5 Tongbai Palace in the Qing Dynasty
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In the previous chapter I focused on the decline of Tongbai Palace during the late Ming dynasty, followed by the restoration of only one part of the temple, the Qingsheng Shrine, thanks to the dedication of the official Zhang Lianyuan and of its resident Daoist Fan Qingyun. Let us keep Master Fan in mind, because he will be attributed a central position in the history of Daoism by later Daoists. With the restoration of Tongbai Palace, then called Chongdao Abbey, in 1734, the temple finally acquired a new physical form and was granted some land: it took the imperial authorities to achieve two of the three objectives deemed necessary by Zhang Lianyuan. The third aim, though, remained unfulfilled: to attract new Daoists who could take care of the temple together with Fan Qingyun and after him. In the following pages I will discuss the restoration of the temple in the 18th century and the arrival of a new lineage of Daoists who moved into Tongbai Palace right after it.
5.1 The Restoration of Tongbai Palace

About ten years after the restoration of the Qingsheng Shrine, another, much more powerful individual became interested in the Daoist temples of Mt. Tongbai. The history of the Yongzheng emperor’s patronage of Tongbai Palace is the history of a radical recombination of the fundamental constituents of local religious symbolism. After the temple was rebuilt, the importance of some elements was greatly reduced, while new ones were added and enhanced in their significance. A fresh tradition was to flourish in this renewed context.

So far, I have found no proof that Zhang Lianyuan’s commitment to defend and support the Qingsheng Shrine is somehow connected with Yongzheng’s interest in Tongbai Palace. Given the emperor’s efforts and economic investment in favour not only of Tongbai Palace, but also of other Daoist and Buddhist temples in Taizhou Prefecture, I would argue that the reasons behind these two enterprises are quite different, and more deeply related to Yongzheng’s religious activities at court. Therefore, to understand the motives of the imperial patronage of Tongbai Palace, we must first concentrate on the emperor’s own religious activities in the capital.

5.1.1 The Yongzheng Emperor and Religion

Yongzheng’s relationship with religion is a complex topic. On the one hand, it is clear that he was personally involved in all three official teachings: Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism. On the other, his religious policies followed the long tradition of Chinese autocratic emperors who employed religion – including the well-known doctrine of the Three Teachings – as a means to ‘educate the people’ or to increase their own ideological and political control over the Chinese territory. Yet, in the late imperial context it is sometimes difficult to clearly distinguish between an emperor’s or a bureaucrat’s personal beliefs and his public stance, especially if we rely only on official documents. This does not mean that it is impossible to obtain information about someone’s personal ideas and beliefs, only that official documents were not composed for the purpose of sharing them and therefore do not represent a valid source for this kind of study. In the case of the Yongzheng Emperor, as this chapter will

---

1 Feng, Yongle zhuan, 461-3; Wang, “Yongzheng huangdi yu Ziyang zhenren (shang)”, 23. Neither author totally rules out the possibility that Yongzheng may have been genuinely interested in Buddhism, at least to some extent.

2 The case of Zhang Lianyuan’s aid to the Qingsheng Shrine is one example of this.
show, the paradigm of political expediency results in a reductive and partial assessment of his involvement in religion.

In the following pages I will focus mainly on those policies adopted by the Yongzheng Emperor that had a direct impact on the restoration of Tongbai Palace. These initiatives were often seemingly undertaken to meet the emperor’s personal interests and objectives, but also had a direct impact on the empire’s religious landscape: for this reason, I have decided to refrain from drawing a clear-cut distinction between instances of ‘political opportunity’ and ones of ‘personal belief’, by simply focusing on facts.

Generally speaking, the Yongzheng Emperor was involved in all three religions. He supported Confucianism as the head of the empire, but also appreciated its alleged positive influence on the people of the realm and on the officials. His reign marks the high point in the building of altars and school shrines, such as the Xiannong Altar 先農壇 (added to the list of county altars reserved for official rituals in 1726) and the shrines of the Loyal, Righteous, Filial and Fraternal (Persons) 忠義節孝祠, dedicated to local personages who had distinguished themselves in the moral field, and those of the Chaste and Dutiful (Women) 節孝(婦女)祠 (both financed by the government). His fascination with Buddhism originated in his youth and developed during his reign as a strong personal interest that cannot be explained merely according to the parameter of political expediency. Barend ter Haar also excluded that the emperor’s Buddhist practices were “an infatuation late in life caused by the fear of death, apprehensions about the historical judgment of his reign, or regret about past acts” and the sources seem to confirm this idea.

The Yongzheng Emperor’s relationship with Daoism is slightly more complicated and is still an object of contention among scholars. He certainly practiced many physiological techniques that were related to Daoism in one way or another, and he showed interest in concocting various kinds of elixirs and in the practice of outer alchemy (waidan 外丹), which some scholars identify as the probable cause of his death by poisoning. Apart from these concrete interests, there is little proof of any active attempts on his part to shape Daoist doctrine, although we know that he supported the Daoist institutions

---

3 See Taylor, “Official Altars, Temples and Shrines”, 96-110. Shizong Xian huangdi shangyu neige 80:22b-24a. The altars also included those dedicated to Sheji 社稷壇, to natural phenomena (feng yun lei yu 風雲雷雨) and to local spirits (shan chuan chenghuan 山川城隍), renamed ‘Shenqi Altar’ 神祇壇 in 1811, as well as the one dedicated to the 屬鬼, Feng, Yongle zhuan, 212-13, 377. On the local presence of state cults, see Feuchtwang, Grassroots Charisma, 63-6. On the significance of the two shrines, see Naquin, Rawski, Chinese Society in the Eighteenth Century, 112-14.

4 Ter Haar, “Yongzheng and His Buddhist Abbots”, 437.

of the Heavenly Masters both on Mt. Longhu 龍虎山 and in the capital and that he patronised various Daoist altars and rituals. One court Daoist who played a central role in this period, surely thanks to the emperor’s support, was Lou Jinyuan 娄近垣 (zi: Sanchen 三臣; hao: Langzhai 郎齋 and Shangqing Waishi 上清外史; 1689-1776).

The case study that we are focusing on here appears to have little to do with the emperor’s attraction to Daoist practice, though. Rather, it stemmed from his personal interest in Buddhist doctrine and especially in the Chan school: my thesis is that the restoration of Tongbai Palace was justified by the emperor’s belief that Zhang Boduan practiced self-cultivation in that place and that, in turn, the relevance of Zhang Boduan in the emperor’s religious system was fuelled by the links between the latter and Chan Buddhism. We might say that, more generally, to the emperor Zhang Boduan represented the connection between the imperial patronage of Daoist institutions in Taizhou and the emperor’s own involvement in Buddhism.

5.1.2 The Emperor, Chan Buddhism and Zhang Boduan

The Yongzheng Emperor’s involvement in religious activities at court increased in the second half of his thirteen-year-long reign and reached its peak in 1733. A crucial event is represented by the establishment, in that year, of the ‘Contemporary Dharma Assembly’ (Dangjin fahui 當今法會), which counted fourteen members of the political and religious elite, including two of the emperor’s brothers and two sons, high officials, two Chan masters, two Buddhist abbots and one court Daoist, the charismatic and very influential ritual master Lou Jinyuan. The Assembly produced a text titled Yuxuan yulu 御選語錄 (1733), a collection of Buddhist teachings and commentaries by the fourteen participants.6 The ‘Imperial General Preface’ (Yuzhi zongxu 御制總序) lays out the emperor’s approach to the subject matter:

I have received responsibilities from my royal parents, so I am not a person who can dedicate himself to spiritual life. If I want the people to lead a peaceful life, I can only follow the path of the Duke of Zhou and Confucius. Therefore, since I ascended to the throne, I have not dealt with Chan teachings for ten years. But I think of the wisdom-life of humans and Heaven and the special transmission of the teachings of the Buddha: in order to awaken all living creatures, he left [us] the Supreme Golden Elixir that can be used to get rid of what is rotten and withered. How could one permit het-

erodoxy to blind one’s own orthodox vision, promote muddled and poisonous [words], and extinguish the subtle mind? I really have words that I cannot bear to keep for myself, so I must say them. Recently, during my leisure time, I have tried to taste the mixed waters of the rivers Zi and Mian [i.e., to deal with very intricate analyses]. I have read from ancient recorded sayings and chosen some to promote true orthodoxy. I have picked their superb words, choosing and compiling them with [my] hands.7

The endeavour was therefore both a personal and a political enterprise and its objective was to define (Buddhist) orthodoxy. This excerpt also highlights the difference, in the emperor’s eyes, between adherence to Confucianism, a political imperative, and adherence to Buddhism, a matter of personal preference.

Among the many texts quoted in the Yuxuan yulu, there is one that is significant for the present study. To the amazement of the unprepared reader, the anthology contains poems attributed to Zhang Boduan that constitute the ‘External Collection’ (waiji 外集) of his Wuzhen pian 悟真篇. The imperial preface to this part states:

The Perfected Ziyang wrote the Wuzhen pian to clarify the essentials of the Mysterious Doctrine [i.e., Daoism]. Thereafter he wrote thirty-two eulogies, each one expressing from the mind the subtle instructions of the Superior Vehicle that came from the West [i.e., Buddhism]. He wrote: “These represent the Ultimate Way of non-action and subtle awakening” and titled them ‘External Collection’.8 Having called [them] ‘external’, did the Perfected regard the Mysterious Doctrine as esoteric and the Ancestral Doctrine [i.e., Buddhism] as exoteric? If so, the Perfected should have focused exclusively on the Mysterious Doctrine; why would he have needed to further discuss the Ancestral Doctrine? Moreover, why would he call the latter the ‘Supreme [Vehicle]’? Isn’t it because [he] considered [it] as transcending the Three Realms,


8 This is a reference to Ziyang zhenren Wuzhen pian zhushu (DZ 141) “houxu”:3a: “the songs and eulogies at the end of the Wuzhen pian discuss the methods for seeing the [Buddha] nature. These are called the Way of non-action and subtle awakening” 篇末歌頌談見性之法，即上之所謂無為妙覺之道.
where perfection cannot have its place, that he then treated it as external to the *Wuzhen pian*?

紫陽真人作《悟真篇》，以明玄門祕要，復作頌偈等三十二篇，一一從性地演出西來最上一乘之妙旨。自敘云：「此無為妙覺之至道也。」標為〈外集〉。夫外之云者，真人豈以玄門為內，而以宗門為外哉？審如是，真人止應專事玄教，又何必旁及於宗說？且又何謂此為最上？豈非以其超乎三界，真亦不立，故為《悟真》之外也歟？

Here we see the emperor’s attempt to explain the name of the ‘External Collection’ by interpreting the *wai* in its title not as the opposite of ‘esoteric’, something reserved to the inner circle of the initiated, but according to its literal meaning of ‘outside’, ‘external’: in this case, external to the core of Zhang Boduan’s work, devoted to ‘perfection’ (*zhen* 真) and external to – therefore transcending – the Three Realms. The emperor’s stance is made quite clear in this preface: his appreciation of Zhang Boduan was based on the latter’s thorough understanding of the Chan doctrine. This point of view had already been expressed in his “Lun zhu jiafeng Ziyang zhenren dacai yuan tong chanxian fenghao bing jiang qi su zhu ‘Waiji’ bianru Fozang” (Edict on the Bestowal of the Title of Most Benevolent and Boundless Chan Immortal Perfected Ziyang and on the Inclusion of His ‘External Collection’ in the Buddhist Canon), dateable between 1731 and 1734:

If the Mysterious Doctrine [i.e. Daoism] were superior to the Chan tradition, then certainly the Perfected [Zhang Boduan] would have dealt with it exclusively. Was it necessary to combine it with the Chan School? If the Perfected thought that the principle of Chan tradition is more wondrous than [that of] the Mysterious Doctrine and wanted to take one side over the other, then he would have simply pilfered others’ ideas to supplement his own. Yet, this is not the kind of behaviour tolerated by the benevolent or the upright. If the mysterious teachings [of Daoism] were indeed inferior to those of the Chan tradition, how difficult would it have been for him to abandon Daoism and follow the Chan school? Why would he straddle two separate teachings? As I see it, [Zhang Boduan’s] *Wuzhen pian* does not mix in a single word of the Chan school. His ‘Exoteric Collection’ does not mix in a single word of the Mysterious Doctrine. One can see that the root of the Way has one origin and a single principle. This is what is called “to do things together without contradiction.” Some say that the Chan School deals with nature but not with vitality, and that the Mysterious Doctrine cultivates vitality but not...
nature. These are all disorderly, erroneous arguments that cannot thoroughly penetrate the supreme principle. The *Wuzhen pian* written by Zhang Boduan is not just specifically about the true knowledge of Daoism, therefore the “External Collection” contains the quintessential tenets of the supreme vehicle of the Chan School.10

假使玄門之理果超於釋宗，則真人止應專事玄門，又何必旁及於宗門耶？如謂釋宗之理妙於玄門，真人若懷人我之見，竊其說以附合其教，何難之有？但非仁人君子之所忍為。蓋玄教若果遜於釋宗，則真人又何難舍道而從釋？豈肯為此兩歧之學耶？今觀其所著《悟真篇》，則不雜宗門一語，而所著〈外集〉則不雜玄門一語，可知道本一原，理無二致。所謂並行而不悖者，此也。或謂宗門言性不言命，玄門修命不修性，是皆於至理未能貫通，支離謬說耳。紫陽真人所著《悟真篇》，不特為道教真詮，即此〈外集〉，亦釋門中最上一乘宗旨。

The purpose of this edict was to canonise the ‘External Collection’ by adding it to the Buddhist Canon (the *Qianlong dazang jing* 乾隆大藏經 or *Longzang* 龍藏, ‘Dragon Canon’, patronised by the Yongzheng Emperor himself) and bestowing a new title on Zhang Boduan. It should be noted that today both the *Longzang* and the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* do not contain neither the *Wuzhen pian* nor any other work attributed to Zhang Boduan as an independent text. Nonetheless, the Yongzheng emperor managed to include the ‘External Collection’ embedded in the *Yuxuan yulu* to the *Longzang*, only one of the 54 works that he had added to this canon.11

The emperor’s interest in Zhang Boduan led him to ask for more information about the places linked with the Daoist. In the year 1731 or slightly before then, the emperor had already sent the following request to Li Wei 李衛 (zi: Youjie 又玠; 1687-1738), then the governor-general (zongdu 總督) of Zhejiang:

> I heard that in Tiantai there is the Grotto-Dominion of the Perfected Ziyang [i.e. Zhang Boduan]. May it be that there are also ritual areas or temples there? Please check carefully. If there are places that we can restore and improve, memorialize this in secret. I also know that there are many Buddhist temples in Tiantai: are there big public monasteries or famous temples [still extant]? Prepare a map of the whole Tiantai area and send it [to me]. Take your time and submit either a paper mountain with buildings made of rice, in the style of an ‘Aoshan’ [model], or made with the ‘bonsai’ tech-

10 Yongzheng chao hanwen yuzhi huibian 3:464. In the original text, the character xuan 玄 is rendered as yuan 元. The translation follows Scarin, “The Chan Immortal and the Tongbai Palace”, 91-2, with minor amendments.

