

Quanzhen Daoists in Chinese Society and Culture, 1500–2010, edited by Xun Liu and Vincent Goossaert. Berkeley: University of California Institute of East Asian Studies, 2013. xii, 382 pp. US\$30.00 (paper), US\$23.95 (e-book).

This collection of articles on the various dimensions of Quanzhen Daoism and its connections to Chinese society is the fruit of a conference titled “Quanzhen Daoism in Chinese Culture and Society,” held in 2007 at the Center for Chinese Studies of the Institute of East Asian Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

The two editors introduce Quanzhen Daoism as “a religious movement” that became an “independent order” recognized both by the state and by other Daoists, and “a nationwide religious institution”—albeit one with an unevenly distributed presence in China. “Quanzhen studies has over the last two decades emerged as a new academic field with its own venues and institutions, such as several dedicated research centers in China” (5). This detailed work is aimed at specialists in the field but also at a wider intellectual audience interested in Chinese society as a whole and the complex religious landscape that in part defines it. It will doubtless become a precious manual for university students of religious studies and Chinese history.

Quanzhen appeared around 1170 in North China “as one among a number of new Daoist movements founded by charismatic leaders teaching self-cultivation techniques, healing arts and other rituals” (1). It developed and split into various branches, with periods of rupture, revival and reinvention, before becoming one of the cornerstones of the Chinese religious landscape today. In some cases, this has led to a process of *Quanzhen-ization* (*quanzhen hua* 全真化) “whereby local Daoists and temple cults have to conform to a certain degree to Quanzhen norms in term of liturgy and organization” (3).

In the editors’ introduction, three points are raised in order to indicate the interest of this subject: (1) there have been close ties between Quanzhen and the state: Quanzhen leaders have consistently been close to political and social elites; (2) Quanzhen

stands at the core of key aspects of modern religion: individualization and body-oriented practices; (3) the order has had major influence on the development of Chinese popular literature and culture, and, more broadly, on premodern and modern Chinese intellectual history.

The editors adopt an analytical framework that distinguishes three levels of reality covered by the term Quanzhen Daoism: Daoists who belong to Quanzhen whether they emphasise this identity or not; persons and institutions that explicitly work to transmit Quanzhen identity; and a corpus of texts that expound a Quanzhen ideology.

One major appeal of the work is that, through variations in approach, scale and perspective (historical, Sinological, sociological, and anthropological), it succeeds in demonstrating that Quanzhen has not been a homogeneous category in time or space. Two other strands of research implicitly pursued throughout the various chapters prove fascinating: questioning the Quanzhen/Zhengyi division; and debating the historical continuity (or discontinuity) of the Quanzhen order. In my view, the richness of this volume also lies in the details to be gleaned from the contributions, including the close link between the use of talismans and Quanzhen culture.

The volume is comprised of ten articles organized into three parts. The first and longest part, consisting of four chapters, analyzes how Quanzhen is perceived and imagined from the outside, notably in popular literary and scholarly discourse. The second part, comprising three chapters, examines the way in which the Quanzhen tradition has by textual and ritual production developed and redefined itself. A third and final part considers the relationship between Quanzhen Daoism, the state, and local society.

The first contribution, from Vincent Goossaert, entitled “Quanzhen, What Quanzhen? Late Imperial Daoist Clerical Identities in Lay Perspective,” starts with the observation that “our image of late imperial Quanzhen is largely based on normative texts (ordination texts, doctrinal essays) written by and for Daoists,” and goes on to expand this perspective, in particular by seeking to establish what constitutes “the Daoist culture (in the narrow sense of what people

knew about Daoism) in late imperial society at large” (20). Goossaert examines texts on Daoism written by non-Daoists in literary, bureaucratic and epigraphic sources. The principle difficulty is that many aspects of Quanzhen were largely internal clerical issues and as such not made available to the wider society. Further, even if the existence of a Quanzhen identity for Quanzhen clerics is demonstrated in the Daoists’ own writings, we should not make the mistake of oversimplifying this identity, as Quanzhen has been subject to major variations in lifestyle and perception depending on location and period. Quanzhen has been reinvented on various occasions (notably during the seventeenth century) and its self-identity was imbued with new content. Finally, one should keep in mind that the normative texts to which present-day historians—and certain monks, I might add—refer when introducing Quanzhen is the result of an elaborate ecclesiastical construction.

