Supreme Stanza on Limitless Salvation], *DZ* 1, 1-13 *ce* 冊, *Dongzhen bu* 洞真部 *benwen lei* 本文類, in sixty-one fascicles.

movement, which amalgamated earlier Taoist liturgical techniques with the Thunder Rites and Tantric rituals.⁶⁰ It may seem paradoxical that the Quanzhen monastic tradition at Baiyun guan was at that time rehabilitated owing to Zhengyi masters. Or, perhaps, the Quanzhen ordination lineage at Baiyun guan had socio-political or religious significance that earlier Daoist lineages did not.

2.2 Life at Baiyun guan

2.2.1 Visualizing the Material Baiyun guan

Physically, Baiyun guan was one of the largest religious institutions in Beijing, and is still one of the best preserved today. Its layout follows the same general organization of many Buddhist and Daoist monasteries. The main north-south axis contains the largest halls, which are

⁶⁰ Peter N. Gregory and Patricia Buckley Ebrey, "The Religious and Historical Landscape" in *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, ed. Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993), 27; Judith M. Boltz, *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries*, China Research Monographs, no. 32 (Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley Center for Chinese Studies, 1987). See also Michel Strickmann, "The Thunder Rites of the Sung: Notes on the Shen-hsiao Order and the Southern School of Taoism," *Tōhō shūkyō 東方宗教* 46 (1975); *Mantras et mandarins: le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*, Bibliothèque des sciences humaines (Paris: Gallimard, 1996), 118-26; Lowell Skar, "Administering Thunder: A Thirteenth Century Memorial deliberating the Thunder Rites," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 9 (1997); Strickmann, "The Thunder Rites of the Sung: Notes on the Shen-hsiao Order and the Southern School of Taoism,"; *Mantras et mandarins: le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*, 118-26; Skar, "Administering Thunder: A Thirteenth Century Memorial deliberating the Thunder Rites."

devoted to the Quanzhen saints and patriarchs and the pure unborn Before Heaven (*xiantian* 先天) deities. Advancing northward from the gate were once the Wang Lingguan 王靈官 hall, for the monastery's guardian deity, and the Jade Emperor (*yuhuang* 玉皇) hall. Once also saw the Hall of Laolü 老律堂, which enshrined the Quanzhen patriarchs. There was a Qiu Changchun hall. And, finally, a two-story building enshrining the Four Emperors (*siyu* 四御) downstairs and the Three Purities (*sanqing* 三清) upstairs. Lateral halls on both sides of this main axis, and other halls on the two lateral axes, which total about twenty altogether, were devoted to many saints. Several of these halls were sponsored by lay ordinations who used them as the venue for their yearly celebrations, and some were built by members of imperial clans. For example, the burial reliquary (*muta* 墓塔)—another relic at Baiyun guan—of Lord Luo the Perfected was built to honor him by Qing Emperor Yongzheng 雍正 (1678-1735) in 1727. Also, the Yuanchen 元宸 Hall dates from 1190, when Emperor Zhangzong of the Jin dynasty decided to build it inside Baiyun guan to worship the deity of the year in which his mother was born; this hall is also known as Ruisheng 瑞聖 hall⁶¹.

⁶¹ Goossaert, *Taoist of Peking*, 77.

The geospatial layout of Baiyun guan clearly expressed one of its fundamental features: it combined two institutions, an ecumenical monastery and a large urban temple housing various cults sponsored by guilds and ordinations. Baiyun guan, therefore, serves even today as a powerful institution “controlling land, charity programs, and donor associations entrenched in Beijing society”⁶² Consequently, Baiyun guan had to maintain monastic isolation and purity while playing host to vibrant cults or local religious groups devoted to particular deities. For example, although an inscription says that the garden built in 1890 at the rear of the temple was intended for teaching and rituals only, the layout of this temple did not strictly separate monastic and lay activities, which were often coextensive⁶³.

Daoists in residence were consequently both members of a self-contained monastic organization, which transmitted its own soteriological doctrines and practices, and clerics at the service of multiple powerful socio-economic lay communities in the capital Beijing. Baiyun guan thus was open on most days and the largest part of the compound was occupied by halls devoted to popular saints, which is rarely seen in other ecumenical Buddhist monasteries and

⁶² Ibid, 63.

⁶³ BYGZ, 49-51.

other rural Quanzhen ones. Another physical indicator of the uniqueness of Baiyun guan is that the monastery clearly owned lands. Its lands were located in the various counties within the larger Beijing region and ranged from about 58 *qing* 頃 to 175 (1 *qing* = approx. 6 ha or 15-16 acre; 100 *mu* 畝). These lands were awarded throughout late imperial times by rich individuals or by ordinations, or were bought by the monastery. By contrast, very few temples had lands during the late nineteenth century. The ideal of land endowment as the best resource to maintain the monastery was not shared by all Daoist leaders. It was recorded that Wang Changyue, for example, once turned down an offer of lands from the Kangxi emperor, saying that “poverty nourishes the Dao” (*pin ke yangdao* 貧可養道)⁶⁴. At Baiyun guan we can see a strange endeavor of acquiring full control of its own resources and not depending upon external funding; most monasteries, such as the Dongyue miao 東嶽廟 in Beijing, were entirely dependent upon support from local communities and the state⁶⁵.

2.2.2 Practices at Baiyun guan

⁶⁴ Goossaert, *Taoist of Peking*, 164.

⁶⁵ BYGZ, 15.

The material aspect of Baiyun guan has clearly showed that Baiyun guan was fundamentally different from other local Daoist monasteries in Beijing. Next, I shall show that there were also unique practices—though were likely influenced by Chan Buddhism— at Baiyun guan.

One prominent feature of Baiyun guan is that Daoists here only practice meditation (*zuochan* 坐禪) on an individual basis. Quanzhen Daoists had developed during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a practice of collective meditation called *zuobo* 坐鉢, inspired by the Chan institution but featuring a uniquely Daoist instrument, a double bowl made into a clepsydra, which was used both for measuring time when meditating and for promoting a rich Inner Alchemical symbolism. By late Qing times, however, even though texts still maintained an occasional allusion to *zuobo*, the practice seems to have largely disappeared, and sources do not speak of the existence of any building for common meditation at Baiyun guan or other Quanzhen monasteries. Another ancient Quanzhen meditation practice is still observed today: an enclosed meditation for a long period (*zuohuan* 坐圜) in a fixed enclosure called a *huandu* 環堵. Highly

dedicated Daoists could lock themselves up in these cells for prolonged periods of time for self-cultivation⁶⁶.

Ascetic practitioners, especially those who locked themselves up in the *huantang*, were only a minority among the clergy at Baiyun guan, but a paradoxically visible elite that drew much interest from outsiders and seem to have contributed to buttressing the monastery's image as a strange, otherworldly place where some people became immortals. This is the reason why we see that temple dignitaries took great pains to co-opt ascetic and unconventional monks of the "holy fool" type⁶⁷. Even though such figures were reluctant to follow collective disciplinary rules, in the *Baiyun xianbiao* 白雲仙表, a hagiographical collection of biographies of the Baiyun guan transcendents, published in 1847, prominently features many ascetic saints. For example, one of them was apparently expelled because of his fondness for tobacco, but he was later revealed as an immortal. "Zhang the sleeping immortal 張睡仙 claimed he did not eat at all. He was expelled from the monastery for bragging, but he came back, and enclosed himself so that the monastics could see that indeed he could remain in a cataleptic state for long periods of

⁶⁶ Goossaert, *Taoist of Peking*, 209.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 210.

time.”⁶⁸ This immortal, along with many others such as the Goodness of the Replicated Bodies (*fenshen niangniang* 分身娘娘)—to promote a cult of relics—are still presented in paintings today at Baiyun guan⁶⁹.

2.2.3 The Abbots of Baiyun guan

Two terms were used interchangeably for abbot as Baiyun guan during the late imperial period: *fangzhang* 方丈 and *zhuchi* 主持. The former literally means “ten feet square”; this describes the dimensions of a prototypical abbot’s quarters in Chan Buddhism and Quanzhen Daoism. *Zhuchi* means something like the manager of all worldly affairs, and is also the modern Mandarin Chinese word for abbot. Many abbots, though certainly not all, led ordination ceremonies and conferred precepts, and were also called *lüshi* 律師. As in most monastic communities in China by the Ming dynasty, an ancestral hall (*citang* 祠堂) kept the tablets of past masters to be worshipped at scheduled times during the ritual calendar. These tablets at Baiyun guan were arranged by generation in the Longmen lineage,⁷⁰ with honor paid to those

⁶⁸ BYGZ, 198.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 29.

⁷⁰ Note at Baiyun guan, monastic records do not serialize the succession of abbots. For example, a “tenth generation abbot” does not mean the actual tenth abbot; rather, it indicates an abbot member of the Longmen lineage in the tenth generation.

who had been *liishi*. The abbot was sometimes invited from another Quanzhen monastery to fill this position at Baiyun guan, although he would almost certainly have resided at Baiyun guan when fulfilling this role; conversely, a *liishi* could be selected among resident monastic Daoists.

2.2.4 The Ordination Process at Baiyun guan

One of the most important functions of Baiyun guan was to perform ordination ceremonies and celebrate this paramount ritual procedure. Baiyun guan was the only ecumenical monastery and thus the only place that provided Quanzhen ordination in Beijing. Between 1800 and 1927, 31 ordination ceremonies were performed at Baiyun guan; that is about one ordination ceremony every four years, with a total of 5465 ordained Daoists or an average of 176 Daoists ordained at each ceremony. The ordination ceremonies did not occur at fixed intervals, however, but only when monastic leaders could accumulate the necessary finances: ordination ceremonies are quite expensive. Expenditures were usually covered by donations from wealthy, lay patrons—either officials or merchants—who, in return, enjoyed seats of honor to witness the public sections of the ordination ritual⁷¹.

⁷¹ Goossaert, *Taoist of Peking*, 286.

The procedure is outlined in a liturgical manual called *Xuandu Lütan weiyi jieke quanbu* 玄都律壇威儀戒科全部 (The Complete Collection of the Ceremony of the Mysterious Metropolis at Precept Altar). The text I have examined was copied in 1874 from older sources⁷². First, prior to the ordination ceremony, the organizing monastery sent announcements to all temples in the area to invite several eminent monks to preside over the ceremony as required by the monastic codes. Besides the *Lüshi*, an ordination required at least eight other masters, each with a specific title and role, but the number of masters could be only as high as twenty or thirty when certain roles were duplicated. These masters tutored and watched over various aspects of the candidates' behavior and training⁷³.

On the fixed date, all interested candidates would arrive at the monastery and register. Candidates were examined by several auxiliary masters who would check their credentials, like the *guadan* 掛單 procedure⁷⁴; they provided a detailed document similar to a curriculum vitae, which would then be used to compile the ordination register (*deng zhenshi* 登真師). Once

⁷² Ibid, 147.

⁷³ BYGZ, 93-94.

⁷⁴ Ordained Daoists are expected to travel to other Daoist monasteries across China as part of the training process. By showing the ordination certificate, ordained Daoists, in theory, can stay in any major Quanzhen monasteries freely. This practice is called *guadan*.

accepted, candidates (*xinjie* 新戒) were given a bowl and an ordination robe (*yibo* 衣鉢) and settle in the common dormitory.

During the training period, the daily regimen for candidates was quite strict and forced on instilling a strict disciplined regimen. The ordination was an intense rite of passage that qualified candidates legitimate Daoists. This entailed ascetic practices; it is recorded that meditation in the courtyard during freezing winter nights sometimes resulted in the death of some candidates⁷⁵. On the more life-affirming side, candidates would also have the chance to learn skills. For example, they rehearsed the final ordination ritual, notably the use of the *gui* 規, a rectangular piece of cloth to sit and kneel on, and the use of the audience tablet (*jian* 簡), as well as the proper uses of the robe and bowl. Complex group choreography involving hundreds of clerics, which had to be executed in perfect order, was a new challenge for Daoists who were probably used to performing in small troupes.

During the training phase occasions for clerics to master “authentic” Quanzhen music arose. But, as Goossaert sharply noted, the liturgy performed by Quanzhen clerics was always mixed with local music, and large monasteries that practiced ordinations saw it as their duty to transmit

⁷⁵ BYGZ, 211.

“pure” monastic Quanzhen liturgy and music. As a result, a music manual, *Quanzhen zhengyun* 全真正韻 (Orthodox Tones [of the] Complete Perfection [Tradition]), was compiled at an unknown point during the Qing⁷⁶. Towards the end of training period, an examination called *kaojie* 考偈—literally an examination of ritualized poetry—was conducted. The auxiliary masters ranked all candidates according to the quality of their poems, and they were listed in the ordination register according to rank and number following the characters of the *Qianziwen* 千字文 (Thousand Character Classic)⁷⁷.

The whole ritual process ended with conferring three sets of precepts—outlining disciplinary rules to follow—for all candidates: *Chuzhenjie* 初真戒 (Initial Pure Precepts), *Zhongjijie* 中極戒 (Intermedia Precepts), and *Tianxian dajie* 天仙大戒 (Precepts for Celestial Immortality), collectively known as *Santan dajie* (Great Precepts of Triple Platform). All three precepts were not necessarily considered sacred, but all candidates had to prove they knew them well. The three sets were originally designed to be conferred separately at different stages.

⁷⁶ Goossaert, *Taoists of Peking*, 149.

⁷⁷ A classical Chinese poem typically used to teach children how to write, arranged in 250 lines with 4 different characters each; it was also used to function like page number in large collections of texts.

However, by late imperial times, all three sets were conferred together, one after the other. The process is described in detail by Goossaert:

The conferral ritual began at night with a litany whereby the candidates repented from past sins; each presented a confession (*zuidan* 罪單) and requested instruction in the precepts (*shenjie* 審戒). Then the ordination master entered, gave a sermon on the precepts, and conferred them in three stages. At each stage, the ordination master wore specific ritual vestments, chanted hymns, burnt an announcement to Qiu Changchun, recited on by one the precepts, and asked all candidates “Can you observe this precept?” to which they answered “Yes!” Finally, all candidates thanked the ordination master and the various auxiliary masters and received their ordination certificate (*jiedie* 戒牒)⁷⁸.

Goossaert also points out that, although the ordination ritual specifically targeted only legitimate candidates, it was also partly a public ritual attended by all kinds of people in Beijing⁷⁹. Notably the last ordination ceremony held in pre-Communist China was in 1927, and not again until 1989. However, the contemporary status of the ordination ritual is beyond the scope of this thesis. This ritual practice was finally resumed under the leadership of the Chinese Daoist Association⁸⁰. The revised version of the three sets of precepts, according to Li Yangzheng, is *Chuzhen jielü* 初真戒律 (Initial Pure Precepts Rules), *Zhongji sanbai dajie* 中極三百大戒

⁷⁸ Li Yangzheng 李養正, *Xinbian Beijing Baiyun guan zhi* 新編北京白雲觀志 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2003), 155-156.

⁷⁹ Goossaert, *Taoists of Peking*, 142.

⁸⁰ BYGZ, 155-156.

(Intermediate Three-Hundred Great Precepts), and *Tianxian dajie* 天仙大戒 (Great Precepts for Celestial Immortality). Without further examination of the content, the titles and structures appear to be very similar to the old version⁸¹.

2.3 Concluding Remarks

The history of Baiyun guan was marked by a persistent pattern of legendary and historical imperial patronage that spans from the Tang dynasty to the Qing dynasty, except for the Ming, yet the status of Baiyun guan remains uncertain. For many reasons, given the upheavals during this long millennium, we cannot but remark that a persistent pattern emerges that appears to be the result of deliberate acts by the ordained clergy Daoists at Baiyun guan. If we consider the Tang dynasty as a possible non-Han state since the imperial family of Li might have used the revelation story of Laozi to legitimate native Chinese identity, then we can further conclude that Baiyun guan seems to have been particularly favored by alien regimes, which I suggested in Chapter One or following note.

The transmission narratives of Daoism, and the Longmen lineage, together with the material representation of Baiyun guan, may demonstrate that the most important figures at Baiyun guan

⁸¹ BYGZ, 94.

were not Laozi—whom we may expect—or any gods or deities; instead, the figures that were primarily promoted at Baiyun guan are the Longmen patriarchs. This conclusion is further reinforced by the practices designated for individual practitioners observed at Baiyun guan for future patriarchs.