11 Wu, Chia, *Spreading Buddha’s Word in East Asia*, 315.
There is no need to make a big one, just attend to details. You do not need to rush to prepare [it]. Send it in due time, so that I can enjoy looking at it. Moreover, [I have heard that] Ge Xianweng’s altar was also in Tiantai, but I do not know if it is in the same place as the Perfected Ziyang’s. I have heard that [Ge] Xianweng’s ritual platforms have all been destroyed and that [his] talismans and registers have been incorporated by Mt. Longhu, but I do not know since which dynasty [the ritual platforms] have been in a state of disrepair. If I wanted to restore them to their ancient state, would it be possible [for you] to make inquiries into their relics and lores, and sort them? I have a wish: for you to conduct a meticulous investigation and careful study, and then present [the results] to me. If they are two separate things, the ritual area of the Perfected Ziyang is the most important, because [with this special order] I am undertaking this matter precisely for his relics, as you should know. 

The emperor was interested in any signs of the presence of Zhang Boduan and Ge Xuan in Tiantai County. As we have seen, the latter was Ge Hong’s paternal granduncle and was associated with alchemical practices and the Lingbao revelations. Zhang Boduan, though, was the one clearly attracting most of the emperor’s attention, as he himself states at the end of the text. The juxtaposition of Zhang Boduan and Buddhist temples seems to reflect the close connection that the two had in the emperor’s mind.

In his memorial to the emperor, Li Wei summarised the history of Tongbai Palace from the Tang dynasty on, including the case of the land appropriation discussed in the previous chapter. Then, he added:

Today, the foundations of the main hall of the Qingfeng Shrine are occupied by the grave of his son Zhang Ruoying and only the two...
The statues of the Pure Sages [Bo Yi and Shu Qi] remain. That was the reason behind the fall and ruin of [Ge] Xianweng and the Perfected Ziyang’s ritual grounds. Now only the Daoist monk, Fan Qingyun, determinedly remains there. It is unknown where Ge’s talismans and registers have gone.  

清風祠正殿之基，已為其子張若英佔塟作墳，惟清聖二石像尚在。此仙翁、真人道場消磨廢墜之所由。至今只有道士范青雲一人苦守於此。其符籙歸於何處，則俱不得而知矣。

Li Wei’s description does not differ much from Zhang Lianyuan’s last reports, although we do not know whether his was based on first-hand evidence or whether he was mainly inspired by the *Qingsheng Ci zhi*. As was the case with the sources discussed above, in this memorial too there is no information about who Fan Qingyun was or how he became a Daoist.

Li Wei executed a thorough survey of all the places linked with Zhang Boduan in Taizhou and recorded the information in his memorial: the Ziyang Mansion in Linhai, deemed to have been Zhang Boduan’s house, already converted into the Yuantan Temple; the Wuzhen Bridge, located north of the prefecture, and Wuzhen Lane, in the northern part of Linhai, both named after the Wuzhen pian; and the Baibu Brook, where according to tradition Zhang Boduan attained transcendence – it was located 60 li northwest of the Linhai county seat and hosted a small shrine with a statue of the Perfected and a poem (probably attributed to him), engraved on a stele. At the end of this list, Li Wei added: “in Tiantai there is only Tongbai Palace, where the Perfected is said to have practised self-cultivation” 其在天台，惟桐柏宮有真人於此棲真修煉之蹟，餘無所傳. In fact, there is no historical evidence that Zhang Boduan ever practised self-cultivation at Tongbai Palace, or in Tiantai for that matter, even though this misconception can still be found in contemporary scholarship. This idea was developed in later sources, such as the *Lidai shenxian tongjian* 歷代神仙通鑑 (or *Lidai shenxian yanyi* 歷代神仙演義, 17th century) by Xu Dao 徐道, but in its most elaborate form it does not appear to precede the...
Yongzheng Emperor’s enquiries.\(^\text{16}\) Li Wei’s memorial ends with the official’s suggested plan of action:

The Emperor has stated that it would be suitable to restore and develop the prosperity of the ancient places listed above. [I suggest] restoring the Ziyang Tower of Taizhou as an abbey as in the past and relocating the Yuantan Temple. The Wuzhen Bridge and Lane should be repaired. It is reported that the sanctuary halfway to Baibu Peak is located on a narrow and steep terrain and that the place, hosting the statue [of Zhang Boduan], is only a tile-covered building with three naves hanging from the mountainside. It cannot be enlarged, therefore a new shrine should be built on a plain area at the foot of the mountain, which will improve the outlook of the area. As regards Tongbai Abbey, encompassing the famous ritual areas of the two transcendents [Zhang Boduan and Ge Xuan], it stands on a place that has many ancient and famous relics; it occupies a large ground and its land records are still extant: we only need to remove the tomb of the local despot, take back the occupied hall, and open up its uncultivated land in compliance with the [aforementioned] records. Once the teachings of the ancestral tradition have been restored, it will be called a grand abbey. I respectfully leave the choice of its scale and style up to his majesty.

[...] His Majesty was already aware that there are many Buddhist temples in Tiantai, but would like to know if there is any renowned, large public monastery. He has ordered an enquiry.

Tiantai was called Grotto-Heaven and Blessed Land. Formerly there were seventy-two Buddhist monasteries in total, but they gradually fell into disrepair. There is no need to speak of the small temples and thatched retreats that are neither Buddhist nor Daoist sites and that literati since the antiquity have seldom described as places to visit. Apart from them, the biggest and most famous Buddhist temples today are two, Wannian and Gaoming: they are intact and the easiest to repair. There are also the Tianzhu, Tianmu, and Tianfeng temples. In addition, there are the Guoqing, Shanxing, Huguo, Daci, Baijing Terrace, and other Buddhist temples, [but] all of them have been in ruins for many years.\(^\text{17}\)

誠如聖諭, 宜為整理振興, 以誌千古之盛。所有台州府城之紫陽樓當復舊觀, 元壇廟應為移建, 悟真橋、坊俱宜興修。其百步嶺半之祠, 據稱地勢窄

\(^{16}\) Scarin, “The Chan Immortal and the Tongbai Palace”, 81-3. For an example of narrative that includes Zhang Boduan among the Daoists related to Tongbai Palace, see Zhu, Tiantai Shan Daojiao shi, 104.

Inner nature and vitality are not separate paths, [just as] transcendents and buddhas do not [follow] separate ways. Seeking long life, but not understanding ‘having no birth’, sticking to the [notion of] having a body and not knowing ‘having no form’ and the ‘body of the law [dharma]’ is like shooting an arrow into the sky: it falls back after depleting its momentum. It is not the supreme subtle Way for achieving perfection. The patriarch of Daoism (i.e. Laozi) stated: “[he] treats [his person] as extraneous to himself and it is preserved”. 18 Is it not the Buddha’s teaching being without a self and yet having a self? [The patriarch] also said: “When one observes emptiness [and sees that it is also] emptiness, then emptiness has not what [is called] emptiness. When emptiness is no more, the absence of non-being is also non-being. When the absence of non-being is no more, [one reaches] profound suchness and everlasting stillness”. 19 So, is this profound suchness and everlasting stillness

---

18 Transl. in Lau, Tao Te Ching, 11.

19 Livia Kohn instead translates: “Use emptiness to observe emptiness,/And see there is not emptiness./When even emptiness is no more,/There is no more nonbeing/either/Without even the existence of nonbeing,/there is only serenity,/Profound and everlasting”. Kohn, The Taoist Experience, 25-7.
Figures 11-15  Fragments of the “Chongdao Guan bei” found in the countryside of Tiantai County. Note the elaborate header in picture 15 and the engraved base in picture 13. Some characters are still visible on the surface. According to local villagers, the stele was cut into pieces and used as building material during the Cultural Revolution.
not [what is called] the subtle essence of permanence, happiness, self and purity? Those who search for these things outside are foolish: how can they understand [even] a fraction [of it]!

The *Wuzhen pian* written by the Most Benevolent and Boundless Chan Immortal Perfected Ziyang, Zhang Pingshu, explains the essence of the Golden Elixir, which is described in his preface to the text as the technique to nurture life. The Yellow Emperor and Laozi followed what they desired, gradually directing themselves to non-action and subtle awakening. The extreme subtleness and the profundity of the instructions of the Supreme Vehicle of the Bodhidharma and of the Sixth Patriarch (Huineng 慧能, 638-713), mentioned by Zhang Boduan in the postface to his *Wuzhen pian*, are difficult to understand thoroughly, therefore [Ziyang] edited the ‘External Collection’ and wrote it in the form of poems to discuss self-awakening. He awaits those with a good innate nature, so that these words may enlighten them. Oh! Those like the Perfected can [really] be considered to unite both [the teachings of] the buddas and of the transcenders! Ziyang was born in Taizhou and in the prefectural city there is the Ziyang Mansion, which is his former residence. Sixty li from the prefectural seat one finds the Baibu Brook, which according to the tradition is where the immortal Ziyang transcended. He also cultivated the Way at the Chongdao Abbey of Tongbai, but after many years, nobody goes there to pray. I sent public funds and dispatched officials by special order to entirely restore all [these places].

---

20 The integral text of the stele can be found in *Zhejiang tongzhi* “juanshou 3”:24b-26a and, bearing minor differences, in *Shizong xian huangdi yuzhi wenji* 世宗憲皇帝御製文集 17:13b-15a with the title “Text of the Stele of the Ziyang Daoist Temple” 紫陽道院碑文, partially transl. in Scarin, “The Chan Immortal and the Tongbai Palace”, 87.
The first characters of the stele powerfully present the emperor’s stance: “Inner nature and vitality are not separate paths, [just as] transcendents and buddhas do not [follow] separate ways”: here the emperor is promoting his idea of the substantial, if not formal, religious unity of the two teachings. This project is carried out in practice in the following lines: first, by quoting both the *Daode jing* and the *Qingjing jing*, two very representative Daoist texts, and relating their content to Buddhist doctrine; then, by referring to Zhang Boduan with the title *Dazi yuanton chanxian Ziyang zhenren Zhang Pingshu* 大慈圓通禪仙紫陽真人張平叔, which defines him as a “Chan Transcendent”, uniting Daoism and Buddhism in himself. The stele clearly explains what the purpose of the restoration of Tongbai Palace is within the imperial religious system: this temple was chosen as a place for self-cultivation by Zhang Boduan, who is celebrated not merely as a Daoist master of the highest sort, but as an embodiment of the highest Buddhist and Daoist achievements. It seems, though, that Buddhism remains prominent throughout the stele: it is Daoism that is legitimised through Buddhism and not vice-versa.

Around 1734, then, there were three temples restored by the Yongzheng Emperor and linked to Zhang Boduan: the Ziyang Abbey 紫陽觀 of Linhai, the Ziyang Daoist Temple 紫陽道院 near the Baibu Brook, and Tongbai Palace. The following year, the Ziyang Daoist Abbey even received an inscription with the four characters *wanfa yuanton* 萬法圓通. To confirm his interest in Buddhism and the extent to which it was related to the restoration of Tongbai Palace, in 1733 the Yongzheng Emperor ordered the restoration of Guoqing Monastery 國清寺, also located on Mt. Tongbai. The following year the monastery was completed and the emperor presented it with a plaque inscribed with the four characters *huayan jingyu* 華嚴淨域.  

---

21 Zhejiang tongzhi 231:33a, 232:12a.
22 Zhejiang tongzhi 232:2a.
The *Jingai xindeng* 金蓋心燈, an anthology of Daoist biographies from the early 19th century, suggests that the emperor granted land to the temple:

Shizong [r. 1722-1735] with a special decree ordered the construction of Chongdao Abbey and granted it 600 mu of fields, so that the ancient statues of the Pure Sage Masters of Guzhu might shine again, and the ancient relics of the Chan Immortal [Zhang] Ziyang might be known far and wide. Mt. Tongbai thus became famous everywhere. This event took place in the twelfth year of the Yongzheng reign (1734), [then] the master [i.e., Fan Qingyun] retired after gaining merit and surviving great perils.23

Granted that 600 mu were few compared to the almost 10 qing calculated by Zhang Lianyuan as the temple’s original endowment, they probably must be added to the terrain already returned to the Shrine. Therefore, thanks to imperial intervention, Tongbai Palace was restored and a portion of its land was returned to it. It also became part of a series of temples that the emperor patronised because they were ideally related to Zhang Boduan’s activities as a practitioner of self-cultivation, within the context of his own interest in Chan Buddhism. What these documents do not discuss is whether imperial patronage could also achieve the last of Zhang Lianyuan’s objectives: finding a group of Daoists willing to move to the temple and to help Fan Qingyun.

### 5.2 The Longmen Lineage

#### 5.2.1 Myth and Historical Facts

The history of the Longmen lineage and especially its origins are still under scholarly scrutiny. According to the traditional narrative, most famously described in Min Yide’s 閔一得 (1748/1758-1836) *Jingai xindeng* (1821, reprinted in 1876; JGXD), the lineage was founded when Qiu Chuji 丘處機 (zi: Tongmi 通密; hao: Changchun 長春; 1148-1227) transmitted his teachings to the disciple Zhao Daojian 趙道堅 (1163-1221) and bestowed a Daoist name on him.24 As we know, Qiu

23 *Jingai xindeng* 3:46a-b.

