



UNIVERSITY of
HAWAI'I
PRESS

Chapter Title: Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960-1279)

Chapter Author(s): MORTEN SCHLUTTER

Book Title: Going Forth

Book Subtitle: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya

Book Author(s): Stanley Weinstein

Book Editor(s): William M. Bodiford

Published by: University of Hawai'i Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvvn5qj.10>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



University of Hawai'i Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Going Forth*

JSTOR

*Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies,
and State Control of Buddhism under
the Song (960-1279)*

MORTEN SCHLUTTER

THE BUDDHIST vinaya pictures the monastic community as a largely autonomous, self-regulating body. But nowhere in premodern East Asia was monastic Buddhism truly free of controls imposed by the secular state, even when the Buddhist church exercised considerable political influence. In China, the imperial government always considered the monastic Buddhist community and its activities as properly subject to state supervision. Chinese dynasties actively sought to regulate and control many aspects of the Buddhist church's activities, such as ordination procedures, the building of monasteries, the activities of monks and nuns, and the teachings Buddhism was spreading. The Chinese state was traditionally extremely hostile toward unregulated religious groups and tended to view all religious expression with suspicion (McKnight 1992, 75-79). The fear was that religious groups could disrupt public order, threaten the authority of the state, corrupt people's morals, and even become sources of rebellion. The mainstream Buddhist church was tolerated precisely because of its close ties with the government and its elite's relative aloofness from the populace. Any Buddhist group that appeared deviant was persecuted by the state—and decried by the Buddhist establishment. The state never completely lost its suspicion of even the elite Buddhist church, and from time to time emperors sought to all but eradicate Buddhism from Chinese soil (prior to the Song there were major suppressions in the years 258, 446, 574, 845, 955; see Overmyer 1976, 23). However, government control of Buddhism and other religion was always far from total, and many factors combined to keep much of the growth and development of monastic Buddhism beyond the reach of the state.

During the Song A dynasty (960-1279) monastic Buddhism experienced a tremendous growth but was also more tightly regulated. At first control measures that had existed earlier, such as rules and restrictions concerning ordinations, were further developed and vigorously implemented (Moroto 1990, 233). But the Song government also instituted several innovative ways of controlling monastic Buddhism and concerned itself with aspects of it that had not been previously legislated or directly controlled. These new control measures had a profound and lasting impact on the development of Buddhism in the Song and subsequent dynasties.

In this essay I focus my attention on the new Song system of classifying Buddhist monasteries as either "hereditary" or "public" according to how their abbots were selected. Although the Song monastic classification system has received some attention from scholars (Takao 1975, Chikusa 1982, Huang 1989, Getz 1994), much of it is not well understood, and the profound impact the implementation of the system had on the development of the Chan ^ school has hitherto gone unnoticed. Furthermore, because hereditary monasteries in the Song were often referred to as "vinaya monasteries," confusion about the meaning of this term has given rise to serious misunderstandings in scholarship concerning both the system of hereditary and public monasteries and the nature and history of the Vinaya school.

The Northern Song System of Registering Monasteries

From its establishment the Song government, like previous imperial governments, saw the primary *raison d'être* for the Buddhist church to be the supernatural assistance and blessings it could provide to the state and the emperor. Prayers for the long life of the emperor and for the prosperity of the state were important functions of all Buddhist monasteries, and emperors no doubt felt they could accrue merit for themselves and their dynasty through pious acts toward Buddhism. The Song court patronized Buddhism in various ways. Famous monasteries were given money or grants of land, and illustrious monks were invited to court and honored with the bestowal of purple robes. The state was actively engaged in the translation of Buddhist scriptures as well as in the compiling and printing of the Buddhist canon. The imperial family also used the services of Buddhist clergy directly. Specially built monasteries

were charged with taking care of the imperial tombs, and a monastery was even erected on the site of the first Song emperor Taizu's Affl (r. 960-976) birthplace (*Song huiyao jigao* fasc. 200.7879c). But the Song rulers were very aware of the considerable economic and social power that the Buddhist church wielded and saw a need to regulate and exercise control over monastic Buddhism. The imperial government was uneasy with the enormous economic impact the building and maintenance of monasteries and the upkeep of monks and nuns had on the economy. It was also concerned about the social and cultural impact of Buddhism and worried that the Buddhist church could become a threat to the state's authority or that monasteries might harbor criminals and insurgents.¹

Central to the Northern Song (960-1127) policy of tolerating and even encouraging the growth of monastic Buddhism, while at the same time seeking to keep it in check, was its policy of granting name plaques (e to a large number of monasteries (Takao 1975, 57-60; Chikusa 1982, 83-110; Huang 1989, 302-305). This policy had originally been a way of honoring certain important monasteries; in the Tang 唐 (618-906) monasteries with name plaques enjoyed a high degree of security from officials who wished to suppress Buddhism, while those that were merely on the list of approved monasteries did not have the same level of protection.² During the initial stages of the notorious Huichang 武宗 (841-847) suppression of Buddhism, when the government issued an edict ordering the dismantling of various types of Buddhist establishments, monasteries with name plaques were explicitly exempted.³ Owning a name plaque also became crucial for a monastery during another vigorous suppression of Buddhism that took place under the Latter Zhou 周 (951-960), the regime under which the Song founder Taizu had served as a general. The Zhou ruler ordered in 955 that any monastery without an imperially bestowed name plaque was to be destroyed.⁴