What really distinguishes Quanzhen Daoism from other Daoist traditions is the ordination process. Although this process establishes a hierarchy among Quanzhen Daoists, since ordained Daoists could enjoy many privileges including *guan*, the presence of non-Daoists—of which most were government officials or civil servants—at the ordination ceremony seems to suggest that the primary audience of this most honorable process for Quanzhen Daoists, is, ironically, the imperial court, aristocrats, the imperial clan, and scholar officials. Lineages, therefore, seem to be much more important for Quanzhen Daoism than are otherworldly deities.

Chapter Three: The Myth of The Longmen “Orthodox” Lineage in Qing China

In Chapter Two I argued that clergy at Baiyun guan, one of the major Daoist monasteries in north China during the Qing dynasty, paid foremost attention to the transmission of the Longmen lineage through ordination ceremonies. Two important, interrelated questions are: How did the Longmen lineage become affiliated with Baiyun guan and can the origin of the Longmen lineage be traced back to a Northern tradition (*beizong* 北宗) of Quanzhen Daoism—located in North China where we see few other examples of religion in China?⁸² Even though the Longmen lineage was certainly a pivotal school Daoist school during the Qing, scholarship on this topic can be described as fragmentary, at best. It appears that consideration of a Northern tradition of the Longmen sub-lineage has been subverted by well-documented and widely accepted official versions of the history of the Longmen lineage. The orthodox story establishes a succinct narrative about how Qiu Chuji (1148-1227) acquired his prestigious position during the beginning of the Yuan dynasty and transmitted his teachings to the later Longmen patriarchs at

⁸² For studies on the Northern tradition of Quanzhen Daoism, see for example, Qing Xitai 卿希泰, ed., *Zhongguo Daojiao shi* 中國道教史 [A History of Daoism in China] (Chongdu: Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 1988-1995), 360; for studies on religions in the Northern China, see for example, Duara Prasenjit, *Culture, Power, and the State: Rural North China, 1900-1942*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Baiyun guan in North China.⁸³ Since Baiyun guan was built or rebuilt as a memorial shrine during the Yuan-Ming transition to Qiu, who is seen as the founding patriarch of the Longmen lineage,⁸⁴ it seems odd that the official historical narrative of the Longmen lineage has received little scrutiny or attention. A close investigation of the historical sources reveals far more discontinuity than continuity. In fact, as I argue, it is difficult to pinpoint precisely when the Longmen lineage arose as a distinctive sub-lineage (*pai*, as opposed to a tradition of school, *zong*), and Qiu's earlier participation within local religious movements cannot necessarily be

⁸³ The presentation of the first seven generations of patriarchs that are recognized as representatives of the Longmen orthodox lineage at Baiyun guan and its affiliated monasteries is reproduced in many sources. See for example Qing Xitai 卿希泰 (ed.), *Zhongguo daojiao shi* 中國道教史 [A History of Daoism in China] (Chengdu: Chengdu Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 1988-1995), vol. 4, 77-181; Lu Yongming 陸永銘, *Longmen zhengzong Jueyun beizhi daotong xinchuan* 龍門正宗覺雲本支道統薪傳 [Transmission of the Orthodox Teaching in the Main Lineage of the Longmen Jueyun Branch], 1927, in *Zangwai daoshu* 藏外道書 [Collections of Extra-Canonical Daoist Books] (Chengdu: Bashu shushe 巴蜀書社, 1994) (abbreviated as ZWDS hereafter), vol. 31, 427-446; *Xuandu lütan weiyi jieke quanbu* 玄都律壇威儀戒科全部, 1874, in Wang Ka 王卡 & Wang Guiping 汪桂平, eds, *Sandong shiyi* 三洞拾遺 [Supplemental Collections of Three Caverns] (Hefei: Huangshan shushe 黃山書社, 2005), 11; *Daotong yuanliu zhi* 道統源流志 [Gazetteer on the Origins and Development of Daoist Orthodoxy] (Wuxi: Zhonghua yinshuju 中華印書局, 1922). It is also interesting to note that besides Chinese sources, Japanese sources also adopted similar themes. See for example BYGZ and Igarashi Kenryū 五十嵐賢隆, *Daojiao conglin taiqinggong zhi* 道教叢林太清宮志 (Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2015). Translated by Guo Xiaofeng and Wang Jing.

⁸⁴ Headquarters of new religious traditions are often erected on the gravesite of their founders in East Asia. In Japan, the gravesite of Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212) at Chion-in 知恩院 in Kyoto became the center of the Jōdoshū 淨土宗. See William Bodiford, "Remembering Dōgen: Eihei-ji and Dōgen Hagiography," *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 2006, 1-21.

connected with the Quanzhen school. What seems to have inspired and perhaps even created iconic status for Qiu Chuji is his legendary role in the re-establishment of an “authentic” path within Daoism.

In this chapter, I first present three different biographical or hagiographical accounts of Zhao Daojian (1163-1221), the first Longmen patriarch—following Qiu Chuji—to demonstrate how problematical the genealogy of the Longmen patriarchs is. Next, I examine the triple-platform Quanzhen ordination ceremony, which is understood to have first been performed by the seventh patriarch, Wang Changyue, at Baiyun guan to show that the precepts of this ordination procedure can be linked to certain Daoist traditions which were established much earlier. Finally, I demonstrate that a genealogy of the Northern Longmen Quanzhen lineage, which, until quite recently, established the official pedigree for Longmen-lineage abbots at Baiyun guan, was elaborated among Southern lineage groups who do not appear to have practiced—or perhaps knows about—Wang Changyue’s teachings.

3.1 The Inconsistencies in the Biographies of First Patriarch Zhao Daojian

3.1.1 Zhao Daojian in the *Jin’gai xindeng* (early nineteenth century)

According to Min Yide's (1758-1836) *Jin'gai xindeng* 金蓋心燈 (The Transmission of the Mind-Lamp (or Flame) from Mt. Jin'gai, hereafter abbreviated as JGXD), the Longmen orthodox lineage (Longmen zhengzong 龍門正宗) was first established during the thirteenth century with the transmission of a "mind-lamp" (*xindeng* 心燈) from Qiu Chuji to his disciple Zhao Daojian (hence the title of the text). Zhao Daojian, a native of [Northern] Henan province 河南省, is described as endowed with a nature so sincere and so pure that his fellow townsmen referred to him as a "man from antiquity" (*guren* 古人), which means he was old and hence an immortal. He visited Qiu and was immediately recognized as the heir to the precepts procedures (*jiefa* 戒法). In order to spread the teachings of his teacher, Zhao followed Qiu to Yan 燕 (i.e., Beijing). According to the *Yilin* 逸林 (A Collection of Anecdotes) commentary, Zhao remained on Mount Longmen in [Northern] Shanxi province 陝西省 for seventeen years. There he persuaded more than two thousand ethnic Chinese (Han 漢) refugees to peacefully submit to China's new Mongolian rulers. After his return to Yan, Zhao is said to have been Qiu Chuji's attendant at Baiyun guan, and he reportedly received the Initial Perfect Precepts (*chuzhen jie*) and the Intermediate Precepts (*zhongji jie*) mentioned in Chapter One in 1280. Finally, he directly obtained from Qiu the final investiture: the "mind-seal" (*xinyin*), along with the robe and

bowl (*yibo*). Through this process, Zhao obtained the last and highest set of precepts, the Celestial Immortal Precepts (*tianxian jie*) mentioned in Chapter One, along with a famous poem in twenty characters confirming him as the first “Precepts” patriarch (*lüshi*) of the Longmen lineage.⁸⁵ Whereas the *Jin 'gai xindeng* does not contain much information about Zhao’s identity, the genealogical chart *Daopu yuanliu tu* 道譜源流圖 (The Figure of the Source and Course of Daoist Genealogy) identifies him as the first of eighteen disciples who accompanied Qiu on his travels to the west.

3.1.2 Zhao Daojian according to the *Baiyun Xianbiao* (late nineteenth century)

While the renowned Quanzhen biographer Li Daoqian 李道謙 (1219-1296) had designated his biography “Zhao jiugu 趙九古” (Nine Old Zhao) using Zhao Daojian’s taboo name (*hui* 諱), in the *Baiyun xianbiao* 白雲仙表 (Chart of Immortals at Baiyun guan) Meng Yongcai 孟永才 (d. 1881) and Wanyan Chongshi 完顏崇實 (1820-1876) compiled their biography under the title *Baoyun Zhao zongshi* 抱元趙宗師 (Master of Baoyuan Zhao), which is referred to in the *Jin 'gai xindeng*. In contrast to the biography in *Jin 'gai xindeng*, the *Baiyun xianbiao* reproduces

⁸⁵ *Lüshi* may also have been understood by Longmen lineage Daoists as Vinaya master, a term used by Chinese Buddhists that refers to something like rector or scholar of monastic codes.

Li Daoqian's biography of Zhao Jiugu. Both biographies, therefore, record that Zhao was born in 1163 in Tanzhou 檀州, in the modern district of Miyun 密雲 in Beijing, and not Nanyang 南陽 in Henan province.⁸⁶ Zhao converted to Daoism in 1177 under the guidance of Cui Yangtuo 崔羊頭, who later sent him to Ma Danyang 馬丹陽 (1123-1184) in Huating 華亭 (contemporary Gansu province 甘肅省, in western China). In 1180, Ma ordered Zhao to seek out instruction from and follow Qiu Chuji. Thus, we see a litany of Northern Chinese sites.

3.1.3 Zhao Daojian according to the Yuan dynasty Quanzhen Hagiographers

According to the record of Qiu Chuji's journey to the west by Li Daoqian, Zhao Daojian was born in Tanzhou and died on the fifth day of the eleventh lunar month of 1221 in Sailan 塞藍 (contemporary Xinjiang Autonomous Region 新疆自治區).⁸⁷ Although Zhao was exhausted by the journey to north western China, he still tried his best to recall Qiu Chuji's teachings every day as follows: "What comes alone must be faced. For me it is time to depart. I

⁸⁶ Wang Zhizhong 王志忠, *Ming-Qing Quanzhen daojiao lungao* 明清全真道教論稿 (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2000), 70, note 1, argues that because Zhao in the *Jin'gai xindeng* received a new birthplace, it is also possible that there were two Zhaos, who at some point had been conflated into one.

⁸⁷ Li Daoqian, *Zhongnan shan Zuitng xianzhen neizhuan* 終南山祖庭仙真內傳 (Inner Biographies of the Immortals and Perfected of the Ancestral Hall at Mount Zhongnan), in Schipper and Verellen eds., *The Taoist Canon*, vol. 2, 1141-42, 955, fasc. 604. This version is also confirmed by Li Zhichang 李志常, *Changchun zhenren xiyou ji* 長春真人西遊記, in Schipper and Verellen eds., *The Taoist Canon*, vol. 2, 1141-42.

hope the rest of you will serve the Father [Qiu] and Master with all your might.”⁸⁸ Following a request by Qiu, when Zhao dies he was buried in the plain to the east of the town of Sailan.

These thirteenth-century portrayals raise several questions about how they were used by hagiographers who lived over six centuries later. For example, is it possible that the first patriarch of the Longmen orthodox lineage had already died before Qiu Chuji, the founder figure of the Longmen lineage? Does it make sense that Qiu would have entrusted a dead disciple to have guaranteed the transmission of the orthodox Longmen lineage? Why was Zhao buried in Chinese Central Asia instead of being laid to rest in a place more appropriate for a distinguished patriarch? Both the *Jin’gai xindeng* and the *Baiyun xianbiao* do not address these questions. Min Yide simply attributes a new date for the of death to Zhao in his *Jin’gai xindeng*, and Meng and Wanyan appear to have erased the date of Zhao’s death along with related passages from Li Zhichang’s biography.

3.1.4 What Are We to Make of the Contradicting Sources?

⁸⁸ Translation by Emil Bretschneider, “Si Yu Ki: Travels to the West of K’iu Ch’ang Ch’un,” *Medieval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co Ltd, 1888; reprinted by Routledge, 2000), vol. 1, 74.

Based upon available sources, it seems somewhat fruitless attempt to produce a more historically accurate narrative of the life of Zhao Daojian using sources written during the Mongol Yuan dynasty in the thirteenth century. There are simply too many inconsistencies about Zhao Daojian in books written during the nineteenth-century, when Qing authors claimed to have corrected the history of such an important figure. Relying on one Yuan dynasty source appears to be a more nuanced approach in view of the efforts Li Daoqian seems to have devoted to building a “true history” of Quanzhen Daoism. In fact, Li’s chronicles are often praised today for closely matching information that is also preserved on many of stone inscriptions.⁸⁹

One question that strikes me as particularly important is why are there such considerable inconsistencies between the nineteenth- and thirteenth-century sources? Qiu Chuji’s journey to the west was almost certainly quite well-known; yet all references given in the *Jin’gai xindeng* show that nineteenth-century hagiographers postdated this event to the later reign of Kublai Khan 忽必烈 (r. 1260-1294). Dates familiar to earlier Quanzhen chroniclers such as the first month of the *gengchen* year 庚辰正月 (1220)—when Qiu allegedly selected his eighteenth

⁸⁹ See Ding Peiren 丁培仁, “*Jin’gai xindeng juan yi zhiyi* 金蓋心燈卷一質疑” [Questions on the First Volume of the *Jin’gai xindeng*], *Daojia wenhua yanjiu*, vol. 23, 411-29.

disciples and began his journey from Laizhou 萊州 (contemporary Shandong province 山東省) to Yan (Beijing)—were postdated in *Jin'gai xinding* to the fifteenth day of the first lunar month of the *gengchen* year of the Zhiyuan era 至元庚辰正月望日 (1280), which is precisely when Zhao is said to have received the Longmen precepts at Baiyun guan. According to other Quanzhen chronicles, it seems clear that Qiu arrived in Yan during the second month of 1220; he transmitted the precepts only two months later at Tianchang guan, the future site of Baiyun guan. Furthermore, it may very well be significant that 1280 is the date assigned to when Kublai Khan ordered Qi Zhicheng 祁志誠 (1219-1293) to burn the entire Daoist canon—excluding, of course, the *Daode jing*?⁹⁰ The date of 1280 becomes even more problematical if we consider that if we follow the chronology in the *Jin'gai xinding*, the crucial first transmission from Qiu Chuji to Zhao Daojian becomes a posthumous event: Qiu had died already in 1227; his purported successor Zhao had passed away in 1221.

Regardless of these historical inconsistencies, from the perspective of hagiographers who wrote about the Longmen lineage during the Qing dynasty, including Min Yide, Meng and Wanyan, Zhao Daojian was a figure of memory, chosen to establish an orthodox Longmen

⁹⁰ Yuanshi, *juan* 11. In this context, Li's work should be read as a transparent attempt to preserve Quanzhen history.

lineage. Amending history to serve their own sectarian agendas, Zhao became the only disciple in a group of eighteen who was closely associated with the Longmen sub-lineage. This apparently fictitious yet productive association appears to have become an important reason why during the Qing period we learn of not one, but two Zhaos.

3.2 The Seventh Patriarch Wang Changyue and the Daoist first Public Ordinations

3.2.1 The Revival of Longmen at the Beginning of the Qing dynasty

The theme of a revival of Daoism at the beginning of the Qing dynasty after the chaotic end of the glorious Ming dynasty is repeatedly mentioned in many Qing-era Daoist texts, but especially in the *Jin'gai xindeng*. As seventh patriarch of the Longmen sub-lineage and foundational abbot of Baiyun guan, Wang Changyue is the key figure who is credited with instigating a “Longmen revival” (*Longmen zhongxing* 龍門中興). He is awarded credit for establishing the precepts-altar (*jietan*) at Baiyun guan and performing the first public ordination ceremony for Daoist novices there in 1656. The content of these ordination procedures was established by Wang in a work entitled *Chuzhen jielü* (Code of Precepts of Initial Perfection,

comp. 1656),⁹¹ as well as in a later compilation by Wang's disciples known as the *Biyuan tanjing* 碧苑壇經 (*Platform Scripture from the Jade Garden*). The title may very well be an allusion to the famous Chan Buddhist *Platform Sūtra* (*Liuzutan jing*) of the Sixth Chan Patriarch Huineng 慧能 (638-713).⁹² The *Biyuan tanjing* consists of speeches by Wang Changyue held during an ordination ceremony in 1663 at Biyuan abbey in Nanyang 南陽 (Nanjing 南京, in contemporary Jiangsu province 江蘇省).⁹³ The purpose of the ceremony seems to have been to inculcate a strong desire to achieve realization (*liaowu* 了悟) among novices. This is said to

⁹¹ This text is found in the *Chongkan Daozang Jiyao* 重刊道藏輯要 (hereafter abbreviated as DZJY) vol.24 (*zhangji* 張集 7:25a-61b). See also Livia Kohn, "Monastic Rules in Quanzhen Daoism: As Collected by Heinrich Hackmann," *Monumenta Serica*, 2003, 367-97. In the introduction, Kohn states that the three precepts/texts "were first compiled by Wang Changyue in 1656."