24 Esposito, *Facets of Qing Daoism*, 67-70.
Chuji was a key figure in 13th-century Daoism. He was the disciple of Wang Chongyang 王重陽 (ming: Zhongfu 中孚; zi: Yunqing 允卿 and Zhiming 智明; 1113-1170), a man from Xianyang 咸陽 (Shaanxi), the founder of the Quanzhen order under the Jin 金 dynasty (1115-1234). The accounts of Wang Chongyang’s life mix historical reality and myth, two aspects that are not always easy to separate. According to Pierre Marsone’s critical study, Wang Chongyang probably undertook a military career before giving it up and experiencing a prolonged period of hardship, when he was hit by what we might call an existential crisis that brought him sixteen years of desperation. He became an alcoholic and progressively distanced himself from his family, until - in 1159 - he experienced a spiritual conversion. Hagiographies explain this event by referring to his encounter with two immortals, identified by later traditions as Lü Dongbin and Zhongli Quan 鍾離權, near Hu County 鄠縣 (Shaanxi). Some texts even mention a second and third encounter with transcendental beings, but these too are considered dubious by Marsone. Wang Chongyang was in contact with local Daoist and Buddhist masters, from which he received various teaching. In 1161 he left his family and went to the nearby village of Nanshi 南時村, where a very famous episode occurred. He dug a hole in the ground, which he called “the tomb of the living dead” (huosiren mu 活死人墓), and practised self-cultivation there for three years. Finally, after various other experiences, he decided to move to Shandong, where he became a successful proselytiser and over time established an influential religious movement, which sparked the Quanzhen order.25 We can define Wang Chongyang’s religious movement as lay, meditative and syncretic. It was a lay movement, in the sense that previous formal initiation into Daoism was not required.26 By meditative I mean that one of the most important goals for Wang Chongyang and his early community was the successful practicing of self-cultivation, a feature that was also maintained over the following centuries as a distinctive trait of Quanzhen Daoists.27 Syncretism refers to Wang Chongyang’s commitment to the doctrine of the Three Teachings, which upheld the radical unity of the principles of Confucianism,

Buddhism and Daoism. Qiu Chuji was but one of Wang’s seven disciples, traditionally known as the ‘Seven Perfected’ (qizhen 七真), each with his or her own following: Ma Yu 马钰 (zi: Xuanbao 玄寶; hao: Danyang 丹陽; 1123-1184); Tan Chuandan 處端 (zi: Tongzheng 通正; hao: Changzheng 长真; 1123-1185); Liu Chuxuan 劉處玄 (zi: Tongmiao 通妙; hao: Changsheng 長生; 1147-1203); Qiu Changchun; Wang Chuyi 王處一 (zi: Yuyang 玉陽; hao: Sanyang 傘陽; 1123-1185); Hao Datong 郝大通 (zi: Taigu 太古; hao: Guangning 廣寧; 1140-1213); and Sun Bu’er 孫不二 (hao: Qingjing 清靜; 1119-1183). At first, it appears that it was Ma Danyang – the first to become a disciple, together with his wife Sun Bu’er – who took over Wang’s legacy. Over time, though, another of Wang’s disciples, Qiu Chuji, was to become the most successful: he not only accepted the followers of the other six Perfected as his own disciples, bestowing new Daoist names on them, but he even managed to earn the benevolence of Chinggis Khan – elected great khan of all Mongols in 1206 – towards the Quanzhen order. In 1220 Qiu Chuji began his journey to Central Asia, which would bring him and a number of his disciples to the court of the Mongol leader in Samarkand. After Qiu Chuji and his disciples returned to Beijing in 1224 (the former capital of the Jin dynasty, conquered by the Mongols in 1215), he took charge of Tianchang Abbey 天常觀, later renamed Changchun Palace 長春宮 in his honour. When Qiu Chuji passed away, his body was buried next to this temple and his disciple Yin Zhiping 尹志平 (1169-1251) built a temple called Baiyun Abbey 白雲觀 in this location. According to the JGXD, Zhao Daojian’s teachings were transmitted to his disciple Zhang Dechun 張德純 (fl. 1312-1367) and so on until the fourth generation [table 5]. This line of transmission is regarded as having safeguarded the true teachings of Qiu Chuji and is therefore called the ‘Longmen orthodox transmission’ (Longmen zhengzong liuchuan 龍門正宗流傳) in the JGXD.

If we focus on the initial character of the Longmen names of these masters, we see that they correspond to the sequence of characters...


29 For a brief overview of these disciples and of the formation of the concept of ‘Seven Perfected’, cf. Marsone, “Accounts of the Foundation of the Quanzhen”, 102-10. The only woman among the seven was Sun Bu’er, Ma Yu’s wife.

30 Cf. Changchun zhenren xiyouji (DZ 1429). Tradition credits this journey with having ensured the high status that the Quanzhen order enjoyed during the Mongol conquest of northern China and even the safety of the population of this territory. In 1223 Chinggis Khan even issued an edict that placed all religions in northern China under the control of the Quanzhen order. It should be noted that another major Daoist tradition, that of the Heavenly Masters of Mt. Longhu, received the support of the Yuan dynasty in 1276, after the conquest of southern China and the demise of the Southern Song dynasty. Goossaert, “La création du Taoïsme moderne”, 29, 79-80.

31 Esposito, Facets of Qing Daoism, 63-4.
of what is known today as the ‘Longmen lineage poem’ (*Longmen pai shi* 龍門派詩). The first ten characters of the poem are: 道德通玄靜, 真常守太清。一陽來復本, 合教永圓明. This poem is therefore used to mark each Daoist’s position in the series of successive generations of Longmen masters: in other words, a Longmen master determines the Longmen name of his disciples by using the character of the poem after the one used in his or her own name. Starting from the fifth generation, the Longmen orthodox lineage supposedly split into two branches, one for the ‘masters of precepts’ (*lüshi* 律師) and one for the ‘masters of doctrine’ (*zongshi* 宗師), because the content of the transmission became divided (through a distinction between doctrine, on the one hand, and initiation by means of the precepts, on the other). The two lineages reunited thanks to a Daoist of the Jingu Grotto 金鼓洞 of Hangzhou, Zhou Mingyang 周明陽: in the early 19th century this made the author of the JGXD, Min Yide, the last legitimate representative of the unified orthodox lineage.

There are some problems with what I have termed the traditional narrative. First, as discussed by Monica Esposito, Zhao Daojian passed away in 1221 in Saram, on his journey to Samarkand, and was buried there. This means that he did not complete the journey with his master Qiu Chuji and that he could not have received the Longmen transmission, let alone have founded a lineage to spread this transmission through his disciples.

Second, sources ranging from the 16th to the 19th century do not mention the separation of the Longmen lineage into two branches respectively focusing on doctrine and on precepts. We can refer to the *Jingu Dong zhi* 金鼓洞志 and to the *Weiyu Dongtian Qiuzu Longmen zongpu* 委羽洞天邱祖宗譜 (*Qiu [Changchun]’s Lineage of the Weiyu Grotto-Heaven; Weiyu zongpu*), just to name two. Moreover, the use of the Longmen lineage poem must be carefully studied. Before the 18th century this poem was certainly already used by a number of traditions, such as a Quanzhen lineage linked with Daoist Yan 閻道人 at the Qianyuan Abbey of the Mao Mountains in the 16th century, or that of Wu Shouyang 吳守陽. Yet, originally the lineage and the poem were not called ‘Longmen’, but simply referred to as Qiu Chuji’s lineage without mentioning Longmen. Wu Shouyang’s case is interesting because we only have four occurrences of the expression ‘Longmen’ in his writings, two of which could be later

32 According to the JGXD, during a supposed meeting between Zhou and Wang Changyue, the latter said to him: “In Jiangnan the [lineages of] doctrine and precepts will be unified in you” 江南宗律於汝一貫. JGXD 3:12b.

33 *Changchun zhenren xiyouji* 1:22b; *Zhongnan Shan zuting xianzhan neizhuan* (DZ 604) 2:10b-12b; Esposito, *Facets of Qing Daoism*, 70.

### Table 5: The succession of Min Yide's Longmen orthodox transmission according to the JGXD, generations 1 to 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Zen Garrison Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Zhao Daojian (趙道堅)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Zhang Dechun (張德純)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Chen Tongwei (陳通微)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Zhou Xuanpu (周玄朴)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Zhao Dong (趙東)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Wei Zhending (衛真定)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Shen Changjing (沈常敬)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Sun Shouyi (孫守一)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Huang Shouyan (黃守元)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wu Shouyang (伍守陽)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Dai Tingyun (戴停雲)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Gao Qingyu (高清昱)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Dai Qingyuan (戴清源)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table represents the line of doctrine and precepts transmission lineage. The generation and corresponding leaders are listed accordingly.
additions, since they are found in the commentary on his Tianxian zhengli zhilun zengzhu 天仙正理論增注 and in Shen Zhaoding’s 申兆 1764 preface to the same text. The last instances of the term are found in the postscript (houba 後跋) to the Dandao jiu pian 丹道九篇, which was not written by Wu Shouyang himself, although it reportedly quotes his words. 35 In signing the texts, Wu Shouyang does not use the term Longmen, but rather describes himself as a disciple of Perfected Qiu [Chuji’s] tradition (Qiu zhenren menxia 邱真人門下 or similar expressions). 36 I should also note that even in the texts attributed to the 17th-century Daoist reformer Wang Changyue 王常月 (?-1680) the term Longmen does not occur.

Third, the three tiers of precepts supposedly used in Longmen initiation ceremonies from Qiu Chuji’s time onwards were in fact the product of late Ming-early Qing systematisation efforts by Wang Changyue 王常月. As discussed by Mori Yuria, the process of redefinition of the precepts and of their transmission was carried out by Wang Changyue in mid-17th-century Nanjing. He argued that Wang Changyue’s efforts were aimed not so much at reviving the transmission of Qiu Changchun’s precepts, as at reorganising the whole system of precepts and Quanzhen ordination. 37 Moreover, the precepts that constitute the three tiers of Wang’s ordination were not originally devised by Qiu Chuji himself, nor were they characteristic of Longmen, but appear to be a collection of different sets of precepts from earlier traditions linked to the Celestial Masters. 38

Fourth, and more generally, the concept of a Longmen lineage as described in the JGXD needs to be heavily revised in the light of the latest scholarship. The Longmen communities of the late 17th-18th centuries were not the product of a single and direct line of transmission, but resulted from multiple initiations given to the same disciples by multiple masters and from the dissemination of the same teachings to different disciples. The complex and composite nature of Daoist (Longmen) transmission in this context is evident from the discrepancy found in the JGXD between the linear, ordered transmission of Longmen teachings in the earlier generations and the multi-layered, interconnected transmission that occurred in Min Yide’s generation and adjacent ones. This will become evident in the pages below. Therefore, scholars should abandon the idea of a unitary

36 Cf. Tianxian zhengli zhilun zengzhu “zixu”:11a.
37 Mori, “Tracing Back Wang Changyue’s Precepts”.
38 Esposito, Creative Daoism, 91-129; Facets of Qing Daoism, 244-8.
Longmen lineage transmitting an ideal, unchanging Quanzhen tradition, and embrace instead the idea of Longmen as the product of specific historical circumstances and the source of a wide array of different traditions. In other words, “Quanzhen Daoism, especially the so-called Longmen lineage, has undergone a multicentered and multifaceted historical development with both strong continuities and institutional innovations and regional variations”.

In the following section I will reconstruct the historical Longmen community linked with Tongbai Palace after its restoration.

5.3 Longmen Daoists in 18th-century Hangzhou and Tiantai

In 1734 the Yongzheng Emperor restored three temples somehow connected with Zhang Boduan: the Ziyang Abbey, the Ziyang Daoist Temple and Tongbai Palace, and sponsored the restoration of the Guoqing Monastery. Just a few years before, Fan Qingyun was reportedly still administering the Qingsheng Shrine. The JGXD states that he was a member of the Longmen orthodox lineage and for this reason it contains a biography of him, according to which Fan Qingyun (ming: Taiqing 太清; zi: Yuanzhen 元真; hao: Qingyun zi 青雲子; 1604/1660?-1748) was born in Jiangxia 江夏 (Hubei) in 1604. He was a Longmen master of doctrine of the ninth generation, ‘Sun Yuyang’s only disciple, the only one carrying on [his] doctrine’ 玉陽孫祖弟子，獨承宗教者也. From his youth, he was erudite and had a strong sense of justice. In 1643 he left his life as a scholar and became a Daoist (literally: ‘took off his blue shirt and changed it into a feathery dress’, tuo qingshan, yi yuyi 脱青衫，易羽衣) and went to the Mao Mountains, where Shen Taihe 沈太和 transmitted the 110 Mysterious Eulogies (xuanjie 玄偈) to him and appointed Sun Yuyang 孫玉陽 as his master. Ten years later, Fan Qingyun returned to Master Shen, but the latter had already passed away, so it was Sun Yuyang who ordained Fan Qingyun and gave him his Daoist name. After recording a series of petitions (zhang 章) on a piece of brocade, he left. When Fan Qingyun arrived in Tiantai the snow was clearing, so he climbed Qiongtai Peak, alone. There, he met Master Sun again, who approached him wearing a straw hat. Fan followed his master for another twelve years, then went back to Mt. Tongbai. The JGXD also records that Fan Qingyun travelled across southeast China during the Kangxi and Yongzheng reigns (1661-1735). In 1667 he reportedly

---

40 The biography of Fan Qingyun can be found in JGXD 3:45a-47b.
41 Shen Taihe is remembered as the master of doctrine of the 7th generation. More on Sun Yuyang below.
met Wang Changyue, who gave him the *Bojian* 瓮鑑 in five fascicles (juan 卷), a history of the transmission of the Quanzhen tradition written by the 9th Longmen patriarch Wang Changyue himself.

Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博, one of the commentators of the JGX, lists the *Bojian xu* 瓮鑑續 (Continuation to the *Bojian*) by Fan Qingyun among the sources of the biographies in that text. The *Bojian xu* is reportedly a continuation of the *Bojian*, which Fan Qingyun expanded from its five scrolls to nine. Monica Esposito suggested that both the *Bojian* and the *Bojian xu* may have been fictitious texts, since no trace of either has survived outside of the quotations in the JGX. Regardless, the fact that Fan Qingyun was regarded as the author of a key text on the historiography of the orthodox lineage places him in a prominent, almost fundamental position.

According to the JGX, he must have travelled to Mt. Jingai, because in the first month of the following year, Fan Qingyun and Tong Rongyang 童融陽 (another Longmen Daoist) left that mountain and returned to Tiantai. There, Master Fan unearthed the two statues of Bo Yi and Shu Qi that he took care of alone until the restoration of Tongbai Palace. The JGX depicts Fan Qingyun as a leading Daoist in the history of the Longmen orthodox lineage: quoting a sentence reportedly uttered by Shen Yibing 沈一炳 (1708-1786), Fan Qingyun “alone embodied the doctrinal tradition of four generations of masters, Shen [Jingyuan], Wei [Zhending], Shen [Changjing] and Sun [Shouyi]” 范宗師以一身獨承沈、衛、沈、孫四代之宗派. These four masters constitute the line of doctrine according to Min Yide’s systematised Longmen orthodox lineage [table 5]. The fact that it is impossible to determine the historical accuracy of the biographies of Shen Jingyuan, Wei Zhending, Shen Changjing and Sun Shouyi in the JGX does not help clarifying Fan Qingyun’s biography. What I can state is that these four Daoists were also regarded, respectively, as the 7th-, 8th-, 9th- and 10th-generation patriarchs of Zhou Mingyang’s lineage at the Jingu Grotto: unfortunately, even the *Jingu Dong zhi* does not contain any information on these masters except their names. Therefore, the part of Fan Qingyun’s biography presented above cannot be confirmed on the basis of other sources – what can be is the final part.

After the restoration of Chongdao Abbey, Fan Qingyun left the management of the temple up to Gao Dongli 高東籬, Shen Yibing’s and Min Yide’s master, while he retired to the Jingu Cave 金鼓洞.

---

42 JGX "wenxian lu".1a-2b. The other sources include the *Bojian* 瓮鑑 by Wang Changyue, the *Daopu yuanliu tu* 道譜源流圖 by Lü Yunyin 呂雲隱 (fl. 1710), the *Yangshi yilin* 揚氏逸林 by Yang Shen’an 揚慎菴 and the *Dongyuan yulu* 東原語錄 by Lü Quanyang 呂全陽. Apparently, only the *Daopu yuanliu tu* is still extant.

43 Esposito, *Facets of Qing Daoism*, 59, 248.

of Hangzhou. This handover must have seemed strange to Min Yide, because Gao Dongli and Fan Qingyun lacked a direct master-disciple relationship, which is probably the reason why he added the following sentence: “although my master Gao [Dongli] did not receive the doctrinal tradition of Fan [Qingyun], he clearly carried it on”

是則我高子之學，雖非范授其宗派之流傳，顯有繼述矣。45 According to the interlinear commentary, Fan Qingyun was buried on the southern side of Helin Temple (i.e. Jingu Grotto in Hangzhou), next to Baoben Hall. I think that the reference to Fan Qingyun’s line of doctrine serves to avoid confusion about the fact that Gao Dongli inherited the unified Longmen orthodox tradition from his master Zhou Mingyang, whereas Fan Qingyun was only considered a “master of doctrine” (zongshi) in this system.