The Song government exploited the positive connotations of name plaques and used them as a way of registering monasteries (Chikusa 1982, 101). Beginning with the second Song emperor, Taizong 太宗 (r. 976-997), the imperial government granted name plaques to monasteries in large numbers. Although the plaque granting took place throughout the Northern Song (and at a much reduced scale in the later part of the Song known as the Southern

Song, 1127-1279), it was especially the reigns of Zhenzong R[^] (r. 977-1022) and Yingzong ^{^^} (r. 1063-1067) that saw large-scale granting of plaques (Chikusa 1982, 109; Huang 1989, 304-305). Usually the main requirement for a plaque was that a monastery's buildings total thirty bays or more (Chikusa 1982, 98-99). This meant that numerous smaller monasteries of primarily local importance could be granted plaques; prior to the Song only especially illustrious or imperially favored monasteries were granted plaques.

It is clear that the Song government's driving motivation in granting plaques was to bring monasteries of any significance under control and supervision. But in spite of the occasional edicts that ordered the destruction of monasteries with no plaques (i.e., those under thirty bays and of no particular significance), plaque-less monasteries seem to have flourished and orders of destruction were rarely, if ever, carried out. The Song government appears to have been fairly unconcerned with smaller monasteries, probably because it was thought that those under thirty bays in general would not be important enough in local life to warrant strong action.⁵ It would also seem that the decrees ordering no new monasteries to be built must have been largely ignored because throughout the Northern Song monasteries that qualified for name plaques by having more than thirty bays continued to appear.⁶

The Northern Song government's policy of registering and facilitating control of all monasteries of importance through the granting of plaques was highly successful. Receiving an imperial plaque was perceived as a great honor and could provide security for a monastery in times of persecution. It is not surprising then that those in charge of monasteries petitioned for them with great enthusiasm. Thus the state achieved its goal of facilitating control in a way that secured the cooperation of the clergy, who otherwise may not have felt that government registration was beneficial to them.⁷ A large number of monasteries were registered during the Northern Song: One source from about 1059 reports that there were thirty-nine thousand registered Buddhist monasteries in the empire, up from twenty-five thousand fifty years earlier (Chikusa 1982, 89).

Registering monasteries was essential for the state, for without doing so, it could not successfully set down and enforce rules and regulations for them. The registration of monasteries facilitated an entirely new way of regulating Buddhist monasteries that had a

profound impact on the further development of Buddhism in China. This was the system of classifying monasteries or, more specifically, their abbacies, into two main groups: hereditary (usually termed "succession" [*jiayi* E^Z], but also known as "disciple" [*tudi* ffiA] or "ordained disciple" [dudi ®A]) monasteries and public ("ten directions" [*shifang* +A]) monasteries (cf. Welch 1967). As I will discuss shortly, a hereditary monastery was associated with a group of monks who held the rights to occupy its abbacy; the monastery and its property in a sense belonged to these monks. Such monasteries could be very large, and many owned land and other property, but in the Song, most were small to medium sized. A hereditary monastery was "private" in the sense that outsiders could not assume any of its offices, and monks from the outside did not have rights to reside there. In contrast, a public monastery was a kind of independent, self-owned institution over which no individual or group of individuals could claim ownership and the abbacy of which supposedly was open to any qualified candidate within certain sectarian restrictions. Any monk with good credentials could be admitted into a public monastery and advance in its various monastic offices. All the largest and most important monasteries in the Song eventually became public monasteries.

Hereditary Monasteries

Hereditary monasteries were recognized by the state as in effect the legal property of the monks or nuns living there. The residents of a hereditary monastery were bound together in a complex lineage relationship and formed a "tonsure family" (cf. Welch 1967, 129-134). Its abbacy was passed down through the tonsure family only and outsiders were excluded. Through its control of the abbacy the tonsure family was able to retain property rights to the monastery and its land because the abbot and his officers were the only ones who could make decisions concerning it. Like the Chan lineages and those developed within other Buddhist groups such as the Tiantai An school, the lineage of a tonsure family was similar to that of a regular family descent group except that it was based on a teacher-disciple relationship. Thus the disciples of one master were regarded as brothers, their master's master was their grandfather, and their master's fellow disciples were their uncles.⁸ But unlike the Chan model, the teacher-disciple relationship in a tonsure fam-

ily was not based on a teacher sanctioning the enlightenment experience or profound insight of a student, but on the tonsure the novice received on entering the Buddhist order. The novice became the personally ordained disciple of the master giving or sponsoring his tonsure and was adopted into the tonsure family of that master. Such personally ordained disciples were usually referred to as "*du-dizi*" S ^ A . In this way, all monks and nuns were members of a tonsure family, and for the vast majority their tonsure lineage was what gave them identity and defined the framework of their monastic career. Some monks and nuns went on to gain admission to one of the big public monasteries and perhaps later received a special transmission in the Chan or Tiantai lineages, but even so they remained members of their tonsure family and any disciples they ordained became members of that family.

