

# みんなくりポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

## The Taoist Priesthood : From Tsai-chia to Ch 'u-chia

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2009-04-28 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 尾崎, 正治 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.15021/00003364">https://doi.org/10.15021/00003364</a>

## The Taoist Priesthood: From Tsai-chia to Ch'u-chia

MASAHARU OZAKI

### INTRODUCTION

During the approximately 1800 years from the latter half of the later Han Dynasty (25–220) to the fall of old China, Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism remained the major Chinese religions. No mention is necessary of how much Taoism learned from the other two, especially Buddhism, and how much it was influenced by them in the process of forming and developing itself. As we are well aware, Confucianism is a *shih-hsien tao* 世間道 (a path within society), and Buddhism is a *ch'u shih-hsien tao* 出世間道 (outside the social order), and hence opposite in nature. Buddhism had to withstand rigorous criticism from Confucianism before it became accepted within Chinese society. One such point of contention remained the question of *hsiao* 孝, filial piety. From a Confucian viewpoint leaving home to become a priest (*ch'u-chia* 出家) is clearly an un-filial act.

As it happened, Confucian ideology declined greatly during the political confusion that occurred from the latter half of the Later Han through the Wei Chin and Northern and Southern Dynasties. As a result, during this period, Buddhism had a good opportunity to permeate into Chinese society, while Taoism was becoming more formalized as a definable religion.

Is and was Taoism intrinsically a *shih-hsien tao*, (within the family), or is it a *ch'u shih-hsien tao*, (leading away from family life), or did it follow a unique path that combined the two? These have become extremely interesting questions now that the recent academic climate is re-examining the definition of Taoism. Without requisite research on the multi-faceted aspects of Taoism we cannot expect easy answers. Therefore, I shall approach this issue here through the historical question of whether or not Taoists practiced *ch'u-chia* and retired from family life during the first half of the T'ang Dynasty.

### TAOISTS DURING THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DYNASTIES

First, let me briefly refer to the actual practices of Taoists that can be presently observed in Taiwan and Hong Kong as well as of those reported by our predecessors in pre-war China. As far as I know there are no "*ch'u-chia*" Taoists living apart in present-day Taiwan: all Taoists are leading family lives and those considered priests simply preside over religious rites in a broad sense. This seems the same in Hong

Kong also [ŌFUCHI 1980: 753–754]. One Taoist with whom I am acquainted is a *T'ien-shih Tao* 天師道 Taoist from Fu-chou 福州 now living in T'ai-nan 台南. His family have been Taoists for over ten generations since the Ch'ing Dynasty, from which we can infer that they have continuously lived married lives. In Pei-ching in pre-war China, however, the *T'ien-shih Tao* Taoists located there seem to have led lives of *ch'u-chia* priests, like the *Ch'üan-chen Chiao* 全真教 Taoists [YOSHIOKA 1975: 418–420]. Another example is that of the Chang *T'ien-shih* 張天師 sect whose family line has continued for about 1800 years from the first *Tien-shih* 天師, Chang Ling 張陵 of the later Han Dynasty, to *T'ien-shih* Chang Yüan-hsien 天師張源先, who is of the sixty-fourth generation now based in Taiwan. In short, there seem historically to have been from the earliest period on two types of Taoists—*ch'u-chia* 出家, or non-secular, and *tsai-chia* 在家, or lay.

Taoism lacks a so-called founder. Its origin is generally considered to be so-called “Primitive Taoism”, or folk cults such as *T'ai-p'ing Tao* 太平道 and *Wu-tou-mi Tao*. 五斗米道. Until the emergence of the *San-tung* 三洞 theory, in the first half of the fifth century, the various Taoist sects scattered throughout China were formed and developed more or less separately. There was some communication among them but there were no feelings of special solidarity or fellowship uniting the various groups. There were no recorded tendencies for the various sects to unite.

Whether the Taoists during this period were prevailingly *ch'u-chia* or *tsai-chia* cannot be fully known, but we know that at least *Wu-tou-mi Tao* Taoists were married. For example, three generations of Changs, Chang Ling 張陵, Chang Hêng 張衡, and Chang Lu 張魯 are often referred to as the San Chang 三張, or the three Changs. They were clearly blood kin, and the position of leader was hereditary within the family. We can also infer from the description in *Lao-chün yin-sung chieh ching* 老君音誦誡經 (*Tao-ts'ang* 道藏 vol. 562) that *T'ien-shih* Taoists in the later periods also practiced primogeniture. This scripture is a remainder of the twenty volume *Yün-chung yin-sung hsin-k'ê chih chieh* 雲中音誦新科之誡 which was given to the priest K'ou Ch'ien-chih 寇謙之 (365?-448) of the Northern Wei Dynasty by T'ai-shang *Lao-chün* 太上老君 in October of the second year of Shen-juei 神瑞 [YANG 1956: 17–18]. It contains Ch'ien-chih's own views under the pretext of being those of *Lao-chün* and is one of few precious materials describing the actual situation of Taoism in Hua-pei (North China) 華北 in about 400, A.D.