There are a few problems with this biography, the most evident being Fan Qingyun’s year of birth. It is highly improbable that he was born in 1604, if he was still active in the Yongzheng era. Moreover, his cousin Fan Zhenyong employed the word tangdi to narrate Fan Qingyun’s story, which indicates a cousin from a younger generation: if master Fan was really 113 years old at that time, Fan Zhenyong could have been even older! Ironically, it almost seems as though the JGXD itself suggests what may have been Fan Qingyun’s real age. According to this text, Shen Yibing once recalled: “his complexion was that of a forty- or fifty-year-old person. If one asked him, he would say that he was 43 years old”

Therefore, at the beginning of the 18th century master Fan was said to be 96 years old, but to look about 40. If instead the latter was his real age, it means that by 1717 he would have been around 57 years old and, consequently, that he may have arrived at the Qingsheng Shrine when he was more or less 32. In this way, when he passed away in 1748, he would have been 88 years old, which was still a respectable age, but far from the 144 years of age recorded in the JGXD! It may therefore be argued that it is not so much his date of death, as his date of birth that should be revised in order to account for the biological and historical discrepancies that surface in the JGXD: a more appropriate birthdate should be set around 1660.

The second aspect worth analysing is Fan Qingyun’s encounter with Wang Changyue. We do not find any evidence external to the JGXD about this event, which could be regarded as historiographically questionable. We should not read it literally, though, as in the case of his direct relationship with the great master Shen Taihe (d. 1653) and probably even with Sun Yuyang, although the latter’s dates of birth and death are not stated.
We should also consider the fact that the messages exchanged between the emperor and Li Wei do not discuss Fan Qingyun’s affiliation with any state-sponsored Daoist temple or lineage: if things had been as they are described in the JGXD, why was Fan Qingyun presented as a lonely Daoist? Why is there no reference to other Longmen institutions in sources other than the JGXD? This circumstance begs the question of why so much information is missing from the sources, information that could have been fundamental to attract Daoists who might have helped Fan Qingyun manage the temple, as Zhang Lianyuan hoped.

Finally, according to the JGXD, Fan Qingyun was very close to the Daoist institution of Hangzhou called Jingu Grotto. He was trained by patriarchs of that lineage who were also tied to the Qianyuan Abbey of the Mao Mountains. Towards the end of his life he retired to the Helin Abbey of the Jingu Grotto, where he was eventually buried.47 While there is no evidence outside the JGXD that can confirm any of the above points, the frequent references to the Jingu Grotto can be explained on the basis of Min Yide’s Daoist lineage. As revealed above, his master was called Gao Dongli, and before becoming the abbot of Tongbai Palace, he had been trained precisely at the Jingu Grotto. It was he who took over the responsibility of managing Tongbai Palace after Fan Qingyun and he was also Min Yide’s first Daoist master: the connections of the Tongbai Palace both to the Jingu Grotto and to Min Yide’s Longmen orthodox lineage are therefore very clear. This is the reason why it is now necessary to study the Daoists of Hangzhou in more detail.

5.4 The Longmen Lineage of the Jingu Grotto

The Jingu Grotto is located on Qixia Peak 棲霞嶺 in Hangzhou. It is also known by the names of Jingu 金固 and Jinguo 金果 Grotto.48 This temple housed two relics of Lü Dongbin: a picture of the transcendent and the four characters feilai yehe 飛來野鶴 (“wild cranes flew over”), which appeared on the outer walls of the temple in 1781.49 In the 17th century Zhou Mingyang (ming: Tailang 太朗; zi: Yuanzhen 元真; hao: Mingyang zi 明陽子; 1627-1710) settled down at the location of this temple and built what later became the Helin Daoist Temple 鶴林道院. The Jingu Dong zhi, edited by Zhu Wenzao 朱文藻 (zi: Yingchun 映漘; hao: Langzhai 郎齋; 1735-1806?) at the beginning of the 19th c., records the story of how the Jingu Grotto became one of the earliest

47 JGXD 3:46a, 47a.
48 Jingu Dong zhi 2:1b-2a.
49 Jingu Dong zhi 1:1a-16a.
Longmen institutions in Zhejiang. In 1664 Zhou Mingyang, born in Chenze 震澤 (Jiangsu), received the precepts from Wang Changyue at Zongyang Palace 宗陽宮 in Hangzhou. This piece of information may well be historically accurate: we know that other influential Daoists received the precepts from Wang Changyue in Hangzhou in the same period. The compilation of the Jingu Dong zhi precedes that of the JGXD and contains a list of the main Daoists of the Longmen lineage of the Helin Temple [table 6].

The first four generations are missing, an interesting circumstance that conflicts with what is recorded in the JGXD. Zhou Mingyang was a disciple of Sun Yuyang, about whom little is known apart from the scant information provided in the JGXD and in turn, the latter was a disciple of Shen Taihe 沈太和. Regarding Shen Taihe (ming: Changjing 常敬; zi: Yizhai 一齋; hao: Taihezi 太和子; 1523-1653), the JGXD recounts as follows: he was born in Tongxiang 桐鄉 (present-day Jiaxing 嘉興) and received a Confucian education. When he was 40 years old, he went to Mt. Jingai, then moved to Wulin and finally to the Yuangai Grotto-Heaven 元蓋洞天 to study longevity techniques, but he was not satisfied with what he learnt. While travelling to famous mountains, Master Shen finally met Wei Pingyang 衛平陽, who became his master and bestowed the Purport of the Supreme Doctrine 太上宗旨 on him. After this, Shen Taihe went to the Mao Mountains and as master of doctrine of the 7th generation he transmitted his teachings to two disciples, Sun Yuyang (Taihe) and Huang Chiyang. He passed away on Mount Mao in Shunzhi 10 (1653), at the age of 131.

The JGXD states that Sun was the Longmen master of doctrine of the 8th generation. He was born in Guian 歸安 (Huzhou) and was considered very smart from his youth. At the age of 19, while travelling in Jinling, he met Shen Taihe. They both retired to the

---

50 Jingu Dong zhi 7:2b-3a.

51 So far, I have found concrete evidence about Lü Shoupu 呂守璞 (zi: Duanxu 端虛; hao: Yunyin 雲隱; original ming: Xie 謝; ?-1710). Cf. Xushuguan zhi 滸墅關志 (1827) 17: "dao" 3a; JGXD 6:28a-29b; Xi Jin shi wai 1:40a-b; Wuxi Jinkui Xian zhi 29:33b. There is another Daoist who received the precepts from Wang Changyue and who was active in Suzhou at the end of the 17th century: he is called Huang Gun 黃衮 (fl. 1682-1692) and may also have been initiated at the Zongyang Palace of Hangzhou in 1664. Cf. Xushuguan zhi 9:15a-16a, 17: "dao" 2a; Suzhou Fu zhi (DG) 45:1b-2a; Suzhou Fu zhi (GX) 41:21a, 135:26b-27a.

52 JGXD 1:18a-19a. The Yuangai Grotto-Heaven is presumably the Dadi Xuangai 大滌玄蓋, the 31st Lesser Grotto-Heaven on Mt. Tianzhu 天柱山 (Lin’an County). For a list of these Grotto-Heavens, see Verellen, “The Beyond Within”, 290.

53 For Wei Pingyang’s biography, see JGXD 1:13a-14b. Wei Pingyang was a Master of Longmen Doctrine of the 6th generation. According to Min Yide, he met master Zhao Fuyang (a 6th-generation master of Vinaya, also known as ‘the unusual person of Tiantai’ 天台異人) in the Tiantai mountains.
Mao Mountains, where Sun received 36 esoteric documents. Master Shen named him master of doctrine and bestowed the name Shouyi on him. In 1656 Sun Yuyang went back to Mt. Jingai to practice self-cultivation, and met Tao Jing’an there. Afterwards, he again travelled to the famous mountains and finally went to stay at the Qianyuan Abbey of the Mao Mountains. In the year jiachen 甲辰 of the Kangxi era (1664) Sun sent his disciple Zhou Tailiang (i.e. Zhou Mingyang) to the Dade Abbey of Hangzhou, to become Huang Chiyang’s disciple. The interlinear commentary interestingly

54 Two biographies of Tao Jing’an can be found in JGXD 2:9a-19b, 20a-22a.
notes that the Bojian xu by Fan Qingyun listed both Yan Xiaofeng閻曉峯 (representing the Maoshan ritual tradition) and Zhou Mingyang周明陽 as disciples of Sun Yuyang’s who carried on the doctrinal lineage, but not Fan Qingyun.55

The information contained in the JGXD regarding these two Daoists, like that about Fan Qingyun, is problematic. Richard Wang studied the Daoist communities of the Qianyuan Abbey and was unable to find a single reference to either Sun or Shen in sources prior to the JGXD. Instead, he found plenty of data on the Quanzhen-inspired Daoist lineage of a certain Daoist Yan閻道人 (ming: Xiyan希言; hao: Xiyan希言; faming: Fuqing/Fuchu復清/復初; 1509-1588) established at the Qianyuan Abbey,56 whose presence is also recorded in Da Changguang’s笪蟾光 (1623-1692) Maoshan quanzhi茅山全志. Daoist Yan and his disciples, most notably Daoist Jiang江道人 (ming: Benshi本實; hao: Wengu文谷; 1545-1606) and Daoist Li李道人 (birth ming: Mengxian夢仙; ming: Yiliao一了, Hekun合坤; hao: Chedu徹度; 1510?-1619) were all assigned characteristics typical of ascetic and monastic communities; they were clearly inspired by the early Quanzhen movement and declared themselves to be part of it. One wonders whether the extreme practices characterising Yan’s lineage, and involving early Quanzhen themes such as being buried alive, were an instance of the ‘back to the origins’ approach to religion of the latter half of the Ming that seems to have also inspired the rebirth of Chan Buddhism.

Different sources contain detailed information on Master Yan’s lineage. One reason for its popularity may have been the strong social influence that its Daoists had in the surrounding area and especially in Nanjing, not least through their links with the local elite. In addition, Li Chidu probably met Matteo Ricci (who called him ‘Liciettò’) during the latter’s third stay in Nanjing at the end of the 17th century, in the context of urban elite gatherings.57 This reinforces the argument that Daoists from Qianyuan Abbey and the urban elite were in close contact during the 16th century Patriarch Yan’s lineage reached even higher levels of society, establishing contacts with the court. In 1614 the emperor organised a Golden Register Retreat金籙齋 for his mother and ordered the Daoists of the Abbey to perform the ritual.58 In the same year he funded the Daoists and sent a copy of the Daoist Canon, brought by the Quanzhen Daoist Zhou Xuanzhen周玄真, to the abbot of the Jiuxiao Wanfu Palace九霄萬福宮 of the

55 JGXD 2:44b-45a.
56 Wang, “Mingdai Jiangnan shishen jingying yu Maoshan Quanzhen dao de xingqi”, 26-70.
57 Song, "Two Daoists", 1-11.
58 Maoshan quanzhi 2:27b; Yang, Pan, Maoshan daojiao zhi, 395.
Mao Mountains. These events point to extensive imperial patronage of this area during the Wanli era, which also benefited Qianyuan Abbey, but no information on any Longmen lineage, Shen Taihe or Sun Yuyang is to be found.

In conclusion, the ties between Fan Qingyun and both the Mao Mountains and the Jingu Grotto are not supported by any evidence uncovered so far that precedes the restoration of Tongbai Palace. Moreover, while the *Jingu Dong zhi* confirms that Shen Taihe and Sun Yuyang were patriarchs of the lineage of the Jingu Grotto, this source does not associate them with Qianyuan Abbey or other institutions of the Mao Mountains: this relationship is not disproved either, but the silence in the sources makes any claim very problematic. It is not possible, for the time being, to determine the origin of Zhou Tailang’s lineage. What we know is that in 1664 he received the precepts from Wang Changyue and settled by the Jingu Grotto. The *Jingu Dong zhi* itself states that the Helin Temple was built only about one hundred years before, more or less at the beginning of the 18th century, and that therefore the lineage did not count many generations. Finally, if Zhou Mingyang received the precepts from Wang Changyue, according to what I have stated above, the Longmen identity of his lineage must have originated with him. Consequently, the relationship between the Helin Temple/Jingu Grotto and Tongbai Palace must have been established rather late, possibly only when Gao Dongli was elected abbot of the Palace. The sources tell us that it was the local population (no doubt the local notables) that invited him to take over the administration of the temple. By that time, he had been residing at the Jingu Grotto for many years and had established close relationships with the other Daoists there.

### 5.5 Tongbai Palace and Its Longmen Lineages

The JGXD states that Gao Dongli (*ming*: Qingyu 清昱, *zi*: Dongli 東離; 1616-1768) became the ‘chief instructor’ (*jiangxi* 講席) of Chongdao Abbey/Tongbai Palace after its restoration. His ancestral home was in Ninghai Prefecture 宁海州 (Shandong), but his ancestors had left it during the Ming Wanli era (1572-1620). In the Kangxi era he followed his father, a *jinshi* graduate, to Taiwan. Gao Dongli reportedly entered Daoism in 1692, when he was 75. He went to

---

59 Maoshan quanzhi 2:26a-27a; Yang, Pan, *Maoshan daojiao zhi*, 395.

60 *Jingu Dong zhi* 7:1a.

61 According to *Longmen zhengzong jueyun benzhi daotong xinchuan*, he was born in the first year of the Tianqi reign, i.e. in 1620.

Zhejiang and brought with him his nephew Gao Lin 高麟 to visit the Jingu Grotto. Thereafter, Zhou Mingyang became his master and transmitted some texts to him, such as the *Nanhua jing* 南華, *Daode jing* 道德, the *Cantong qi* 參同, the *Wuzhen pian* and *Huayan* 華嚴 (i.e. the *Dafangguang Fo huayan jing* 大方佛華嚴經, also known as the *Avatamsaka sutra*), the *Daxue*, *Zhongyong* 中庸 and *Xinjing*. Zhou told Gao Dongli: “All of them are means by which sages can become perfected” 皆此證聖成真之寶筏也, thus confirming the persistent support of the doctrine of the Three Teachings among Quanzhen-inspired traditions. He was later invited to become the abbot of Tongbai Palace (at that time called Chongdao Abbey) soon after its restoration and went there with his disciple Shen Yibing. He reportedly died on Mt. Tongbai at the age of 151 and was buried there. We know of three disciples who dwelled with their master Gao Dongli at Tongbai Palace: Shen Yibing (zi: Zhenyang 真揚; hao: Guyin 谷音 and Qingyun zi 輕雲子; 1708-1786), Min Yide 閔一得 (ming: Tiaofu 蘇超; zi: Buzhi 補之 and Xiaogen 小艮; hao: Lanyun 懶雲; 1748/1758-1836) and Fang Yiding 方一定 (zi: Rongyang 錫陽; fl. second half of the 18th century). The lives of the first two are better known than that of the third, because historical sources contain multiple biographies about them and they seem to have left a stronger influence on the traditions that produced the sources known today. For example, the texts written or edited by Min Yide for his anthology *Gushu yinlou cangshu* 古書隱樓藏書 contain numerous additional details about his own activities and those of Shen Yibing. The relationship that binds these two Daoists is more complicated than that between disciples of the same master: after Gao Dongli’s death, Min Yide completed his training with Shen Yibing. Therefore, even though Min Yide is described in all sources – and described himself – as Gao Dongli’s disciple, he also considered Shen Yibing to be his master, although both went down in history as Longmen masters of the 11th generation.