Hereditary monasteries may have had a long history by the Song, and it is likely that prior to the Song most monasteries were in some sense hereditary.⁹ However, it was only in the Song that hereditary monasteries acquired a specific legal status, which recognized the tonsure family's rights to its monastery. This legal status no doubt offered the tonsure families in hereditary monasteries some protection against those who might try to usurp their property. But together with the system of registration, it also greatly facilitated government control and made it possible for the state to set down and enforce rules concerning many aspects of monastic life, including how the abbacy was to be filled.

An important source for the study of Song legislation on monastic Buddhism is the section on Buddhism and Daoism in the Song law compendium the *Classified Legal Articles of the Qingyuan Period* (*Qingyuan tiaofa shilei* ftAfft&ffffi).¹⁰ The *Classified Legal Articles* is the only extant (though incomplete) Song law manual. Although it dates from the Southern Song, many of the regulations it contains are clearly of long standing, and in the Buddhism and Daoism section some were even long outdated by the Qingyuan period (1195-1200). In this text rules for the passing down of the abbacy in a hereditary monastery are clearly spelled out. For example, when an abbot of a "nonpublic" monastery died or for some reason stepped down, the abbacy passed on to one of his dharma brothers (the other tonsure disciples of his master) according to their order in the lineage, that is, when they were ordained. If there were no dharma brothers available, the abbacy was passed to one of the retiring

abbot's disciples or to one of his dharma brothers' disciples, also in accordance with seniority (fasc. 50.476d). In this way, everybody in each generation had a chance, at least theoretically, to succeed to the abbacy, and only when one generation had been exhausted would the abbacy be passed on to the next generation. It seems the abbacy in a hereditary monastery was often held by one person until he passed away, so many members of big tonsure family may not have lived long enough to succeed to the abbacy.¹¹

On the other hand, a monk capable of taking over a vacant abbacy may not always have been available from the tonsure family. A note in the *Classified Legal Articles* (fasc. 50, 476d) says that if there is a worthy, well-esteemed monk whom the congregation wants as abbot, they can present him to the authorities to have him first installed to fill the position. This probably refers for the most part to a situation where no one in the tonsure family was ready to take over the abbacy, such as instances when everyone in line for the abbacy was underage. It is also possible that the tonsure family could simply decide to bring an abbot in from outside the group, although it would seem likely that the monks normally in line for the abbacy would protest such a move.¹² The *Classified Legal Articles* further states that only those who were actively involved with the affairs of a hereditary monastery could be appointed to its abbacy (fasc. 50, 476b). Those who had been away from the monastery for more than half a year or who were not actually fulfilling the duties of their positions were not allowed to take over the abbacy even if they were in line for it. The text also asserts that, in most cases, those who had been punished by the law could not succeed to the abbacy (fasc. 50, 477a).

Significantly, a stipulation required the newly selected abbot of a hereditary monastery to be approved by the authorities before he could be installed in the abbacy (fasc. 50.476b). Thus, although the Song state had to recognize the rights of the tonsure family to control the abbacy of its monastery, the government could at least set down very strict rules for how the succession was to take place and who in fact could occupy the abbacy. As we have just seen, by law only those who were actively taking part in the life of a monastery could become its abbots; this rule helped ensure that the governing of the monastery remained a local affair and thus easier to supervise. Because all appointments had to be approved by officials, there were plenty of opportunities in the final instance for local au-

thorities to intervene in various ways and to be sure that no undesirable person occupied an abbacy in their area of jurisdiction.

There are other indications that the state in principle acknowledged that a tonsure family had a legal right to its monastery. An article in the *Classified Legal Articles* concerning the selection of abbots at public monasteries notes that the succession rules must be followed strictly, even at previously hereditary monasteries where "the disciples had agreed to [the] change into public" (fasc. 50.476c). This remark indicates that a tonsure family had to agree to its monastery being changed into a public one and implies that the state recognized that the family had property rights. As will be discussed below, several documented cases of the conversion of hereditary monasteries into public ones further attest to this.

Finally, hereditary monasteries were probably supposed to apply to the government to have their status officially approved.¹³ But this seems to have been rarely done—at least there are very few records of such applications. Most likely the understanding was that if a monastery was not categorized as public it was automatically considered hereditary.¹⁴

Public Monasteries

As noted above, the *Classified Legal Articles* addresses its rules for succession in hereditary monasteries to "all nonpublic" institutions. This suggests that the most important feature of the system of classification, and its main innovation, was the public monastery. In a public monastery the abbacy was not passed down in a tonsure family. In fact, an abbot's own tonsure disciples were not allowed to succeed him to the abbacy, a measure clearly meant to prevent a return to a hereditary system. The abbot of a public monastery was supposed to be the best candidate available, whether he could be found within the walls of the monastery or had to be invited from elsewhere.

Some form of the public abbacy system appears to have existed prior to the Song.¹⁵ But although the Song government did not invent the system of public abbacies, it was only in the Song that public monasteries become an official legal category. The Song government seems very quickly to have become aware of the advantages of having monasteries designated as public and began early on to promote public abbacies as an important part of a national

policy toward monastic Buddhism. Unlike the case of hereditary monasteries, where the secular authorities' power over the selection process was limited because the choice of abbot was mainly determined by rules of succession within the tonsure family, the abbacies at public monasteries were wide open to state control.