Ch'ien-chih's Taoism is called the *New T'ien-shih Tao* 新天師道. He considers the first *T'ien-shih* to be T'ai-shang *Lao-chün*, Chang Ling the second, and himself as the third *T'ien-shih*, which indicates quite clearly that there was no blood relationship among the three. Furthermore, Ch'ien-chih criticizes the common practice of the priest's son inheriting the father's position after his death, and strongly asserts the need to adopt the policy of respecting ability rather than birth. This, then, would indicate that *T'ien-shih* Taoists in the Hua-pei area during this period took wives but did not approve of the priesthood being passed on as part of inheritance.

Among the collected works that play an important role in the study of Taoism are the *Tao-ts'ang* and the *Tao-ts'ang chi-yao* 道藏輯要, from which we can extract a

considerable number of scriptures written in the Chiang-nan 江南 area during the Six Dynasties. These are where the term "*ch'u-chia*" is found. A minor qualification is necessary. We cannot find the term among those that were written early in the Six Dynasties, such as *Ku shang-ch'ing ching* 古上清經 and *Ku ling-pao ching* 古靈寶經, but we begin to see the term in writings appearing toward the end of the Six Dynasties. One example of this is the twenty volume *Tao-hsüeh chuan* 道學傳 written by Ma Shu 馬樞 of the Ch'en Dynasty (557-589). Although the entire collection is not extant, it is quoted not only in Taoist books but in many others. Ch'en Kuo-fu 陳國符 once made tremendous effort to collect the lost text [CH'EN 1963: Appendix 454-504]. In it we find specific mention of 14 Taoist priests and nuns. These priests and nuns whose activities are relatively well known were all active in the Chiang-nan area during the Liang (502-557) and Ch'en (557-589) Dynasties. We can infer from this that they did not have clear *ch'u-chia* consciousness in the fourth and fifth centuries. Such consciousness of specific priesthood became clear in the sixth century. This contention would explain the fact that the term *ch'u-chia* cannot be found in prior works like *Ku shang-ch'ing ching* and *Ku ling-pao ching*.

There were, however, Taoists who were practically leading a *ch'u-chia* life even before the term actually appears in the texts. One such example is Lu Hsiu-ching 陸修靜, who was active during the Sung Dynasty (420-479). There is a description of him in the *Tao-hsüeh chuan* 道學傳 quoted in chapter two of the Chao Sung Dynasty author Ch'en Pao-kuang's 陳葆光 *San-tung ch'ün hsien lu* 三洞群仙錄 (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 992). "He left his wife and children, removed himself from his worldly responsibilities, and day and night strove solely to acquire the teachings." Also a famous work by Ma Shu (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 780) includes an anecdote in which they pleaded with him to cure his own daughter who had suddenly become ill. He declined to do so by saying, "Having abandoned my family, I am in the midst of training. The house I stopped by is no different from an inn and is a passing point to my destination. How can I not abandon my love toward my family?" This is a clear case of *ch'u-chia* since Hsiu-ching left his family in order to search for the Way.

Does this imply, then, that Taoists in Hua-pei were *tsai-chia* and those in Chiang-nan were *ch'u-chia*? Or did they vary from sect to sect? In order to clarify this it is necessary to specifically examine the situation of the T'ien-shih Taoists in the Chiang-nan area, because by the period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties *T'ien-shih Tao* was influential in that region.

Chang Yü 張裕, who was active in Chiang-nan during the Liang Dynasty, is said to be a twelfth generation descendent of Chang Ling. It is clear that he retreated from family into *ch'u-chia*, but there is no document to our knowledge that indicates he was actively enlightening the masses. This makes us wonder how faithful he was to the teachings of *T'ien-shih Tao*. A converse example is that of a T'ien-shih Taoist during the Liu Sung Dynasty, Liu Ning-chih 劉凝之. He apparently brought his wife and children to the mountains (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 780).

Taoism, like Buddhism, in Hua-pei was strongly influenced by the state and was very practical, whereas in Chiang-nan it was influenced by the nobility and was logical

[OZAKI 1979: 66–67]. Therefore, one can observe a strong tendency for Taoism in Hua-pei to be *tsai-chia* Taoism, and in Chiang-nan to be *ch'u-chia* Taoism, although there is some variation depending upon the tradition of different sects. Granted that it is dangerous to judge on the basis of the one example of Liu Ning-chih, it seems that T'ien-shih Taoists in the Chiang-nan area were *tsai-chia* on the whole, even though they were influenced by other Taoist sects, like the Mao Shan 茅山.

