

Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500–2010



Edited by Xun Liu and
Vincent Goossaert

CHINA RESEARCH MONOGRAPH 70

Notes to this edition

This is an electronic edition of the printed book. Minor corrections may have been made within the text; new information and any errata appear on the current page only.

China Research Monograph 70

Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500-2010

Xun Liu and Vincent Goossaert, editors

ISBN-13: 978-1-55729-159-2 (electronic)

ISBN-13: 978-1-55729-107-3 (print)

ISBN-10: 1-55729-107-1 (print)

Please visit the IEAS Publications website at
<http://ieas.berkeley.edu/publications/>
for more information and to see our catalogue.

Send correspondence and manuscripts to
Katherine Lawn Chouta, Managing Editor
Institute of East Asian Studies
1995 University Avenue, Suite 510H
Berkeley, CA 94720-2318 USA
ieaseditor@berkeley.edu



**Institute of
East Asian Studies**
University of California, Berkeley

May 2015

CHINA RESEARCH MONOGRAPH 70

CENTER FOR CHINA STUDIES

Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500–2010

Edited by
Xun Liu and Vincent Goossaert



**Institute of
East Asian Studies**
University of California, Berkeley

A publication of the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley. Although the institute is responsible for the selection and acceptance of manuscripts in this series, responsibility for the opinions expressed and for the accuracy of statements rests with their authors.

The China Research Monograph series is one of several publication series sponsored by the Institute of East Asian Studies in conjunction with its constituent units. The others include the Korea Research Monograph series, the Japan Research Monograph series, and the Research Papers and Policy Studies series.

Send correspondence and manuscripts to

Katherine Lawn Chouta, Managing Editor
Institute of East Asian Studies
2223 Fulton Street, 6th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94720-2318
ieaseditor@berkeley.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese society and culture, 1500-2010 / edited by Xun Liu and Vincent Goossaert.

pages cm. -- (China research monograph ; 70)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN-13: 978-1-55729-107-3 (alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 1-55729-107-1 (alk. paper)

1. Quan zhen jiao--History. 2. Taoism--China--History. 3. Taoism--Rituals--History. I. Liu, Xun, 1959- II. Goossaert, Vincent.

BL1943.C55L65 2013

299.5'149--dc23

2013028704

Copyright © 2013 by the Regents of the University of California.

Printed in the United States of America.

All rights reserved.

Cover design: Mindy Chen

Contents

Contributors	ix
Acknowledgments	xi
Conventions	xiii
Introduction	1
<i>Xun Liu and Vincent Goossaert</i>	

PART 1. MAKING QUANZHEN IDENTITIES

1 Quanzhen, What Quanzhen? Late Imperial Daoist Clerical Identities in Lay Perspective <i>Vincent Goossaert</i>	19
2 The Invention of a Quanzhen Canon: The Wondrous Fate of the <i>Daozang jiyao</i> <i>Monica Esposito</i>	44
3 A Late Qing Blossoming of the Seven Lotus: Hagiographic Novels about the Qizhen <i>Vincent Durand-Dastès</i>	78
4 Globalizing Daoism at Huashan: Quanzhen Monks, <i>Danwei</i> Politics, and International Dream Trippers <i>David A. Palmer</i>	113

PART 2. QUANZHEN TEXTUAL AND RITUAL PRODUCTIONS

5 Quanzhen and Longmen Identities in the Works of Wu Shouyang <i>Paul G. G. Van Enckevoort</i>	141
6 Being Local through Ritual: Quanzhen Appropriation of Zhengyi Liturgy in the <i>Chongkan Daozang jiyao</i> <i>Mori Yuria</i>	171

7	Quanzhen Daoism and Ritual Medicine: A Study of “Thirteen Sections of <i>Zhuyou</i> Medicine from the Yellow Emperor Inscription” <i>Fang Ling</i>	208
---	---	-----

PART 3. QUANZHEN DAOISTS AND LOCAL SOCIETY

8	A Local Longmen Lineage in Late Ming–Early Qing Yunnan <i>Richard G. Wang</i>	235
9	Quanzhen Proliferates Learning: The Xuanmiao Temple, Clerical Activism, and the Modern Reforms in Nanyang, 1880s–1940s <i>Xun Liu</i>	269
10	Temple and Household Daoists: Notes from North China <i>Stephen Jones</i>	308
	Bibliography	335
	Index	369

Contributors

Vincent Durand-Dastès
Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Paris

Monica Esposito[†]
Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University

Vincent Goossaert
Ecole pratique des hautes études

Stephen Jones
School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London

Fang Ling
Groupe Sociétés, Religions, Laïcités (CNRS-EPHE)