Goossaert demonstrates that while the distinction between Quanzhen and Zhengyi was operative for Daoists clerics, until the Republican period it was not emphasised in fictional narratives or in the press, where Daoists were rarely linked to either the Quanzhen or Zhengyi orders. These affiliations were not deployed as legal categories mentioned in contracts drawn up by the state or local officials, nor were they heeded by gentry authors of local gazetteers who were primarily interested in distinguishing elite Daoists affiliated with the state from other Daoists. On the other hand, ordinary Chinese who employed Daoists highlighted “a difference between “Daoists (who happen to be either Quanzhen or Zhengyi) based in temples (practicing temple liturgy and having rights over the temple) and those who were home based” (36). For lay people, what mattered were not only the rank and social status of clerics but also their social functions: temple manager, ritual specialist, self-cultivation teacher, fundraiser. The situation changed radically in 1912, when the categories Quanzhen and Zhengyi began to gain new visibility and relevance outside clerical circles. The (Western-imported) definition of religion played an important role, as did the breakdown in relations between the state and elite Daoists, as well as the disappearance of the very category *elite Daoist*. “Having no more category of their own to think about

Daoists, officials, local scholars and journalists began to use the Daoists' own categories" (42). Our vision of Quanzhen Daoism may therefore be "shaped by the 20th century and particularly Republican-period experiences of reinventing Daoism along sectarian lines" (43).

Next is another very interesting article, "The Invention of a Quanzhen Canon: The Wonderful Fate of the *Daozang Jiyao* 道藏輯要," by the late Monica Esposito (to whom the entire volume is dedicated). Focusing on a new Daoist canon compiled during the Qing dynasty—which was not, as with previous canons, produced by the imperial court in conjunction with clerical elites, but instead produced by high-ranking officials forming a lay Quanzhen group—Esposito reveals the impact of this collection of texts, which called for a reaffirmation of sects and schools in general, and of monasticism for the Quanzhen in particular. "The reinvented Quanzhen of the Qing fashioned, via Longmen 龍門 leaders and spirit-writing communities, a new identity built on ordination manuals, texts on monastic liturgy and newly revealed *neidan* 內丹 texts, including some devoted to inner alchemy for women, *nüdan* 女丹" (53).

On the basis of this textual production, Esposito challenges the idea of a real continuity of the Quanzhen identity from the Yuan dynasty until modern times, thus disagreeing with those who, like Goossaert, affirm such a view "on the basis of a presumed continuity of Quanzhen lineages, monastic institutions, and ordination procedures legitimized at the Baiyun Temple by the 'Longmen orthodox lineage' (*Longmen zhengzong* 龍門正宗)" (46). She proposes to approach Quanzhen history from a different point of view. The scriptures that are at the core of its canon express the will "to bring Daoism back to its source by producing a new Daoist Canon, that, on the basis of the previous Ming Canon, has the power to reestablish authentic Daoism and make up for its lack of direct transmission" (65).

According to Esposito, Quanzhen and Daoism as a whole underwent a crisis. "When Daoism was purportedly on the verge of disappearing because of the alleged lack of authentic transmission among its monastic leaders and religious specialists, this canon thus

opened up a new chapter by allowing for the first time everyone, inside and outside religious institutions, to become familiar not only with the classics of the earlier Ming Daoist Canon and its traditional liturgy but also with the core doctrine and [the Daoist transcendent] Lü Dongbin's 呂洞賓 newly revealed liturgy" (68).

In an almost polemical chapter, Esposito establishes a constructive reproach to scholars who "tend to regard Quanzhen as a deep-rooted, influential, and stable Daoist order that survived from the Yuan until modern times by adapting and transforming it" (47) and concludes with the question "whom are we trying to convert, and to what end?" In a note on page 50, she associates this view of the uninterrupted transmission of the Quanzhen ordination via Wang Changyue 王常月 (d. 1680), often portrayed as the great Longmen restorer, with Min Zhiting's 閔智亭 (1924–2004) *Daojiao yifan* 道教儀範 (*Daoist Liturgy*), published in 1990. Min Zhiting was the famous abbot of Baxian gong 八仙宮 and chairman of the Chinese Taoist Association (*Zhongguo Daojiao xiehui* 中國道教協會). It seems to me that the perception of Quanzhen identity by Quanzhen monks themselves should not be considered from the same angle. For them, the creation of fictitious or partly imagined genealogies seems to arise less from the discourse of an ideology than from a certain sense of belonging to a close-knit "family," a sort of ritual kinship constituting an identity.