### TAOISTS DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE T'ANG DYNASTY

The two major types of priests in the Northern and Southern Dynasties changed during the T'ang Period as a world empire was gradually being formed.

Let me begin with a six volume Taoist text entitled *Tung-hsüan ling-pao san-tung fêng-tao k'ê-chieh ying-shih* 洞玄靈寶三洞奉道科戒營始 (*Tao-ts'ang* vols. 760–761). There are many dates given for its completion: none is generally accepted as convincing. I would like to suggest that it was written sometime during T'ai-tsung's 太宗 reign (626–649). One can clearly tell, however, that the version available at present is not the authorized one, by comparing it against the Tuen-huang 敦煌 manuscript [ŌFUCHI 1978: 115–121]. In *Fêng-tao k'ê-chieh ying-shih* quoted in “Ming-k'ai tu ming-k'ai tu 明開度, *I-ch'ieh tao-ching yin-i miao-men yu-ch'i* 一切道經音義妙門由起 (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 760), we find a description of Taoists.

Taoists are those who are not concerned with worldly responsibilities but rather strive to serve the ever-unchanging Tao. They all are courteous as Taoists, should be and are completely different from the lay people in their spirit and behavior. Therefore they do not worship the emperor and the nobles. The Taoists of today are Taoist priests (*ch'u-chia*) and they should not attempt to acquire wealth by coming into close contact with those with power.

Here they say clearly, “The Taoists today are Taoist priests written *ch'u-chia*, “out of home”, which is extremely important to us. If we were to investigate this literally, there were no lay (*tsai-chia*) Taoists during the reign of T'ai-tsung and all the Taoists were (*ch'u-chia*) priests. In other words, there may have been lay (*tsai-chia*) Taoists in the society of that time, but they were operating subrosa, so to speak, and were not authorized by the sects. We may note here that this text is not something that was prepared from the perspective of a single sect, as the term *san-tung* in the title indicates.

As mentioned earlier, there is no specific founder in Taoism. Although Lao-tzŭ 老子 is often mentioned as such, it is simply a measure with which to compete against Śākya-muni-buddha 釈迦牟尼仏 of Buddhism, and the Taoists did not consciously think of Lao-tzŭ as their founder. Diverse sects were not unified until the end of Eastern Chin Dynasty (317–420). At this time a large number of Buddhist scriptures were being translated into Chinese. The nobles found Buddhism attractive which contributed to its spread in the Chiang-nan area. Taoists began to realize that single sects could not meet this challenge. Various sects of the Chiang-nan area who shared

relatively similar scriptures began to unite around the *Shang-ch'ing* 上清 sect. This is the beginning of the San-tung theory, a major event in the history of Taoism.

San-tung in a narrow sense includes Tung-chen 洞真, Tung-hsüan 洞玄 and Tung-shen 洞神. The basic scriptures are the *Shang-ch'ing ching* 上清經 for Tung-chen, the *Ling-pao ching* 靈寶經 for Tung-hsüan, and the *San-huang wen* 三皇文 for Tung-shen. Although it was still in a very primitive form, we can consider that the Tao-ts'ang of Taoism as I-Ch'ieh Ching 一切經 was formed here. This is when the Taoists began to have a certain sense of comradery, and each group can be understood as a religious sect. Later orders with long tradition, such as the *T'ien-shih Tao* 天師道 and the *T'ai-p'ing Tao* 太平道 and their scriptures, were incorporated into one organization.

San-tung in a broader sense refers to all the sects, all the scriptures, and ultimately Taoism itself. Some examples of this are a ten chapter collection compiled by the early T'ang Taoist, Wang Hsüan-hê 王懸河 entitled *San-tung chu-nang* 三洞珠囊 (Tao-ts'ang vols. 780-782), and the *San-tung fêng-tao k'ê-chieh ying-shih*. That the term was used in a broader sense is indicated by the fact that the major sects from the Six Dynasties are all grouped into one system in Chapter 4, "Fa-tz'ü i 法次儀" and Chapter 5, "Fa-fu t'u-i 法服圖儀". All these indicated that during T'ai-sung's reign all the Taoists were priests, including the T'ien-shih Taoists.