Xun Liu
Department of History, Rutgers University

David A. Palmer
Department of Sociology, Hong Kong University

Paul G. G. van Enckevort
Institute for Area Studies, Leiden University

Richard G. Wang
Department of African and Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Florida

Mori Yuria
Asian Area Cultural Studies, Waseda University

Acknowledgments

Several institutions and many people have played vital roles in bringing forth this book. We gratefully acknowledge their contributions here. The Center for Chinese Studies of the Institute of East Asian Studies (IEAS) at the University of California, Berkeley, Groupe Sociétés, Religions, Laïcités (GSRL) of Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE) and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) in Paris, and the “Temples, Urban Society and Taoists” project (funded by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange and Agence Nationale de la Recherche, France) provided the funding support for the conference titled “Quanzhen Daoism in Chinese Culture and Society” held at UC Berkeley, November 1–4, 2007. Dr. Kevin O’Brien, then director of the Center for Chinese Studies, and Prof. Phillippe Portier, director of GSRL, both deserve our special thanks for recognizing the academic value of our proposed conference project. In the end, eight of the present ten chapters were selected from the sixteen papers presented at the Berkeley conference, while most of the other presented papers have since been published in scholarly journals.

We would like to acknowledge the other presenters at the Berkeley conference for their contributions: Stephen Eskildsen of University of Tennessee, Chattanooga; Fan Guangchun 樊光春 of Shaanxi Provincial Academy of Social Sciences in Xi’an; Mei Li 梅莉 of Huazhong Normal University in Wuhan; Guo Wu 郭武 of Sichuan University in Chengdu; Kang Xiaofei 康曉菲 of George Washington University; Lai Chi-tim 黎志添 of the Chinese University of Hong Kong; Wu Yakui 吳亞魁, independent scholar, Philadelphia; Yau Chi-on 游子安 of the Chinese University of Hong Kong; and Zhang Guangbao 張廣保 of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing.

We are indebted to the discussants—Raoul Birnbaum, Philip Clart, Eugene Cooper, David Johnson, Richard Madsen, Paul Katz, Terry Kleeman, Susan Naquin, and Robert Sharf—who all raised probing questions and made insightful comments at the conference. We are particularly grateful

for the detailed and useful suggestions for editing that Raoul Birnbaum, Philip Clart, Paul Katz, and Sue Naquin each prepared for us after the conference. In addition, we would like to thank the two anonymous manuscript reviewers for IEAS whose questions and suggestions have also helped us improve the book.

We thank Paul G.G. Van Enckevort of Leiden University and Stephen Jones of SOAS who both joined the project after the conference. Their additions to the volume have greatly enriched its content. Several other colleagues have contributed to the volume's publication. We gratefully acknowledge their assistance: Ms. Tessara Thompson for her able English language editing at an early stage; Dr. David Palmer of Hong Kong University for providing the funds for the translation; and Dr. QIN Guoshuai 秦國帥 of Shandong Normal University, currently a postdoctoral fellow at Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes in Paris, for his painstaking efforts in preparing the index. Ms. Mindy Chen at UC Berkeley designed a poignant cover.

Finally, this volume would not have seen its day of publication without the superb and professional editorial guidance and assistance provided by Mrs. Katherine Lawn Chouta, the managing editor of IEAS, and her able colleague, Ms. Keila Diehl. Kate Chouta worked tirelessly throughout the whole editorial process, providing guidance and professional help nearly all the way to the birth of her own child. After a much deserved yet short maternity leave, Kate got right back to seeing the edited volume to its final production. To Kate's dedication and professionalism, and to her able staff, we owe a great debt of gratitude.

XL and VG

Conventions

Daozang editions are listed by their number in Kristofer Schipper and Franciscus Verellen, eds. *The Taoist Canon: A Historical Companion to the Daozang*. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Key passages from the original sources are provided in Chinese characters without pinyin romanization.

Introduction

XUN LIU AND VINCENT GOOSSAERT

We dedicate the present volume to the memory of Monica Esposito (1962–2011), a dear friend and well-respected colleague of our community. The sad news of Monica’s passing in Kyoto reached us just as we were completing the editing of the present volume for final submission to the press in March 2011. In our fast-expanding field of Quanzhen Daoist studies and Chinese religion over the last twenty years, Monica is one of the few leading figures whose scholarship written in Chinese, Japanese, English, Italian, and French not only covers various aspects of Daoist modern history but has also helped shape the scholarly discourse and debates in the field. She was a much respected and loved member of the group that met at a conference in Berkeley in the fall of 2007, and her paper at the conference helped advance and deepen our discussion and understanding of the various dimensions of Quanzhen Daoism and its connections to Chinese society. She worked diligently with us to bring forth this volume to readers. Thus, on this happy occasion of its publication, it is only fitting and proper that we as coeditors and authors honor in loving memory Monica Esposito.