The *Classified Legal Articles* includes a section of rules concerning the selection of the abbot at a public monastery. According to this text, when the abbacy at a public monastery became vacant, the prefectural authorities were to charge the local Buddhist registry (*Seng zhengsi* - A¹) with arranging a meeting between the abbots of the other public monasteries (presumably from the whole prefecture). These abbots were to select someone (again, it would seem, from the prefecture) who had been a monk for many years, who was accomplished in conduct and study, and who was held in high esteem by other monks. The choice of the gathered abbots was presented to the prefectural authorities, who would investigate and confirm the appointment if no problems were found. If there was no suitable candidate, perhaps because no one could be found in the prefecture or because the abbots could not agree on anyone, the authorities would select a monk from another area who was held in high regard and who was not known to have committed any crime or to have had other things against him. The *Classified Legal Articles* stresses that this person, once chosen, could not be substituted. Also, as mentioned above, even if the monastery previously had been hereditary, these rules still had to be obeyed (p. 476c). Another source that casts some light on the procedure of appointing a new abbot in a public monastery is the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* (*Chanyuan qinggui* 𐄁𐄂𐄃), compiled by the monk Changlu Zongze AMA© in 1103. Although this code is specifically for public monasteries associated with the Chan school, much of what it contains is derived from the standard vinaya, and later monastic codes of other schools are very similar to it (see Yifa in this volume). The procedures of the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* in general do not seem unique to the Chan school.

Interestingly, the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* does not describe how an abbot was to be selected. However, it does include a detailed outline of the procedure for inviting a new abbot once he had been chosen (fasc. 7, pp. 250-255). This seems to have been a rather complicated affair. From the monastery with a vacant abbacy a group of envoys was chosen to go the monastery where the

prospective abbot was residing. They carried with them numerous letters and documents from officials, the monastery itself, Buddhist officials in the area, abbots of other monasteries in the area, lay patrons of the monastery, and retired officials, in addition to letters and reports from the withdrawing abbot to the local authorities in both the area where he had been serving and where the prospective abbot resided (fasc. 7, p. 250). The envoys traveled to the prospective abbot's monastery and lodged there while one of them went to present the various documents to local officials. In the event that the officials refused to let the prospective abbot go, one of the envoys would return to their home district and present the refusal to the officials there. If the officials in the home district wanted the envoys to make a second request they would do so; if not, the envoys would all return home. The authorities in the prospective abbot's area had to agree to his release before the candidate himself could be formally presented with an invitation (fasc. 7, p. 251; cf. Yifa 2002, 212-215). Although much of what is found in the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* is perhaps prescriptive rather than descriptive (i.e., reflecting how its author thought things ought to be done rather than how things were actually done), this section is likely to have been based on Zongze's own personal experience and is hardly an idealized account. It is probable that the process described was common to all public monasteries and not specific to Chan public monasteries.

The most striking aspect of the accounts in both the *Classified Legal Articles* and the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* is the depiction of the very active and central role that the secular authorities played in the selection and invitation of a new abbot. According to the instructions in the *Classified Legal Articles*, the secular authorities were to initiate the search for a new abbot; if there were any problems in finding a candidate, they were to step in and select someone directly. Of course, as with appointments to hereditary monasteries, the authorities always had to approve the choice of a new abbot. The account in the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* nicely complements the one found in the *Classified Legal Articles*. Again it is very clear that the secular authorities played a central role. Among other things, officials in the district of the candidate had the power to refuse to release him; and only after they had decided to do so could the prospective abbot be formally invited to the new post.

Although the *Classified Legal Articles* and the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* depict the secular authorities as having decisive power in the selection of an abbot, members of the Buddhist clergy in both accounts have an important role to play. According to the *Classified Legal Articles*, abbots of other monasteries were actually charged with picking a candidate to present to the authorities, and the statement in the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* that the envoys were to carry with them letters from the abbots in the area of the vacant monastery may be seen as a confirmation of this. The possibility that the person chosen for the abbacy might decline the position is also made explicit in the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* (fasc. 7, 252).

Reading the *Classified Legal Articles* it would seem that the new abbot in most cases was expected to be found within the prefecture; in contrast the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* assumes he will be found in a place outside the jurisdiction of the officials searching for an abbot.¹⁶ According to the *Classified Legal Articles* the selection of the new abbot became the sole responsibility of the officials if he had to be found outside the prefecture, something that is not reflected in the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries*. It is possible that the *Classified Legal Articles* stems from a time when public monasteries had become so common that finding an abbot locally was easy. On the other hand, it seems that by the thirteenth century at least half of all registered monasteries were public (cf. Takao 1975, 67), and a number of prefectures must have had several hundred public monasteries: It would hardly have been practicable to gather abbots from all of them for a meeting. The *Classified Legal Articles* is probably reiterating older rules on how the selection of an abbot ought to be done rather than how it was usually done in the late twelfth century. The fact that the *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* does not include any information on how the abbot was to be selected is also noteworthy. It may be a recognition by its editor that the clergy had little or no control over most appointments. There is, in fact, much evidence that from early on in the Song the abbot of a public monastery was in many cases appointed directly by secular authorities—without members of the clergy having any formal role in the selection of the candidate. No legislation appears to have existed for this kind of appointment, but it was very widespread. Direct appointment would most often take place at a prefectural level, and in this case the appointing authority was usually the prefect.