⁹² This text is found in the first volume of *Min Yide* 閔一得, *Gu Shuyinlou cangshu* 古書隱樓藏書, Wuxing: Jin'gai Chunyang gong cangban, 1904 (hereafter abbreviated as YLCS). Another version of this text is also known under the title *Longmen xinfa* 龍門心法. It shows some differences with the *Biyuan tanjing* that would be worthy of further study. For the influence of the Platform Sūtra of Chan's Sixth Patriarch Huineng from different perspectives see Morten Schlütter, *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-dynasty China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

⁹³ Note this is a different place than Zhao Daojian's hometown Nanyang, which is now in Henan province.

have been achievable through the progressive path of the so-called “great ordination with three stages”.⁹⁴

As I briefly described above, the Three stages of precepts include: the Initial Precepts of Perfection (*chuzhen jie*), the Intermediate Precepts (*zhongji jie*), and the Precepts of the Celestial Immortals (*tianxian jie*). These three precepts were conferred in order and include specific disciplinary precepts to be observed by all postulants. The initial precepts had to be observed for 100 days before conferral of the intermediate precepts could take place. These intermediate precepts, in turn, had to be observed for three years before conferral of the ultimate precepts.

3.2.2 The Three Stages of Precepts

The *Chuzhen jielü* mentions different sets of precepts that came to be linked to the three stages in the following manner:

Those who have received the ten Precepts of Initial Perfection, the Three Precepts, the Five, the Eight, and the Extraordinary Precepts of Nine Perfected, wear the Devotion Robe of Initial Perfection. The robe has two hundred and forty patches, three layers of cloth, and ten pleats. It is tied with a cloud-belt with two ends, a pure kerchief, and one wears straw sandals. If one does one thousand and two hundred good deeds and recites

⁹⁴ This term refers in the Buddhist context to an ordination conferred in three stages or acts: 1) the novice ordination; 2) the complete ordination; 3) the Bodhisattva ordination. See Monica Esposito, *Creative Daoism*, Part Two).

the *Qingjing jing*, *Daotong jing*, and *Donggu jing*, they will attain the fruits of the Precepts of the Perfected.

領受初真十戒、三戒、五戒、八戒、九真妙戒者、身著初真信衣、計二百四十條、三台十褶、雲帶二拽、淨巾、芒鞋。行千二百善、持清淨經、大通經、洞古經、得真人戒果。

The *Dandong zhongjie wen* 三洞眾戒文 (Precept Writings for the Devotees of the Three Caverns) includes the *Sanguijie* 三歸戒 (Triple Refuge Precepts), in addition to Three, Five, and Eight precepts.⁹⁵ These sets of precepts appear to have been administered during the Tang dynasty for the conferral of ranks by Zhengyi Daoists (*lusheng dizi* 籙生弟子).⁹⁶ In addition, the Extraordinary Precepts of the Nine Perfected may refer to a Lingbao text that probably can be traced to the Tang period: the *Taishang jiuzhen miaojie jinlu duming bazui miaojing* 太上九真妙戒金籙度命拔罪妙經 (Scripture of the Golden Register for the Redemption of Sins and for Salvation, [including] the Nine True and Marvelous Precepts; *DZ* 137).⁹⁷ Furthermore, not surprisingly, the Daoist canon contains several sets of nine precepts that are associated with Lingbao texts. The *Duren jing* [discussed before] (*The Scripture of Salvation*), for example, also

⁹⁵ See Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 178.

⁹⁶ See Kristofer Schipper, "Taoist Ordination Ranks in the Tunhuang Manuscripts," *Religion and Philosophie in Ostasien*, eds., Gert Naudorf, Karl-Heinz Pohl and Hans-Hermann Schmidt (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1985), 120-130.

⁹⁷ See Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 181.

known as the first and longest scripture in the Daoist canon, also mentions a *Lingbao jiujie* 靈寶

九戒 after the Extraordinary Precepts of Nine Perfected.⁹⁸

If one observes all previous precepts, one will receive the Pure Precepts of the Medium Ultimate, also called the Precepts for Maintaining the Body, the Precepts of Wisdom, the Precepts for Observing the Self, or the Precepts of the Marvelous Forest. One wears the Pure Robe of Light Dust, which is made of simple light blue cotton or pure three-layered silk, a cloud-belt, a pure kerchief, and straw sandals. If one does two thousand and four hundred good deeds and performs the great ritual of the Jade Emperor, they will attain the fruits of the Precepts of Earthly Immortals.

行持具足、受中極淨戒、或持身戒、或智慧戒、或觀身戒、或妙林戒、俱著青塵淨衣、或用淺藍單布為之、或用純帛為之、亦三台、雲帶、淨巾、芒鞋。行二千四百善、持玉帝大法、得地仙戒果。

We can find in the Daoist canon *Shijie shisi chishen jie* 十戒十四持身戒 (Ten Precepts and Fourteen Precepts of Self-Control), which are followed by the note: “ Those who receive these precepts have the title of ‘Disciples of Laozi’s Green Thread and Gold Button’ (shoucheng Laozi qingsi jiniu dizi, 受稱老子青絲金鈕弟子)”.⁹⁹ This set of precepts is discussed in *Dongxuan lingbao tianzun shuo shijie jing* 洞玄靈寶天尊說十戒經 (Scripture of Ten Precepts of the Cavern of Mystery in Accordance with the Sayings of the Heavenly Lord of the Numinous

⁹⁸ For a detailed study on the *Duren jing*, see Michel Strickmann, “The Longest Taoist Scripture”, *History of Religions*, 1979, 331-354.

⁹⁹ See Livia Kohn, *Cosmos and Community: The Ethical Dimension of Daoism* (Cambridge, Mass: Three Pines Press, 2004), 184-186.

Treasure; *DZ* 459).¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, the Precepts of Wisdom might refer to the *Zhihui shangpin dajie* 智慧上品大戒 in *Taishang dongxuan lingbao zhihui shangpin dajie jing* 太上洞玄靈寶智慧上品大戒經 (Scripture on the Great Precepts of the Upper Chapters on Wisdom of Transgression from Numinous Treasure of the Great High Cavern Mystery; *DZ* 177), which were conferred for the middle stage of the Lingbao pact 靈寶中盟 (Lingbao zhongmeng)¹⁰¹. Perhaps even more interesting are the “Precepts of Wisdom” and the “Precepts for Observing the Self”, which might both refer to the *Shangqing dongzhen zhihui guanshen dajie wen* 上清洞真智慧觀身大戒文 (Great Precepts of Wisdom and Self-Observation of the Cavern of Perfection of Highest Clarity; *DZ* 1364):¹⁰²

If one observes all the above-mentioned precepts, one will receive the Extraordinary Precepts of the Great Virtue of the Celestial Immortals, after which they must put in practice the One hundred and eighty Esoteric Precepts to be Meticulously Observed or the Three Hundred Great Precepts. If one performs three thousand and six hundred good deeds and venerates (or recites) the *Daode zhenjing*, they can wear the Mist-Robe of the Celestial Immortality, which features a straight, open collar, and sleeves of disconnected seams, a mist girdle with cloudlike borders, the Crown of the Perfect Form of the Five Peaks, and the Light Shoes of the Five Clouds. If one observes all these precepts, they will attain the fruits of the Precepts of the Celestial Immortals.

¹⁰⁰ See Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 459.

¹⁰¹ See Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 177; For Lingbao alliance, Schipper, “Taoist Ordination Ranks in the Tunhuang Manuscripts,” 130.

¹⁰² See Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 1364.

行持具足、當受天仙大德妙戒、行一百八十細行密戒、或三百大戒。行三千六百善、恭道德真經、身著天仙霞衣、領用直開、袖不合縫、霞帶雲邊、戴五岳真形冠、著五雲青履。行持具足、得天仙戒果。

Apart from the *Biyuan tanjing*, the only text that mentions the Precepts of the Celestial Immortals, according to Esposito, is the *Yuquan* 玉詮 (Jade Annotation; ZWDS 91), which is a collection spirit writing compiled during the Qing dynasty and included in the old *Daozang jiyao* 道藏輯要 (Digest of the Daoist Canon).¹⁰³

We can gather from these passages that there are different sets of precepts for the three stages of precepts. It is beyond the scope of this study to ascertain which sets are referred to. In general, however, it appears that those for the initial stage were already part of ordination rituals or ceremonies (*duren yi* 度人儀) for Daoist novices during the Tang dynasty. Regarding the middle stage precepts, the text refers to progressive sets of precepts, which are probably related to the conferral of Lingbao ranks or the later, highest ranks within the earlier Shangqing tradition. It seems clear that the precepts mentioned in these three stages replicate earlier ordination systems that follow the gist of seventh-century Lingbao program (Lingbao Qianzhen ke 靈寶千真科): “People who leave their family can observe the three, five, nine, and ten

¹⁰³ Esposito, *Creative Daoism*, 111, note 206.

precepts up to the three hundred great precepts 出家之人、能持三戒、五戒、九戒、十戒、乃至三百大戒。”¹⁰⁴

3.3 The Longmen Lineage in the South

Various Longmen branches were established after Wang Changyue's time. Most of these branches can only be traced to Southern China [Jiangnan 江南] instead of the North. While some of these branches were affiliated with temples associated with famous Daoist traditions, including the Shangqing, Jingming 淨明, and Lingbao, others flourished at less well-known sites. In contrast to the north, where Baiyun guan in Beijing became a famous abbey that served as the center for the ordination of all Daoists, including both Quanzhen and Celestial masters, there was no central religious authority or central institution for Daoism in the south. This does not mean that Daoism in the south was less well organized than in the north. Both “north” and “south” are crude delineations; Goossaert's work shows that even the sub-temples of Baiyun guan were diverse and defy such simplistic labels.¹⁰⁵ Yet Quanzhen monastic histories have only recently begun to reveal to scholars information about the grand events in north China such as

¹⁰⁴ *Dongxuan lingbao qianzhen ke* 洞玄靈寶千真科, in Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 576.

¹⁰⁵ Goossaert, *Taoists of Peking*, 123-125, 328.

public ordinations, imperial patronage and local celebrations. One conclusion could be that there was a revival of institutional Daoism in north China during the early Qing period. I offer another perspective in this section that shows how a southern Longmen branch at Mt. Jin'gai 金蓋山 and its most influential figure—the author of the *Jin'gai xindeng*, Min Yide—tied Southern Daoism to the north and Baiyun guan.

3.3.1 The Longmen Branch at Mount Jin'gai

According to Min Yide's *Jin'gai xindeng*, Mt. Jin'gai (Huzhou 湖州, Zhejiang province 浙江省) was only connected with the Longmen lineage toward the end of the Ming dynasty via two figures: Tao Jing'an 陶靖庵 (d. 1673) and Huang Chiyang 黃赤陽 (1595-1673).¹⁰⁶ Tao and Huang are said to have been direct disciples of the seventh Longmen patriarch, Wang Changyue. Tao allegedly visited Baiyun guan in 1658, where he apparently met Wang. Wang promptly recognized Tao as a Longmen heir, and transmitted the precepts to him with the ordination name of Shouzhen 守貞. Through this investiture by ordination, Tao inherited the orthodox Longmen patriarchal lineage and came to be recognized as the founding patriarch of the Longmen tradition from Mt. Jin'gai. In order to add legitimacy to this event, the *Jin'gai*

¹⁰⁶ See respectively the biographies of Zhao Xujing and Wang Changyue in *Jin'gai xindeng*.

xindeng tells us that in 1658, Wang had transmitted to Tao Jing'an the Daoist regalia and a manuscript called *Jinhua zongzhi* 金華宗旨 (The Essential Points of the Golden Flower), thus enabling him to celebrate proper abbot's services at his local temple on Mt. Jin'gai.¹⁰⁷ Bolstered by the apparent prestige resulting from transmission of the objector, one year later (1659), Tao brought fellow Daoist Huang Chiyang to Baiyun guan so that he could also enjoy the privilege of meeting Wang. Huang directly obtained from Wang the precepts and received a new ordination name.¹⁰⁸ Huang was thereby recognized as a founding figure within the Longmen lineage at Hangzhou's 杭州 Dade guan 大德觀. As for Huang's lineage, the transmission of regalia suitable for an abbot was only conferred via Tao. On his deathbed, Tao allegedly ordered the transferal of the regalia inherited from Wang Changyue to Huang's disciple, Zhou Mingyang 周明陽 (1628-1711), the future founding patriarch of Jingu dong 金鼓洞 in Hangzhou.¹⁰⁹

3.3.2 Connecting Baiyun guan to the South

¹⁰⁷ *Jin'gai xindeng* j.2, 21b, in ZWDS 31:195.

¹⁰⁸ *Jin'gai xindeng* j.2, 23a-26a, in ZWDS 31. 196.

¹⁰⁹ *Jin'gai xindeng* j2, 18b-19a in ZWDS 31:194.

By recording several meetings at Baiyun guan concerning the legendary transmission of regalia to Tao, Min Yide's *Jin'gai xindeng* creates not only a direct connection between Mt. Jin'gai and Baiyun guan in the form of a link between Wang and the two Longmen patriarchs of Mt. Jin'gai, but the narrative also establishes Mt. Jin'gai as the center for the orthodox dissemination of Longmen ordination in the south.

Paralleling the myth of investiture via ordination at Baiyun guan through two local, southern figures, Tao and Huang are also presented in the *Jin'gai xindeng* as two managers of Mt. Jin'gai's Patriarchal-Ordination altar 呂祖宗壇, which had allegedly been established toward the end of the Song dynasty (960-1279) to honor Lü Dongbin 呂洞賓. Because this site is associated with revelations described in Lü's texts about spirit writing in the Jiangnan region, this altar is central to the scriptural tradition of Mt. Jin'gai. In their role as managers of Lü Dongbin's altar, Tao and Huang are said to have met Wang Changyue one more time. This encounter allegedly took place at Zongyang gong 宗陽宮 in Hangzhou, where the Precepts Patriarch Wang recognized Tao and Huang as orthodox recipients of the "quintessential doctrines" (zongzhi) revealed by Lü Dongbin in the form of the *Golden Flower*. In this legendary encounter with Tao Jing'an and Huang Chiyang, Patriarch Wang is viewed as a witness to

substantiate the claim that this foundational scripture which is associated with Lü Dongbin, known as the *Golden Flower*, follows direct transmission from Highest Lord Lao for saving the world. At the end of this passage, Tao Taiding 陶太定 (? -1692), the successor to Tao and Huang at Mt. Jin'gai's altar, is presented as having commemorated this event on the occasion of the printing of the *Golden Flower* for the benefit of future generations. Because this is clearly a legendary event, rather than an historical one, one can easily understand why it had to have occurred in 1688. In fact, all three protagonists of this legendary encounter—Patriarch Wang and his two Longmen heirs at Mt. Jin'gai, Tao and Huang—had already died by then. Rather than a macabre encounter with the living dead, this fabricated meeting commemorates the date of the revelation of *Golden Flower* at Patriarch Lü's altar on Mt. Jin'gai, and creates a legendary moment of legitimization by Wang Changyue, the legendary promoter of Longmen orthodoxy. Through this idealized act of legitimization by Wang Changyue, the site of the Patriarchal-Ordination altar on Mount Jin'gai can be recognized as a site where orthodox Quanzhen Daoist mind-to-mind transmission in the Jiangnan region took place. Closely associated with Lü Dongbin's cult and its lore, the local tradition surrounding Mt. Jin'gai was integrated within a

more broadly conceived, universal orthodoxy symbolically engendered as *the* Longmen

Ordination tradition of Baiyun guan.