Focusing on vernacular literature relating to Quanzhen themes, the third article by Vincent Durand-Dastès, entitled "A Late Qing Blossoming of the Seven Lotus: Hagiographic Novels about the Qizhen 七真," provides a compelling analysis of a literary genre with an ambiguous status in the world of Chinese religions: hagiographic short stories that are treated as works of fiction but can in some cases be found in temples today (110), while their printing blocks are also sometimes said to be kept in temples (84). They may therefore be included in the relatively broad category of Daoist books (*daoshu* 道書). They "aim at instructing and converting, and often claim a religious legitimacy of their own—they are in some ways not far from constituting an alternative lay canon, crucial for the religious education of the masses" (79).

These texts, which include many formulae (*jue* 訣), poems and

poetic prose pieces by the patriarchs, “both desecrate and popularize respected holy masters” (79). “They are not canonical texts: they often take some liberty with the scriptural ‘truth,’ and in doing so, have sometimes stirred up anger within religious circles” (78). On the other hand, some are presented as being revealed through spirit writing.

Focusing on writings relating to Wang Chongyang 王重陽 and his disciples, the Seven Perfected, Durand-Dastès reveals how they play a role in the diffusion of knowledge about Quanzhen Daoism in modern China. In addition to the fascinating stories it contains, including the famous journey to the West by Qiu Chuji (丘處機, 1148–1227), the most famous among the seven disciples of Wang Chongyang, or the account of how the holy site of the Baiyun Temple 白雲觀 in Beijing was won for the Quanzhen, this chapter is particularly useful for the assistance it provides in orienting oneself within (and developing a critical perspective on) the variety of sources on the Quanzhen.

A key article in the volume, David Palmer’s “Globalizing Daoism at Huashan: Quanzhen Monks, Danwei Politics, and International Dream Trippers,” is dedicated to a particularly well-constructed analysis—to my knowledge, one of the finest in this area to date—of the meeting of Quanzhen Daoist monks with Western Daoists, in this case with Americans on Huashan 華山. Palmer explores how Chinese monks reacted to the American visitors, while his co-researcher Elijah Siegler focused on the Westerners’ encounter with their Quanzhen hosts.

Palmer describes in great detail—and not without humour, a rare quality in academic research—the meeting between three Huashan monks and a group of “Western Daoists,” with moments of affinity and incomprehension alike. His narrative is “a composite of two trips that occurred in July 2004 and May 2006” (119) organised by the Healing Tao center led by Michael Winn, who wanted to take his group back to the roots of Daoism in China. Examining how the various individuals perceive one another and how this encounter changes them, Palmer particularly explores its impact on the Daoist monks. He depicts in a very fair manner the motivations of the foreigners, who “were uninterested in the religious

expression of Daoism as it exists in Quanzhen monasticism, and saw themselves as practitioners of a ‘true’ way they consider was lost in Communist China. This is a form of silent missionizing” (117). The tour is not about China or Chinese Daoism but about connecting with an energy of which Chinese and even most Chinese Daoists are not aware. Ultimately, the Americans do not come to seek wisdom from true masters—as practitioners do in China—but instead to communicate with the mountain’s energy.

Palmer observes that “the Quanzhen monks were coming closer to the Westerners’ point of view, while taking a more critical stance toward their own tradition and becoming increasingly marginalized within the monastic community” (119). Here he provides a glimpse of the disputes and rivalries within the local Daoist community, and the disappointment or pessimism of some monks toward their fellow disciples.

Observing that certain rare “moments of bonding usually occurred when they were least expected,” while “at other times when both sides consciously attempted to establish a more enduring relationship, they failed” (135), this article sheds light on the divergence of expectations that is so often the cause of misunderstanding and disillusionment between Chinese Daoists and their Western counterparts.