* * *

Quanzhen Daoism appeared around 1170 in North China under the Jürchen Jin 金 empire (1115–1234), as one among a number of new Daoist movements founded by charismatic leaders teaching self-cultivation techniques, healing arts, and other rituals.¹ The Quanzhen was founded by Wang Zhe 王嘉 (*hao* Chongyang 重陽; 1113–1170), but the movement gained rapid development and expansion under the leadership of his disciples, notably Qiu Chuji 邱處機 (*hao* Changchun 長春; 1148–1227), who reorganized it into a centralized ascetic order with himself as patriarch.

¹ Good introductions to the early history of Quanzhen include Chen Yuan, *Nan Song chu Hebei xin Daojiao kao*; Goossaert and Katz, “Special Section”; Komjathy, *Cultivating Perfection*; Marsone, “Accounts.”

It was recognized as an independent order both by the state and by other Daoists. Quanzhen rose to fame when the Mongol emperor Genghis Khan summoned Qiu for an audience in 1223 and granted him extensive privileges and a leading role in supervising Daoist affairs in North China. Ever since, Qiu has been hailed for his successful plea for the Mongol emperor to stop the alleged slaughter of millions of Chinese living in North China; so were his disciples for attenuating the impact of the Mongol invasion and safeguarding Chinese culture in the traumatic decades of the Mongol conquest of North China in the early thirteenth century. Under the leadership of Qiu and his successors, Quanzhen built up a large network composed of major monasteries that served as training centers and thousands of smaller temples throughout the region. This network later expanded to South China during the thirteenth century. During the Jin and Yuan periods (1260–1368), except for a few setbacks, the newly established Quanzhen Daoism not only developed close ties with the Jürchen and Mongol courts, but its extensive monastic network also became intimately woven into the fabric of the Jin and Yuan societies, patronized by both the elite and the commoners.² To this day, it remains a nationwide religious institution, even though its presence is unevenly distributed throughout China.

Official recognition of Quanzhen Daoism, and a distinction between the Quanzhen and Zhengyi Daoist orders, continued to be sanctioned under the governments of the Ming, the Qing, the Republic, and the People's Republic. Its fortunes waned and waxed under the various regimes. During the Ming, Quanzhen institutions were largely under Zhengyi supervision, but they did maintain their distinct network of temples and lineages in discrete places where they continued to be part of the social and cultural landscape, attracting royal patrons, literati clients, and commoners as their followers (as shown in the chapters by Richard Wang and Paul van Enckevort herein). Beginning around the middle of the seventeenth century, Quanzhen underwent a process of revival (and, arguably, reinvention) and built a new independent network of large monasteries and small temples. Throughout the Qing, this network of temples constituted a significant component of the Chinese religious, social, and cultural landscape. During the turbulent political and social upheavals of the twentieth century, Quanzhen Daoism, together with Zhengyi Daoist organizations, had to adapt to the new challenges of the times. With the Zhengyi Daoists, Quanzhen Daoists evolved to form national Daoist organizations, culminating in the establishment of the Daojiao xiehui 道教協會, the National

² Yao Tao-chung, "Ch'üan-chen"; Zheng Suchun, *Quanzhenjiao*; Yao Congwu, "Yuan Qiu Chuji nianpu"; Hachiya Kunio, *Kin-Gen jidai no dōkyō*; Goossaert, "La création du taoïsme moderne."

ONE

Quanzhen, What Quanzhen?

Late Imperial Daoist Clerical Identities in Lay Perspective

VINCENT GOOSSAERT

Virtually all studies on late imperial and modern Daoism (including mine¹) begin with a blanket statement that Daoists were divided between two orders (or schools, or sects),² namely, Quanzhen 全真 and Zhengyi 正一/乙. But were they?

There is no denying that the Quanzhen and Zhengyi institutions—primarily ordination systems—were very real and important. If we work, as scholars of Daoism usually do, with internal sources, that is, books written by Quanzhen or Zhengyi Daoists to describe or prescribe themselves, then the bipartition is plainly in evidence. But, how would a late imperial layperson have described Daoism? Would s/he have begun with that bipartition? Would s/he have deemed it important? Would s/he have even been aware of it? This chapter questions the importance and relevance of the category “Quanzhen” for those late imperial (focusing on the mid and late Qing) persons who were not Daoists but dealt with Daoists, as

¹ See, e.g., Goossaert, “Quanzhen Clergy,” for a description of Quanzhen clerical identity primarily based on internal (Daoist) sources.