3.3.3 Doctrines of Longmen Branch of Mt. Jin'gai

Based upon this contrived strategy of affiliation with an orthodox Longmen lineage in southern China, one might expect the Longmen branch of Mt. Jin'gai to closely follow Wang Changyue's teachings. However, instead of the threefold precepts as previously described, the branch on Mt. Jin'gai instead produced a specific doctrine to become a future Celestial Immortal, which goes by the name of the "doctrine of the Three Sages who heal the worlds" (*sanni yishi* 三尼醫世). This teaching lies at the core of the Longmen tradition on Mount Jin'gai. We can find the first use of this procedure in *Zhenyin xianjing* 真陰仙經 (Secret of the Golden Flower and the Immortal's Scripture of the Perfect Yin; ZWDS 381). This teaching appears in a more fully developed corpus of texts also allegedly transmitted by Patriarch Lü Dongbin through spirit writing. These texts feature the expression "*sanni yishi*" in their titles. *Sanni yishi* refers to the Three Sages (*sanni* 三尼)—Heaven by Confucius (Zhongni 仲尼), Laozi (Qingni 青尼), and

Shakyamuni Buddha (Moni 牟尼)—who revealed these teachings to Patriarch Lü.¹¹⁰ Lü

Dongbin descended to the altar of Mt. Jin'gai to transmit these healing rituals to Longmen masters using spirit writing.¹¹¹

In his 1828 preface to *Lü zushi sannī yishi shuoshu* 呂祖師三尼醫世說述 (Explanations of the Three Sages' Doctrine of Healing the World by Patriarch Lü), Min Yide tells us that his master, Gao Dongli 高東籬 (? -1768), understood that the tenth Longmen patriarch discovered a text in a bamboo casket owned by the famous Ming-era Neo-Confucian philosopher, Wang Yangming 王陽明 (1472-1529). This text presents a soteriological doctrine that had apparently been originally transmitted by Fu Xi 伏羲 to the Yellow Emperor 黃帝.¹¹² By highlighting transmission through Wang Yangming, this text demonstrates how famous Wang Yangming

¹¹⁰ The term “ni 尼” is a Sanscrit term referring to Buddhist monks, often used interchangeably with the Chinese term “seng 僧”. It was later accepted by some local religious traditions in China.

¹¹¹ Preface by Tao Taiding to the *Lü zushi sannī yishi shuoshu* 呂祖師三尼醫世說述, in Min Yide, ed., *Daozang xubian* 道藏續編 (Continuous Compilation of the Daoist Canon) (Beijing: Haiyang chubanshe 海洋出版社, 1989) (abbreviated as DZXB hereafter), 2:1b.

¹¹² The discovery of this text evokes that of the revelation of the apocryphal scrolls that were sealed in jade caskets; see Anna Seidel, “Imperial Treasures and Taoist Sacraments: Taoist Roots in Apocrypha”, in *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R.A. Stein*, ed. by Michel Strikmann (Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, 1982), 216-318.

must have become to be included within the purported transmission narrative of this doctrine.

Furthermore, the evocation of legendary, archaic figures like Fuxi and the Yellow Emperor

establishes not only a transmission from great antiquity—and perhaps even “Chinese”

orthodoxy—for this teaching, but also an even more seamless continuity in terms of the lineage

of masters and disciples. This facilitates a possible return to a “golden age of antiquity,” which in

China corresponds to the ahistorical period starting with Fu Xi and Huangdi, and traditionally

ends with the Han dynasty (206 BCE-220 CE). It appears that this chronology may have been

designed to compete with the legendary transmission narratives of Buddhist lineages in China,

and in particular the lineage of twenty-eight Indian patriarchs of the Chan tradition back to the

seven buddhas of the past.¹¹³

The Longmen branch of Mt. Jin’gai seems to have been in possession of these crucial texts

that describe the healing doctrine of the Sanni. The main scripture is the *Lü zushi sannī yishi*

shuoshu. Other texts seem to have been primarily transmitted with the help of extraordinary—or

legendary—figures, including Li Niwan 李泥丸 and Min Yide’s own master, Shen Yibing 沈

¹¹³ See John R. McRae, *Seeing through Zen*.

一炳 (1708-1786).¹¹⁴ *Tianxian xinchuan* 天仙心傳 (Mind Transmission of Celestial Immortality), for example, is a kind of final investiture for Celestial Immortals, which also includes a specific liturgical text (*Xuanke* 玄科) that ends with advice and admonitions by two Longmen masters, Taixushi 太虛氏 and Li Pengtou 李蓬頭. According to *Tianxian xinchuan*, realization of Celestial Immortality was the primary goal for those on the Golden Elixir (*jindan* 金丹) path, which follows Wang Changyue's teachings about strict ethical discipline through ordination procedures. This is illustrated in two supplementary texts now preserved in the *Daozang xubian* (comp. Min Yide, ca. 1834): *Tianxian dao jieji xuzhi* 天仙道戒忌須知 (Required Knowledge on Precepts and Prohibitions for the Path to Celestial Immortality) and the *Tianxian daocheng baoze* 天仙道程寶則 (Precious Principles for the Path to Celestial Immortality). If this kind of “Celestial Immortality program,” which consists of moral and practical precepts, clearly demonstrates a connection between the Longmen branch of Mt. Jin'gai and the “official” or orthodox Longmen school (which is the product of a standardized ordination system and pure rules for the Longmen school), then members of the Jin'gai branch must have also added their own interpretations to it. Min Yide's soteriological texts attest to the survival of

¹¹⁴ JGXD 10:8, 48a-49b.

individual salvation practices through alchemical training, a goal which lies beyond the notion of universal salvation guaranteed by Longmen Ordination Masters (*Lishi*) who are seen to convey supreme ordination precepts—the *tianxian jie*.

It is interesting to observe that self-cultivation practices remained popular at Mount. Jin'gai in Southern China, even though the ordination ceremony ought to render these practices trivial. It appears that there existed another kind of network, often in the form of spirit-writing groups or redemptive societies, that focused largely on transmitting Daoist self-cultivation techniques rather than the “orthodox” ordination ceremony. While one might argue that the ordination ceremony was rarely performed due to its financial and political restrictions, the popularity of self-cultivation practices in the South nevertheless suggests to us that Daoism is a highly diverse religious tradition.

Chapter Four: What is Daoism? The Quanzhen Affiliation to Buddhism

One of the main purposes of this thesis is to provide a more nuanced way to understand the complexities of the later history of Daoism in China. Despite that fact that it very well may be inevitable to adopt terms like “Daoism” or “Buddhism” to conveniently convey a clear sense of separate religious traditions in English, using these terms is essentially misleading because they connote the idea of separate religious traditions. Yet using these terms will hopefully lead readers—especially those who presuppose that Chinese religions have a similar structure to the Western notion of religious sectarianism (i.e. Judaism, Christianity, Islam, etc.)—to realize that Daoism also includes separate entities, and, therefore, can be distinguished unambiguously from other religious traditions in China. Whereas Daoism certainly has unique characteristics as an indigenous Chinese religion Daoism simply cannot be fully comprehended without taking into consideration other religious traditions in China, especially Chinese Buddhism—and local Chinese religious groups.

In this chapter I first show the possible Buddhist affiliation with the “great ordination with three stages” (*santan dajie*) performed by Wang Changyue (1522-1680), followed by a brief discussion of the Daoist monastic rules, which were first widely adopted in large, public

Buddhist monasteries during the Northern Song dynasty. Next, I analyze the emergence of a Chan (or Zen) Buddhist genre, *denglu*, “flame” or “lamp” histories, as a new Daoist genre that appears to have emerged during the Qing dynasty with particular focus on an extra-canonical text: Min Yide’s *Jin ’gai xindeng*. Then I examine two other texts, *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* 天皇至道太清玉冊 (The Jade Fascicles of Taiqing on the Ultimate Dao of the Celestial Sovereign) and *Xiuzhen shishu* 修真十書 (Ten Compilations on the Cultivation of Perfection, CT 263), to further trace the historical precedents of Daoist textual borrowing from [Chan] Buddhism during the Ming period, to demonstrate that Quanzhen Daoist borrowings and connections with Chinese Buddhism cannot be restricted only to the Qing dynasty.

4.1 Daoist Allusions to Buddhist Precepts

According to a nineteenth-century work of Longmen historiography spearheaded by Min Yide (1748-1836), Wang Changyue was recognized by the Qing court as the reformer of so-called strict Quanzhen discipline and moral rules. Leaving aside the historicity of this claim, the ordination program “re-established” by Wang Changyue under the Longmen label is understood

to have consisted of the so-called “great ordination with three stages”¹¹⁵, a term that by Wang’s time had been widely used to refer to [Chan] Buddhist ordinations for centuries. It refers to an ordination in three stages:

1. novice (śramaṇera or postulant) ordination (*shami jiefa* 沙彌戒法)
2. complete (bhikṣu or full ordained-monk) ordination (*biqiu jiefa* 比丘戒法)
3. conferral of Bodhisattva precepts via ordination (*pusa jiefa* 菩薩戒法).

It is difficult to know precisely when this type of ordination ceremony was first performed in one session in China; there are traces of the combined application of ten novice precepts, complete ordination, and Bodhisattva precepts by Chan Buddhist reformers during the late-Ming and early-Qing period who emigrated to Japan (e.g., Ōbakushū 黃檗宗 Zen masters like Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦, 1592-1673).¹¹⁶ Called *sandan kaie* 三壇戒會 (Triple-Platform

¹¹⁵ For a detailed description of *Santan dajie*, see Monica Esposito, *Creative Daoism*, Wil/Paris: UniversityMedia, 2013, Part Two; Wang explains his teaching in a way similar to the *yulu* 語錄, a well-known Buddhist genre: see also Vincent Goossaert, “Yulu Recorded Sayings,” *The Encyclopedia of Taoism*, ed. By Fabrizio Pregadio, vol.2 (London: Routledge, 2008), 1200-1202.

¹¹⁶ There is a rich literature even in English on the subject of ordination procedures in Chinese Buddhism: see, for example, Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China : an Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan qinggui*, Classics in East Asian Buddhism (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002); William M. Bodiford and Stanley Weinstein, eds., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya, Essays presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005). On the Bodhisattva precepts and their development especially in the Japanese Tendai tradition 天台宗, see Paul Groner, "The Fan-wang ching and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku" in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr. (Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawai'i, 1990). On Buddhist the history of

Ordination Ceremony) in Japan, it was during the late sixteenth-century when this ceremony was certainly performed on the continent¹¹⁷.

4.2 Daoist Allusions to Buddhist “Pure Rules”

Buddhist ordination procedures, see Akira Hirakawa and Paul Groner, *A History of Indian Buddhism: from Sakyamuni to early Mahayana*, Asian studies at Hawaii ; no. 36 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990). I must also acknowledge that Gregory Schopen has significantly changed the way scholars who focus on nearly all aspects of the history of Buddhism think about monastics’ lives and the codes they live by; see Gregory Schopen, "Redeeming Bugs, Birds, and Really Bad Sinners in Some Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtras and Dhāraṇīs" in *Sins and Sinners: Perspectives from Asian Religions*, ed. Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012); "The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two Vinayas," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17, no. 2 (1994); "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Muulasarvaastivaadin Monasticism," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19, no. 1 (1996); "The Good Monk and his Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of "The Mahāyāna Period", " *The Eastern Buddhist* n.s. 32, no. 1 (2000); "Burial *Ad Sanctos* and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archeology of Religions," *Religion* 17 (1987); "Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism" in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997).

On Ōbakushū monastic regulations, see Wu Jiang, *Leaving for the Rising Sun: Chinese Zen Master Yinyuan & the Authenticity Crisis in Early Modern East Asia* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-century China* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

¹¹⁷ For how the Chan revival during the seventeenth-century reshaped Chinese Buddhism, if not the entire Chinese Religion, see Wu Jiang, “*Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Sevnteenth-Century China*” (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

When the *Chanyuan qinggui* 禪院清規 (Pure rules for Chan Monasteries)—probably first compiled in the second year of the Chongning 崇寧 era (1103) by Changlu Zongze 長蘆宗曠 (1107?), abbot of Hongji yuan 洪濟禪院 (Hongji Chan Cloister)—was first published in 1103, Buddhism had already been a vital presence in Chinese culture for about a millennium.¹¹⁸

Scholarly consensus tells us that by the early eighth-century, not only had there had been many and sundry efforts to translate Indian monastic codes (Vinaya: *lǜ* 律) texts, but also to interpret and adapt them for use in China. Following eminent monks like Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667), ninth-, tenth-, and eleventh-century Chinese Buddhist monastics worked to supplement Indic Vinaya-related rules by “developing new architectural arrangements, bureaucratic structures, and ritual procedures that came to be sanctioned by custom, but had no clear precedent in the received teachings of Indian Buddhism”¹¹⁹. A few eminent prelates, such as Daoan 道安 (312-385) and Zhiyi 智顓 (538-597), for example, became famous enough that “the rules and

¹¹⁸ See T. Griffith Foulk, ““Rules of Purity” in Japanese Zen” in *Zen Classics: Formative Texts in the History of Zen Buddhism*, ed. Steven Heine and Dale Stuart Wright (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); “*Chanyuan Qinggui* and Other ‘Rules of Purity’ in Chinese Buddhism” in *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts*, ed. Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004) and Albert Welter, *The Linji lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan’s Records of Sayings Literature* (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 90-121. See also Schlütter, *How Zen became Zen* .

¹¹⁹ Foulk, “*Chanyuan Qinggui* and Other ‘Rules of Purity’ in Chinese Buddhism”, 276.

regulations they wrote entered into the historical record and collective consciousness of the Buddhist samgha (assembly), and exerted considerable influence on subsequent generations of Buddhist leaders”.¹²⁰ However, prior to the compilation of various editions of *Chuanyuan qinggui*, “no set of indigenous Chinese monastic rules ever came close to matching the universal acceptance and unquestioned authority of the Indian monastic codes (i.e., Vinaya)”.¹²¹ By contrast, because the concept of Vinaya—or an obsession with Indic origins—did not apply to Daoism, Daoist monastic pure rules varied greatly in different monasteries. Yet the drive to unify Quanzhen disciplinary and body techniques appears to have been primarily expressed in manuals that outline Quanzhen monastic life.

The earliest example, *Quanzhen qinggui* 全真清規 (Pure Rules of Quanzhen; *DZ* 1235), almost certainly compiled during the thirteenth century, synthesizes various texts that provide models of rules and descriptions of clerical life. A well-known ritual manual called *Qinggui*

¹²⁰ Ibid, 277. For example, the “Standards for Monks and Nuns” (*sengni guifan* 僧尼規範) attributed to Daoan when he was unable to obtain a complete *Vinayapitaka* (in *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 [Biographies of Eminent Monks], T. 50, no. 2059: 353b-c; T 54-241a.); and the “Rules in Ten Clauses” (*lizhifa shitiao* 立制法十條) written by Zhiyi in 595 for his monastery on Mount Tiantai and recorded in the “One Hundred Records of Guoqing Monastery” (*Guoqing bailu* 國清百錄), compiled by his disciple Guanding 灌頂 (T. 46, no. 1934:793b-794a).

¹²¹ Ibid, 277.

xunmiao 清規玄妙 (Abstruse and Marvelous Pure Rules) was compiled in the early nineteenth century by an eminent Daoist, Min Yide, on the basis of earlier and now mostly lost material.

Another normative text on Quanzhen discipline in use at Baiyun guan, the *Xuedao xuzhi* 學道須知 (Notice about How to Learn the Dao), also targets laypeople, but the author of this book remains unknown. None of these texts was ever published in Beijing; yet these texts were clearly studied and edited there. Perhaps as proof of conferral of transmission, it appears that texts were copied as part of manuscript collections, including one collection of instructions given by a Daoist in Beijing to his disciples¹²².

Michal Strickmann observed that the higher someone is in the spiritual hierarchy of Daoist cosmology, the more numerous and constraining the precepts one is expected to observe¹²³. This perhaps explains why the clerical hierarchy is as enduring as the discourse on discipline is in Quanzhen Daoist teachings. For this reason, a simplified version of the three sets of precepts received considerable opposition in late imperial times. Rules (*gui*) were thus introduced as an alternative to the precepts, which were then linked to ordination ceremonies,

¹²² BYGZ, 35.

¹²³ Strickmann, "Saitly Fools and Chinese Masters (Holy Fools)." *Asian Major*, vol. 3, 1994, 35-57.

and constitute a contract between practitioners of communal, monastic life. Rules, as such, are contractual arrangements between humans and do not involve gods; whereas precepts only entail undefined punishment by gods, rules carry detailed punishments executed by the community.