The fifth chapter by Paul G. G. Van Enkevort, entitled “Quanzhen and Longmen Identities in the works of Wu Shouyang,” deals with the “best known Quanzhen author of the end of the Ming dynasty,” Wu Shouyang 伍守陽 (1574–c. 1644), whose writings, both by him and attributed to him, have been continuously republished up to the present day, and are included in the *Daozang jiyao* and many other collections.

In order to establish how the Longmen branch and the Quanzhen tradition are represented in Wu’s works, the author focuses on the works and life of Wu Shouyang, who “instead of setting his mind on a career as a scholar-official...started to ‘develop the unconventional ambition to study the Dao’” (156). He became a self-cultivator and a teacher of “Xianhood”—Van Enkevort chooses to leave the term *xian* 仙 untranslated since “immortality” does not cover all the connotations of this important concept.

Besides using the life stories of the early figures of the Quanzhen school “as paradigmatic examples of the embodiment and practice of this Xiandao 仙道 (“Way of Xianhood”) theory,” Wu sheds light on “their inspirational role” (154–155). For instance, the 12th-century patriarch Wang Chongyang “illustrated the ‘old saying’ that it is easier for a disciple to find a teacher than for a teacher to find a [capable and moral] disciple” (157).

Wu’s activity “did not take place in an institutional context but in a context of the master-disciple relationship surrounded with elements of secrecy” (169). He did claim the existence of an oral tradition associated with the school, notably consisting of oral formulae (*koujue* 口訣) and instructional verses, which describe some of the fundamental principles of the Xiandao teaching (161). Wu was not an ordained monk but “precept scriptures were available in certain Daoist communities and he argued for some kind of public transmission accessible to ‘those who study the Dao in the [mundane] world’” (165). Wu did not seem to have had any contact with Quanzhen clerics, whom he occasionally portrays in a somewhat negative light as “incapable, perverted, and calculating” (148).

This highly instructive chapter suggests that there were from an early stage Longmen disciples who were not monks (or who did “not conform to a ‘normative’ or ‘ideal’ image of a Quanzhen adept: the ordained, celibate monk”) but saw themselves as part of the same lineage as monks. They had a name created using the Longmen poem, and “the possession of the oral formulae and a talisman that accompanied the reception of the Dao” (170).

Mori Yuria’s sixth chapter, entitled “Being Local Through Ritual: Quanzhen Appropriation of Zhengyi Liturgy in the *Chongkan Daozang jiyao*,” is based on three ritual manuals—the *Yayiji* 雅宜集 (*Anthology of Exquisiteness and Righteousness*), the *Xinxiang miaoyu* 心香妙語 (*Esoteric Words with Sincerity of Offering Incense*) and the *Lingbao wenjian* 靈寶文檢 (*Writings Models of the Lingbao Rituals*)—compiled by Quanzhen Daoists living in western Sichuan during the Qing dynasty, and found by the author at Qingcheng shan 青城山 in Sichuan in 2005. Each page of these manuals displays the standing Chinese characters for the

title *Daozang jiyao*. The manuals were kept at Qingcheng shan where the recarved printing blocks of the Qing Daoist collection *Chongkan Daozang jiyao* 重刊道藏輯要 were preserved prior to the Cultural Revolution. However, they are not included in the widely circulated version of the *Daozang jiyao* published by Xinwenfeng Press in 1986, nor are they recorded in the index of the newly added texts of this collection.

These manuals contain mainly Zhengyi ritual documents, but the compilers referred to themselves as Quanzhen clerics (172). Exploring the continuities between these compilers who were important figures of Sichuan Daoism and studying the local background, Mori seeks to “focus on their shared visions of the history of Daoism in general and Lingbao 靈寶 liturgy in particular” (200).

This chapter provides some highly valuable information on various other subjects. It shows the competition between different projects at a temple, for example, putting off the re-engraving of printing blocks damaged by fire due to construction projects motivated by financial incentives. It also gives us a glimpse of a *qishi* 啟師 ritual “in which various great Daoist masters of the past are addressed by the living ritual master to support the successful completion of the ritual” (202).