By this time they had tried to classify Taoists such as the seven categories of *T'ien-chen* 天真, *Shen-hsien* 神仙, *Yu-i* 幽逸, *Shan-chü* 山居, *Ch'u-chia* 出家, *Tsai-chia* 在家 and *Chi-chiu* 祭酒 in *Miao-men yu-ch'i hsü* 妙門由起序. The seven category system first appears in *T'ai-shang tung-hsüan ling-pao ch'u-chia yin-yüan ching* 太上洞玄靈寶出家因緣經 (Tao-ts'ang vol. 176). This is considered to have been written before the *Miao-men yu-ch'i hsü* but after *San-tung fêng-tao k'ê-chieh ying-shih* (quoted by "ming-k'ai tu", *I-ch'ieh tao-ching yin-i miao-men yu-ch'i*), in which the category *Yu-i* is missing.

In the explanation of Taoists given in the *Miao-men yu-ch'i hsü* the seven categories are further divided into two groups, the first one being from the first *T'ien-chen* to the fifth *Ch'u-chia*, and the second being the sixth *Tsai-chia* and the seventh *Chi-chiu*. Taoists in the former group were pure priests, being completely separated from the lay world. Those in the latter group did not lead a normal lay life as do the Taoists in present day Taiwan and Hong Kong, but rather were considered to be students who were seeking the way through such activities which brought them lay benefits such as curing illness, while they lived among the lay people. These Taoists were regarded as lower than those in the former group, although nonetheless as one form of genuine Taoists. It has been said that this type of Taoism was popular in Chiennan 劍南, (the area south of Chien-kê 劍閣, Ssü-ch'uan 四川 Province) and Chiang-piao 江表 (the area south of the Yang-tz'ü 揚子 River), which is probably Taoism of the *T'ien-shih Tao* type.

## SOME RE-EXAMINATION

Having pointed out that during the first half of the T'ang Dynasty Taoists were classified into six or seven categories and that all Taoists were considered to be non-secular priests, I shall now try to examine these points from other perspectives by referring to some curious records and questions.

First, let me begin with an example from a text in which a Taoist refers to himself as a "ch'u chia": Pelliot no. 4659 of the Tuen-huang manuscripts is a segment of a text with the subtitle, "T'ai-shang (tung)-hsüan ling-pao tzü-jan chih-chen chiu-t'ien shêng-shen chang" 太上(洞)玄靈寶自然至真九天生神章. This piece is the last part of *Tung-hsüan ling-pao tzü-jan chiu-t'ien shêng-shen chang ching* contained in the current version of the *Tao-ts'ang* vol. 165. It is a chapter that makes up the so-called *Ku ling-pao ching*. The curious thing about it is that there appears in the colophon of the Tuen-huang manuscripts the sentence, "ch'u-chia Taoist priest Wang Fa-ch'ien 王法遷 respectfully finished copying on the third of May in the year of Ping-wu 丙午." As far as I know there is no other example of this among the Taoist texts in Tuen-huang manuscripts.

The term "ch'u-chia" has two meanings: In the broad sense it means non-secular, *ch'u-chia* in contrast to *tsai-chia* or lay; a man has left his family to seek the way, living away from the lay world; in the narrow sense it means a specific category of Taoists. Since Wang Fa-ch'ien's accomplishments are not known it is unclear just what the text really meant. One possible interpretation, however, is: According to Dr. Ôfuchi [1978: 19] that this version was copied in the Tuen-huang. The year of Ping-wu is calculated to be the twentieth year of Chen-kuan 貞觀 (646). If so, this date was very close to the time when the *San-tung fêng-tao k'ê-chieh ying-shih* was finished, and when the seven fold categorization was done for the first time. In this vein we could interpret that the term was used in the narrow sense, as a category of Taoists. This, of course, is only one possible interpretation, and whether it is correct or not is another matter.

The writing of "ch'u-chia Taoist priest" in the colophon is indeed peculiar. The common practice was to write "temple name, name of the priest", also a practice of Buddhist monks. The difference is that Taoists used their lay names before becoming priests.

As mentioned earlier, this is the only extant example to use the term "ch'u-chia Taoist priest". This, however, does indicate that the Taoist thought of himself as a *ch'u-chia* priest. Obviously, further examination is necessary as to the content and the degree of consciousness for being *ch'u-chia* on the priests' part as well as the question of how such a designation was used to differ Taoists from Buddhist priests.

In *Fêng-tao k'ê-chieh ying-shih* 奉道科戒營始 (quoted in "Ming-k'ai tu 明開度, I-ch'ieh tao-ching yin-i miao-men yu-ch'i 一切道經音義妙門由起) there is a list of names of two Taoists in each class along with explanations:

T'ien-chen Taoist priests:	Kao Hsüan	高玄
	Huang Jen	皇人

<i>Shen-hsien</i> Taoist priests:	Tu Ch'ung	杜冲
	Yin Kuei	尹軌
<i>Shan-chü</i> Taoist priests:	Hsü Yu	許由
	Ch'ao Fu	巢父
<i>Ch'u-chia</i> Taoist priests:	Sung Luen	宋倫
	P'êng Ch'en	彭謹
<i>Tsai-chia</i> Taoist priests:	Huang Ch'ung	黃瓊
	Chien K'êng	錢鏗
<i>Chi-chiu</i> Taoist priests:	Li Tung	李東
	Kan Shih	干室

Although the accomplishments of all these twelve Taoists are not known, our purpose here is to examine the difference between the first four and the last two types. For this we will compare Sung Luen a *ch'u-chia* Taoist; Chien K'êng, a *tsai-chia* Taoist; and Kan Shih, a *chi-chiu* Taoist. We have to keep in mind here that we need to examine them not historically but as individuals who had become idealized.