But the appointment could also come directly from the court, ultimately deriving its authority from the emperor himself.

The direct appointment of abbots to public monasteries by secular authorities would seem to be a blatant encroachment on the power of the Buddhist church, and one would perhaps expect the clergy to be unhappy with such appointments. But this does not seem to have been normally the case. In biographies of Buddhist monks it is often mentioned that they were appointed to such and such a post by the command of a prefect or through the recommendation of famous literati (which probably then led to an appointment by the prefect). These appointments clearly were seen as evidence of the importance and eminence of a particular monk. Of course, imperial appointments were even more prestigious, and much is made of monks who were appointed to abbacies by imperial command.

The practice of direct appointments to abbacies, whether by the prefect or by imperial command, does not seem to have been a formal category during most of the Song.¹⁷ But in 1103, a special class of monasteries called Chongning (later renamed Tianning Wanshou) was established (Chikusa 1982, 95-98). These were Buddhist monasteries set up specifically to pray for the long life of the emperor. Each prefecture was charged with setting up one of these monasteries, although it is not clear whether new monasteries were built or existing ones appropriated. The Chongning monasteries were given various privileges, and it was decreed that the most illustrious monks in the empire were to be appointed to their abbacies (*Luohu yelu* *M^{WM}*, Z 2B.15.497b). The abbots for the Chongning monasteries were naturally appointed by imperial command, and it seems likely that this inspired imperial appointments to the abbacies of other monasteries deemed important to the state. In the late Southern Song, the practice of imperially appointed abbacies seems to have been formalized by classifying the most important public monasteries in the so-called "five mountains" system, in which all abbots were imperially appointed (cf. Imaeda 1970).

Most of the extant biographies of Song-dynasty monks note that their subjects were appointed to at least some of their posts by direct order from secular authorities. For example, every monk in the Song Caodong ^^ Chan lineage for whom relevant biographical information can be found is reported to have been appointed to

abbacies by influential officials and, for the more illustrious ones, by imperial order. Random sampling of the biographies of monks in other Chan lineages confirms this pervasive tendency. These monks would be moved from monastery to monastery at the will of the politically powerful, and it is clear that the clerical community had little or no direct influence over their appointments.

However, the extant biographical material probably distorts the picture. Relatively few public monasteries would have been considered important enough for the court or powerful officials to take a direct interest. By the late twelfth century there may have been as many as twenty thousand public monasteries in the Song empire. Only a small percentage of these, the largest and most famous, would ever have had their abbots appointed directly by the court or a high official. The monks for whom biographical information is still available were almost all part of the clerical elite and exactly the kind of people who would be appointed to famous monasteries. Virtually nothing is known about the vast majority of monks who served as abbots at the less illustrious public monasteries. It is quite likely that at many of these monasteries, and perhaps also at some of the more prestigious ones, abbots were picked for their posts by a congregation of their peers in a fashion similar to the system outlined in the *Classified Legal Articles*. The notion that this method was the proper one certainly persisted, and a very similar process is described in a Chan code from the Yuan ^ (1279-1368) dynasty (*Qixiu Baizhang qinggui* T 48.1130b).

But there was yet another way by which a monk could be appointed to the abbacy of a public monastery. At times, secular authorities would demand bribes for, or outright sell, the right to the position. This practice seems to have become increasingly common during the course of the Song. As public monasteries became more numerous, many monks had a chance to be appointed to a public abbacy. This was naturally an attractive opportunity since it was a prestigious position in the clerical world. But there was another aspect of the matter, which seems to have loomed large. Even smaller public monasteries frequently had considerable holdings of land and other property and, without the check of an entrenched tonsure family, abbots at such institutions often took the opportunity to enrich themselves at the expense of the monastery.¹⁸ Unscrupulous officials recognized this and encouraged the trend by demanding bribes to install someone as abbot at a public monastery.¹⁹

The notion of having to pay for an abbot's position at a public monastery became institutionalized, at least in Fujian when in 1131 the prefect of Fujian, Zhang Shou (1084-1145), conferred with the local literati and, as a means of creating revenue, set up a system by which abbacies were auctioned off to the highest bidder. The forty-odd top monasteries in Fujian were exempted (*Song huiyao jigao*, fasc. 134.5240d; Chikusa 1982, 163). It is possible that such a system became common elsewhere. Having to pay either bribes to officials or money to the provincial coffers no doubt further encouraged abbots at public monasteries to exploit their institutions for all they were worth. This exploitation became a problem of such magnitude in the late Song that many public monasteries converted back to the hereditary system, in spite of the severe laws forbidding it (Takao 1975, 65).

Conversion of Hereditary Monasteries into Public Monasteries

Although the Song government's laws stipulated severe punishments for those who tried to convert a public monastery into a hereditary one, it was quite easy to get permission to turn a hereditary monastery into a public one (*Classified Legal Articles*, fasc. 50.476a). Clearly the state had a strong interest in having as many monasteries as possible be public rather than hereditary. Whether the abbot at a public monastery was chosen directly by the court or local authorities, or the abbacy was sold to the highest bidder, or the abbot was selected in a process that heavily involved officials, the state maintained a high level of control. Furthermore, abbots in public monasteries usually held their position for only a few years, and every time a new abbot was selected government officials could make their influence felt.