Next in the volume is an excellent article by Fang Ling entitled “Quanzhen Daoism and Ritual Medicine: A Study of ‘Thirteen Sections of *Zhuyou* Medicine from the Yellow Emperor Inscription,’” which examines a tradition of talisman-based medicine known as *zhuyou* 祝由—“the ritual practice of using talismans, incantations, and exorcistic rites to ‘conjure away the causes of illness’” (208).

Fang shows how, according to Ge Hong, a ritual tradition of healing by exorcistic methods “not only cured illnesses but also protected the body against various dangers such as epidemic diseases, weapons, and wild animals” (209). In the same spirit, *zhuyou* was used as a remedy not only for symptoms due to causes that were “undetermined in material or physical terms” but also for illnesses with no apparent symptoms attributed to malevolent spirits. In the later case, *zhuyou* was part of “a therapeutic strategy employed to ‘cure the mind’ by exorcising such malevolent spirits”

(222). According to Fang, the study of *zhuyou* “offers a new vision of the role of Quanzhen Daoists in the field of mental health in China” (209). “Whenever any condition was ascribed to supernatural causes, be they karmic retribution, possession by ghosts or ancestors, or infringing taboos or cosmic patterns, people could only resort to Daoists, regardless of whether they were Zhengyi or Quanzhen” (232). All the more so since this was not a marginal practice. “By the Sui dynasty (581–618), when the official institution for teaching medicine was divided into distinct disciplines (*ke* 科) for the first time, ritual medicine was included among the three recognized disciplines: ritual medicine (*zhujin* 祝禁), medicine (*yi* 醫) and massages (*anmo* 按摩)” (209).

The text shows that drugs and ritual healing were used concurrently but also that “*zhuyou*, beside oral rites of invocation and prayers, included other ritual techniques such as talismans (*fu* 符) [ingested and/or used externally], spitting (*tuo* 唾) [empowered or talismanic water], cosmic steps (*yubu* 禹步), exhalation of *qi* (*huqi* 呼氣), sacrifice of substitute bodies (*tishen* 替身),” mudras and more (209). Fang details the way in which these rituals require, among other things, the focusing of *qi* through mind concentration, while also explaining that those medical officers who teach ritual medicine specialize in expelling the demons that cause illness (210).

Only through the help of gods could doctors exorcise and so get rid of illness caused by ghosts, given that the three parts of the body each has its own talismans and healing deities associated with it. This explains the need for a specific master-disciple initiation. On the other hand, Quanzhen has emphasized self-healing, of both bodily and psychological illnesses, through self-cultivation (222).

While “some scholars have argued that the medical value of *zhuyou* boils down to these drugs taken in conjunction with the ritual parts of the cure,” Fang shows that “such a view neglects the psychological and mental effects of the cure,” which is particularly intended to address desire, correct thoughts, eliminate vices and appease fears (218). Fang cites the renowned doctor Wu Jutong 吳掬通 (1758–1836) who quoted “another celebrated doctor, Ye Tianshi 葉天士 (1666–1745): ‘Drugs, which are material things without emotions, cannot cure diseases that are rooted in emotions’” (218).

“A Local Longmen Lineage in Late Ming-Early Qing Yunnan” by Richard G. Wang discusses the singular case of the earliest known Quanzhen tradition in Yunnan, which provides a counterpoint to the perspective on Quanzhen given by Wang Changyue’s 王常月 (d. 1680) official Longmen lineage. This local lineage in Kunming dates earlier than, and was independent of, that of Wang Changyue.

Wang focuses on Xuning’an 虛凝庵 temple, which was founded in the sixteenth century and survived until 1955 when it was dismantled. It was used as a place of self-cultivation, but it also had a more political role. Daoism was seen as a sign of Chinese identity in the Yunnan region where, during the Ming dynasty, the Han were a minority. The mission of establishing Ming authority in this province and pacifying (i.e., Sinicizing) the aboriginal people was achieved not only by using military force but also by means of places like the temple.

Wang provides a nuanced description of the different categories of lay people involved in the life of the temple and the terms of their involvement. The patrons of the temple included civil officials and local elites whose role, “as Timothy Brook writes, was more that of supervisor or guarantor than donor” (256); certain donors who might try to place their land under the temple’s registration to evade taxes; members of the local gentry; and various lay associations which participated in the temple cult by either making donations or raising funds for the temple. “By participating in and supporting the maintenance and running of a temple, a clan on one hand enhances its internal cohesion and on the other hand demonstrates its power” (264).