² I favor “order” as a way to translate Quanzhen Daoists’ understanding of Quanzhen, but I keep the cumbersome “order/sect/school” phrasing here so as to leave the meaning of the Quanzhen category totally open for interpretation.

I am very grateful to the discussants and other participants in the Berkeley conference for their comments on my early draft of this article, and to Xun Liu for innumerable suggestions and for his friendship. Research for this article was conducted in the framework of the Temples and Taoists Project (2007–2010), funded by the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche, France) and the CCKF (Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange); see the project website at <http://www.gsrl.cnrs.fr/taoist-and-temple/>.

TWO

The Invention of a Quanzhen Canon

The Wondrous Fate of the Daozang jiyao

MONICA ESPOSITO[†]

While working in these recent years on an international project about the *Daozang jiyao* 道藏輯要, or *Essentials of the Daoist Canon*, I was struck to see how scholars of the past and present have constructed theories about this last “Daoist Canon” of the Qing dynasty (Jiaqing era, 1796–1820).¹ Interestingly, these theories are mostly unsupported by available textual materials. The *Daozang jiyao* lends itself to multiple interpretations, but even basic data are disputed. Today, scholars are still confused about its editorship, the number of its editions, and the texts this collection contains.² Recently the *Daozang jiyao* has also acquired a specific identity as a “Quanzhen Canon,” but this is only the last phase of what I call its “wondrous fate.”

¹ This study has been done in the framework of the Daozang Jiyao Project (www.daozangjiyao.org) supported by the CCKF (Chiang-Ching Kuo Foundation, Taiwan) and Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). An abridged and simplified version of this study was published in Chinese: Esposito, “Yibu Quanzhen Daozang.” I am grateful to Susan Naquin and Raoul Birnbaum, both discussants at the 2007 conference in Berkeley, for having pointed out the necessity of defining the term “canon” for the *Daozang jiyao*, and to Terry Kleeman for his comments on my paper recognizing that it was the first time that the continuity of the Quanzhen identity was questioned in the domain of modern Quanzhen studies. My thanks also go to Xun Liu for his precious comments and suggestions in editing this chapter, to Vincent Goossaert for his help in refining it, and to my husband Urs App for reading earlier drafts of it and making me aware of the studies of Robert Sharf and William Bodiford on Japanese Zen lineages that offer interesting parallels with Quanzhen history and its identity.

² See Esposito, “*Daozang jiyao* ji qi bianzuan de lishi.” Thanks to the permission of Professor Liao Hongchang 廖宏昌, this paper is available on the website of the Daozang Jiyao Project.

THREE

A Late Qing Blossoming of the Seven Lotus

Hagiographic Novels about the Qizhen 七真

VINCENT DURAND-DASTÈS

Quanzhen 全真 teachings have played a significant role in the history of Chinese vernacular novels, or *tongsu xiaoshuo* 通俗小說. The most illustrious example is the importance of Quanzhen themes in the sixteenth-century masterwork *Xiyouji* 西遊記,¹ long attributed to Quanzhen Patriarch Qiu Changchun 丘長春 himself,² and later even commentated as a Quanzhen scripture by Qing dynasty Daoists such as Liu Yiming 劉一明 (1734–ca. 1820).³ Besides, Quanzhen Daoists, as studied by Vincent Goossaert in this volume, are alluded to, or directly appear, in a significant number of Ming and Qing vernacular novels. However, Wang Chongyang and his disciples, the Qizhen 七真, or “Seven Perfected,” hardly appeared as a group until late in the history of vernacular literature. Though it cannot be ruled out that a Ming novella about them existed, it was only at the end of the Qing dynasty that the Qizhen were chosen as the subject of several extant vernacular hagiographies.

This chapter will focus on the late Qing revival of vernacular hagiographies through hagiographic novels about Quanzhen’s patriarchs. One common feature of these hagiographies is that they are not canonical texts: they often take some liberty with the scriptural “truth,” and, in doing so, have sometimes stirred up anger within religious circles. However, as representatives of the *tongsu xiaoshuo* genre, with its long didactic tradition,

¹ Liu Ts’un-yan, “Quanzhenjiao he xiaoshuo *Xiyouji*.” For recent readings of the *Xiyouji* as an inner alchemy (*neidan* 內丹) allegory, see Wang Guoguang, *Xiyouji bielun*; Wang Gang, “*Xiyouji*.” For a good summary of the interpretation and reception of the *Xiyouji* throughout history, see Wang Ping, “Lun *Xiyouji* yuanzhi.”

² Widmer, “Hsi-yu Cheng-tao shu.”

³ Yu, “Liu I-Ming on How to Read the *Hsi-yu chi*.”