There are four biographies of Shen Yibing in the JGXD, all roughly agreeing on the fundamental data. One was authored by Min Yide himself, the others by three different literati: Wang Yixian 王以銜 (1761-1823), Zhou Yangben 周陽本 (1715-1813) and Yao Wentian 姚文田 (1758-1827). Of these authors, the first two were themselves Longmen Daoists of the 12th generation, whose biographies are also included in the JGXD. The biography by Yao Wentian can also be found in

---

63 JGXD 4:11b. *Baofa* 寶筏 is a Buddhist term meaning ‘precious raft’ and indicating the Dharma teachings which lead practitioners to Nirvana, just as a raft is used to cross a river from shore to shore. *Nanhua* refers to the *Nanhua jing* 南華經, also known as the *Zhuangzi*.

64 JGXD 3:47a.2-3, 4:13a.3.

65 For the biography by Min Yide, see JGXD 4:31a-32b. For Yao Wentian’s, Wang Yixian’s and Zhou Yangmu’s, see JGXD 4:37b-44b.
the *Jingu Dong zhi*, together with a shorter one by the abbot of the Jingu Grotto, Zhang Fuchun 張復純 (fl. 1805-1807) and one by Hong Wangyuan 鴻王源, who described himself as a disciple of Shen Yibing from Yanjing 燕京 (Beijing); neither of these biographies are included in the JGXD. These texts mix biographical data and myth, so I will proceed with their comparative study in order to highlight their common and historically most reliable elements.

5.5.1 Shen Yibing

Shen Yibing, like Min Yide, hailed from the Huzhou area. He was born into a prominent family of Wuxing 吳興, but both his parents passed away when he was seven. Yao Wentian proposes a first mythical, but highly significant, element: reportedly, at the age of six Shen Yibing met the Daoist Li Niwan 李泥丸 on Mt. Jingai for the first time and after having received three secret poems from him, he decided to transcend the mortal world. At seventeen (1725), Shen Yibing went to the Jingu Grotto, where he became Gao Dongli’s disciple. The latter bestowed the Daoist name ‘Yibing’ on him and, according to Zhang Fuchun, gave him a series of texts: the *Datong jing* 大通經, the *Aozhi* 奧旨, the *Cantong qi*, and the *Zhongyong*. Two of these, namely the *Cantong qi* and the *Zhongyong*, were also bestowed on Gao Dongli by his master Zhou Mingyang. A third one, the *Aozhi*, may be related to a third scripture bestowed on Gao, the *Dafangguang Fo huayan jing*. We can see, therefore, that the doctrinal foundations of these Daoists encompassed texts from all three officially sanctioned religions. Despite his close relationship with Gao Dongli, it was Dai Qingyuan 戴清源 (courtesy name Rongyang zi 融陽子; hao: Chuyang zi 初陽子; 1692-1735) who bestowed on him the three levels of precepts, effectively initiating him into the Longmen lineage. I would explain this event by pointing out that the initiation may have taken place in 1727 or in the following years, when Dai Qingyuan was the abbot of the Helin Temple.

---

66 *Jingu Dong zhi* 4:6b-8a, 8:7b-8a.

67 Li Niwan is a mythical Daoist who was reportedly active in the 11th century, and who according to the JGXD was also Wu Shouyang’s 吳守陽 (trad. 1552-1641) master. On Li Niwan, cf. JGXD 8:48a-49b; Esposito, *Facets of Qing Daoism*, 106-7, 111-25. For Wu Shouyang’s biography, cf. JGXD 2:1a-2b.

68 This likely to be either the *Aozhi* by Wang Zihua 汪子華 (714-789), also quoted in Wang Jie’s 王玠 (14th century) *Ruyao jing zhujie* 入藥鏡註解, or the *Xiu Huayan aozhi wangjin huanyuan guan* 修華嚴奧旨妄盡還源觀 by the monk Fazang 法藏 (643-712). Cf. Wang, *Commentary on the Mirror for Compounding the Medicine*, 39.

In 1736 Gao Dongli accepted the abbotship of Tongbai Palace and Shen Yibing followed him. Later, he left Tiantai for Mt. Gaochi 高池山, near Shanghai, where he befriended the Daoist Bei Changji 貝常吉. He then moved to the Zhenxi Retreat 鎮溪庵 (also called Zhengqi 正氣 Retreat in some sources), located in the western outskirts of Wuxi 無錫, where he “faced the wall” in meditation for three years. The Zhenxi Retreat was built as a Daoist institution in the Ming Zhengde 正德 era (1505-1521) and enlarged in the Chongzhen 崇禎 era (1627-1644). It is noteworthy that the Wuxi Jinkui Xian zhi 無錫金匱縣志 (1882) records that during the Jiaqing 嘉慶 era (1796-1820), i.e. at least ten years after Shen Yibing’s death, the Retreat temporarily became the dwelling place of Buddhist monks. Thereafter, Master Shen travelled to the Songjiang 松江 area, where he reportedly met Li Niwan again and followed a ritual master (fashi 法師), from whom he received the ‘secret doctrine of the great method’ (or ‘the great methods of Tantrism’, dafa mizong 大法密宗). Gao Dongli passed away in 1768, so Shen Yibing became the teacher of a still young Min Yide.

Although the biographies do not explain in detail the role that Li Niwan played in Shen Yibing’s education, it is undeniable that his teachings constituted the core of Shen Yibing’s tradition as it was transmitted to Min Yide. Out of the 23 texts that constitute what Monica Esposito defined as ‘the core’ of Min Yide’s Daoist anthology, five are attributed to or transmitted by Li Niwan; of these, four were reportedly recorded by Shen Yibing. In 1786 Shen Yibing transmitted part of the Tianxian xinchuan 天仙心傳 (Transmission of the Heart of the Celestial Transcendent) to Min Yide at the Xuanai Grotto-Heaven 玄蓋洞天 of Mt. Dadi 大滌山, in Yuhang 餘杭. This grotto is located near Dongxiao Palace 洞霄宮, one of the main Daoist temples of the Song dynasty, which has maintained its importance ever since; this can be considered the third major Daoist centre in Shen Yibing’s network after the Helin Temple and Tongbai Palace. Shen himself died in 1786, and was buried on the Jinzhu Terrace 金筑坪 of Dongxiao Palace. His image was enshrined in the Lanyun

70 Zhenxi is the name reported in the biography by Yao Wentian and in Wuxi xian zhi 無錫縣志 19:12b.
71 Wuxi Jinkui Xian zhi 13:16b.
72 Esposito, Facets of Qing Daoism, 164, 191-211. The four texts are: Tianxian dao jieji xuzhi 天仙道戒忌須知, Tianxian daocheng baoze 天仙道程寶則, Niwan Li zushi nüzong shuangxiu baofa 泥丸李祖師女宗雙修寶筏 and Suoyan xu 須言續, all dealing with self-cultivation. There are other texts transmitted by Shen Yibing, but apparently unrelated to Li Niwan, the Xi Wang Mu nüxiu zhengtu shize 西王母女修正途十則 and part of the Tianxian xinchuan 天仙心傳.
73 Tianxian xinchuan “xu”:2a. The Xuanai Grotto-Heaven was listed by Sima Chengzhen as the 34th minor grotto-heaven and by Du Guangting as the 31st.
74 Cf. Dongxiao tu zhi; Da Qing yitong zhi 洞霄宮志.
Nest 懶雲窩 of the Jingu Grotto, at the Yunchao Temple 雲巢廟 of Mt. Jingai, at the Kaihua Temple 開化院 of Guian, at Wenchang Palace 文昌宮 of Xushuguan and on the Juhua Slope 菊花坡 of Weiyang 維揚 (Yangzhou 扬州).\textsuperscript{75} According to the commentary on the JGXD, these were all places visited by Shen Yibing when he was still alive.

Although he was certainly a charismatic Daoist who was worshipped in a vast area after his death, we know that Shen Yibing was already a prominent Daoist before arriving at Tongbai Palace. Evidence of this is found in the \textit{Jingu Dong zhi}, which contains hints of the competition between Shen Yibing and Luo Yizhong 駱一中 (\textit{zi}: Shengzhe 聖哲; 18th century), who would eventually become abbot of the Jingu Grotto and who himself received the teachings of both Gao Dongli and Dai Qingyuan (師事清源戴真人, 面壁苦修。上接周祖之傳, 下衍戴師、高師之派).\textsuperscript{76} Both Shen Yibing and Luo Yizhong are described as well-endowed and equally skilled Daoists.\textsuperscript{77} According to what I have explained so far, the Longmen lineage that Gao Dongli established at Tongbai Palace originated from the Helin Temple, or the Jingu Grotto, of Hangzhou. This institution, founded by Zhou Mingyang, was originally the continuation of an undetermined lineage and an offshoot of the Longmen communities established by Wang Changyue in the second half of the 17th century Shen Yibing endeavoured to expand his Daoist network by establishing contacts with numerous institutions in an area that went from Wuxi and possibly Weiyang in the north to Tiantai in the south, and from Yuhang in the west to Suzhou and Shanghai in the east.

This network was established by Shen Yibing also by befriending several highly respected personalities in Jiangnan, such as Ji Huang 稽璜, the Gu 顧 clan of Wuxi, the Zhang 張 clan of Wulin 武林 and the Yang 楊 clan of Songjiang 松江.\textsuperscript{78} One Daoist friend of his was the aforementioned Bei Changji (\textit{ming}: Benheng 本恆; 1688-1758), whose first Daoist affiliation originated from the Daoist communities of Mt. Wudang, where he became the disciple of Yuan Zhengyu 袁正遇 at the age of seventeen. He was later drawn to Wang Changyue's reformed Quanzhen tradition and went to Qianyuan Abbey on the Mao Mountains ‘asking Wang Changyue’ to receive the precepts: because Master Wang had passed away in 1680, this should not be interpreted literally as Bei Changji’s direct request to Wang himself, but to his disciples.\textsuperscript{79} In itself, this detail demonstrates just

\textsuperscript{75} JGXD 4:36a-b.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Jingu Dong zhi} 7:6a.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Jingu Dong zhi} 7:6b.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Jingu Dong zhi} 4:8a; JGXD 4:25a.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Pinluo an yiji} 頻羅蕐遺集 9:21b.
how popular and esteemed Wang Changyue’s Quanzhen resurgence was among Daoists at the beginning of the Qing dynasty. The JGXD also confirms that Bei Changji was affiliated with two lineages: the Quanzhen of Mt. Hua 華山派 and the Longmen (i.e. Wang Changyue’s reformed Quanzhen tradition).

In 1719 Bei Changji built a retreat on Mt. Gaoci and over time became a respected practitioner: this might explain why Shen Yibing went there. His charisma resulted in his appointment as abbot of the Dongxiao Palace of Yuhang in 1745. There, Bei Changji repeatedly distinguished himself by helping the population fight diseases and improved the prestige of the temple by promoting the publication of the Da Qing yitong zhi 洞霄宮志.

Shen Yibing’s connections with Bei Changji resulted in him becoming a central figure for Daoism in Yuhang, another node in his network. Indeed, he was even chosen as a master by one of Bei Changji’s foremost disciples, Li Renning 李仁凝 (hao: Yuefeng 月峯; Langu 蘭谷; fl. middle of the 18th century), also known as Li Fang 李芳 or Miaozhong Dingming Zhenren 妙表定命真人 (Perfected of the Subtle Heart of the Fixed Destiny). It was at the Lanyun Nest of the Jingu Grotto, where he resided later in life, that Li Renning studied as a disciple of Shen Yibing. Like Bei Changji, he was therefore initiated into two lineages: that of Mt. Hua and the Longmen one. Moreover, as though to stress the close bond between them, Li is also remembered as the Daoist who established Shen Yibing’s shrine (feng kan 封龕) at Dongxiao Palace.

We see that the relations between Daoist communities were much more fluid than they are usually described in the emic systematisations of the late empire: each master had many disciples who could carry on his tradition; at the same time, each disciple could have more than one master and be initiated into more than one tradition. When applied to our study of Tongbai Palace, this allows us to argue that the temple, because it hosted a prominent Longmen lineage of Zhejiang, was part of the coeval network of ‘Longmen’ temples of southeast China, but only if we amend the traditional concept of Longmen orthodoxy.

80 Yin, Qingdai Quanzhen dao lishi xintan, 180; Wu, Jiangnan Quanzhen Daojiao, 320-1. JGXD 3:22a-b states that Bei Changji was initiated into the Longmen lineage by his master Fan Chuyang 樊初陽.

81 Pinluo an yiji 9:21b. We are told that another Daoist, Shen Yueguang 沈月光 (Daoist name: Heyi 和一) of the Tongyuan Abbey 通元觀 of Mt. Jichou 計籌山, went looking for Bei Changji. Yin, Qingdai Quanzhen dao lishi xintan, 180.