As we have seen, the Song state in principle recognized the rights of the tonsure family to its monastery, and a rule existed that the tonsure family's agreement was needed to turn a hereditary monastery into a public one. Because such a change in effect meant that the tonsure family lost all rights to its monastery, this seems reasonable enough. Tonsure disciples were excluded from taking over the abbacy of a public monastery from their master or even holding other important monastic office, so the disciples in line for the abbacy of a hereditary monastery would lose both their rights to

the abbacy as well as any chance of ever obtaining it (*Shishi yaolan* ff^MR, T 54.302b2-3). Furthermore, monks must have had the right to stay in the monastery of their tonsure family, where they would be fed and could live comfortable lives; no one seems to have had an inalienable right to stay in a public monastery, where life usually was much more strictly regulated.

In an early well-documented instance of a hereditary monastery being turned into a public one, further indications are found that the tonsure family, and especially the younger generation of disciples who had a good chance of succeeding to the abbacy, had to agree to the change. This was the case at Yanqing MA Monastery, which the famous monk of the Tiantai school Siming Zhili I (960-1028), together with Yiwen petitioned the court in 1010 to convert into a public monastery dedicated to the Tiantai teachings (Getz 1994, 139-159). Accompanying Zhili and Yiwen's petition was another petition from six of their personally ordained tonsure disciples that voiced the disciples' support for their two masters' plan (*Siming Zunzhe jiaoxing lu* T 46.909a-910a, 910a-c; Getz 1994, 139-141). Thus the monks most likely to have the opportunity to take over the abbacy of the Yanqing Monastery under the hereditary system agreed to relinquish their rights to it. In light of the remark in the *Classified Legal Articles* cited above, it would seem that the agreement of the students to the conversion not only strengthened the petition but was a legal requirement.²⁰

One might well wonder what would persuade especially the younger generation in a tonsure family to give up its monastery and face an uncertain future. In the case of Yanqing Monastery, it seems the sheer charismatic force of someone like Zhili could move tonsure disciples to give up what might otherwise have been theirs. But even Zhili and Yiwen were concerned about their tonsure disciples' willingness to give up their rights. They feared that once the two of them were gone, their tonsure disciples might try to claim back the abbacy, causing Yanqing Monastery to revert to the hereditary system. This is evidenced by an oath Zhili and Yiwen composed and asked their tonsured disciples to take, which stated that the disciples under no circumstances would take over the abbacy after their masters' deaths, even if one of them was the most qualified person that could be found (T 46.907c; Getz 1994, 143-147).

In fact many, and perhaps most, conversions of hereditary monasteries into public ones did not happen voluntarily. The *Classified Legal Articles* includes various laws that show how relatively easy it was for the state to force the conversion of hereditary monasteries. If a monastery was found to harbor criminals, it could be turned into a public institution (fasc. 50.477a). Likewise, if no successor was at hand in a hereditary monastery, it would automatically be converted into a public abbacy, as would a monastery that had become dilapidated and been abandoned (fasc. 50.476a). Furthermore, as was the case with the appointment of abbots to public monasteries, important monasteries would often be converted into public institutions by the government or by high-ranking local officials simply by decree.²¹

Besides pressure from the state and powerful officials on hereditary monasteries to convert to public ones, other forces were at work. In the wars that followed the fall of the Tang, many monasteries were damaged and lost their land holdings; their tonsure families were dispersed. Among the monasteries that continued to operate many must have become almost fully dependent on local lay supporters. These supporters of course had little interest in patronizing a hereditary monastery, and they must at times have been able to force their institution to adopt the system of public abbacies. There is evidence for this in a text by the literatus Yu Jing Ain (1000-1064) dated to 1038, which describes the succession of abbots at the Puli Monastery at Dongshan MIA. Its abbacy had first been occupied by the "founder" of the Caodong tradition of Chan, Dongshan Liangjie MIAA (807-869). The text implies that at the time of writing the Puli Monastery was a public Chan monastery, although nothing is said about when the conversion took place. According to the text, in the generations after Liangjie the abbacy was passed on from master to disciple, clearly (although this is not stated) in a tonsure relationship. However, during the Five Dynasties period (907-960), which followed the breakdown of the Tang, this system seems to have been disrupted. When the area came under the control of the Southern Tang (937-958) regime, the king ordered a certain monk to take up the abbacy. Later, perhaps at the beginning of the Song, another abbot (it is not clear how he came into the position) wanted his disciple to take over the abbacy after him. The lay supporters of the monastery objected, and another monk was chosen (*Yunzhou Dongshan Puli chanyuan chuanfa ji* fAHMH^fJ^l^

ABB, fasc. 9.14b-18b, in *Siku quanshu zhenben* 6). The main forces in converting a monastery from hereditary to public in the Song, aside from those of the state, must thus have been lay supporters from the local elite and local officials. These groups gained from having a prestigious monastery in their area, and they would often have been in a position to apply pressure on hereditary monasteries to convert.

The efforts to convert monasteries from hereditary to public were very successful. As mentioned above, by the end of the Northern Song about half of all registered monasteries were public. Although the total number of hereditary monasteries would be much higher if one were to include unregistered monasteries, which had proliferated greatly by this time, the proportion of public monasteries to hereditary ones was still remarkably high.