Goossaert lists some examples:

Offences ranged from lack of respect toward masters and scriptures to failure to follow the communal schedule and hierarchical order, to breach of purity rules (sex, food, vestments, and general deportment). Minor offences were met with kneeling in prayer the time an incense stick takes to burn (*guixiang* 跪香), but punishments also included being fined (*fa* 罰), being publicly scolded (*gongze* 公責), being demoted in the monastery's seniority order (*juandan* 卷單), canning (*zhang* 杖) ...being burned on a pyre (*fexing* 焚形). The death penalty...was...also included¹²⁴.

What rules were used or applied at Baiyun guan? Goossaert argues that in most Quanzhen monasteries, rules did not at all have the “inviolable character of precepts, and they were changed occasionally, mostly when a new abbot enacted new rules as a way to make his mark on the community and express his will for a new start after a period of perceived decline”.¹²⁵ But a new board was written and implemented during the late twentieth century that concerned “deportment” (*weiyi* 威儀), that is, “body techniques that ensure purity, proper to Daoists”¹²⁶.

¹²⁴ Goossaert, *Taoists of Peking*, 151.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, 119.

¹²⁶ Strickmann, 1994, 40.

These texts describe the many actions that Quanzhen Daoists should take—how to sleep, sit, stand, walk, dress, speak, eat, urinate, and so on. In this regard, during both late nineteenth and late twentieth centuries, few changes were implemented with respect to Quanzhen discipline. A culture of bodily techniques and ritual purity, whereby Daoists were made conscious of their distinct role within the universe that also differentiated them from laypeople, can be seen with Daoists of both periods.

4.3 A Daoist “Lamp” History and Min Yide

The primary source for the early history of Longmen lineage of Daoism is the *Bojian* 鉢鑑 (Examination of the Bowl), a now lost or possibly fictitious work, which is attributed to Wang Changyue¹²⁷. It is interesting to note that the contents of *Bojian*, which can be regarded as “the foundation stone of the Longmen lineage” (*bojian* literally means something like “reflection in an alms bowl”), is only known through a few quotations in the *Jin’gai xindeng*. This text,

¹²⁷ I have not been able to locate the *Bojian* though this text has been mentioned by many scholars. See, for example, Mori Yuria, “Zenshinkyō ryūmonha keifu kō” 全真龍門派系譜考, in Dōkyō bunka kenkyūkai ed., *Dōkyō bunka e no tenbō* 道教文化のへ展望 [Perspectives on Daoist Culture] (Tokyo: Hirakawa, 1994), p.189; Qing Xitai 卿希泰 (ed.), *Zhongguo dao jiao shi* 中國道教史 (Chengdu: Sichuan remin, 1996), vol. 4, p.81. According to Professor Yin Zhihua 尹志華, who now serves at the Daoist Association in China, this *Bojian* is reserved at Baiyun guan in Beijing, but I have not managed to see it.

compiled by the eleventh-generation Longmen master Min Yide, who was formally a literati serving as a Departmental Vice Magistrate (Zhou Sima 州司馬) in Yunnan¹²⁸, contains detailed biographies of Longmen masters from South China. It was published for the first time in 1821 at the library of the Ancient Hidden Pavilion of Books (*Gushu Yinlou zangshu* 古書隱樓藏書) in Yunchao 雲巢 temple on Mt. Jin'gai. Because the original printing blocks were destroyed in a fire, it was reprinted with newly-carved printing blocks in 1876. A copy of the 1876 edition is owned today by the library of the Collège de France, in Paris.

According to Monica Esposito, Min Yide withdrew to Mt. Jin'gai to write the *Jin'gai xindeng* because the site had a legendary connection to the Returning Immortal (*Huixian*, 回仙) Lü Dongbin (b. 796?)¹²⁹. Chan Buddhist lamp histories that trace the “mind to mind transmission” (*yixin chuanxin* 以心傳心) from seven buddhas of the past to Śākyamuni Buddha through a succession of Chinese patriarchs had enjoyed a smashing success in China for centuries, and were instrumental in catapulting a relatively small movement of southern Chinese Buddhist monastics to a dominant institutional position within Chinese Buddhism by the

¹²⁸ For a detailed biography of Min Yide, see Esposito, *Qing Daoism*, 160-161.

¹²⁹ Esposito, *Qing Daoism*, 249-252.

eleventh-century. Taking this approach as his apparent model, Min, in his own Mind-Lamp text, presents the origins and development of the Longmen lineage explicitly in genealogical terms by mapping out a chronological Daoist “family tree” (*daopu* 道譜)¹³⁰. Tracing the Longmen tradition back to the Ancestor of the Dao (Daozu 道祖, i.e., Lord Lao) and to its lineage Master (Daozong 道宗, i.e., Lü Dongbin), this genealogy was designed to equip the Longmen lineage with an unsurpassable Daoist pedigree and identity, which is exactly how it still functions today within Chinese Daoist communities.

Analogous to Chan Buddhist models, such as the famous *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (Jingde-era Record of the Transmission of the Lamp, ca. 1004, Taishō no. 2076), *Jin'gai xindeng* also includes an intricate genealogical chart, the *Longmen zhengzong liuchuan zhipai tu* 龍門正宗流傳支派圖 (Genealogical Chart of the Orthodox Longmen Branches). This chart records the uninterrupted transmission of the orthodox Longmen tradition from its first seven—an essential number in Chinese transmission narratives—patriarchs to the diffusion of the tradition in the

¹³⁰ See the “Daopu yuanliu tu” 道譜源流圖 in *Jin'gai xindeng*, 1.1a-7b.

Jiangnan region after Wang Changyue¹³¹. Although Min's effort to use a lamp history text modeled on Chan Buddhism seems unique, and we might just as easily dismiss it as an apocryphal Daoist text because it borrows so heavily from Chan Buddhism and the author was primarily a Confucian-trained scholar, there are many intriguing historical precedents of Daoist texts referencing Buddhist texts, which can be dated to the early Ming period, or earlier. As a result, in the following sections I discuss two texts compiled during the Ming period.

4.3.1 Historical Precedent 1: *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* 天皇至道太清玉冊

During the Ming dynasty, smaller and more general encyclopedic references to Daoist traditions began to appear in print. One such text is *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* (Supreme Clarity Jade Book of the Higher Dao of the Celestial Sovereign). This modest compilation proves to be an indispensable compendium about the beliefs and practices of the early Ming court as seen through the eyes of a member of the imperial clan. The editor of the work identifies himself merely by the sobriquet *Quxian* 懼仙. This is the pseudonym adopted by Zhu Quan 朱權 (1378-1448), the sixteenth son of Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 (1328-1398), the founder of the

¹³¹ This lineage is also recognized by two Japanese sources, namely Oyanagi Shikita's 小柳司氣太 *Haakuunkan shi* 白雲觀志 and Igarashi Kenryū's 五十嵐賢隆 *Taiseikyū shi* 太清宮志. Guo Xiaofeng 郭曉峰 & Wang Jing 王晶, trans. (Jinan, Shandong: Qilu shushe, 2015).

Ming dynasty. Zhu Quan not only compiled anthologies of *qu* 曲 (arias), but is also said to have authored twelve comedic-dramas (*zaju* 雜劇).

Zhu Quan's preface to *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* is dated the ninth day of the first lunar month of 1444. Had it been completed earlier, his text would presumably have been included in the new edition of the Daoist canon begun initially under the auspices of his older brother, Ming Chengzu 明成祖 (c. 1403-1424). Today, it is preserved instead within the *Xu Daozang* 續道藏 (Continued Daoist canon) of 1607. According to Zhu Quan, *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* ought to be viewed as the product of several decades of mature reflections. He vividly recalls the day when, for example, he was approached at the age of eleven by an old woman dressed in blue who cautioned him never to forget the past. After some sixty years had passed, Zhu confides, he found himself ready—literally—to open his mouth. With this text, he seeks to convey a sense of [Daoist] history in terms of what he calls the *Tianhuang zhidadao* 天皇之大道 (Great Dao of the Celestial Sovereign) or, more simply, the *Tiandao* 天道 (Way of Heaven). While he acknowledges the contributions of both Laozi and Confucius in articulating the principles behind *tiandao*, Zhu ultimately traces the origins of these teachings back to Huangdi, the Yellow Emperor, whom he calls Daozu.

The eight chapters of this text are subdivided into a series of nineteenth sections. Chapter Two provides an inventory of sacred texts and ordination registers, supplemented by accounts of the infamous book burning during the Mongol Yuan dynasty. Zhu also inserts repeated reminders that the people of China must revere the teachings of the Chinese (as opposed to foreigners like the Tibetans or Mongolians). Chapter Four includes various behavioral codes. For example, it includes rules that cover how to offer the seat of honor to Buddhist monks who visit Daoist temples, and in turn, to Daoist masters who visit Buddhist temples. Zhu reiterates that rivalry should be outlawed, and counsels that the people of China should uphold the teachings of the Chinese and not turn their backs on their own country to follow alien teachings. Chapter five is most remarkable because it lists a set of instructions about a Quanzhen meditation rite called *zuobo* (sitting with an alms bowl)¹³². Regulations governing this contemplative exercise, which are scheduled for three ninety-day periods each year, invite rather obvious comparisons with the Chan Buddhist practice of *zuochan* (seated meditation). Thus, even though the *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* is not as obvious as *Jin'gai xindeng* is in terms of apparently adopting a Buddhist

¹³² See *Quanzhen qinggui* 全真清規 (DZ. 1325) and Vincent Goossaert, “The Invention of an Order: Collective Identity in 13th Century Quanzhen.” *Journal of Chinese Religion* 29 (2001): 111-138.

genre, it still demonstrates that, at least during the early Ming period, Buddhist practices were incorporated within Daoist texts.

4.3.2 Historical Precedent 2: *Xiuzhen shishu* 修真十書

Both *Jin'gai xindeng* and *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* are extra-canonical texts, and they are quite instructive in terms of how they show traces of textual syncretism between Buddhism and Daoism. Yet, this is not to suggest that the affiliation between these two religions can only be found outside the official Daoist canon. The anonymous compiler of the *Xiuzhen shishu* (Ten Books for Cultivating Perfection) appears to have been particularly interested in observing many points of common ground between Chan Buddhist instruction and the legacy of Zhang Boduan 張伯端 (d.1082), who became the second of the Five Southern Patriarchs in the separate Southern Daoist lineage (*nanzong* 南宗)¹³³.

¹³³ *Nanzong* consists of a series of five masters whose works describe forms of *neidan* closely related to one another (in addition to displaying similar formal features, such as the use of poetry). After Zhang Boduan, the lineage continues with Shi Tai 石泰 (?-1158), Xue Daoguang 薛道光 (1078?-1191), Chen Nan 陳楠 (?-1213) and Bai Yuchan 白玉蟾 (1194-1229?). It is now understood that the Southern Lineage had, in its beginnings, no conventionally recognized form or structure, and was formally established as a lineage only later, possibly by Bai Yuchan himself. The nomination of its five masters as the Five Patriarchs (*wuzu* 五祖) was inspired by the identical designation used within the Northern Lineage better known as Quanzhen.

The most outstanding collection of materials in the entire text is, by far, to be found in chapter thirty. This chapter, which is intended to serve as a sort of précis of Zhang's text, *Wuzhen pian* 悟真篇 (Folios on Awakening to Perfection), is exclusively devoted to Chan teachings. According to an unsigned introductory statement, the teachings of Zhang's corpus are threefold. First, to induce the cultivation of transmutation by means of the techniques ordained by Divine Transcendents (*xianyi shenxian mingshu youqi xiulian* 先以神仙命術誘其修煉). Next, to expand upon communication with the divine by means of the wondrous applications of the myriad buddhas (*ciyi zhufu miaoyong guangqi shentong* 次以諸佛妙用廣其神通). And, finally, to banish illusion by means of an absolute awakening, thereby resulting in a return to the primal wellsprings of ultimate emptiness (*zhongyi zhenru juexingqian qi huanwang er guiyu jiujiing kongji zhiben yuanyi* 終以真如覺性遣其幻妄而歸於究竟空寂之本源矣).¹³⁴

Outside of an essay on the *Sanxue* 三學, or Three Studies, entitled “*Jie Ding Hui Jie*” 戒定慧解 (An Explanation of *Śīla*, *Samādhi*, and *Prajñā*, or morality, concentration, and wisdom in Sanskrit), the texts that follow are all verses, ranging from short quatrains to lengthy songs (*ge*

¹³⁴ For a complete translation and description of the *Wuzhen pian*, see Fabrizio Pregadio, *Taoist Internal Alchemy and the Awakening to Reality (Wuzhen pian)* (Golden Elixir Press, 2009).

歌). Included is a tribute to Chan master Xuedou Chongxian 雪竇重顯 (980-1052), composed after reading a copy of his famous *gong'an* 公案 (public case) collection, *Biyān lù* 碧巖錄 (Blue Grotto Records, Taishō no. 2003). Those with any insight, the unnamed author of a postface concludes, will find that by examining *Wuzhen pian* one benefits from the highest level of instruction, namely, the six patriarchs of Chan from Bodhidharma to Huineng (638-713). With this remarkable declaration, the subdivision of the *Xiuzhen shishu* labeled *Wuzhen pian* ends.

Among the latest collections of writings preserved in this text is the *Jindan dacheng ji* 金丹大成集 (Anthology on the Great Completion of the Golden Elixir [of Xiao Tingzhi 蕭廷芝, b. 1260]), a second-generation disciple of Bai Yuchan 白玉蟾. Xiao's writings seem to be modeled on the sequences of verses found in *Wuzhen pian*. The text opens with several diagrams and illustrations of the principles of the Golden Elixir. The "Jindan Wenda" 金丹問答 (Questions and Answers Concerning the Golden Elixir) recorded thereafter is based largely upon the sayings of five generations of Southern Lineage patriarchs, from Zhang to Bai.

While Xiao compiled a joint roster of Southern Lineage and Quanzhen Daoist masters, there is no apparent evidence to suggest that he drew inspiration from the latter. It is of some significance, therefore, to find that one text linked to the Quanzhen legacy is included in the

Xiuzhen shishu: the *Panshan yulu* 盤山語錄 (Records sayings of Panshan). This record of Wang Zhijin's 王志瑾 (1178-1263) teachings is printed separately in the Daoist canon, with a preface dated 1247 by a disciple named Lun Zhihuan 論志煥. No clues concerning the provenance of the abridged version are given in the *Xiuzhen shishu*. It immediately precedes the final corpus of texts preserved therein, with a full chapter focused on the venerable *Huangting jing* 黃庭經 (Yellow Court Scripture; *DZ* 331 & 332). The fact that editions of this early scripture, so prominent in the much earlier Shangqing revelatory tradition, attests to its importance as a resource for the codification of inner alchemy (*neidan* 內丹) techniques within later Chinese Daoism. The compilers of this eclectic anthology clearly disclose an extraordinarily broad perception of the textual history of inner alchemy. This, at least, seems to imply that there is a mystery behind the admission of Quanzhen and Southern Lineage teachings under the same title, but also behind the forthright presentation of Chan Buddhist writings, a synthesis apparently without precedent in the Daoist Canon.

4.4 Concluding Remarks

It does not seem plausible within the confines of this study to fully contextualize my research within the vast volumes of Ming-Qing Daoist texts that are intimately associated with

Buddhist literature. While Wang Changyue's precepts have shown mere "allusion" to Buddhist precepts, and *Quanzhen qinggui*—the only canonical source discussed here—is almost compulsory for establishing institutional Daoism, the three extra-canonical texts discussed above are much blunter. These three texts, namely *Jin'gai xindeng*, *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* and *Xiuzhen shishu*, provide evidences of Daoist texts apparently associated with the Chan Buddhist genres of "lamp" histories, meditation self-cultivation, as well as discourse records, respectively. Taken together, the similar attitudes with respect to Chan Buddhism within these texts shows the modest approach of Daoist texts towards Buddhism, with Chan Buddhism in particular.

Of course, it is not my intention to suggest that Buddhism and Daoism, during the Ming and Qing periods, synthesized to become one religious tradition. Furthermore, many of the hagiographical writings about the lives of sacred individuals, as presented in the aforementioned three texts, were much later incorporated into what is now known as the Daoist Canon, or never. These texts were originally understood as hagiographical accounts, historical rather than canonical works, because they were not considered to be revelation texts that are direct divine discourse "transcribed" by human hands, nor are these texts with a primary purpose to instruct postulants in the fundamentals of a religious or moral teaching meant for readers who were

already religious “insiders”. As a result, these explicitly pro-Daoist and pro-Buddhist works were, in fact, written to be read by religious outsiders, and perhaps also by some targeted insiders; they are polemical, apologetic texts intended to persuade readers that their respective tradition’s teachings are genuine and authoritative. Yet, although they were never considered scripture or *jingdian* 經典, they still deal with the spirit world. The genre’s liminal position, betwixt and between ideological persuasions and religious traditions, dealing with the spirit world, but from the point of view of ordinary life and in texts deemed non-canonical, as Robert Company argues, is one of the main reasons for us to rethink our rigid definition of Daoism and of religious “orthodoxy”¹³⁵.