FOUR

Globalizing Daoism at Huashan

*Quanzhen Monks, Danwei Politics,
and International Dream Trippers*

DAVID A. PALMER

Introduction

What happens when groups of Western Daoists go back to the “roots” of Daoism in China and meet with “real” Chinese Daoists? Does the encounter change them? Does it change the Chinese Daoists? This chapter is part of a study of a moment in the globalization of Daoism: a moment in which, having expanded to the West through the emigration of masters, a Daoism adapted to Western values and culture returns to China, bringing the process full circle. This is the moment when Daoism becomes truly “global”—after its outward dissemination and acculturation in various countries, in which the link between the indigenous “root” and the foreign “seed” becomes increasingly tenuous with the passage of time and divergent trajectories in China and abroad, a new stage begins in which a more mature Westernized Daoism returns to China, not only to connect with its roots, but also to bring something new to its ancestral soil. How does the mother respond to her long-lost child, who returns with the assertiveness and brimming self-confidence of a grown youth?

This chapter is part of a joint research project conducted with Elijah Siegler—see Siegler and Palmer, *Dream Trippers*. In addition to Siegler’s contributions (“Chinese Traditions”; “Back to the Pristine”; “Daoism beyond Modernity”), other essays compare the construction of sacred space by Chinese and American pilgrims and spiritual tourists to Huashan (Palmer, “Transnational Sacralities”), and the constructions of body, self, and subjectivity by Chinese and American meditators at the mountain (Palmer, “Care of the Self”). The financial support of the London School of Economics and Political Science and the French Centre for Research on Contemporary China is gratefully acknowledged. My thanks are extended to Michael Winn, Fan Guangchun, and Daoist Masters Hu, Hao and Wen (pseudonyms) for their invaluable collaboration with this project.

Quanzhen and Longmen Identities in the Works of Wu Shouyang

PAUL G. G. VAN ENCKEVORT

The best known Quanzhen author of the end of the Ming dynasty is Wu Shouyang 伍守陽 (1574–1644?; *hao* Chongxuzi 沖虛子, “Master Who Permeates the Void”), who explicitly claimed to be a lineage holder of the Longmen branch of Quanzhen. Wu’s importance can be seen from the continuous republications of his works up to today and their inclusion in the *Daozang jiyao* 道藏輯要 and many other collectanea. Yet, although he is often quoted as an influential Quanzhen writer on self-cultivation theory, his identity as a “Quanzhen Daoist” has not been much explored. In this chapter, I will make use of the writings by him and attributed to him to explore how Daoist identity and Quanzhen identity are defined, used, and appropriated in various social and intellectual contexts.

Specifically, in this chapter I will examine how the Longmen branch and the Quanzhen tradition are represented in Wu’s writings. In the first part, we will look at how Wu uses the various names for the Quanzhen tradition—“Quanzhen 全真,” “Northern lineage” (Beizong 北宗), and “Golden Lotus orthodox lineage” (Jinlian zhengzong 金蓮正宗)—as well as how he uses the name “Longmen 龍門.” In the second part, we will look at how Wu presents the early figures of the Quanzhen school in his works by examining some passages that concern Wang Chongyang 王重陽 (1113–1170) and Qiu Changchun 邱長春 (1148–1227). In the third part, we will look at some passages in Wu’s works that discuss various aspects

This chapter presents part of my Ph.D. research project on Wu Shouyang and his legacy that is being conducted at the Leiden Institute of Area Studies under the guidance of Barend ter Haar. I thank Vincent Goossaert and Xun Liu for their many useful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

Being Local through Ritual

Quanzhen Appropriation of Zhengyi Liturgy in the Chongkan Daozang jiyao

MORI YURIA

When I visited the Qingyanggong 青羊宮 in Chengdu, Sichuan, in the autumn of 2005, I found three Daoist ritual manuals that I had never seen before: namely, the *Yayiji* 雅宜集, the *Xinxiang miaoyu* 心香妙語, and the *Lingbao wenjian* 靈寶文檢. These three ritual manuals were compiled by Quanzhen Daoists living in western Sichuan during the Qing dynasty (1644–1911). To my surprise, on the central column of each page there were Chinese characters standing for the title of the *Daozang jiyao* 道藏輯要. It is well known that the Qingyanggong preserved the recarved printing blocks of the famed Qing Daoist collection at the Erxian'an 二仙菴 (a temple adjoining the Qingyanggong) before the Cultural Revolution. However, these three books are not included in the widely circulated version of the *Chongkan Daozang jiyao* 重刊道藏輯要 published by Xinwenfeng Press in 1986, nor recorded in the *Catalogue of the Newly Added Daoist Scriptures in the Daozang jiyao* (*Daozang jiyao xinzheng Daojing mulu* 道藏輯要新增道經目錄) compiled by Weng Dujian 翁獨建.¹