According to legend, Sung Luen had acquired a technique of apparition; sometimes he lived among the people, and when the mood struck him he cured people's illnesses. However, people did not know who he really was. It would be safe to say he was a *ch'u-chia* priest, keeping quite apart from the human world (*Tao-ts'ang* vols. 140, 605, 639, 698, 992).

Chien K'êng was not always in the human world, and not much of his active engagement with the lay world is reported. He was half-lay half-immortal, so to speak, K'êng was a health regimenist, *yang-shêng chia* 養生家, and had acquired various special techniques for lovemaking or *p'ang-chung* 房中, breathing, or *fu-ch'i tao-yin* 服氣導引 and taking pills, or *fu-shih* 服食. In his answer to a question by a courtesan he clearly distinguishes an immortal, or *shen-hsien*, from one who has attained the way, or *tê-tao chê* 得道者. He himself strove to attain the way and live long *ti-hsien* 地仙. According to the *Fêng-tao K'ê-chieh ying-shih*, a lay Taoist, *tsai-chia* is someone who concentrates his mind on the way but places his body in human society and quietly follows the trend of the world around him, without seeking fame and displaying the light of his wisdom. In this sense K'êng is a most appropriate person to represent this type of Taoist (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 139; *Shen-hsien chuan chap. 1*)

Kan Shih 干室 always lived in the human world, and his strong relationship with lay people is emphasized. Therefore, he is not given high credit as an immortal, *shen-hsien*, by people in the later period. However, people in Chiang-nan served him as if he had been a god, and Shih cured their illnesses with dispatch, with magic water of *fu-shuei* 符水. This is a good indication of what kind of teaching he employed (*Tao-ts'ang* vols. 143, 700, 994).

When we compare these three biographies, there are common areas but the differences between Sung Luen, Chien K'êng and Kan Shih in terms of the questions of whether they lived a lay life or not are great. This actually does not contradict too much the description in the *Miao-men yu-ch'i hsü*.

Lastly, if we accept that the Taoists were non-secular, we must re-examine the

undisrupted family line of the T'ien-shih since Chang Ling of the Later Han Dynasty because it is only natural to think that if the family line has not been disrupted then they must have been married. However, this contradicts the fact that Taoists during T'ang were all *ch'u-chia* priests. Thus we have to examine the way the T'ien-shih actually lived during the T'ang.

The earliest existing document which makes full use of the biographies of all the T'ien-shih is the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* 体道通鑑 (*Tao-ts'ang* vols. 139-148) by Chao Tao-i 趙道一 (Yüan). According to Chao's introduction he utilized then existing materials fully and did not construct a biography based on his own opinion. While this attitude as an editor is commendable, it would not be safe to assume that biographies are made up of historical facts alone, and should expect a considerable number of articles of faith as well.

Although not extant, a text that precedes this and touches upon the T'ien-shih Taoists during the Sui and T'ang Dynasties is the *San-tung ch'ün-hsien lu* (*Tao-ts'ang* vols. 992-995) edited by Ch'en Pao-kuang, a Chêng-i Taoist. (Chêng-i Taoism is the later form of T'ien-shih Taoism.) The introduction to this book, written in the Southern Sung, Shao-hsing 紹興<sup>24</sup> (1154, A.D.), describes three T'ien-shih, quoting the *T'ien-shih chuan* 天師伝 and the *T'ien-shih nei-chuan* 天師内伝: the tenth generation Chang Tzŭ-hsiang 張子祥 (Sui); the twelfth generation Chang Chung-ch'ang (Kao-tsung 高宗 period, T'ang: appears as Chang Hêng 張恒 in *Han t'ien-shih shih-chia* 漢天師世家 and the fourteenth generation Chang Tz'ü 張慈: appears as Chang Tz'ü-chêng 張慈正 in both *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* and *Han t'ien-shih shih-chia*.