¹³⁵ Robert Ford Company. *Signs from the Unseen Realm: Buddhist Miracle Tales from Early Medieval China* (Kuroda Institute Series in East Asian Buddhism, University of Hawaii Press, 2012), 30.

Chapter FIVE: Understanding the Daoist Canon and Local Extra-Canonical Daoist Texts

One of the most difficult issues one encounters in almost any effort to understand Qing dynasty Daoism involves how we understand separate Daoist texts. Part of the difficulty lies in the fact that Daoism is largely an esoteric tradition, and, therefore, many Daoist books are not meant to be read or understood by outsiders. On the other hand, even for insiders, the textual history of the Daoist canon—one would expect them to carefully read and follow—is also problematical. Ever since the mid-Tang (730), because defining the Daoist canon, supervising its compilation, and selection of the institutions to be granted a copy were imperial privileges, as was also the case for the Buddhist canon, very few monasteries possessed a copy of the Daoist canon. As a result, Baiyun guan, being the place where the only surviving copy of the Daoist canon could be found has become the single most important Daoist monastery in China, and is even called “Chief Public Monastery of Quanzhen Daoism (*Daojiao Quanzhen diyi conglin* 道教全真第一叢林, in which the term *conglin* is used in Chan Buddhism to refer to public monastery).” In the first part of this chapter, I challenge this traditional view by showing that the Daoist canon preserved at Baiyun guan was never actually complete, despite the apparent shared obsession with a complete canon at Baiyun guan between both insiders and outsiders.

Another problem is the uncertainty of how to determine the legitimacy of a Daoist text. Buddhist texts, for example, were categorized long ago by monastic bibliographers as either authentic or apocryphal (*yijing* 疑經 or *weijing* 偽經). By the Kaiyuan (712-756) era of the Tang dynasty, what quickly came to be considered as an authoritative catalogue, the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (Catalogue of Buddhist Scriptures made during the Kaiyuan-era, Taishō no. 2154), had synthesized seven previous catalogues to present what medieval Buddhists in China maintained were authentic Buddhist texts that should be included in the Buddhist canon. Chief among the criteria used to establish authenticity by the Buddhists was the existence of an Indian original (i.e. Sanskrit manuscripts); when no original text in any Indic language could be found, scriptures were deemed apocryphal, either *weijing* or *yijing*. The former refers to texts that are not consistent with teachings of the Buddha, while the latter term is less disparaging, because it indicates only a suspicion about whether the attributed author or translator indeed played a role in the writing of the text.¹³⁶ Many Daoist texts are apparently extra- or non-

¹³⁶ See Tokuno, Kyoko, "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues." In *Chinese Buddhist apocrypha*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. (Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990), 31-74 and Tanya Storch, *The History of Chinese Buddhist Bibliography: Censorship and Transformation of the Tripiṭaka* (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2014).

canonical, and just as we can find with Buddhist scriptures almost certainly composed much earlier in China, non-canonical scriptures became very popular among various Daoist communities during the Qing period. Consequently, the answer to the question of how should we understand Daoist texts varies according to precisely how we want to categorize Daoist scriptures or texts. In the second part of this chapter, because they are the most convenient sources available, I first discuss how scholars traditionally categorized canonical Daoist texts. I then focus on the categorization of the four non-canonical Daoist texts that we have examined in previous chapters, namely the *Jin'gai xindeng*, *Lüzü sannü yishi shuoshu*, *Longmen xinfā*, and *Baiyun xianbiao*, to demonstrate why I chose these four texts, and more importantly, why these texts are crucial for any well-informed understanding of Quanzhen Daoism during the Qing.

5.1 The Daoist Canon: History and Categorization

5.1.1 Overview of the Daoist Canon

The first catalogs of Daoist texts were compiled after revelations that occurred during the fourth and fifth centuries, for the purpose of defining a list of authentic scriptures produced by and during these revelations. An expanded catalog was produced during the seventh century,

which included all the so-called “orthodox Daoist texts” within a hierarchical system sanctioned by Tang state support for an official Daoist church. From then on, different versions of Daoist canons were compiled and distributed during the Tang, Song, Jin, and Ming dynasties, always under the authority of the Son of Heaven himself (i.e., the emperor). The last one was published in 1445, during the Ming Zhengtong 正統 reign period, and is, therefore, known as the *Zhengtong Daozang*, which literally means the Orthodox Daoist canon. According to Goossaert, Qing emperors decided not to compile a new canon, possibly because “they did not feel the need for the Daoist legitimization of the dynasty that such an act entailed”.¹³⁷ Therefore, the Ming Daoist canon became the last official version.

5.1.2 The Only Surviving Copy of the Daoist Canon at Baiyun guan

The Ming Zhengtong emperor gave a copy of the last canon, the 1445 *Daozang*, to Baiyun guan in 1448. The monastery also received a supplementary collection shortly after, in 1607.¹³⁸ It constituted one of the most cherished treasures of the monastery, and it became a potent tool

¹³⁷ Goossaert, *The Taoists of Peking*, Appendix B.

¹³⁸ Chen Guofu 陳國符, *Daozang yuanliu kao* 道藏源流考. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963), 174.

for the legitimization of Baiyun guan's top status among other Quanzhen monasteries.¹³⁹ During the late Qing, there were allegedly two other (partial) copies that were kept at Yuqing guan 玉清觀, a subsidiary of Baiyun guan, and Renwei guan 仁威觀.¹⁴⁰ Yet another copy was once kept within the imperial palace. This contrasts the seemingly massive number of Buddhist canons—in multiple languages—in Beijing at the time.¹⁴¹ Of the many copies distributed throughout China since 1445, very few were still extant and complete during the late Qing.¹⁴² The original woodblocks were kept in the Da Guangming Hall 大光明殿, the center of court Daoism—as a reminder that canons were the preserve of the state and not independent religious institutions. Unfortunately, these woodblocks, too, were lost when it burned to the ground during the Boxer Rebellion in 1900.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ At least two other Daoist monasteries in Beijing also received an imperial gift of the canon shortly after the publication in 1445, but neither survived today.

¹⁴⁰ *Shoujie bichi*, 12a. Renwei guan, also known as Lüzu ci 呂祖祠, was located in the outer city of Beijing. An inscription, authored by Meng Yongcai, a Daoist at Baiyun guan, claims that Renwei guan copy of the Daoist canon was acquired thanks to an imperial prince.

¹⁴¹ Naquin, *Peking*, 95, contends that by the late Ming there were 36 Buddhist canons and three Daoist canons in Beijing. There is no accurate estimation of the status of the Qing canons that I am aware of, but the proportion should remain roughly the same.

¹⁴² Chen, *Daoang yuanliu kao*, 190-203, lists several dozen references to canons given to Daoist monasteries all over China during the Ming.

¹⁴³ *Ibid*, 181.

Since the Qing Manchurian imperial court kept the woodblocks of the canon, it could easily make and grant new copies as a favor. The archives of the Zhangyi si 掌儀司, the office of religious affairs of the Imperial Household Department (Neiwu fu 內務府), provides evidence of grants of copies of the Qing dynasty Dragon edition of the Buddhist canon (*Longzang jing* 龍藏經), completed at court in 1738; presumably the procedure was the same for the Daoist canon. The monks made a request through the Senglu si 僧錄司, the office of Buddhist Affairs, which then forwarded it to the Zhangyi si, who then memorialized the throne. Upon receiving approval, the monks went to the temple where the *Longzang jing* woodblocks were kept, made copies with paper, ink and labor they provided themselves, and were then issued a “passport” (*luyin* 路引) to carry the copy back to their monastery.¹⁴⁴

New copies of the Daoist canon copied from the original woodblocks kept in Da Guangming Hall were made only rarely during the Qing.¹⁴⁵ At least two copies were conferred to Quanzhen monasteries: one for the Xuanmiao guan 玄妙觀 in Nanyang in 1867, and another

¹⁴⁴ Goossaert, *The Taoists of Peking*, Appendix B.

¹⁴⁵ Chen, *Daozang yuanliu kao*, 197, 198, and 202.

for Baiyun guan in Shanghai, in 1888.¹⁴⁶ Copies of the whole canon were usually kept at libraries inside the monasteries, but not at Baiyun guan (in Beijing). Copies were certainly not easily accessible to a wide array of readers. Monastic leaders limited access to the canon because of the symbolic and physical value of a complete and pristine copy of the canon, and because most books often used or read by Daoists also existed in handier editions. Two monastic leaders of Baiyun guan, Meng Yongcai 孟永才 (d. 1881) and Zheng Yongxiang 鄭永祥 (d. 1873), even complained that many texts had been lost or damaged because supplemental printed editions of Daoist texts frequently consulted texts borrowed from the Daoist canon on site. Whether this was a true or fabricated accusation, nonetheless, Meng and Zheng decided to restrict access to the canon. They also set about retrieving missing volumes, borrowed copies from other institutions, and restored their own original copy of the canon.¹⁴⁷ It is not clear if the missing parts were copied by hand or printed. At any rate, this project of reconstructing the 1445 *Daozang*, financed by a lay devotee named Wang Tingbi 王廷弼 (fl. 1845),¹⁴⁸ was essentially

¹⁴⁶ Note this Baiyun guan in Shanghai is not the same as the one in Beijing, which I discuss extensively in chapter one.

¹⁴⁷ “Baiyun guan chongxiu Daozang ji” 白雲觀重修道藏記, in *Daozang jinghua lu*, 24089-90.

¹⁴⁸ According to Luo Dekun 羅德昆. (*Daoguang*) *Shinanfu zhi* (道光) 施南府志 (Enshi: Enshi diqu bowuguan, 1982), vol. 7, 136, the only figure that matched the name Wang Tingshi in Beijing during the nineteenth century was

complete in 1845. It appears to have been immediately useful, because during the next twenty years, two other monasteries, the Taiqing gong 太清宮 in Shenyang and Renwei guan in Beijing, requested copies in turn made from the now-complete Baiyun guan set, in order to complete their own canons. Why Meng and Zheng did not request a partial copy at Da Guangming Hall is still not clear to me; it seems possible that the Da Guangming Hall woodblocks were also incomplete at that time.

The obsession of having a complete Daoist canon was also shared by the Qing imperial court. In 1893, a government official by the name of Wen Tingshi 文廷式 (1856-1904) went to visit Da Guangming Hall and observed that the *Daozang* woodblocks were stored on shelves in corridors. A Daoist showed him a checklist of the missing volumes. This list had been

a eunuch, who was the chief manager of the *Jingshi fang* 敬事房, the office of eunuch affairs of the Imperial Household Department; for information on the close relationship between eunuchs and religious institutions during the Qing, see Evelyn Rawski. *The Last Emperors: A Social History of Qing Imperial Institutions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, 162-66. This observation is also supported by the records in Wu Changyuan 吳長元, *Chenyuan shilüe* 宸垣識略, 1788. (Beijing: Beijing gujichubanshe, 1983), 72, that the Da Guangming Hall was largely managed by eunuch-Daoists. As Naquin, *Peking*, 180-86, has suggested, eunuchs have consistently displayed an exceptional capacity for organization and collective action. A eunuch subscribed to an association throughout his career could after retirement live in the association's temples until he died, when he would be buried in the cemetery and enjoy in perpetuity the sacrifices offered there by the resident cleric. This may explain why Wang funded the project.

commissioned by emperor Xianfeng 咸豐 (1831-1861) in 1855, and shows that a significant number of the woodblocks were missing even then.¹⁴⁹ This, in turn, makes one wonder whether the copies obtained by Xuanmiao guan and Shanghai Baiyun guan were also incomplete, or were later patched up with the now-restored Beijing Baiyun guan's copy? Whatever the intricate details of this textual history may be, the operation of restoring the Daoist canon, without which some parts of the canon would have been lost forever, enhanced Baiyun guan's reputation as the guardian of the Daoist canon, and thereby of the Daoist religion.

One striking matter is that ordinary Daoists do not appear to have used the Daoist canon very much or at all; it seems to have been used even less by lay scholars, who encountered significant difficulties even accessing it, even though many were clearly interested in *Daozang* editions of rare ancient texts. During the late eighteenth century, the texts that were widely circulated were from the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 (*Complete Library of the Four Treasuries*) compiled under Qing Emperor Qianlong 乾隆 (1735-1795), supposedly a complete collection of all Qing texts. The “Four Treasuries” refer to the four traditional categories of Chinese literature, namely the Classics (*Jing* 經), the Histories, (*Shi* 史), the Philosophies (*Zi* 子) and

¹⁴⁹ *Chunchang zi zhiyu* 純常子枝語. Wen Tingshi 文廷式 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guangling keyinshe), 1990.

Anthologies (*Ji* 集). The editors of *Siku quanshu* availed themselves of the *Daozang* edition for several titles.¹⁵⁰ It is said that during the annual ceremony of airing the books (*liangjing* 晾經)—held in all major Daoist monasteries on the sixth day of the sixth lunar month—some scholars were permitted to see the physical copy of the Daoist canon, but their viewing was limited to just a glance.¹⁵¹ Texts in the canon were difficult to see with one's own eyes until the 1920s, when the project to publish the *Daozang* using the Photo Lithographic process was carried out with the financial and institutional support from the Chinese Republican-era government. In this sense, even though the Daoist canon certainly contains invaluable sources, it still seems more than a bit ironic that modern scholars try to understand the Daoist textual tradition from a collection of books that most people—both insiders and outsiders—could hardly have had access to in the past.

5.1.3 The Three Caverns and the Four Supplements

The project to restore the Daoist canon was stimulated by both the Daoists and the imperial court's steadfast commitment to achieve a complete collection, and served not only to preserve

¹⁵⁰ Goossaert, *The Taoists of Peking*, Appendix B.

¹⁵¹ Li Yangzheng, *Xinbian Baiyun guan zhi*, 516-17.

the religious or even textual inheritance of Daoism, but also primarily to define and sanction the place that Daoism occupied within the context of Chinese civilization. That western scholars refer to the *Daozang* with the term *canon* is, therefore, well justified. While this term might catch the general gist of the Buddhist canon, in which the Chinese term *Yiqiejing* 一切經 literally means “all the sūtras”, the Chinese term (i.e., *Zang* or *Cang* 藏) of the Daoist canon might simply mean “treasury” or “storehouse.” In light of the story of restoring the Daoist canon at Baiyun guan above, it seems that the process to complete the Daoist canon primarily concerned the matter of availability or scarcity of Daoist texts, rather than sorting them according to certain pre-determined categories. Consequently, any attempt to categorize Daoist texts inside the canon is presumably a scholarly construction, rather than any historical practice.

The most thorough study of the Daoist canon to date is *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*, edited by Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen. According to their study, the initial categorization of the Daoist canon had only three divisions (not coincidentally following the Buddhists’ “three baskets” or Tripitaka (*sanzang* 三藏): *Dongzhen* 洞真 (the Cavern of Perfection), *Dongxuan* (the Cavern of Mystery), and *Dongshen* (the Cavern of Divinity). At the request of the emperor to whom he presented a list of “genuine” Daoist

scriptures, this method of categorizing Daoist texts was first adopted by a Daoist master named Lu Xiuqing 陸修靜 (420-479).¹⁵² These categories, however convenient, are more than just simple tags. It turns out that “each of the primordial caverns is associated with the revelation not just of cosmic writings but of a particular groups of texts. Each of these groups, moreover, had not only, as we have seen, its particular history, but also its own characteristics.”¹⁵³ Specifically, Dongzhen is associated with Shangqing 上清 texts, which include a considerable amount of information about immortality techniques; Dongzhen is associated with Lingbao 靈寶 texts, which mainly include liturgies and ritual manuals; and Dongshen, being the lowest one in the hierarchy, contains exorcism writings related to a book called *Sanhuang wen* 三皇文 (The writing of the Three Sovereigns). As the collection of Daoist works continued to expand, especially after Zhengyi 正一 Daoism started to flourish in South China during the early Tang, a subsequent category of “four supplements” (*sifu* 四輔), namely the *Taixuan bu* 太玄部 (the Division of the Supreme Mystery), the *Taiping bu* (the Division of the Supreme Peace), the

¹⁵² Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen, eds. *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 14.