83 Jingu Dong zhi 8:8b.

84 JGXD 4:32a; Jingu Dong zhi 8:8b-9a, 12b-13a; Wu, Jiangnan Quanzhen Daojiao, 323.
as a linear and univocal transmission. Moreover, by focusing on the figure of Shen Yibing, we have uncovered a broad Daoist network that encompassed multiple temples in Jiangsu and Zhejiang. If we extend our perspective to Shen Yibing’s disciples, we find that two of them are especially significant: Zhou Yangben 周陽本 (zi: Yonglin 用霖; hao: Tixia 梯霞; 1715-1813) and Chen Qiaoyun 陳樵雲 (ming: Yangfu 陽復; yuanning: Qufei 去非; zi: Yiting 翼庭; 1730-1785) from Guian. The former set up a lineage branch at the Banchi Retreat 半持菴 of Mt. Tong 銅山 (Yuhang, in present-day Deqing County 德清縣). The latter also operated in Yuhang, but established his lineage at Sanyuan Palace 三元宮 and had four prominent disciples mentioned in the JGXD: Ruan Laizong 阮來宗, Yang Laiyi 杨来逸, Qian Laiyu 钱来玉 and Bao Laijin 鲍来金.\(^85\)

5.5.2 Fang Yiding

The second of Gao Dongli’s disciples is Fang Yiding, the only one of the three not from Huzhou, since he reportedly hailed from Ninghai 宁海.\(^87\) The Jingu Dong zhi 金僧行志 inserts him in the Longmen lineage of the Jingu Grotto, but it is difficult to determine whether this was an affiliation determined a posteriori due to the fact that he was Gao Dongli’s disciple, or if Fang Yiding actually trained or dwelled at the Jingu Grotto.\(^88\) Unlike Shen and Min, his area of action would appear to have been to the east and to the south of Tiantai, since according to the JGXD he had many disciples in Wenzhou, Taizhou and Ningbo. He was Gao Dongli’s successor as “chief instructor” of Tongbai Palace, which may also imply that he became its abbot.\(^89\) Among the temples that he visited, those mentioned are the ones of Baibu 百步, Jinlei 金罍, Zilang 紫琅, Weiyu 委羽 and Gaizhu 蓋竹, where he appears to have been a successful proselytiser.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Baibu Brook 百步溪 of Linhai County was tied to Zhang Boduan’s transcendence to immortality and the temple built in that location in honour of

---

85 The biography of Zhou Yangben can be found in JGXD 5:9a-10b.
86 JGXD “Longmen zhengzong liuchuan zhipai tu” 龍門正宗流傳支派圖 (Chart of the Transmission of the Longmen Orthodox Lineage): 3b. The JGXD contains an entry on the four of them together, JGXD 5:38a-39b. The biography of Chen Yangfu can be found in JGXD 5:5a-8b.
87 Fang Yiding’s biography can be found in JGXD 4:30a–b.
88 Jingu Dong zhi 金僧行志 7:6b.
89 The JGXD describes Gao Dongli as chief instructor of the Palace as well, but we know from the Jingu Dong zhi that he was in fact its administrator: one wonders whether there were so few Daoists living at the temple that they had to perform different roles or if, due to a peculiar custom, jiangxi was used at Tongbai Palace to indicate the abbotship.
this event, Ziyang Abbey 紫陽觀, received the Yongzheng Emperor’s patronage at the same time as Tongbai Palace. It is possible, although difficult to demonstrate, that Fang Yiding’s activities at the Baibu Brook were related to Ziyang Abbey.\footnote{On Ziyang Abbey, cf. Zhejiang tongzhi 232:12a; Gongzhong dang Yongzheng chao zouzhe 19:51a-53a.} Another area mentioned among those frequented by Fang Yiding is Mt. Weiyu, where it was located the Dayou Palace 大有宮, which became a major Longmen center in Taizhou during the late 19th century. The close relationship between Fang Yiding and southern Zhejiang is confirmed by the \textit{Jingu Dong zhi}, where the Daoist is said to have practiced the Way for more than thirty years at the Gaizhu Grotto-Heaven 蓋竹洞天 and to have been buried at the Xianyan Cave 仙岩洞 after death, both places located in Linhai.

Not much is known about Fang Yiding’s activities and his disciples, yet they may all be considered part of the Longmen community, or lineage, of Tongbai Palace. According to the JGXD, his lineage was as follows: Fang Yiding (11th generation) $\rightarrow$ Gu Yangkun 顧陽崑 (12th generation) $\rightarrow$ Wang Laizhen 王來真 (13th generation) $\rightarrow$ Pan Fuyuan 潘復圓 (14th generation).\footnote{JGXD “Longmen zhengzong liuchuan zhipai tu”: 3a. Cf. JGXD 4:30a-30b, 5:4a-4b, 5:36a-37a; Longmen zhengzong jueyun benzhi daotong xinchuan 21b-22a.} Gu Yangkun (zi: Cangzhou 滄州; hao: Cangzhou 蒼州; end of the 18th century) hailed from Gusu 姑蘇 and resided at Tongbai Palace for some years.\footnote{Gu Yangkun’s biography can be found in JGXD 5:4a-b.} At some point, he “got weary of responding [to requests (for ritual services?)]” 疲於酬應 and “interrupted the contacts with the lay world” 退隱於俗. A few decades later, he passed away. His disciple Wang Laizhen (zi: Mengsheng 孟生; hao: Yiyang 嶧陽; ?-1782) also hailed from Gusu. He was first trained by Shen Yibing and then became Gu Yangkun’s disciple.\footnote{Wang Laizhen’s biography can be found in JGXD 5:36a-37a.} He eventually settled down near the Zhuangjia Bridge 裝嫁橋 and his grave was located on Mt. Daoshi 道士山 in Gusu. The only disciple of his that is mentioned in the JGXD is Pan Fuyuan (hao: Xuefeng 雪峰; ?-1798), also from Gusu. He was not related to Tongbai Palace and befriended Min Yide, became the disciple of a certain Qian Yang’ao 錢陽璈 and received the precepts from Shen Yibing in Wuxi and the \textit{Chu qi shen cangshu} 出其身藏書 (Collection of Books to Leave One’s Body) from Wang Laizhen.\footnote{Pan Fuyuan’s biography can be found in JGXD 5:40a-41b. The interlinear commentary states that Master Qian established the lineage of the Dengyun Abbey 登雲觀 of Mount Tianzhen 天真山 (Hangzhou). JGXD 5:40a. I could not locate the \textit{Chu qi shen cangshu}.} He passed away in Gusu. Whereas his area of activity was mostly located south of Tongbai Palace, Pan...
Yiding’s three generations of disciples would appear to have mostly operated in the area of Lake Tai and that after Fang Yiding they were mostly related with Suzhou.

5.5.3 Min Yide

Min Yide’s life is too complex and his enterprises too numerous to be discussed here in detail. I will limit myself to addressing a few fundamental aspects that are significant for our study of the history of Tongbai Palace.

The JGXD contains three biographies of Min Yide, written by Yan Duanshu 晏端書 (fl. 19th century), Yang Weikun 楊維崑 (fl. 19th century) and Shen Bingcheng 沈秉成 (1823-1895), while the Shengshe Zhen zhi 晟舍鎮志 (Gazetteer of Shengshe Village) has one. His year of birth is debated, either 1748 or 1758. Min Yide’s place of origin is indicated as Wuxing 吳興 or Guian 歸安, but in fact we can more precisely pinpoint his hometown as Shengshe Village 晟舍鎮 (Huzhou). Min Yide hailed from a prominent local family. His father was a juren 舉人, and numerous members of his clan were graduates and held bureaucratic positions. He was initiated into the Longmen tradition at Tongbai Palace by Master Gao Dongli. His father brought him to this temple because he suffered from ailments that made it difficult for him to walk – they may have been caused by a fall into a well when he was nine years old. According to the JGXD, Master Gao cured him by teaching him gymnastics (daoyin 導引). After a few years of practice, despite the fact that he had failed to earn even the juren degree, Min Yide complied with his father’s desires and embarked on a bureaucratic career as Departmental Vice Magistrate (zhou sima 州司馬) in Yunnan. This allowed him to familiarise himself with Daoist traditions at the fringes of the empire: his link with a tradition based on Mt. Jizu and called Xizhu xinzong 西竺心宗 (Heart Lineage of India) lasted his whole life and traces of this connection can be found in his Daoist anthology Gu shuyinlou cangshu. After his father’s death, though, Min Yide returned to Jiangnan, where he dedicated his life to Daoism. He possibly first studied under Shen Yiping and then set up his own Daoist community on Mt. Jingai, where he built the Yunchao Temple 雲巢廟.

Min Yide was in close contact with many members of the elite. We know that he had exchanges with Jiang Yuanting 蔣元庭 (1756-1819), which allowed him to influence the earliest editions of the Daozang
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95 JGXD “Min zhuan fu”:1a-5a; Shengshe Zhen zhi 49b-50a. Cf. Esposito, Creative Daoism, 160-5.
96 JGXD “Min zhuan fu”:1a.
Min Yide also found a circle of lay supporters among his friends and relatives. In 1834 he was at the Zanhua Palace 贊化宮 of Yaotan 瑤潭 (Suzhou), where he received the part of the Tianxian xinchuan 天仙心傳 titled “Warning Oneself” 自警篇. This temple had been built by Chen Lanyun 陳蘭雲 (Daoist hao: Yanglai 阳來; fl. early 19th century), who was married to a member of the prominent Yuan 袁 clan of Changshan 長山 (Hangzhou) and was a cousin of the famous poet and official Chen Wenshu 陳文述 (1774-1845), as well as the leader of a community of more than 20 disciples at the Baoyuan Altar 保元壇 (Altar for Preserving the Origin) of Zanhua Palace. The necessary funds for building this altar had been granted to Chen Lanyun by a local prefect in Changshan after her successful healing of the man’s daughter from a ghost possession. In addition to enshrining Lü Dongbin, this temple also worshipped Qiu Changchun, Bai Yuchan and Shen Yibing. Min Yide was acquainted with Chen Wenshu himself and taught him some esoteric methods of the Heart Lineage of India via his disciple Chen Lanyun. Min Yide also directly bestowed on him instructions on neidan 内丹 (inner alchemy). The two had known each other since 1818, when Min Yide healed Chen Wenshu by reciting the Dadong yuzhang jing 大洞玉章經. It was during Min Yide’s stay at Zanhua Palace that Chen Wenshu successfully insisted on him becoming his disciple. Because Chen was a married man with three concubines, Min Yide transmitted to him a sexual method of cultivation. After their death, some Daoists of the Tongbai lineage and their disciples reportedly acted as spiritual counsellors of Daoist practitioners belonging to these circles of local elite: for instance, Liu Xun describes how Shen Yibing and his disciple Chen Qiaoyun descended to the Zhuhe Altar 駐鶴壇 (“Crane-Perching Altar”) to instruct Chen Wenshu and his wife. Recent studies have highlighted the fact that Chen Wenshu patronised several spirit-writing altars in Hangzhou, Suzhou and Yangzhou 揚州.

The events discussed above demonstrate that interest in Daoist cults and practices was common among the elite, including its male representatives, who have been traditionally depicted as...
(exclusively) Confucian. One interesting aspect that I do not have the opportunity to discuss in detail here, but which nonetheless deserves to be mentioned, is the prominent role of female practitioners in the development and spread of Daoism among the elite during the Qing dynasty. Another noteworthy example related to Min Yide is that of Wang Duan 汪端 (1739-1839), poetess and wife of Chen Peizhi 陳裴之 (1794-1826), a son of Chen Wenshu. Wang Duan was a representative of the Hangzhou elite, since she counted awardees of the jinshi degree and officials among her ancestors. Wang Duan was one of the members of Chen Wenshu’s following of female artists and authors, and had a close relationship with him, fostered by their shared literary and religious interests.¹⁰⁴ Although initially, influenced by her Confucian upbringing, she strongly opposed Daoism and Buddhism, later she became a devotee of Gao Qi 高啟 (1336-1374), a scholar and official of the Ming court who had been impeached and sentenced to death, and whom she had enshrined at the Baoyuan Altar later in life. Wang Duan became involved in a variety of religious and cultural activities, including spirit-writing. After the death of her husband in 1826, Wang Duan started reciting the Dadong yuzhang jing on his behalf on a daily basis, a practice that had been suggested by Min Yide. In this period, Chen Lanyun was very close to Wang Duan and helped her overcome her pain, and it was she who convinced Wang Duan to become a lay Quanzhen practitioner and an active participant in the spirit-writing sessions at Chen Lanyun’s Baoyuan Altar.¹⁰⁵ Wang Duan was also initiated into the Longmen lineage, thanks to her master Chen Lanyun and became acquainted with Min Yide, in whose honour she wrote an elegy after his death.¹⁰⁶ It appears evident, then, that leaving Tongbai Palace in order to live in the main urban centres of Jiangnan (such as Huzhou and Suzhou) proved an effective strategy for Min Yide, who was then able to earn the support of the most prominent social groups in the area. This kind of strategy, whether it was applied consciously or not, was very useful to ensure that a Daoist institution would thrive, especially when imperial sponsorship was lacking, but unfortunately it was less viable in Tiantai.

Min Yide’s links to the Jiangnan elite, though, were not exclusively a product of his social skills. The Min clan itself was a prominent and influential one in the Huzhou area, counting many juren and jinshi and several state officials. The Min clan had close ties with other prominent lineages of Jiangnan: for example, its members established marriage relations with the aforementioned Yuans of Changshan.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ Liu, “An Intoning Immortal at the West Lake”, 93.
This power was used by Min Yide to support his Daoist initiatives. One of the most notable members of the clan during the Qing dynasty was Min Eyuan 閔鶚元, who obtained his jinshi degree in the period 1744-1745. Later, he was an examiner in Shanxi in 1756 and Sichuan in 1759, before taking up a series of offices in Shandong, Anhui, Hubei, Guangdong and Jiangning between 1762 and 1771. He was promoted to governor (xunfu 巡撫) of Anhui first (1776) and then of Jiangsu in 1780. He promoted the construction of the guildhall (huiguan 會館) of Suzhou before retiring in 1791. He is also know for the restoration of the Taiwei Temple of Precepts 太微律院 in 1788, an institution previously inhabited by a Daoist called Huang Gun 黃衮 (zi: Shanbu 山補; daohao: Xutang 虛堂; fl. 1682-1692), who had received the precepts from Wang Changyue. This temple was later restored by a Daoist called Huang Fucheng 黃復成, who must have been a Longmen master. Min Eyuan’s family is also tied to the Daoist institutions of Mt. Jingai, since one of his sons, Min Sijian 閔思堅 (juren in 1789), at a certain point retired to the Yunchao Temple.

Future studies on the significance of the Min clan and of its tight social network for the development of Longmen Daoism in Jiangnan will have to explain the broader significance of these data in more detail.

5.6 Other Daoists Active at Tongbai Palace

The JGXD contains the biographies of other Daoists associated with Tongbai Palace. Chen Chungu 陳春谷 (ming at birth: Yangzhen 陽真; zi: Taipu 太樸; ming: Pusheng 樸生; other hao: Qiyun zi 棲雲子; 1763-1806, 12th generation) was born into a wealthy family of Taizhou Prefecture. When Chen was young, his father and brother urged him to get married, but he refused: he packed his belongings and went to Tiantai County, where he paid homage to Master Sun Laiming 孫來明 (13th generation), who at that time was dwelling at Tongbai Palace. At the age of 17 he met Master Fang Yiding at the Weiyu Grotto-Heaven 委羽洞天 (Huangyan County, Zhejiang) and became his disciple. The JGXD does not state whether he had received a Daoist name from these two masters and had been formally initiated into their lineages, which is possible: as a disciple of Fang Yiding, he would have been a Longmen Daoist of the 12th generation and would have received a Daoist name starting with the character yang 陽;

---

108 Shengshe Zhen zhi 5:42a-b.
109 See note 49, ch. 5.
110 Xushuguan zhi 10:15b-16a.
111 Chen Chungu’s biography can be found in JGXD 5:16a-18a.
otherwise, he would have been a Daoist of the 14th generation and his name would have started with the character fu 復.

Chen donated his possessions, possibly to Tongbai Palace, and went back to his family in Taizhou. His father and brother tried to question him, but he fled again and on the way to Huangyan County he met Master Li Pengtou. He then travelled to “famous mountains and caves”, studying with different masters. He went back home again, but this time his parents were not angry and instead welcomed him. He returned to Tiantai and Weiyu many times and finally Chen Chunghu asked Min Yide to become a member of his lineage on Mt. Jingai, so he left the Tiantai Mountains and went there in 1802, at the age of 39. He received the initiation of the three altars from Min Yide in front of the statue of Shen Yibing. The JGXD records that when Min Yide’s disciples saw him, they perceived Zhou Mingyang’s marks in him and knew that he had studied with Fang Yiding, Li Pengtou and many others. He was buried on Mt. Handan 蕙葇山 (of Mt. Jingai) in 1808.