As mentioned earlier, this text does not exist today, but it was probably written after the fifteenth generation T'ien-shih Chang Kao 張高, who is said to have been active during Hsüan-tsung's 玄宗 reign (712-756), because there is a passage about the immortalization of the fourteenth T'ien-shih. As far as I know, *T'ien-shih (nei-) chuan* is only quoted in the *San-tung ch'ün-hsien lu*. It probably did not get too popularized. Or it may be that it was intended mostly for internal use, and Ch'en Pao-kuang could get hold of it because he was a Chêng-i priest. It is probably correct, however, to think that it was written when the genealogy of the past T'ien-shih had been organized and made clear. Then again, it may be that it was written out of necessity, because of political and social changes occurring in society. The *T'ien-shih (nei-) chuan*, only segments of which exist today, is significant since there is very little material on the generations of the T'ien-shih which precedes the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien*. It should also be noted that the descriptions of the T'ien-shih are limited only to those three mentioned above in the *San-tung ch'ün-hsien lu* and that all of the three are based on the *T'ien-shih (nei-) chuan*.

There is a description in the introduction of Suen I-chung's 孫夷中 *San-tung hsiu-tao i* 三洞修道儀 (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 989) that each one of the ancestors of T'ien-shih is recorded and known even today, which is the Chang family at Mt. Lung-hu 龍虎山 in Hsin-chou 信州. Suen I-chung seems to have lived during the Later Chou of the Five Dynasties period, when there was a family on Mt. Lung-hu who claimed to be descended from Chang Ling. In this connection we should turn our

attention to the biography of Chang Hsiu 張修 (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 142) which cites *Ling-yen chi* 靈驗記. In this is a description of Liu Ch'ien 劉遷, a wealthy merchant in Chiang-hsi 江西, who was given *Tu-kung fa-lu* 都功法籙 by the nineteenth T'ien-shih: after his death he revived and entered Mt. Lung-hu to respect and serve the T'ien-shih as his teacher. Whether this story is true or not is unimportant here. But that T'ien-shih is enumerated up to the nineteenth generation, although his name is not mentioned, and that the T'ien-shih based himself in Mt. Lung-hu are of extreme importance to us for the following reason: although there are descriptions about a T'ien-shih's entering Mt. Lung-hu in the previously mentioned sources, we should not believe these descriptions without careful examination because they were all compiled in later periods. But it is also incorrect to assume that older materials have more truth in them. What we have to do is try to look for the oldest possible materials, with which we should compare the materials from later periods for the purpose of verification. It is in this connection that the *Ling-yen chi* is very important. The *Ling-yen chi* corresponds to twenty chapters of the *Tao-chiao ling-yen chi* 道教靈驗記 written by Tu Kuang-t'ing 杜光庭 which is recorded in *Sung-shih* 宋史, chapter 205, "I-wen chih 藝文志". It is also included in the current version of the *Tao-ts'ang* (vols. 325-326) in chapter 11 of which the above story is recorded in full. Tu Kuang-t'ing, the author of the *Ling-yen chi*, lived from Ta-chung 大中 4 of Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 of T'ang (850) to Ch'ang-hsing 長興 4 of Chuang-tsung 莊宗 of the Later T'ang (933), according to chapter 40 of the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien*, that is, he lived during the end of T'ang into Five Dynasties. We do have to acknowledge that by that time the T'ien-shih was already based in Mt. Lung-hu, and that the genealogy of the past T'ien-shih was fairly well organized. However, we cannot find any materials about the T'ien-shih older than this one.

There is no trustworthy description of the T'ien-shih during the T'ang Dynasty either in the general sources, representative of which is *Chêng-shih* 正史, or in Taoist sources. Even the description in *T'i-tao t'ung-chien* is very brief. This leads us to suppose that even in the Yüan Dynasty the materials were scarce. This is probably because, we may conjecture, the T'ien-shih during the T'ang did not have much power, let alone the power to unify the *T'ien-shih Tao* sects all over China, and was merely a local power among many. There remain many unanswered questions: Was it because it was so small and the government allowed them to continue their family line as an exception because it had continued so long?; did they become powerful when government control weakened during the second half of the Dynasty?; furthermore, what was the relationship with Chang Ling? In the remainder of this section I will describe a T'ang Dynasty T'ien-shih that appears in the *T'i-tao t'ung-chien*.

The position of T'ien-shih is handed down basically by primogeniture. The first sons do not always get special education from birth to immortalization at Mt. Lung-hu and continue their life-long training. There were cases where the son entered the Mountain (to become a priest) at the mid-point of his life. For example, the eighteenth T'ien-shih, Tzŭ-yüan 子元, is recorded to have studied the Tao 道 for the first time in his forties; the twentieth T'ien-shih, Ch'en 謹 is said to have liked the

Tao and avoided eating grains. Often in old age when they entered the Mountains some took their wives with them and some did not. All in all, the image of the T'ien-shih, though it may be vague because of lack of information, cannot be turned into that of individuals practicing strict asceticism.