Among other things, this case study also shows that as early as the 17th century “the practice of wandering in search of masters (*yunyou* 雲遊) and visiting sacred mountains (*canfang* 參訪) became required Quanzhen training and part of the common Quanzhen culture” (241).

The next fascinating chapter is by Xun Liu. “Quanzhen Daoism Proliferates Learning: The Xuanmiao Temple, Clerical Activism, and the Modern Reform in Nanyang, 1880s–1940s” provides valuable and moving insight into the initiatives of Quanzhen temples in the

area of philanthropic and educational services.

Liu takes an opposite stance from studies that have focused on how temples were subject to state policies aimed at “converting temples into schools” (*miaochan xingxue* 廟產興學). Liu shows how, on the contrary, some temples made efforts to promote the late-Qing, state-sponsored education project. Even if “the juxtaposition of Quanzhen Daoism and modern education is sufficiently counterintuitive, if not outright bizarre” (271–272), this monastic involvement should not be seen in simplistic terms of self-preservation or cynic opportunism but rather as a real desire to help improve education, healthcare and agriculture, using the means at their disposal.

Such is the case with Xuanmiao Temple 玄妙觀 in Nanyang, “a crucial node of the Zhenwu pilgrimage circuits, and a major trade and distribution center on the upper Han River and in Southwestern Henan” (269). The temple and its leading clerics were actively involved in promoting and implementing state-initiated reforms in primary education and social philanthropy. They were among the pioneers in establishing new schools under their own initiative and with their own resources. They created a large, traditional private school (*sishu* 私塾)—one of the largest in the prefectural seat—and two additional free village schools (*yixue* 義學) for children of poor families. “In October of 1905, just one month after the Qing court issued the decree to abolish the civil service examination system and to implement the new school standards, Abbot Yao and his temple set about converting the two free schools into new schools” (281). The abbot recruited teachers trained in the new Western learning to teach at these schools.

This was not a marginal undertaking. “Altogether, the primary schools funded and run by Quanzhen Daoists admitted more than one third of the total annual enrollment for the whole city of Nanyang during the late Qing period” (283). They also promoted “the new agricultural learning among the tenants who cultivated the monastery’s vast farmland throughout the region” (285), which included innovative tilling and irrigating methods. They were involved in local public health reforms and founded an orphanage especially for war-displaced and homeless children. They also

adapted to changing local economic conditions and market demand.

One of the explanations provided by Liu is that “in Nanyang, where large and established landholding lineages were relatively weak and few in number due to devastating wars and depopulation, it is not surprising that large wealthy and public religious institutions such as the Quanzhen Xuanmiao Temple were often the dominant and leading movers and shakers in local society” (304). More essentially, it is made clear that the Quanzhen Daoists were not anti-modern conservatives.

In the final chapter, entitled “Temple and Household Daoists: Notes from North China,” Stephen Jones investigates local ritual specialists in Hebei, Shanxi, Shaanxi and Gansu who perform complex liturgical sequences among the people, mainly for funerals (*baishi* 白事) and temple fairs (*miaohui* 廟會), which were and are still conducted by both Quanzhen and Zhengyi temple priests and household Daoists alike.

On a local level, the ritual specialists do not always represent the core of the religious system, leaving space for, or interacting closely with, other important participants. At temple fairs, the cast of performers includes opera troupes, mediums and their disciples, temple committees, bards, and performing art associations. Funerals may be performed without a ritual specialist, except for a master of ceremonies, a geomancer, and a band of shawm players and helpers.

Ritual specialists today are rarely based in temples. They are hired by temple committees to perform at their fairs. Moreover, temple-dwelling priests do not necessarily have more ritual expertise than household Daoists. Jones explains that in central Hebei, if local temples were occupied, “it was by a very small staff, rarely adequate to field a team able to perform a complex ritual” and thus when these Daoists performed rituals outside the temple “they might collaborate with priests from other temples nearby to ‘make up a band’ (*dabanr* 搭班兒),” and in many cases “they sought local villagers whom they could teach and form into a viable ritual group” (322). When household Daoists need to form a ritual group, they generally call on the men of the family or outside it who are also Daoists, since “a reputable Daoist may also take one or more

disciples from other lineages” (315). They may also link up with other Daoists from nearby villages to work together. On the other hand, Quanzhen temple Daoists do not appear to be cut off from the other Daoists. They “could bestow generational names on household disciples” (319).