Vinaya Monasteries and Chan Monasteries

In public monasteries the abbacy was supposed to be open to any competent candidate, but with an important qualification. Most, and possibly all, public monasteries in the Song had an official association with a particular tradition within Buddhism, and their abbacies were restricted to lineage holders in that tradition. At first public monasteries all seem to have been associated with the Chan tradition, but early in the Song public monasteries associated with the Tiantai school came into existence and later some public monasteries became affiliated with the Huayan ^^ school. In the late Southern Song, public Tiantai and Huayan monasteries were classified as teaching (*jiao* or *jiang* p) monasteries. Also in the Southern Song, a further category of public vinaya (lu #) monasteries appeared. These were monasteries associated with the newly emerged Vinaya school of Buddhism.

One of the most intriguing aspects of the Song system of hereditary and public monasteries is the special connection between the institution of public monasteries and the Chan school. Not only were public monasteries in the beginning all affiliated with the Chan school, but even after public teaching monasteries had become common the system of public abbacies continued to be especially associated with the Chan school. Another important point to be made here is that the term "*Usi*" ## (vinaya monastery) originally was a designation for hereditary monasteries and had no con-

nection whatsoever with the later public vinaya monasteries associated with the Vinaya school. These two points are closely related: Because public abbacies began with the Chan school and hereditary monasteries were called "vinaya monasteries," the conversion of a hereditary monastery into a public Chan monastery is often described in Song sources as a change from Vinaya to Chan. This has been almost universally understood to mean that the monastery in question changed its affiliation from the Vinaya school to the Chan school, a serious misinterpretation that obscures the nature of the system of public and hereditary monasteries as well as the history of the Vinaya school.

Several sources attest to the special relationship between the institution of public abbacies and the Chan school on the one hand and the use of "vinaya monastery" for "hereditary monastery" on the other. Consider, for example, an inscription for the Lingfeng g || Monastery at Mount Dahong AA ("Da Song Suizhou Dahong-shan Lingfeng Chansi ji" written by the famous statesman Zhang Shangying (1043-1121) in 1102 (*Hubei jinshi zhi* fasc. 10.7b-10b, in *Shike shiliao xinbian* S M ^ M , 1.16; cf. Ishii Shudo, 1987, 430-437). Zhang reports that in the fall of 1087 the Lingfeng Monastery was by imperial command changed from Vinaya to Chan, and in 1094 members of the Outer Censorate asked to have the monk Dahong Baoen AAISM. (1058-1111) moved there to take up the abbacy. Then, Zhang says, in 1102 he was asked to write a "Record of [Becoming] a Public Chan Monastery" for the Lingfeng Monastery. Zhang goes on to relate that a disciple of the famous Chan master Mazu Mffl. (707-786, or 709-788), known as Great Master Ciren Lingji MMM first became abbot of the Lingfeng Monastery during the Yuanhe Afn period (806-820) of the Tang. After a description of the monastery and its history Zhang states that, after having compared and analyzed Chan and Vinaya, he came to the following conclusion:

Vinaya uses [hereditary] succession (*jiayi*) and Chan uses the public (*shifang*) [system]. That which is called "succession" means that where one generation (*jia*) is coming from, that is where the next generation (*yi*) establishes itself. So [at the time before Lingfeng Monastery became public] they would necessarily say: "We are the sons and grandsons of Ciren [the founder of Lingfeng]." Now that a person [to be the

abbot] is selected publicly the descendants of Ciren have been cut off.
(*Hubei jinshi zhi*, fasc. 10.9b)

Here Zhang Shangyin describes the Lingfeng Monastery's new designation as a public Chan monastery as a change from Vinaya to Chan. He explicitly identifies vinaya monasteries with hereditary succession and Chan monasteries with public abbacies. In explaining how the vinaya system works, Zhang describes how previously those who were abbots at Lingfeng would be the descendants of the monastery's founder, Ciren. But because the monastery had now become public, Ciren's descendants had lost their rights to the abbacy.

First of all, this shows that, as T. Griffith Foulk has already suggested, in the Northern Song the designation "vinaya monastery" did not mean a monastery with an abbacy that was held by members of a Vinaya school.²² Rather, "vinaya" in this context simply seems to mean "governed by the vinaya." A vinaya monastery is, therefore, an ordinary hereditary monastery.²³ Zhang's statement also shows that even if a monastery had some sort of connection to the Chan lineage through its tonsure family (as was the case with Lingfeng Monastery), it was still a vinaya monastery because the succession to its abbacy was hereditary and stayed within the tonsure family. This statement further drives home the point that "vinaya monastery" in this context has no association whatsoever with a Vinaya school. Another important point to note here is that Zhang Shangyin in the inscription above seems to associate public abbacies exclusively with the Chan school. As we have already seen, and as Zhang must have known, a number of non-Chan public monasteries were in existence at the time he wrote his record of the Lingfeng Monastery in 1102. However, Zhang must have felt that Chan was associated with the system of public monasteries in a special way to write as he did.