## CONCLUSION

Although our attempt to acquire detailed information about Chang T'ien-shih 張天師 during the T'ang Dynasty may not have been too successful, we did learn with confidence that as a basic rule Taoists were supposed to become priests during this period. In concluding, I would like to fill in a few points that I have not yet discussed.

First, why did all the Taoists have to become priests (*ch'u-chia*)? At present, there is no material that would indicate any internal reasons within the Taoist sects, which makes me suspect that there were outside reasons. It may be possible to ascribe it to the intervention of the state with the organization of Taoist sects. The relationship between the Taoist sects and the government has been touched upon in well-researched studies written from the Buddhist point of view. Therefore, I shall attempt a brief discussion based on such previous studies.

Throughout the T'ang Dynasty Buddhism and Taoism were both generally respected. One could say that Taoism practically had achieved the position of a national religion in those times when the political climate favored using religion for the enhancement of the imperial position and state unification, which, conversely, meant that when a religious sect became a hindrance to the state it was suppressed. Taoist sects as well as Buddhist sects grew steadily from the Six Dynasties on despite many such suppressions. However, this brought about the inevitable deterioration of the quality of Taoist practitioners. A fair number of them became Taoists simply because they had the advantage of tax exemption. This sometimes led to the issuing of certificates of ordination (*tu-tieh* 度牒) by the government to questionable Taoist "priests". For example, in as early as May of the ninth year of Wu-tê 武德 (626) Kao-tsu 高祖 issued an edict to discern who were worthy Buddhist monks and Taoists for the reason that many of the Buddhist and Taoist temples in the capitol were considered impure. The government thereby allowed for three Buddhist and two Taoist temples in the capitol and one each in other prefectures to be established by the state, where only those who studied seriously and observed the rules could live. They were to be fed and clothed by the government, in addition to which they were to receive treatment comparable to state employees. If anyone should violate the rules he risked losing his status as a priest and being sent to his home town. This edict, however, was never carried out because Kao-tsu resigned (626) after the upheaval at Hsüan-wu men 玄武門. The T'ang policy toward religions was continued with little change thereafter. As far as this edict is concerned, there is no specification as to the necessity for Taoists to become priests. However, it is possible to interpret the equal treatment given to Taoist as well as Buddhist priests and nuns, with violaters

being sent home, as meaning that they would be returned to the lay life. Judging from the spirit of this edict, it is not unlikely that Taoists were also requested to become priests (*ch'u-chia*). Furthermore, it may not be too wrong to see that there were advantages to be gained when Taoists chose to become priests.

Even though one assumes the state intervention in religion directly caused all the Taoists to become priests, it still remains as only an outer factor. It is necessary first to examine those developments within Taoism that made it feasible for the government to treat Taoists as basically the same in nature as Buddhist priests, and a Taoist sect similar to a Buddhist sect. As mentioned earlier, some Taoists in the fifth century were practically leading a separate priestly (*ch'u-chia*) life. It was also mentioned that toward the end of the sixth century, such Taoist priests were more in evidence. It is easily imagined that Taoists became priests because they were influenced by the practices of hermits and Buddhist monks. It is generally said that *Ling-pao Chiao* 靈寶教 and *Shang-ch'ing Chiao* 上清教 are strongly influenced by Buddhism. However, when compared with Taoism during the T'ang, Taoism during the Northern and Southern Dynasties shows much less such influence. This makes it necessary for us to look at, albeit schematically, the Taoist idea of leaving the lay life (*ch'u-chia*) during the period from the last half of the Northern and Southern Dynasties to the Sui Dynasty. Unfortunately, however, we are not fully prepared to discuss this in detail except to offer a very interesting reference: ten volumes of the *T'ai-hsüan chen-i pen-chi ching* 太玄真一本際經 according to the second chapter of Hsüan I's 玄嶽 (T'ang) *Chen-chêng luen* 甄正論 recorded in *Taishō Daizōkyō* 大正大藏經 vol. 52. The first five chapters were written by Liu Chin-hsi 劉進喜 of Sui, and the other five were added by Li Chung-ch'ing 李仲卿. At this point the two parts cannot be discerned clearly, but chapter two, "Fu-chu p'in 付囑品 (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 758) for now is assumed to belong to the first group. In this chapter one finds two further meanings given to "chia 家" or house: one is "love of the family", and the other is "all existence". Furthermore, leaving love of parents and wives and children to strive to study is considered as elementary *ch'u-chia*, and leaving all existence is considered as ultimate *ch'u-chia*. This is clearly a Buddhistic influence, from which we can infer that they attempted a rather theoretical study of *ch'u-chia*. This helps us to infer that by the Sui, *ch'u-chia* was an expected course of behavior in certain sects and met very little resistance.