Another surprising aspect of these three manuals is that they contain various documents related to ritual services for local communities. If we employ the Quanzhen 全真/Zhengyi 正一 division, we might be able to

¹ On the extra books added to the *Chongkan Daozang jiyao*, see also Zhao Zongcheng, "Daozang jiyao de bianzuan." The three ritual manuals are also not in his list of the books newly included in the *Chongkan Daozang jiyao* (pp. 462–463). Although he does not refer to our three books, he admits (p. 462, n. 1) that we cannot regard his list of titles as comprehensive because there is a difference between the number of books recorded in He Longxiang's *Catalogue of the Extra Books* and those recorded in the table of contents of the *zhengwen* 正文 of the *Chongkan Daozang jiyao*. The finding at the Qingyanggong proves that Zhao's observation was correct.

SEVEN

Quanzhen Daoism and Ritual Medicine:

A Study of "Thirteen Sections of Zhuyou Medicine from the Yellow Emperor Inscription"

FANG LING

Scholarship on Chinese medicine and Daoism has long recognized the close relationship between the two and the importance accorded by Daoists to medical practice, but it still suffers from misunderstanding and even prejudice. Many scholars continue to believe that *zhuyou* 祝由, the ritual practice of using talismans, incantations, and exorcistic rites to "conjure away the cause of illness," is the preserve of Zhengyi Daoists, whereas Quanzhen Daoists devoted themselves entirely to self-cultivation and only used drugs and inner alchemical methods in healing. Yet, it seems unlikely that the two Daoist orders' approaches to medical treatment can be so different. Although some scholars have drawn attention to how Yuan-period Quanzhen Daoists treated illnesses with ritual means, including conducting large *zhai* 齋 retreats and *jiao* 醮 communal rituals, and administering talismanic water (*fushui* 符水) to patients,¹ we still lack a comprehensive study on Quanzhen Daoist ritual medical practices. To what extent do Quanzhen Daoists use ritual healing, and *zhuyou* rites in particular?

This chapter analyzes the basic, and hitherto unstudied, manual for *zhuyou* healing: "Thirteen Sections of *Zhuyou* Medicine from the Yellow Emperor Inscription" ("Xuanyuan beiji yixue zhuyou shisanke 軒轅碑記醫學祝由十三科"; hereafter "Thirteen Sections"), which is still circulated and used in modern times. I will show that this important text was disseminated by Quanzhen Daoists. Then, drawing on other sources such as stele inscriptions and Daoist genealogies, I will sketch out the use of

A version of this chapter was published as Fang Ling, "Quanzhendao yu Zhuyou."

¹ Zheng Suchun, *Quanzhenjiao yu Da Mengguguo dishi*, 101–104; Gai Jianmin, "Quanzhendao," 461–462.

A Local Longmen Lineage in Late Ming–Early Qing Yunnan

RICHARD G. WANG

Recent study of Ming–Qing Daoism has questioned the genealogies of the so-called Longmen orthodox lineage (Longmen zhengzong 龍門正宗) centered on the White Cloud Monastery (Baiyun Temple) in Beijing as described in such major Qing Daoist sources of Longmen history as the *Jin'gai xindeng* 金蓋心燈 (Transmission of the mind-lamp from Mount Jin'gai; 1821, rpt. 1876).¹ Traditional views hold that the Longmen lineage traces its origin to Qiu Chuji 丘處機 (1148–1227) and his disciple Zhao Daojian 趙道堅 (1163–1221). Monica Esposito has convincingly shown that the Longmen “orthodox lineage” was certainly created a posteriori at the end of the Ming.² In the late Ming, however, there emerged a movement in which there were “only some masters who claimed to be ‘disciples of Qiu Chuji,’” and they already had a lineage name based on a “lineage verse” (*paishi* 派詩).³ Many other scholars have already shown that, outside the “Longmen orthodox lineage” established in the early Qing at the

¹ On this issue, see Esposito, “The Longmen School,” 621–698; Mori, “Zenshinkyō,” 180–211; Zeng Zhaonan, “Longmenpai,” 200–201; Wang Zhizhong, *Ming Qing Quanzhenjiao lungao*, 4–5, 72–73.

² Esposito, “The Longmen School,” 622, 628, 640, 654, 657, 660, 671–674; “Daoism in the Qing,” 628. See also de Bruyn, “Daoism in the Ming,” 612; Zeng Zhaonan, “Longmenpai,” 202; Chen Yaoting, “Quanzhen jiaopai,” 11.