¹⁵³ *Ibid*, 15.

Taiqing bu 太清部 (the Division of the Supreme Tranquility),¹⁵⁴ and the seventh division of the *Zhengyi bu* 正一部 (the Division of the Orthodox and One), was added to the three caverns to form a new system called the “Seven Parts”. The general gist of the new four supplements seems to have been to incorporate any qualified texts that were left out by previous collections.

5.1.4 The Twelve Categories and the Thirty-Six Divisions

In order to further differentiate the voluminous Daoist books in the canon, a much more elaborate categorization of the twelve categories (*shier bu* 十二部) was produced. This system, almost certainly inspired by the twelve divisions of Buddhist Tripiṭaka, results in a total of thirty-six subdivisions (*sanshiliu fenbu* 三十六分部) when applied to each of the Three Caverns.¹⁵⁵ According to Schipper and Verellen, this system was then used persistently for all later canons, ranging from the Tang-era *Sandong qionggang* 三洞瓊綱 (*The Exquisite Compendium of the Three Caverns*) to the last *Zhengtong Daozang* preserved at Baiyun guan.¹⁵⁶

Table 1. Categories of Buddhist and Daoist Scriptures

¹⁵⁴ It is noteworthy that in the four supplements, the *Taiqing bu*—which presumably should contain similar kind of texts to *Dongzhen*—is now ranked as the third, not the first.

¹⁵⁵ See Table 1.

¹⁵⁶ Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 25-39.

	Divisions of Buddhist Tripiṭaka	Divisions of Texts in the Daoist Canon
1	Sūtra	Main texts (<i>Benwen</i>) 本文類
2	<i>geya</i> (<i>yingsong</i> 應頌)	Talismans (<i>Shenfu</i>) 神符類
3	<i>vyākaraṇa</i> (<i>shouji</i> 授記)	Commentaries (<i>Yujüe</i>) 玉訣類
4	<i>gāthā</i> (<i>jiatuo</i> 迦陀)	Diagrams and illustrations (<i>Lingtu</i>) 靈圖類
5	<i>udāna</i> (<i>zishuo</i> 自說)	Histories and genealogies (<i>Pulu</i>) 譜錄類
6	<i>nidāna</i> (<i>yinyuan</i> 因緣)	Precepts (<i>Jielü</i>) 戒律類
7	<i>avadāna</i> (<i>piyu</i> 譬喻)	Ceremonies (<i>Weiyi</i>) 威儀類
8	<i>itivr̥ttaka</i> (<i>benshi</i> 本事)	Rituals (<i>Fangfa</i>) 方法類
9	<i>jātaka</i> (<i>bensheng</i> 本生)	Practices (<i>Zhongshu</i>) 象術類
10	<i>vaipulya</i> (<i>fangdeng</i> 方等)	Biographies (i) 記傳類
11	<i>adbhuta-dharma</i> (<i>weiceng youfa</i> 未曾有法)	Hymns (<i>Zansong</i>) 讚頌類
12	<i>upadeśa</i> (<i>lunyi</i> 論議)	Memorials (<i>Biaozou</i>) 表奏類

5.2 Extra-Canonical Daoist Texts: Where do they fit?

Textual history of the Daoist canon shows that the compilation of the Daoist canon was not necessarily to produce an exclusive catalogue by claiming authenticity while silencing non-canonical texts. However, the importance of the Daoist canon demonstrated by Meng and Wanyan's efforts in retrieving the missing canonical texts was also clearly established. What are

we to make, therefore, of the non-canonical texts related to Baiyun guan that were much influential than the canonical ones during the Qing?

5.2.1 *Jin'gai xindeng*

Before dedicating himself to compiling *Jin'gai xindeng*, Min Yide (1758-1836) left his official charge as a Departmental Vice Magistrate (*zhou sima* 州司馬) after his father's death and peregrinated to multiple sites. Having finally withdrawn to Mt. Jingai in Huzhou, Zhejiang province, Min is said to have published his *Jin'gai xindeng* in eight fascicles (*juan*) for the first time in 1821 on Mt. Jin'gai. Because the woodblocks were later lost, Shen Bingcheng 沈秉成 (1823-1895), a second-generation disciple of Min, reprinted Min's work in 1873.¹⁵⁷

In his work, Min presents a list of biographies which include commentaries by the well-known scholars Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博 (1728-1814) and Bao Kun 鮑琨 (fl. 1814), both donated a significant number of rare texts to the *Siku quanshu* project, paying particular attention to the history of Longmen patriarchs and the Longmen lineage. In addition to the biographies of masters from Jiangnan (South China), *Jin'gai xindeng* is also the best source to examine the first seven generations of patriarchs who are recognized as representatives of the Longmen orthodox

¹⁵⁷ See Esposito, *Qing Daoism*, 265-8.

lineage at Baiyun guan, at its affiliated monasteries, and in subsequent Longmen branches and sub-branches. Similar to so-called lamp or flame histories (*dengshi* 燈史) in the Chinese Chan Buddhist tradition, *Jin'gai xindeng* is a text that plays the vital role of conveying an official genealogy.

5.2.2 *Lüzu sannü yishi shuoshu*

Lüzu sannü yishi shuoshu was compiled by Huang Chiyang (1595-1673), and later edited by Tao Shi'an (? -1692). Min Yide also extensively commented on this text in his work, *Du Lü zushi sannü yishi shuoshu guankui* 讀呂祖師三尼醫世說述管窺 (A Personal Reading of the Explanations of the Three Sages' Doctrine of Healing the World by Patriarch Lü).¹⁵⁸ The alchemical practice described in this text is divided into six stages and explained through the use of diagrams (*shier xiaoxi* 十二消息). This text presents, therefore, a combination of diagrams (*lingtu* 靈圖類) as well as charts for practice (*xiangshu* 象術類).

5.2.3 *Longmen xinfu*

Longmen xinfu was derived from another text called the *Biyuan tanjing* (*Platform Scripture from the Jade Garden*), a work clearly influenced by the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*

¹⁵⁸ Preface to *Lüzu sannü yishi shuoshu*, DZXB 2:1a.

(*Liuzu tanjing* 六祖壇經), Huineng (638-713). Our *Platform Scripture* consists of discourses given by Wang Changyue during an ordination ceremony held at Biyuan guan 碧苑觀 in Nanjing. *Longmen xinfu* and *Biyuan tanjing* are almost identical in content and attributed to Wang, with the exception that the names of disciples who were responsible for the record are added in *Longmen xinfu*. The preface to *Longmen xinfu* indicates that it was edited by Zhan Tailin 詹太林 (1625-1712), whereas *Biyuan taijing* was compiled by Shi Shouping 施守平 (?) and revised by Min.¹⁵⁹ However, the original copy of these two versions is a manuscript written by Wang as part of his teachings and bears the title *Xinfu zhengyan* 心法正言 (*Core Teachings and Upright Sayings*). Nevertheless, the purpose of this text seems to be to inculcate a strong desire to realize enlightenment. Here, enlightenment can be achieved through the progressive path of the so-called “great ordination precepts of Triple altar” (*santan dajie*). According to Wang, “Secular and religious teachings both are of the same spirit.”¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, “the saints who wanted to transcend the secular teachings purified the mind according to them,” and “the path for transcending the world (Daoism as religious path) becomes the royal path

¹⁵⁹ ZWDS, Vol 6, 729-85.

¹⁶⁰ Here I rely on Monica Esposito’s translation; Esposito, *Facets of Qing Daoism*, 154.

(Confucianism as secular path) for those who have the will.”¹⁶¹ Wang’s teachings may thus be regarded as a deliberate attempt to unite the dominated so-called Confucian “orthodoxy” of his time with his Longmen doctrine. Such promotion of lay ethics was designed to receive support from the ruling class, which wanted both lay people and religious devotees to follow social rules. Looking carefully, we can clearly see that these texts were intended for both lay and monastic believers and tailored by Wang to meet the needs of the ruling class.

5.2.4 *Baiyun xianbiao*

Baiyun xianbiao first presents a preface by Wanyan Chongshi 完顏崇實 (1820-1876), dated 1847, which is preceded by a preface dated 1848.¹⁶² This text’s woodblocks were originally stored at Baiyun guan. Its authors—the Baiyun guan prior Meng Yongcai and the Manchu official Wanyan Chongshi—considered it necessary to compile a hagiography of the Baiyun guan immortals. Noticeably, unlike the term *xian* (immortal) suggests, these figures were not otherworldly deities, rather they were very much alive inside the temple. One of them, for example, Transcendent Luo 羅真人 (d. 1727), was a trickster-fool figure who apparently

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 154-155.

¹⁶² Ibid, 373-45.

performed ascetic tricks in the streets of Beijing; he then went to Baiyun guan just before his death to sequester himself and passed away in meditation. Luo was honored with a funerary pagoda erected in a courtyard of the monastery, a site where visitors could devotion in contrast to the secluded abbots' cemetery.¹⁶³

5.2.5 An Alternative Explanation

The above four texts that I have briefly introduced all fall within the category of non-canonical Daoist texts. All of them, furthermore, were compiled during the Qing and, therefore, can be dated much later than the compilation of the *Zhengtong Daoist canon*. It might be perfectly logical for both monastics or lay devotees who might want to compile a legitimate collection of Daoist texts to closely follow an authoritative list of orthodox texts that would fit nicely with the categories set by the canon. Had Daoists had done this, the collection would naturally produce or engender a sense of legitimacy. However, the four texts discussed above demonstrate that no such effort was undertaken to promote them within what scholars often assume is the process by which religious texts are produced. Take, for example, the *Jin'gai xindeng*, which I also discussed in Chapter Three. It appears to have rather liberally borrowed a

¹⁶³ Ibid, 54a-b.

literary genre from Chan Buddhism; as for *Lüzü sannī yīshī shuoshu*, it is not common to see a

canonical Daoist text that features more than two of the canonical categories. No canonical

Daoist texts within the Daoist canon can be of the literary genre of *shuoshu* or inner alchemy.

The *Longmen xīnfā* is the closest one to the precepts category (*jielǜ wén* 戒律文) in the Daoist

canon, but it also contains a detailed description of an ordination ceremony, which suggests that

this one belongs to the category of ceremonies (*weiyì*). Although the *Baiyun xiānbào* certainly

belongs to an eminent genre of *bào*, or memorials, these do not appear elsewhere within the

Daoist canon.

Can we simply dismiss those non-canonical texts which do not seem to fit in the Daoist canon? At the first glance, this conclusion might seem reasonable. But, even if we look at those canonical texts that fit perfectly with the twelve categories, as Schipper and Verellen suggest we ought to, the organization of the Ming canon is still “so confused” and filled with its own retrospective views and biases.¹⁶⁴ The fact that both canonical and non-canonical Daoist texts do not justify the organization of the Ming canon, at the very least, challenges many pre-existing

¹⁶⁴ Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*, 35.

ideas about what a proper canon should look like and urges us to reexamine the nature of Daoist texts.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

6.1 Understanding Quanzhen Daoism Through Institutions and State Sponsorship

Let us return to the story about the murder of An Shilin, the abbot of Baiyun guan in Beijing in 1935. Based on this study, it seems plausible to argue that this story is not an isolated case in the history of Daoism, but reflects fierce competition among different Daoist groups (or lineages) at Baiyun guan. The dynamic behind the complex lives of Daoists in Beijing is an important religious movement that has shaped and reshaped contemporary Daoism in late imperial China—that is, Quanzhen Daoism. Contrary to many contemporary studies of Daoism, which tend to focus on Daoist beliefs, ritual practices, the Daoist canon, or scriptural revelations, this study has demonstrated that Quanzhen Daoism, and its Longmen sub-lineage were primarily centered upon institutions where this lineage could be propagated during the Qing dynasty. For this reason, Baiyun guan—and the legitimacy awarded to leading the monastery—was of vital importance for An Shilin and the Daoists who burnt him alive. However, contrary to the traditional views that An Shilin’s death had been a hall mark representing the “decline” of Daoism on the eve of

the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949,¹⁶⁵ this study has shown that institutional Daoism has been much more resilient.

In the introductory chapter of this study, I outlined two main objectives for this study. The first is to examine why the notion of lineage competition or construction is particularly important for the history of Daoism in China. As I demonstrated in Chapter Two following Mote's note, the history of Quanzhen Daoism at Baiyun guan was marked by a recurring theme of non-Han Chinese patronage, such as the Jin, Yuan, and the Qing dynasties (possibly the Tang). Although it is still unclear why Quanzhen Daoism at Baiyun guan was favored by these alien regimes, we can be almost certain to say that Quanzhen Daoism was different than other Daoist traditions in many ways. First, the transmission narratives of Daoism, and the Longmen lineage in particular, together with the material representation of Baiyun guan, have demonstrated that unlike traditional Daoist temples in which the most conspicuous figures were always deities or local gods (e.g., Lord Lao), the most central figures at Baiyun guan were Longmen patriarchs, who were living people at Baiyun guan. Second, the most distinguishing feature of Quanzhen Daoism

¹⁶⁵ See for example, Yoshioka Yoshitoyo *Dōkyō no kenkyū*, who lived within Baiyun guan from 1940-1946, returned to Japan and learned of the murder of his friend, An Shilin.

is the ordination ceremony performed at Baiyun guan. The general purpose of this grand ritual ceremony was to establish a hierarchy among Quanzhen Daoists since ordained Daoists would automatically enjoy many privileges such as *guan*, but the real purpose was to showcase a well-organized Daoist community to the imperial court, thereby possibly receiving imperial patronage.

Furthermore, the new methodological approach of this study aims to shed additional light on our current understanding of what Quanzhen Daoism is and who Quanzhen Daoists are. While the latter is largely covered by the first objective, the former, which is also the second main objective of this study, entails my contention that Quanzhen Daoism can only be understood as a reaction and adjustment to other religious traditions in China—especially Chan Buddhism, and more importantly, the imperial state. Indeed, this study has demonstrated that Quanzhen Daoism—though the term entails a sense of exclusion—was not a fixed entity. Rather, it was a hybrid tradition that actively interacted with other traditions, reinventing itself, and constantly in search of prosperity and posterity. By examining individuals, monasteries, lineages, texts, state regulations and patterns of patronage, and the overall role Daoism played within Chinese culture and society in late imperial Chinese history, Chapter Three has shown that

Quanzhen Daoism—traditionally viewed as Northern tradition (*beizong*) of Daoism during the Qing—was constructed upon a rich and complicated network that consisted of multiple Daoist groups in both the north and the south. Whereas it may seem bizarre to learn that Southern lineage groups of the Longmen lineage deliberately set up a transmission line affiliated to the North, where the so-called “barbarians” or alien regimes who ruled China once resided and hence Chinese cultural orthodoxy could not, it is hoped that this thesis has demonstrated that the primary goal of Quanzhen Daoists in the south (and the north, too) was again, to establish connections with the imperial court.

This study also presents Quanzhen Daoism as *the other* great religious tradition, alongside—but not necessarily in opposition to—the notoriously-known and well-studied case of Chinese Chan Buddhism, in imperial China based on its strong assertions about the centrality of monasteries, lineages, and ordinations. While Quanzhen Daoism strongly displayed many distinctive features that have fundamentally shaped and reshaped contemporary Daoism, its interactions with other religious traditions in China should also be taken seriously. For example, in Chapter Four, I have demonstrated that Wang Changyue’s precepts and *Quanzhen qinggui* (the Quanzhen Pure Rules)—note a different version of Pure Rules was still referenced by the

local Daoists in the An Shilin's case—have shown mere “allusions” to their Buddhist counterparts. The three more obvious examples, namely *Jin'gai xindeng*, *Tianhuang zhidao taiqing yuce* and *Xiuzhen shishu*, provided evidences of Daoist texts apparently associated with the Chan Buddhist genres of “lamp” histories, meditation or self-cultivation, and discourse records, respectively. I have also demonstrated that these texts were likely written to be read by religious outsiders, and perhaps also by some targeted insiders; they are polemical, apologetic texts intended to persuade readers that their respective tradition's teachings are genuine and authoritative. As such, Quanzhen Daoism was almost certainly not in competition with Chinese Buddhism. In other words, the most urgent task in understanding Quanzhen Daoism is not to see it as a “Daoist” tradition, but to carefully examine it as a complicated body that consists of various religious traditions in China. While it stands to reason that the Longmen lineage has heavily mirrored on Chan Buddhism, the most successfully institutionalized religious tradition in China, the interactions between the Longmen lineage and popular religion—which seemed to flourish exactly right at the time when the Longmen lineage advocated for its institutionalized identity during the Qing—still needs further research.