Finally, I will point out the differences between the Buddhist monks and Taoist priests to whom the term *ch'u-chia* was equally applied. The first difference was that Taoists did not shave their heads. Despite the strong similarity, which sometimes elicits such remarks as that Taoists imitate Buddhists in many respects, Taoists kept their hair. Shaving of the head was one of the central issues in the debates between Confucianism and Buddhism because it violated the teaching the *Classic of Filial Piety*, *Hsiao ching* 孝經, the most respected classic: "One's body, hair and skin are given by your parents. It is the first step to filial piety not to damage these." Although it is possible to think that this teaching of filial piety was powerful enough for the Taoists to keep their hair, a more direct reason would be a Taoist teaching that

says that a spirit resides in every part of one's body. For example, in "Shen-shen p'in 身神品" Chapter 5 of *Wu-shang pi-yao* 無上秘要 (*Tao-ts'ang* vol. 768), cited in *Tung-chen ts'ao-hsing tzü-yüan êrh-shih-ssü-shen ching* 洞真造形紫元二十四神經, there is a sentence, "the spirit of hair, its name is Hsüan wen-hua 玄文華, its style-name is Tao-hsing 道行". This scripture is contained in *Tao-ts'ang* (vol. 1064) as *T'ai-wei ti-chün êrh-shih-ssü-shen huei-yüan ching* 太微帝君二十四神回元經 and was compiled by the end of the Six Dynasties. Thus it is probably more likely that the direct reason for Taoist priests to maintain their hair was that there is a spirit in the hair.

The second difference is a question of surnames. Until Tao-an's 道安 (314–385) time in the Former Ch'in Dynasty Buddhist monks carried over their teachers' surnames like An 安, K'ang 康, Po 帛, Chu 竺, etc. Tao-an declared that priests should use Shih as their surname, since monks were those who believe in the teachings of Śākya-muni-buddha 釈迦牟尼仏. He subsequently called himself Shih Tao-an 釈道安. From this precedent Buddhist monks generally have followed this practice. On the contrary Taoists, with some exceptions, continued to use their lay surnames even after becoming priests. Also we should note that when the Taoists prayed they used *ch'en* 臣 vis-à-vis the immortals. All Taoist spirits in heaven possess different surnames, and their status and official rank are clearly distinguishable. The world of spirits is a reflected image of the real world.

Another possible reason for this distinction in names may be because there was no specific founder recognized in Taoism as was true for Buddhism. However, a more realistic reason may be that Taoism, unlike Buddhism, was indigenous to Chinese culture and therefore could not completely separate itself from a Chinese way of thought. Taoists could not leave "chia" completely in the spiritual sense though they could become "ch'u-chia".

In the foregoing I have presented and attempted to present evidence for a shift from the presence of both *tsai-chia* and *ch'u-chia* during the Northern and Southern Dynasties to the dominance of *ch'u-chia* during T'ang. Obviously I could not exhaust all the issues in this matter, especially the point which was raised by Professor Lancaster, that is, that it is necessary to examine the relationships between Taoism and the wide spread of the *Wei-mo ching* 維摩經 and the popularity of Buddhism among the devotees of (chü-shih 居士 Buddhism). I shall have to save this consideration along with many other issues, for future work.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

CH'EN, Kuo-fu

- 1963 *Tao-hsüeh chuan chi-i. Tao-ts'ang yüan-liu k'ao, Appendix 7*, Peking: Zhonghua Shungju, pp. 454–504. (Collected Documents of Tao-hsüeh chuan chi-i. *Origin and Development of Tao-ts'ang, Appendix 7*.)

OFUCHI, Ninji

- 1978 *Tonkō Dōkyō Mokuroku-hen*. Tokyo: Fukutake Shoten. (*Catalogue of the Taoist Scriptures at Tuen-huang*.)

- 1980 Hong Kong no Dōkyō Girei. *Oriental Studies: Essays and Studies Presented to Dr. Ikeda Suetoshi in Honor of His Seventieth Birthday*, Tokyo: Ikeda Suetoshi Koki Kinen Jigyōkai, pp. 753–769. (Taoist Rituals in Hong Kong.)

OZAKI, Masaharu

- 1979 Kō kenshi no shinsen shisō. *Tōhō Shūkyō* 54: 52–69. (K'ou Ch'ien-chih's idea about hermit.)

YANG, Lien-sheng

- 1956 Collation and Annotation of the Taoist Text Entitled Lao-chün yin-sung chieh-ching. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 28: 17–54.

YOSHIOKA, Yoshitoyo

- 1975 *Dōkyō no Jittai*. Kyoto: Hōyū Shoten. (*Actual State of Taoism.*)