Who was Sun Laiming (fl. 1754-1785; 13th generation), mentioned in Chen’s biography? Information about him is lacking. The *Daotong yuanliu* (Origin and Development of Orthodox Daoism) describes him as a disciple of Chen Qiaoyun, whom we have already mentioned as a prominent disciple of Shen Yibing. At the age of 16 he studied the Way with Xu Longyan 徐嶐岩, from whom he received the Ziguang fandou 紫光梵斗. In 1754 he went to the Yunchao Temple on Mt. Jingai, where he received the initiation of the three platforms from Shen Yibing in 1775. Sun Laiming was called upon to pray for auspicious weather, suggesting that he practised arts typical of southern traditions, very close to those used by Shen Yibing. He was buried in the Jinzhu Terrace. Very few other lineages used the character ‘lai’ in their lineage poem, (the *Yushan pai* 遇山派, the *He xiangu yunxia pai* 何仙姑雲霞派 and the *Sanfeng pai* 三丰派) and this would support the theory that Sun Laiming was indeed part of the Longmen lineage. His initiation by Shen Yibing agrees with this narrative: whether he previously belonged to other Daoist traditions, we do not know.

The presence of such a Daoist, belonging to a lineage without detectable direct links to Fang Yiding, ordained by Shen Yibing and
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112 *Daotong yuanliu* 2:16a. See also Yin, *Qingdai Quanzhen dao lishi xintan*, 246. For a biography of Chen Qiaoyun, see *Daotong yuanliu* 2:13a. I would like to thank Prof. Lai Chi-Tim for sharing with me his copy of the *Daotong yuanliu*.

113 *Baiyun Guan zhi* 3:1a-16b. I could not find any other lineage poem containing the character ‘lai’ apart from the Longmen one in the Jueyun xuanyun xiaoxuan puzhi 2:1a-2a. The *Tiantai pai zidi* 天台派字遞 (Transmission Characters of the Tiantai Lineage) in vol. 2 of the *Jueyun xuanyun xiaoxuan puzhi* does not contain ‘lai’ and we do not have any other information about it. We should bear in mind that these are rather late texts compared to the period under scrutiny in this study and that they may in any case represent a later systematisation.
possibly dwelling for a period at Tongbai Palace, means that towards the end of the 18th century the temple still constituted a central node in the Longmen network in southeast China. It is important to stress that both Shen Yibing and Fang Yiding were disciples of Gao Dongli, meaning that Sun Laiming shared with the aforementioned Gu Cangzhou and other Daoists the legacy of the lineage established at Tongbai Palace. This case also highlights the effectiveness of Shen Yibing’s efforts to spread his tradition in southern China, confirming that he was a powerful force behind the development of the Longmen lineage even before Min Yide.

The biographies of Chen Chungu and Sun Laiming prove that the situation was much less defined than many scholars have assumed: Daoists belonging to different lineages travelled to and from Tongbai Palace, studying the Way under different masters, some of whom belonged to the Longmen community established on Mt. Tongbai. This mobility was instrumental for the establishment, strengthening and expansion of the Longmen network in south-eastern China, but such a result was not necessarily the cause of the disciples’ relocations: social, economic and political factors surely influenced the development of these shifts between lineages and institutions, and determined their relative power and influence. We should also consider the fact that the precocious exit of Gu Cangzhou from the scene may have left Tongbai Palace without proper management, allowing or even requiring the presence of other Daoists at the temple. Finally, it is interesting to note that Sun Laiming belonged to the Longmen generation immediately after that of Gu Cangzhou, and we are left to wonder whether the two were somehow related by a master-disciple bond.

Chen Chungu’s shift to Min Yide’s lineage may be interpreted as a matter of personal preference, as a reflection of the greater prestige of the institution of Mt. Jingai or as a sign of problems involving Tongbai Palace at the end of the 18th century. It is recorded that Chen Chungu became Fang Yiding’s disciple at the Weiyu Grotto in 1780 and later of Sun Laiming at Tongbai Palace, ultimately passing into Min Yide’s lineage on Mount Jingai. Therefore, from his biography it can be inferred that Tongbai Palace was still active at the beginning of the 19th century, when Chen Chungu left it for Mt. Jingai. This suggests a development very similar to what happened at the birth of the Quanzhen tradition. In his doctoral dissertation, Vincent Goossaert observed that Qiu Changchun was able to spread his own Quanzhen lineage by re-initiating many of the Quanzhen disciples from the other lineages and by bestowing on them a new ordination name that clearly marked them as his own disciples. Goossaert, “La création du Taoïsme moderne”, 75-7. It is my understanding
that this may be what also happened in cases such as that of Chen Chungu and of other disciples of Min Yide.

According to Ren Linhao and Ma Shuming, after Gao Dongli’s death no one was left at Tongbai Palace to carry on the lineage, but as we have seen and as I will keep showing below, this is not entirely true: Daoists associated with the legacy of Gao Dongli, Shen Yibing and Fang Yiding still dwelled in the temple between the late 18th century and the Taiping Rebellion.\footnote{Ren, Ma, Taizhou Daojiao kao, 359.} It is possible that as a religious centre Tongbai Palace gradually lost much of its influence and importance, but it certainly remained an active temple throughout the first part of the 19th century. In fact, the early 19th century was an era in which patronage from – and contact with – the local urban population was a much more significant factor for Daoism than imperial patronage, a period in which lay communities were emerging and imperial support for Daoism was declining. Therefore, it is understandable that an institution such as Tongbai Palace, located in a relatively poor region, on a mountain and far from significant urban centres was difficult to maintain and slowly losing its prominence. As we have seen, both Shen Yibing and Min Yide preferred to entertain relations with major regional urban centres, such as Suzhou, Huzhou and Yuhang. Moreover, the relationship between the temple and the court during the Qing dynasty was very different from that during the Tang dynasty, resulting only in a sporadic act of patronage.

In the following decades, Tongbai Palace gradually became detached from the Longmen lineages of Huzhou and Hangzhou: it is seldom mentioned in Daoist sources and usually only in relation to the Daoists already discussed in the JGXD. Local factors are not enough to explain the reasons for the disappearance of the Palace from Daoist documents after the end of the 18th century. This may have been caused by the new social and political environment, as explained, but also by tragic events like the Taiping Rebellion, which marked a watershed in late imperial Chinese history and offered an opportunity to redefine the religious geography of southeast China. This is why, in the last part of this chapter, I will end my study in the 1850s: the 19th century was a period of great instability for Chinese society and politics, marred by foreign invasions, attempted reforms and rebellions. The Taiping Rebellion, with its legacy of destruction – especially against traditional religious institutions – is a watershed in modern Chinese history and from a religioushistorical perspective what happened after it may be regarded as a very different story, whose study requires a profound understanding of the events that occurred both during and right after the rebellion.
5.7 The Last Decades

Compared to previous periods, we possess much less information on the final decades of the history of Tongbai Palace before 1851. The little we know can be inferred from the lives of Daoists belonging to another lineage, that of the Dayou Palace 大有宮 of Huangyan County. According to the tradition of the Weiyu zongpu, this temple was rebuilt by Yang Laiji 杨来基 (zi: Guoning 國甯; fl. 1796-1815) in 1815.116

The Jingai and the Weiyu Longmen lineages, as recorded respectively in the JGXD and the Weiyu zongpu, share their patriarchs until the 7th generation, i.e. until Wang Changyue. The Longmen lineage of Dayou Palace was then founded by Yang Laiji, who is remembered as the first patriarch of this tradition [table 7]. What’s more, this lineage does not present the separation between a line of doctrine and one of precepts, of the sort laid out in the JGXD, which serve as a further proof that this claim is historically unsound.

I am especially interested in the lineage of Mt. Weiyu because it includes the Daoists Yang Laiji, Shen Yongliang and Chen Fupu (Chungu), who are associated with Tongbai Palace. Yang Laiji hailed from Huanglin 黄林. In the Weiyu Shan xuzhi 委羽山續志 (Continuation of the Gazetteer of Mt. Weiyu, 1864) he is presented as a powerful exorcist and healer. In one case, he liberated the population of the western foothills of Mt. Fang 方山 in Huangyan from haunting by weeping ghosts: Master Yang was able to exorcise the spirits with his Daoist techniques (daoshu 道術) and to restore tranquillity. During the Qianlong era he dwelled on Mt. Weiyu, which became his place of self-refinement for the following decades. The gazetteer also specifies that he used blessed water to treat people’s ailments.117 In the Weiyu zongpu, Yang Laiji plays a fundamental role in the history of Dayou Palace: before restoring the temple, he had been its abbot since 1796; more generally, he was able to establish a Daoist network in the area of Wenzhou 溫州 and Taizhou 台州, through the transmission of his teachings to 14 disciples. Yang Laiji’s role as a major depositary of the Longmen tradition lies at the basis of two elements in the Weiyu zongpu: the narrative of how the Weiyu lineage was built and the prestige of Dayou Palace.

116 See Chen Yingning’s 陳攖寧 (1880-1969) ”Chongxiu Weiyu Shan Dayou Gong zongpu xu” 重修委羽山大有宮宗譜序 in Weiyu Dongtian Qizu Longmen zongpu 1:”xu”:2a-b; Ren, Ma, Taizhou Daojiao kao, 360-3; Katz, Religion in China and Its Modern Fate. The Weiyu zongpu (1991) is an updated version of a work that was first published in 1909, revised in the 1940s and rediscovered by the Daoist Association of Wenzhou 温州市道教協會 in 1989. Cf. Katz, “The Development of Jiangnan Daoist Networks”, 194.

117 Weiyu Shan xuzhi 1:6a-b; ”Weiyu Shan lidai chengxian biao jilüe” 委羽山歷代成仙表紀略 in Weiyu Dongtian Qizu Longmen zongpu 1:”lidai chengxian biao jilüe”:4b; ”Shixi tu” 世系圖 in Weiyu Dongtian Qizu Longmen zongpu 2:”shixi tu”:3a. Cf. Weiyu Dongtian Qizu Longmen zongpu 1:”lidai chengxian biao jilüe”:4b.
### Table 7: The Longmen Lineage of Dayou Palace, according to the Weiyu Zongpu. Generations 1 to 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Zhao Daojian</td>
<td>Zhao Daojian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Zhang Dechun</td>
<td>Zhang Dechun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Chen Tongwei</td>
<td>Chen Tongwei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Zhou Xiuqiu</td>
<td>Zhou Xiuqiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Zhang Jingding</td>
<td>Zhang Jingding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Zhao Zhensong</td>
<td>Zhao Zhensong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Wang Changyue</td>
<td>Wang Changyue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Yan Shoucheng</td>
<td>Yan Shoucheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Zhan Tailin</td>
<td>Zhan Tailin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Sheng Qingxin</td>
<td>Sheng Qingxin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Yuan Yangyue</td>
<td>Yuan Yangyue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li Yanggeng</td>
<td>Li Yanggeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fang Yangwu</td>
<td>Fang Yangwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yangshen</td>
<td>Zhang Yangshen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su Yangming</td>
<td>Su Yangming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yang Yangguan</td>
<td>Yang Yangguan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wei Yangshan</td>
<td>Wei Yangshan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Xu Yanping</td>
<td>Xu Yanping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li Yanggeng</td>
<td>Li Yanggeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fang Yangwu</td>
<td>Fang Yangwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yangshen</td>
<td>Zhang Yangshen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su Yangming</td>
<td>Su Yangming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yang Yangguan</td>
<td>Yang Yangguan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wei Yangshan</td>
<td>Wei Yangshan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yan Laihong</td>
<td>Yan Laihong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
<td>Xu Yiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
<td>Zhang Yikun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
<td>Lu Yichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
<td>Yang Laiji</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Weiyu zongpu* proposes a version of the orthodox lineage of Dayou Palace [table7]. The fact that Yang’s name was Laiji indicates that he was a Longmen master of the 13th generation. This membership is confirmed by the name of his disciple in the *Weiyu Shan xuzhi*, Chen Fupu, *fu* 復 being the 14th character in the Longmen lineage poem, about whom I will say more below. The question remains of how Yang Laiji was initiated into the Longmen lineage. One hypothesis, which I cannot demonstrate with the data currently in my possession, is that his initiation was somehow related to Fang Yiding’s activities in the area south of Tiantai, as discussed above. According to the *Weiyu zongpu*, after Yang Laiji, the lineage was divided into twelve branches that spread across southern Zhejiang and that, between the middle of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, extended northward, reaching Tongbai Palace.

This lineage chart graphically illustrates the importance of Yang Laiji for the establishment of the legitimacy of the lineage. Not only was he the representative of the tradition that was established by Qiu Chuji and that was transmitted down to Wang Changyue’s disciple, Tan Shoucheng, but he was also the inheritor of the tradition of all the lineages established by Master Tan’s fourth-generation disciples Lu Yichun 陸一純, Zhang Yikun 張一崑 (who was also associated with the Jingu Grotto) and Xu Yiqian 徐一乾, except four: those transmitted by two disciples of Lu Yichun, Wei Yangshan 魏陽山 and Yang Yangyuan 楊陽元 and those of two disciples of Zhang Yikun, Gu Yangshu 顧陽數 and Wu Yangren 吳陽仁. It is interesting to note that the second of Lu Yichun’s disciples, Yang Yangyuan (1686-1772), is in fact described as Yang Laiji’s father and hailed from Huanglin (Huangyan) like his son. We are not given much information here, and the lineage chart only states that he received Lu Yichun’s teachings. Nothing is said about Gu Yangshu and Wu Yangren’s lineages, whether they survived or faded away: the *Weiyu zongpu* only deals with the lineages of Yang Laiji and Yan Laihong 閻來洪, a disciple of Wei Yangshan. Therefore, in this version of the history of the lineage, all the other surviving branches were connected to Master Yang. We can recognise some similarities between this process of reunification of the lineages and the one described in the JGXD and centred on Zhou Mingyang.

The *Weiyu zongpu* also contains two biographies of a certain Chen Fupu 陳復樸 (*ming*: Fupu 復樸; *hao*: Chungu 春谷; *suming*: Zhihua Zhihua

---

118 *Weiyu Dongtian Qiuzu Longmen zongpu* 2: “shixi tu”:1b-2b. Lu Yichun was disciple of Sheng Qingxin. Xu Yangming was Lu’s disciple. The ‘orthodox’ line represented by Yang Laiji was not the only one that developed starting from the two Daoists: in total the *Weiyu zongpu* lists two other disciples of Sheng Qingxin (for a total of three belonging to the 11th generation), and seven more disciples belonging to the 12th generation.