³ The late Ming Daoist Wu Shouyang was among the first to cite a genealogy poem connected to the Qiu Chuji school of Quanzhen Daoism. The genealogy poem runs, “Dao de tong xuan jing, zhen chang shou tai qing, yi yang lai fu ben, he jiao yong yuan ming 道德通玄靜，真常守太清，一陽來復本，合教永圓明。” See Wu Shouyang, *Tianxian zhengli zhilun zengzhu*, 52a. For scholarly discussion of the formation of the Longmen genealogy, see also Esposito, “The Longmen School,” 657, and Paul van Enckevort’s chapter in this volume.

I wish to express my gratitude to David Johnson, Paul Katz, Vincent Goossaert, and Xun Liu for generous suggestions to improve this chapter.

Quanzhen Daoism Proliferates Learning

The Xuanmiao Temple, Clerical Activism, and the Modern Reforms in Nanyang, 1880s–1940s

XUN LIU

As an important epicenter of Quanzhen Daoism, a crucial node of the Zhenwu pilgrimage circuits, and a major trade and distribution center on the upper Han River and in southwestern Henan, the city of Nanyang attracted merchants, pilgrims, and Daoist itinerants throughout the Ming and Qing periods. From the early eighteenth century onward, the Xuanmiao Temple, with the glistening yellow tiles of its soaring Shrine of the Dipper Mother (Doumuge 斗姆閣), was the city's most eye-catching landmark, along with the imposing Princely Mansion Mount (Wangfushan 王府山) built during the early fifteenth century by the Ming prince Zhu Jing 朱經 (1388–1415) with the expensive Lake Tai lime rock in the center of the old city. Located just outside the city's northern wall (see figs. 1–4), the temple was first built during the Yuan period on the site of an old shrine in honor of Lord Laozi (Laojunmiao 老君廟) allegedly with roots dating back to the Han era. Towering above the massive city wall, the Daoist shrine and the surrounding monastic buildings could be seen from miles away on clear days. In 1906, the Daoist temple saw another impressive addition: an imposing gate tower erected at the entrance to the monastic compound.

The magnificent gate tower (*pailou* 牌樓) consisted of a large roofed tower framed by massive wooden posts buttressed by four sets of large foundation stones carved with images of dragons and phoenixes. The center plaque displayed the name of the monastery, “Xuanmiaoguan 玄妙觀,” composed beautifully by Zhu Midi 朱彌錡 (?–1523), the Ming prince in the famous Guan-ge style (*guange ti* 館閣體).¹ Below the center plaque was

¹ The original monastic name of “Xuanmiaoguan 玄妙觀” was adopted at the founding

TEN

Temple and Household Daoists

Notes from North China

STEPHEN JONES

In my recent book, *In Search of the Folk Daoists of North China*, I outline some types of Daoist ritual specialists and the rituals they perform in rural North China in modern times, on the basis of both my own fieldwork since 1986 and reports by Chinese scholars, mainly for Hebei, Shanxi, Shaanxi, and Gansu.¹ This work is based on witnessing ritual in performance, but our interviews reference living memory, back to Maoist and pre-Communist eras; for all the dramatic social changes of these periods, our notes suggest basic continuity with the late imperial era.

Published material on Daoist ritual in modern times (still a minor part of Daoist studies) is dominated by reports from South China—notably south Fujian and Taiwan. Of course, both “north” and “south” are crude delineations; even the ritual practices of south Fujian are magnificently diverse, as the pioneering work of Lagerwey, Dean, and their Chinese colleagues shows. By contrast, the growing body of work on religious behavior in North China has mainly revealed more vernacular practices such as “hosting,”² and the activities of temple committees, spirit mediums, and performing arts groups. All this tends to support the cliché that North China is (or has become) almost a tabula rasa for Daoist ritual practice among the folk. However, I have come to expect to find Daoists wherever

¹ Readers may consult my book for greater detail on the local traditions discussed here. I thank the innumerable ritual specialists and villagers whom I have consulted since 1986; central and local scholars, notably my long-term fieldwork companions Xue Yibing and Zhang Zhentao; Vincent Goossaert, who has encouraged my work, commenting meticulously and giving me many further leads; Xun Liu, for his fine comments on this chapter’s draft; as well as John Lagerwey and Stephan Feuchtwang, who also commented astutely on the draft of my book.

² Chau, *Miraculous Response*.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

Beitu: *Beijing tushuguan cang Zhongguo lidai shike taben huibian* 北京圖書館藏中國歷代石刻拓本匯編.

CK: *Chongkan Daozang jiyao* 重刊道藏輯要.