In order to further explore new approaches to the study of Quanzhen Daoism, in Chapter Five, I have also chosen to highlight extra-canonical sources to examine the historical context of Quanzhen Daoism. These sources, though they may not have attracted much scholarly attention, show a much more comprehensive picture of Quanzhen Daoism in the Qing period than canonical sources (i.e., the Ming Daoist canon) could otherwise provide. The fruitful outcomes produced by reading these extra-canonical sources further suggest that in the case of interpreting Daoist texts, the paradigms of canonical versus extra-canonical (or non-canonical), or authentic and apocryphal, are merely modern scholarly inventions.

6.2 The Present

Today Daoists who live in a Daoist monastery, which is very likely assured by his (or her) lineage affiliation—with proof of an ordination certificate, is still prestigious for most Daoists in China. Daoist monasteries have, of course, had to adapt to the many social, political, and economic changes that have taken place since 1949, but also since 1978. In terms of the organization of labour as the core of the new social organizational system, the Daoist monastery is not itself a “work-unit”, mainly because it does not deal with work contracts or salaries and is not involved in overseeing family planning among its members. However, the Daoist

Association (currently at Baiyun guan) serves as a “work-unit” by representing its members and enabling state involvement in monastic affairs. Daoists receive an allowance for their personal needs and medical. They must complete the residence registration formalities required of everyone in China, where the strict control of population movement has only recently been relaxed. When they first establish their home in a monastery (that is, when they receive the Daoist robe) they usually change their “residence registration” (*hukou* 戶口) from the address of their family home to that of the temple. Because the residence registration stems from the state’s desire to control migration within the country, until recently it was difficult to change one’s residence card but some categories of people have always been exempt, including Buddhist monks and Daoists. When Daoists move, they don’t have to change their residence registration. They form a special kind of network that is like a family, and this allows them to be hosted in any Daoist monasteries in the country just as if they had relatives in each town. However, a Daoist has to carry a “Daoist master’s certificate” (*daoshi zheng* 道士証). Once he has obtained this certificate from his home monastery, he does not need to obtain a new card at each monastery he visits, except for a few major *shifang* (ten-directions) monasteries (e.g., Baiyun

guan) where an ordination certificate is a *must*, even if he must leave a trail of his passage by filling out a form at each monastery visited.¹⁶⁶

6.3 Future Research

One question that remains unaddressed by this study is why was Baiyun guan generously patronized by alien regimes? While it may be accurate to say that Quanzhen Daoism received great state support because of Qiu Chuji at the beginning of the Mongol Yuan period, one of the central themes of religious culture in China shortly after Qiu's death is marked by a series of debates held at the imperial court in Beijing between Buddhists and Daoists. The subject of these debates chiefly focused on the authenticity of an infamous Daoist text, the *Laozi huahu jing* 老子化胡經 (Scripture of Laozi's Conversion of the Barbarians), in which Laozi is depicted as the founder of Daoism who travelled west to India and instructed—or even became—the Buddha. Tibetan Buddhists allegedly won these debates and consequently all Daoist books, with exception of the *Daode jing* (Book of the Way and Its Power), were officially banned and destroyed. Due to a perceived paucity of surviving textual evidence for the study of Daoism,

¹⁶⁶ For further readings on Daoism in contemporary China, especially non-institutionalized Daoism, see Ian Johnson, *The Souls of China: The Return of Religion After Mao* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2017).

contemporary scholars are either deterred from pursuing research on the topic of the history of Daoism during the Yuan period or turn their attention to other more readily available sources, such as stele inscriptions (*bei* 碑), epitaphs (*muzhi* 墓誌), and miscellaneous literary writings. Although the last and only surviving Daoist canon can only be dated back as early as the early Ming dynasty (1445), there are still many valuable, yet neglected Yuan period manuscripts that are readily accessible in Japan—where local officials (*Kentōshi* 遣唐使) and Buddhist monks curiously learned about and studied Chinese civilization from the seventh century onward. One related future research project about Quanzhen Daoism could pay more attention to the Yuan—the period when the Longmen lineage purposely claims to have been founded—and extra-canonical sources that are available in China, Japan, and beyond.

Bibliography

- Akira, Hirakawa, and Groner, Paul. *A History of Indian Buddhism: from Sakyamuni to early Mahayana*. Asian studies at Hawaii ; no. 36. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.
- “Baiyun guan chongxiu Daozang ji” 白雲觀重修道藏記 [Record of Restoration of Baiyun guan], in *Daozang jinghua lu* 道藏精華錄, 24089-90.
- Bodiford, William M., and Stanley Weinstein, eds. *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya, Essays presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- Bokenkamp, Stephen R. *Ancestors and Anxiety: Daoism and the Birth of Rebirth in China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007.
- Boltz, Judith M. “Taoism: Taoist Literature.” In Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, first edition, 14: 317-29; Lindsay Jones, ed., second edition, 4: 2202-12. New York and London: Macmillan, 1987 and 2005. University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- . *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries*, China Research Monographs, no. 32. Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley Center for Chinese Studies, 1987.
- Bretschneider, Emil, trans. “Si Yu Ki: Travels to the West of K'iu Ch'ang Ch'un,” *Medieval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co Ltd, 1888; reprinted by Routledge, 2000, vol. 1, 74.
- Campany, Robert Ford. *Signs from the Unseen Realm: Buddhist Miracle Tales from Early Medieval China*, Kuroda Institute Series in East Asian Buddhism, University of Hawaii Press, 2012.
- . “On the Very Idea of Religions (In the Modern West and in Early Medieval China)”, *History of Religions* 42.4 (2003).
- Chau, Adam Yuet, ed. *Religion in Contemporary China: Revitalization and Innovation*. New York: Routledge Press, 2011.
- Chen Guofu 陳國符. *Daozang yuanliu kao* 道藏源流考. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014.
- Chen Yuan 陳垣, ed. *Daojia jinsh lue* 道家金石略. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1988.
- Daotong yuanliu zhi* 道統源流志 [Gazetteer on the Origins and Development of Daoist Orthodoxy], Wuxi: Zhonghua yinshuju 中華印書局, 1922.

- Dardess, John W. *Conquerors and Confucians: Aspects Political Change in Late Yuan China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Ding Peiren 丁培仁. "Jin 'gai xindeng juan yi zhiyi 金蓋心燈卷一質疑", *Daojia wenhua yuanjiu 道家文化源流*, 2008, vol. 23, 411-29.
- Elman, Benjamin. *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000.
- Esposito, Monica. *Facets of Qing Daoism*, Wil/Paris: UniversityMedia, 2014.
- , *Creative Daoism*, Wil/Paris: UniversityMedia, 2013.
- Faure, Bernard. *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, trans. Phyllis Brooks (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 1997).
- Foulk, T. Griffith. "Chanyuan Qinggui and Other 'Rules of Purity' in Chinese Buddhism." In *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 275-312. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . "'Rules of Purity' in Japanese Zen." In *Zen Classics: Formative Texts in the History of Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale Stuart Wright, 137-70. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Goossaert, Vincent. "Yulu Recorded Sayings," *The Encyclopedia of Taoism*, ed. By Fabrizio Pregadio, vol.2, 1200-1202. London: Routledge, 2008.
- . *The Taoists of Peking, 1800-1949: A Social History of Urban Clerics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007
- . and Paul R. Katz, "Special Issue: New Perspectives on Quanzhen Taoism. The Formation of Religious Identity", *Journal of Chinese Religions*, 2001. Fabrizio Pregadio, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Taoism*. London: Routledge, 2007, 814.
- . "The Invention of an Order: Collective Identity in Thirteenth- Century Quanzhen Taoism," *Journal of Chinese Religions* 29 (2001): 111- 138.
- Gregory, Peter N. and Ebrey, Patricia Buckley. "The Religious and Historical Landscape" in *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, ed. Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993.
- Groner, Paul. "The Fan-wang ching and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku." In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 251-90. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawai'i, 1990.
- Hucker, Charles. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford

- University Press, 1985.
- Igarashi, Kenryū 五十嵐賢隆. *Daojiao conglin taiqinggong zhi* 道教叢林太清宮志, Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2015. Translated by Guo Xiaofeng and Wang Jing.
- Johnson, Ian. *The Souls of China: The Return of Religion After Mao*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2017.
- Kohn, Livia. *Cosmos and Community: The Ethical Dimension of Daoism*. Cambridge, Mass: Three Pines Press, 2004.
- . “Monastic Rules in Quanzhen Daoism: As Collected by Heinrich Hackmann,” *Monumenta Serica*, 2003, 367-97.
- and Russel Kirkland, “Daoism in the Tang (618-907)”, in *Daoism Handbook*, ed. Livia Kohn. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Kyoko, Tokuno. "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues." In *Chinese Buddhist apocrypha*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990.
- Lagerwey, John, ed. *Religion and Chinese Society: The Transformation of a Field*. Paris: Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient; and Hongkong: Chinese University Press, 2004.
- Lai, Chi-tim. “Daoism and Political Rebellion during the Eastern Jin Dynasty”, in *Politics and Religion in Ancient and Medieval Europe and China*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1999.
- Li, Yangzheng 李養正. *Xinbian Beijing Baiyun guan zhi* 新編北京白雲觀志. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2003.
- Li, Zhichang 李志常. *Changchun zhenren xiyou ji* 長春真人西遊記 DZ 973.
- Liu Xun and Goossaert, Vincent, eds. *Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500-2010*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Liu Yi 刘屹. 论 20 世纪敦煌道教文献研究, 敦煌吐鲁番研, 7 卷. 北京: 中华书局, 2004.
- Luo Dekun 羅德昆. (*Daoguang*) *Shinanfu zhi* (道光)施南府志. Enshi: Enshi diqu bowuguan, 1982.
- McRae, John R. *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Min Yide 閔一得. *Gushu yinlou cangshu* 古書隱樓藏書. Wuxing: Jin'gai Chunyang gong cangban, 1904.
- Mori Yuria 森由利亞. “Zenshinkyō ryūmonha keifu kō” 全真龍門派系譜考, in *Dōkyō bunka*

- kenkyūkai ed., *Dōkyō bunka e no tenbō* 道教文化のへ展望 [Perspectives on Daoist Culture]. Tokyo: Hirakawa, 1994.
- Mote, Frederick W. *Imperial China, 900-1800*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Naquin, Susan. *Peking: Temples and City Life, 1400-1900*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Oyanagi Shigeta 小柳司気太. *Hakuunkan shi* 白雲觀志, Tokyo: Tōhō bunka gakuin Tokyo kenkyūjo, 1934.
- Prasenjit, Duara. *Culture, Power, and the State: Rural North China, 1900-1942*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Pregadio, Fabrizio. *Taoist Internal Alchemy and the Awakening to Reality (Wuzhen pian)*. Mountain View: Golden Elixir Press, 2009.
- Qing Xitai 卿希泰 et al., eds. *Zhongguo daojiao* 中國道教, 100-103, 126-127, 151-153. Shanghai: Zhishi chubanshe, 1994.
- (ed.), *Zhongguo daojiao shi* 中國道教史 [A History of Daoism in China], Chengdu: Chengdu Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 1988-1995.
- Robson, James. "Brushes with Some "Dirty Truths": Handwritten Manuscripts and Religion in China," *History of Religions* 51, no. 4 (2012): 324-26.
- Schopen, Gregory. "Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism." In *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*, 7-22. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.
- . "Burial *Ad Sanctos* and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archeology of Religions." *Religion* 17 (1987): 193-225.
- . "The Good Monk and his Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of "The Mahāyāna Period"." *The Eastern Buddhist* n.s. 32, no. 1 (2000): 85-105.
- . "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Muulasarvaastivaadin Monasticism." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19, no. 1 (Summer 1996 1996): 81-126.
- . "The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two *Vinayas*." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17, no. 2 (Winter 1994): 145-74.
- . "Redeeming Bugs, Birds, and Really Bad Sinners in Some Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtras

- and Dhāraṇīs." In *Sins and Sinners: Perspectives from Asian Religions*, edited by Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, 276-94. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Schipper, Kristofer and Verellen, Franciscus, eds. *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Schipper, Kristofer. "Purity and Strangers: Shifting Boundaries in Medieval Taoism," *T'oung-pao*, 80, 1994, 61-81.
- Schlütter, Morten. *How Zen became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song- dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.
- Seidel, Anna. "Imperial Treasures and Taoist Sacraments: Taoist Roots in Apocrypha", in *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R.A. Stein*, ed. by Michel Strickmann 216-318. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, 1982.
- Skar, Lowell. "Administering Thunder: A Thirteenth Century Memorial deliberating the Thunder Rites," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 9, 1997.
- Storch, Tanya. *The History of Chinese Buddhist Bibliography: Censorship and Transformation of the Tripiṭaka*. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2014.
- Strickmann, Michel. "The Thunder Rites of the Sung: Notes on the Shen-hsiao Order and the Southern School of Taoism," *Tōhō shūkyō 東方宗教* 46 (1975); *Mantras et mandarins: le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*, Bibliothèque des sciences humaines. Paris: Gallimard, 1996.
- . *Chinese Magical Medicine*. Bernard Faure, ed. Standford, CA: Standford University Press, 1996.
- . "Saitly Fools and Chinese Masters (Holy Fools)". *Asian Major*, vol. 3, 1994.
- . "The Longest Taoist Scriputre", *History of Religions*, 1979, 331-354.
- Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭, and et al., eds. *Taishō shinshū dai zōkyō 大正新脩大藏經*. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924-1935.
- ter Haar, Barend. *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992; paperback edition: Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- Twitchett, Denis, ed. *Sui and T'ang China, 589-906 Part I*, vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of China*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

- Waley, Arther, trans. *The Travels of an Alchemist: The Journey of the Taoist Ch'ang-Ch'un from China to the Hindu Kush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1931.
- Wang Ka 王卡 and Wang Guiping 汪桂平, eds. *Sandong shiyi* 三洞拾遺, Hefei: Huangshan shushe 黃山書社, 2005.
- Wang Mingqing 王明清. *Huichen lu* 揮塵錄, c.13th century. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1934.
- Wang Pu 王溥. *Tang huiyao* 唐會要, c. 10th century. Taipei: Shijie shuju, 1963.
- Wang Zhizhong 王志忠. *Ming-Qing Quanzhen dao jiao lun gao* 明清全真道教論稿, Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2000.
- Wen Tingshi 文廷式, ed. *Chunchang zi zhiyu* 純常子枝語.. Nanjing: Jiangsu guangling keyinshe 江蘇廣陵刻印社, 1990.
- . ed., *Index of Zhengtong Daozang*. Mountain View, CA: Golden Elixir Press, 2008.
- . “Zenshinkyō ryūmonha keifu kō” 全真龍門派系譜考, in Dōkyō bunka kenkyūkai (ed.), *Dōkyō bunka e no tenbō* 道教文化のへ展望. Tokyo: Hirakawa, 1994.
- William, Bodiford. “Remembering Dōgen: Eiheiiji and Dōgen Hagiography,” *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 2006, 1-21.
- Wu, Jiang. *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-century China*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- , *Leaving for the Rising Sun: Chinese Zen Master Yinyuan & the Authenticity Crisis in Early Modern East Asia* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Yifa. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China : an Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan qinggui*. Classics in East Asian Buddhism. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.
- Yin Zhihua 尹志華. “Beijing Baiyun guan cang Longmen chuanjie puxi chutan 北京白雲觀藏龍門傳戒譜系初探” [A Preliminary Study on the Ordination Lineage of the Longmen at Baiyun guan in Beijing], *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究, 2009, 72-82.
- Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豊. *Dōkyō no kenkyū* 道教の研究. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1952.
- Yu Minzhong 于敏中, *Qinding Rixia jiuwenkao* 钦定日下舊聞考, 1785, reprint. Beijing: Beijing guji chubanshe, 1985.
- Yuan yitong zhi* 元一統志. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004.
- Zhang Xiuhua 張修華. “Wo he Tianhou gong” 我和天后宮. *Tianjin wenshi ziliao xuanji* 天津

文史資料選輯 19, 158-207.

Zhu Yueli 朱越利. *Daojing zonglun* 道經總論. Shenyang: Liaoning Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 1992.