Jones also deftly explores the matter of proximity and collaboration between Daoists and Buddhists. For example, the sole temple-keeper (*kanmiaode* 看廟的) in one village in north Shanxi is an old Buddhist monk, but a group of household occupational Daoists is regularly invited to perform rituals at the temple. “For funerals, of course, ideally one would wish to invite both Buddhists and Daoists [who can combine their rituals] and in some places where both are available (such as Daxing in Beijing Municipality), people can still do so” (311). Locally, amateur ritual associations called *foshihui* 佛事會 are also closely linked with the Daoists in the temples (326).

Situations change depending on location. They are also transformed over time. It is possible to come across household Quanzhen Daoists “who had formerly been (or learnt from) Quanzhen Daoist priests” (317) who were laicized when their temples were closed, and who were unable to stay in the temples during the religious revival. With the destruction of the temples, the former patrons also vanished.

After reading this volume, a degree of uncertainty persists as to the actual nature of a Quanzhen Daoist. While one of the objectives of the volume is “to adopt a multidisciplinary approach to modern Daoism that treats its blurred boundaries for what they are” (9), the reader is often left wanting to know more. What is meant by a “Quanzhen who lived at home” (Goossaert, 22); or someone (the compiler of the *Xinxiang miaoyu*) who “was not a nominal Quanzhen Daoist but a clerical Quanzhen Daoist who led a monastic life after leaving his family” (Mori, 188); or a Quanzhen who presents himself as a lineage holder of the Longmen branch but without contact with Quanzhen clerics (Van Enckevort, 152); or “a non-Quanzhen priest who might use Longmen titles” (Jones, 314). Does the term *Quanzhen* refer to recluses, monks, household

clerics or lay practitioners? Most important, what distinguishes and what unifies them? In other words, what constitutes the Quanzhen part of their identity?

At a time when the Quanzhen order in China is undergoing a major transformation with the tacit acceptance (said to be almost official) of married Quanzhen who do not live like the Zhengyi but rather resemble the “married monks” of Japan (and who already existed in the past—Jones relates that some temple Daoists were given permission to marry in the Republican period, possibly in 1924 [320]), the reader would benefit from additional knowledge of the daily lives of this “supposedly monastic” order.

Further, while the Quanzhen/Zhengyi division is discussed in several chapters, there is no mention of any collaboration between them. We learn that certain specialists received double initiations—first Zhengyi and then Quanzhen (or the inverse)—and that “instances where Daoists practice Quanzhen and Zhengyi concurrently are more common” (Fang, 224–225). We learn that Quanzhen were “strongly committed to the Zhengyi (Qingwei-Lingbao) ritual tradition for a long time” (Mori, 207) without discovering whether they often interacted or rather had few opportunities to meet due to the existence of zones of influence or authority, or simply because they did not generally travel far, as Jones indicates when he notes that “the Daoists of Yanggao 陽高 had not even visited Hengshan 恆山, a mere 60 kilometers south” (315).

Fang Ling writes that “scholars overemphasize the difference between Quanzhen and Zhengyi Daoism” (230). More information on any exchanges between the two would help our understanding of this distinction, which nonetheless remains important due to the alternative career path that Quanzhen Daoism proposes, at least in theory.

Finally, the volume would have benefited from more extensive treatment of women. While several authors suggest that women may have held an important position within Quanzhen, we ultimately learn relatively little about them. Goossaert asserts that “in Qing times, the Quanzhen clergy was in good part female, almost exclusively in some areas” (22), while Durand-Dastès uses the case of Sun Buer 孫不二 to show that vernacular literature

stresses and values the role of women, but he reveals little about what their role was. However, to my knowledge, accounts of certain nuns who entered the order before the Cultural Revolution indicate that they often occupied a difficult position away from their male counterparts, and that at the very least they did not live a life identical to male monks.

Nevertheless, this pioneering book on Quanzhen in a Western language is a work of impressive depth and an essential reference in the field.

Adeline Herrou
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
Laboratoire d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie Comparative (France)