Daozang texts are numbered following Schipper and Verellen, *The Taoist Canon*.

Primary Sources

Baxian dedao zhuan 八仙得道傳. Wugou daoren 無垢道人. Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 1988.

(*Minguo*) *Baxian zhi* (民國)巴縣志. 1939.

Beijing tushuguan cang Zhongguo lidai shike taben huibian 北京圖書館藏中國歷代石刻拓本匯編. 100 vols. Comp. Beijing tushuguan jinshi zu 北京圖書館金石組. Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1989–1991.

Biyuan tanjing 碧苑壇經. In *Gu Shuyinlou cangshu* 古書隱樓藏書.

Chaxiangshi congchao 茶香室叢鈔. Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1906). *Biji xiaoshuo daguan* edition.

Chan zhen yishi 禪真逸史. Harbin: Heilongjiang renmin chubanshe, 1986.

Chanfa daguan 懺法大觀. *CK*, vol. 21.

Changchun daoqiao yuanliu 長春道教源流. Chen Minggui 陳銘珪 (1824–1881). In Yan Yiping 嚴一萍, ed., *Daoqiao yanjiu ziliao* 道教研究資料, vol. 2. Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1974.

Changchunguan zhi 長春觀志. Li Li'an 李理安. Wuchang: privately printed, ca. 1936.

Chongkan Daozang jiyao 重刊道藏輯要. 1906. 25 vols. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1986.

Chongyang jiaohuaji 重陽教化集. *Daozang* 1154.

Chongyang Qizhen zhuan 重陽七真傳. 1899. Jinan: Longwenzhai, 1919.

Chongyang Quanzhen ji 重陽全真集. *Daozang* 1153.

Index

- after heaven, 145, 146
alcohol, 39, 219
anecdotes (*biji xiaoshuo* 筆記小說), 20,
23–29, 78–83, 86, 88, 89, 93, 104, 106,
108–112. *See also* novels
at home (*huo/huoju* 火/伙居), 22, 25, 38,
39, 292
- Baibuguan 百步觀, 227
baishi 拜師, 126
baishi 白事, 309. *See also* funeral
Bai Yuchan 白玉蟾, 87
Baiyunshan 白雲山, 320
Baiyun Temple 白雲觀 (White Cloud
Temple, White Cloud Monastery), 29,
46, 50, 51, 57, 62, 72, 73, 75, 80, 98, 99,
106, 109, 213, 223, 224, 235, 236, 241,
244, 253, 268, 277, 286, 292, 295, 320,
323, 324, 327, 329
- Baldrian-Hussein, Farzeen, 149
baojuan 寶卷, 79, 80, 82, 96, 108, 326
Baowuguan 寶婺觀, 195
baozhao 報兆, 146
barbarians, 82, 97, 98, 100–102
Baxian'an 八仙庵, 293
Baxiangong 八仙宮, 292, 320
beggars. *See* mendicancy
Beidi jinzhou jing 北帝禁咒經, 230
Beidi Leigong fa 北帝雷公法, 230
Beidi taixuan daoshi 北帝太玄道士, 230
Beidou jing 北斗經, 67
Beidouping 北斗坪, 115, 122, 123, 135–138
- Beijing 北京, 14, 35, 50, 54–57, 72, 80, 98,
99, 106, 108, 111, 116, 127, 206, 213, 223,
235–236, 244, 249, 253, 262, 279, 283, 286,
292–295, 311, 316, 318, 320–324, 327–331
- Beizong 北宗. *See* Northern lineage
Bidong Hall 碧洞堂, 173, 174
Birnbaum, Raoul, 22
Bodhidharma, 81, 97, 100
Buddhism and Buddhists, 4, 22–23,
26, 30–31, 34–35, 39, 43, 53, 56–58,
63–64, 67, 70, 82, 97–100, 107–108, 112,
125, 146–156, 163–170, 210, 239, 243,
245, 257–260, 279–283, 287–292, 305,
310–311, 316, 321–323, 326–332
- Bu Zhang 布張, 240
- canfang* 參訪, 241
Cantongqi 參同契, 66
Cangjingge 藏經閣, 270
Caodong 曹洞 lineage, 31
Cao Huanyang 曹還陽, 142, 144, 153, 159,
161, 169
celibacy, 22, 39, 40
Chan 禪, 31, 43, 53, 56, 57, 75, 81, 84,
97–100, 146, 149
Chanfa daguan 懺法大觀, 56
chanmenshi 禪門士, 317
Changchun daojiang yuanliu 長春道教源流,
21
Changchungong 長春宮, 223, 224
Changde 常德 Prefecture, 262
changzhu tian 常住田, 239, 250, 257