120 *Weiyu Dongtian Qiuzu Longmen zongpu* 2: “shixi tu”:1b-3a.
志華; 1755-before 1850), in addition to a shorter one copied from the *Weiyu Shan xuzhi*, which is also the oldest one. He is especially interesting because he shares the same name as one of Fang Yiding’s disciples, the aforementioned Chen Chungu. His biography in the *Weiyu Shan xuzhi* is just a brief sketch of the Daoist’s life, describing his divinatory skills and placing him in the lineage of Mt. Weiyu. He is described as hailing from the Taiping Cliff 太平巖 and as Wang Laiji’s disciple, as well as a gifted practitioner who could foresee the future. He reportedly visited the most important temples of the empire and was so widely esteemed that at his death the inhabitants of Huangyan built a statue of him, so they could worship it.121

One possibility is that the two Daoists are the same person, but if this was the case, each source omitted any information that referred to the other, competing, lineage. Yet, the two sources present profound differences that cannot be explained away in such fashion: the only true common element between the Chen Chungu of the *Weiyu Shan xuzhi* and that of the JGXD remains their name. The other two, much later biographies found in the *Weiyu zongpu* more explicitly tend to conflate the two Daoists into one person. Is it possible that two Daoists with the same name dwelled at the Dayou Palace around the same period? As improbable as this hypothesis may seem, the fact remains that their biographies are almost incompatible, as demonstrated by the awkward attempts to conflate them in the *Weiyu zongpu*. Yin Zhihua supporting the thesis that the two Daoists by the name of Chen Chungu were different persons, noted that they belonged to two different generations of the Longmen lineage, which is clear from their respective Daoist name. I have decided not to rely on this argument for a simple reason: I think that this is the least controversial point, unless we are to assume that at that time there existed only one ‘orthodox’ Longmen lineage – a notion which I have already argued to be a historiographical misrepresentation. This said, I still agree with Yin Zhihua’s conclusion because the details of the biographies do not match.122

The life of another Daoist suggests that Tongbai Palace was still a significant temple in the decades before the Taiping Rebellion and that it was connected to Mt. Weiyu by a shared Longmen network. Shen Yongliang 沈永良 (lay *ming*: Qishan 岐山; *zi*: Fengzhi 凤芝; *hao*: Zuidian 醉颠; ?-1865), one of the major Daoists presented in the *Minguo Taizhou Fu zhi* 民國台州府志 (Gazetteer of Taizhou Prefecture of the Republican Era) of 1936, also has a biography devoted to him

121  *Weiyu Shan xuzhi* 1:6b-7a; *Weiyu Dongtian Qiuizu Longmen zongpu* 1:“lidai chengxian biao jilüe”:4b.

in the earlier *Weiyu Shan xuzhi*. The latter source records that he was an eccentric local personage born into a poor family and active during the Daoguang era (1821-1850) and that his ancestors came from Shaoxing, but later moved to Huangdao Road, in Huangyan. At a certain point in his life, he left home and went to the Siming mountain range (a northern extension of the Tiantai mountain range), where he became a soldier. After he left the army, he went on to study the Way on Mt. Weiyu with his master Jin Jiaoshan. Later he dwelt at Tongbai Palace for some years. He left again to travel to the Southern Marchmount (Mount Heng in Hunan), where he met a Daoist who declared to be more than 200 years old and to be able to travel for hundreds of li per day. This mysterious figure transmitted alchemical teachings to Shen Yongliang. The latter then went back to Huangyan ‘with a gourd and a book’. He would drink spirits without stopping until he got drunk, behaving eccentrically: for this reason, local people called him Shen Motou (‘Shen Demon-head’ or ‘Shen the Mad’). One day he went into the waters of the Hongjia-chang River (Taizhou Prefecture), stood still and died.

The *Weiyu zongpu* provides much more material on Shen Yongliang, including more detailed biographies written by eminent practitioners and a chart of his lineage: for example, the biography written by Chen Yingning (1881-1969) provides the year of Shen’s passing and seems to “domesticate” this figure, stating among other things that in reality he ‘feigned madness’ (yang kuang 佯狂).

Who was Shen Yongliang? Yin Zhihua considers his fame as a “living divine immortal” fundamental for the rapid success of the Daoist tradition of Mt. Weiyu. His biographies, from the earliest version in the *Weiyu Shan xuzhi* down to the Republican-era *Taizhou Fu zhi*, describe him as a link between Tongbai Palace and Mount Weiyu. The character yong in his name indicates that he was a Longmen Daoist of the 18th generation. The lineage presented in the *Weiyu zongpu* indicates the following transmission: Kong Hetang → Jin Jiaoshan → Shen Yongliang → Chu Yuantu [table 7]. We are not told whether he had other Longmen masters in addition to Jin Jiaoshan, but it is possible. The *Weiyu zongpu* adds that after having studied under his master Kong Hetang, a Daoist of the Dayou Palace, Jin Jiaoshan went to Tongbai Palace to practice self-
cultivation. It would be impossible to present a full-fledged picture of what was happening at Tongbai Palace at that time; all that we know for sure is that there were different Daoists dwelling at the Palace with ties to multiple Daoist temples in Zhejiang and Jiangsu.

My focus on one of Shen Yongliang’s disciples will provide the reader with some additional pieces of information on the history of Tongbai Palace in the years before the Taiping Rebellion. Chu Yuantu 褚圓圖 (zi: Menglian 夢煉; ?-1874), is the last and latest ‘transcendent’ explicitly associated with Tiantai to receive an extensive biography in the first scroll of the Weiyu zongpu. His biography is obviously not included in the Weiyu Shan xuzhi, but the Weiyu zongpu has plenty of information about him. The Ji Chu Yuantu daoshi shi 述褚圓圖道士事 (Record of the Deeds of the Daoist Chu Yuantu), by Chu Chuangao 褚傳誥 of Tiantai, records that he was originally from Taifang 太坊, in Tiantai County. The local people were surprised to see him wandering with straw shoes and a straw hat regardless of the season and thought that he was a divine transcendent, so they also called him Transcendent Chu 褚仙. He left his family and went to the Xiyanan Grotto 仙岩洞 (Sanmen County 三門縣, Taizhou), where he took Shen Yongliang as his master to study the Way for 20 years. One wonders whether Chu heard of Shen Yongliang when the latter was dwelling at Tongbai Palace: surely, there were similarities between his eccentric behaviour and Shen Yongliang’s. When Chu Yuantu drank alcohol, he would get drunk, and when this happened, he would insult random passers-by, even if they gave him money. During winter he did not feel cold and in hot weather he would not sweat. Chu Yuantu finally went to the Qiongtai Peaks, near Mt. Tongbai, where he stayed for over a month. The biography also contains a supernatural element. Once, an acquaintance of his met him in Xinchang 新昌 County (Shaoxing) and Chu Yuantu asked the man to return a pair of red shoes given to him by the abbot of Mt. Yuhuang 玉皇山, Jiang Yonglin 蔣永林.

127 Weiyu Dongtian Qizhu Longmen zongpu, 2:41a.
128 Weiyu Dongtian Qizhu Longmen zongpu 1:“lidai chengxian zhuan”.1a-b. There are other biographies of Chen Chungu in 1:“lidai chengxian biaoji lüe”.5a, 2:“shixi tu”:38a.
129 Weiyu Dongtian Qizhu Longmen zongpu 1:“lidai chengxian zhuan”:1a-b. Yin Zhihua, Ren Lihao and Ma Shuming all state that Taifang is in Tiantai. Chu Chuangao also hailed from that county and the two may have been kin. Chu Chuangao is also known for his preface to the Tiantai Xian zhigao 天台縣志稿, dated to the year yimao (1915). Minguo Tiantai Xian zhigao “Tiantai Xian zhigao xu”:1a-3a. Cf. Yin, Qingdai Quanzhen dao lishi xintan, 348.
130 This is what is recorded in the Weiyu zongpu (sui taoru Xiyanan Dong, bai Weiyu Shan Shen Motou wei shi 遂逃入仙岩洞，拜委羽山沈魔頭為師), which is also Yin Zhihua’s source, but the latter states that this happened on Mt. Weiyu. Cf. Yin, Qingdai Quanzhen dao lishi xintan, 348.
131 The Minguo zhigao records a different name: Zhang Yonglin 張永林, which I consider an error. Minguo Tiantai Xian zhigao 5:“fangwai zhuan, xian”:12a.
When the latter saw the shoes, he explained that Chu Yuantu had in fact passed away more than one month before and that he had been buried wearing that very pair. Chu Yuantu is the only Daoist of the Qing dynasty to receive a separate entry in the *Minguo Tiantai Xian zhigao* (Draft of the Gazetteer of Tiantai County of the Republican Period; *Minguo zhigao*). Even though the entry is only titled “Daoist Chu” 褚道士, we know that it refers to Chu Yuantu because it closely resembles the biography in the *Weiyu zongpu*. The *Minguo zhigao* was also edited by Chu Chuangao, the author of Chu Yuantu’s biography in the *Weiyu zongpu*, which along with the shared surname explains the presence of the Daoist in the gazetteer.

These biographies do not state the year in which Shen Yongliang moved to Tongbai Palace, nor when Chu Yuantu encountered him at the Xianyan Grotto or why Shen Yongliang went to Sanmen County – all very important pieces of information for our study of the history of the temple. His decision to move out of Tongbai Palace, if not due to personal motivations, may have had to do either with the same reasons that drove Chen Yangming away from the Palace, which would suggest the temple’s decline, or with regional events, such as the Taiping Rebellion. Be that as it may, Chu Yuantu’s biography describes the Daoist life of a person from Tiantai who was already practising Daoism in his hometown in a way reminiscent of the behavioural pattern of ‘feigned madness’ proper of the Daoists linked to Mt. Weiyu.

Chu Yuantu’s biography mentions another important Daoist, Jiang Yonglin, whose life connects Tongbai Palace to the development of Daoism in Hangzhou at the end of the Qing dynasty. The biography of Jiang Yonglin 蒋永林 (Daoist hao: Xuanjing zi 玄晶子; hao: Siwei 四為; other hao: Changqingzi 長青子; 1826-after 1896) from Dongyang County 東陽縣 (Zhejiang) is further proof that Tongbai Palace was still active in the first half of the 19th century. Just like other Daoists, he did not wish to get married, so he fled to Mt. Putuo 普陀山. Later, he was initiated into Daoism at Tongbai Palace, where he became the disciple of Dong Jiaoli 董教禮 (17th Longmen generation). According to Zhuo Binsen’s 卓炳森 *Yuhuang Shan Miao zhi* 玉皇山廟志 (Gazetteer of the Temples of Mt. Yuhuang; published in 1881), in 1864 Jiang Yonglin left Tiantai and went to Mt. Yuhuang 玉皇山, where he built a retreat to worship the Jade Emperor 玉皇. Later, he became acquainted with the local elite, who helped him restore Fuxing Abbey 福星觀. Once they finished building it, Daoists and Buddhists alike went to the Abbey to find peace, and so it was “fashioned into a public monastery” 叢林之風. Master Jiang was invited to the Dongxiao
Palace 洞霄宮 of Yuhang, to Yousheng Abbey 優聖觀 in Hangzhou, to Yuande Abbey 淵德觀 in Zhenhai 鎮海, to Xuanmiao Abbey 玄妙觀 in Jiaxing and to the Dongyue Temple 東嶽廟 in Sixiang 四鄉. In 1875 he received the abbotship of the Dongxiao Palace 洞霄宮 in Yuhang. Jiang Yonglin was very active and performed ordinations on Mt. Yuhuang in 1882, 1883 (in which his disciple Zhu Yuanheng 朱圓亨 also participated), 1885 and 1896: to appreciate the magnitude of these initiatives, we should consider the fact that during the last ceremony alone he ordained 336 Daoists. Paul Katz highlighted the important contribution that the institution of Mt. Yuhuang provided to Daoist ordinations in the late 19th century. I could add that many of the most prominent local Daoists of Zhejiang and southern Jiangsu were associated with Tongbai Palace in one way or another, which demonstrates that this temple continued to provide a fundamental contribution to the formation of new lineages operating in the area. The Yuhuang Shan Miao zhi suggests that Jiang Yonglin’s disciples were mainly active in Zhejiang, but none of them appears to have been associated with Tongbai Palace. While the JGXD describes a southward expansion of the Longmen lineages originating from the Jingu Grotto, the Weiyu zongpu narrates a later northward extension of the lineage of Mt. Weiyu, passing through Tongbai Palace.

My analysis of the available sources has not yet uncovered references to any restoration of Tongbai Palace during the late 18th or early 19th century. This does not necessarily mean that the temple was never repaired during the 19th century, but it still represents a problem for the present study. Because a wooden structure in imperial China needed to be repaired at least once every 25-50 years and the Yongzheng Emperor restored the Palace in 1735, we would expect it to have been repaired at least once before 1785 and again before 1835. Instead, the latest unequivocal reference to a restoration of Tongbai Palace before the second half of the 19th century is that mentioned in Fang Yiding’s biography. No epigraphy survives today at the temple to attest this and the sources that I have consulted are silent regarding any further intervention in the first half of the 19th century: not even the Minguo zhigao, of the beginning of the 20th century, provides updated information on the status of the temple in the section dedicated to the Daoist and Buddhist institutions in the county.

135 Pan, “Yandansan to Dōkyō”, 9; Yin, Qingdai Quanzhen dao lishi xintan, 345-6.
138 Minguo Tiantai Xian zhigao 3:“siguan”:13b-14b.
By relying on the information provided by the tradition of Mt. Weiyu, we can identify a line of transmission that developed at Tongbai Palace, that of Jin Jiaoshan → Shen Yongliang → Chu Yuantu. Even though Shen Yongliang is described as a prominent Daoist of Dayou Palace in the Weiyu zongpu and even in the earlier Weiyu Shan xuzhi, his area of activity would appear to have extended far beyond Huangyan County. This is confirmed by the fact that Shen Yongliang received his teachings from Jin Jiaoshan at Tongbai Palace and that Chu Yuantu, born in Tiantai, was trained by Shen Yongliang and later moved to Mt. Yuhuang. This mountain became a prominent Daoist institution through the efforts of Jiang Yonglin: it attracted at least another Daoist associated with the Tongbai Palace community, Chu Yuanyun, and the temple became a major Daoist ordination platform in Hangzhou during the last decades of the Qing dynasty, reportedly appealing to Daoists and Buddhists alike.

5.8 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the restoration of the temple by the Yongzheng Emperor’s order and I analysed the main links between the Longmen lineages of Jiangnan and Tongbai Palace, the contribution of the temple to the development of these Daoist communities in southeast China and the last stages in the life of the temple before the Taiping Rebellion. One aspect that is worth highlighting is the very close relationship between the Daoists of Tongbai Palace and those of Suzhou. As we have seen, all three of Gao Dongli’s disciples were active there or were somehow related to that area. At the same time, the Longmen community of Tongbai Palace was also involved in the expansion of Longmen in the southern part of Zhejiang Province. The links between the Daoists of the Tongbai and the northern area of Jiangnan, including Suzhou, Huzhou and Hangzhou, appear to have weakened during the 19th century, whereas those with the southern region remained strong. Whether this can be explained by the lack of sources about the former or as a historical development caused by Fang Yiding’s and other Daoists’ activities in the south, is a question still open to further research. What is clear is that the older symbolic strata tied with the temple were gradually supplanted by the Longmen tradition. In sources from the late 18th and early 19th century we still find references to Bo Yi and Shu Qi in relation to Tongbai Palace, but these are rare and do not appear to be of primary importance for Min Yide or Shen Yibing. At the same time, Sima Chengzhen is seldom mentioned, nor is Wangzi Qiao. Instead, what significance Tongbai Palace retained appears to have been due to the presence of the Longmen Daoists and to imperial patronage more than to ancient lineages or specific cultural practices.