Ironically, perhaps the earliest evidence of a special relationship between Chan and public abbacies is found in the 1010 petition referred to earlier by Zhili and Yiwen. In this petition Zhili and Yiwen note that the prefecture already had two monasteries with public abbacies, the Jingde Monastery at Mount Tiantong and the Xianju ffg Monastery at Mount Damei A[^]. According to them, these institutions were based on the "model of the Buddhist monasteries" in the Jiangnan (most of modern Anhui and

Jiangxi provinces) and Hunan circuits (*Siming Zunzhe jiaoxing lu*, T 46.909c2-5, 909c26-28; Getz 1994, 139-159). The *Baoqing Siming zhi* reports that the Jingde Monastery received a name plaque in 1007 and the Xianju Monastery had one bestowed in 1008 (*Baoqing Siming zhi*, fasc. 13.18b, in *Song Yuan difang zhi congshu* 8). The monasteries must have become public at this point and been designated Chan, but the *Baoqing Siming zhi* makes no mention of that. However, the *Tiansheng Era Expanded Record of the Lamp* (*Tiansheng guangdeng lu* ASSISM, Z 2B.8.435c, hereafter *Expanded Record*), a Chan genealogical history first published in 1036, mentions that the Chan master Basheng Qingjian (957-1014) late in his life became the abbot at Tiantong. It would seem that Qingjian must have become the abbot at Tiantong very soon after it had become public. At Mount Damei, perhaps the first Chan abbot was Damei Juxu who, according to the *Expanded Record* (Z 2B.8.445a), gained his position there in the Xiangfu period (1008-1016). All this suggests that Tiantong and Damei around the time of Zhili's petition were in fact public Chan monasteries. In any event, there is ample evidence from later in the Song that both Tiantong and Damei were famous public Chan monasteries, and it seems likely that at the time they received their new plaques they were converted to public Chan monasteries. We should also note that Zhili and Yiwen's petition does not cite any examples of public monasteries devoted to the Tiantai teachings, which suggests that there were none at the time. The 1010 petition leaves the impression that, until then, whatever public monasteries existed had been designated Chan.

The association between Chan and the institution of public abbacies is made further explicit in Yu Jing's previously mentioned text from 1038, which describes the succession of abbots at the Dongshan Puli Monastery:

In recent times there has been a twofold division of Chan and Vinaya, based on the [selection of] the abbot in residence. In Chan [monasteries] he is chosen according to virtue (*de* in vinaya [monasteries] according to family relationship (*qin* [i.e., tonsure family]. (*Wuxi ji* fasc. 9.14b, in *Siku quanshu zhenben* 6).

Again vinaya monasteries are identified with the hereditary system, and Chan is presented as synonymous with the system of public

abbacies. Much additional evidence can be found in Song sources. For example, in an inscription for the Fuyan Monastery, which became public in 1050, it is said several times that disciples agreed to turn their hereditary monastery into a public one, after which authorities were petitioned. The inscription then states that there are not two ways in Buddhism but that Chan and Vinaya are distinguished by the different living arrangements monks have in monasteries. Monasteries where living is communal and where monks are not asked whether they have a "family" connection are called public. Monasteries where monks live in their own rooms and call each other "sons" and "brothers" are called hereditary (*jiayi*) ("Fuyan chanyuan ji" IHS¹l¹fB, *Zhiyuan Jiahe zhi* AA¹AA, fasc. 26, 7b-9a, in *Song Yuan difangzhi congshu* A A A A A S * 12).

Even in the late twelfth century, when public monasteries designated Chan were only slightly more numerous than those designated teaching or Vinaya, the tendency to associate Chan with the system of public abbacies continued. A late Song inscription relates how a monastery became public in 1177 and then describes this change as one from Vinaya to Chan ("Jingyan chansi ji" M¹ A¹ fB, *Zhiyuan Jiahe zhi*, fasc. 18.1b, in *Song Yuan difangzhi congshu* 12). It should also be noted that even after public vinaya monasteries appeared, the term "vinaya monastery" continued to be used for hereditary monasteries, so it was necessary to distinguish between public and hereditary vinaya monasteries (e.g., *Baoqing siming zhi*, fasc. 11, 6a-11d, in *Song Yuan difangzhi congshu* 8).

It is safe to conclude that when a Song text mentions that a monastery was changed from Vinaya to Chan, it means that it went from being a monastery with a hereditary abbacy to one that was public and reserved for members of the Chan lineage. However, the granting of a plaque giving a monastery a name that contained the word "Chan monastery" (*Chansi* A¹, or *Chanyuan*) did not necessarily mean that the monastery was converted into a public Chan monastery.²⁴ Likewise, a monastery designated as a public Chan monastery did not necessarily have the words "Chan monastery" in its official name.

Because public monasteries in the early part of the Song were exclusively associated with the Chan school at the time, no further classification was needed. However, perhaps beginning with Zhili's petition in 1010, public monasteries officially reserved for members of the Tiantai school came into existence. This eventually led to a formal distinction between public Chan monasteries, and public

teaching monasteries that were associated with the Tiantai school or the Huayan school that emerged in the eleventh century. A law from 1145 (reformulated in 1154) concerning the taxation of monks has different rates for monks living in hereditary vinaya and public teaching monasteries and those living in public Chan monasteries, making it clear that the distinction by this time had become official (*Song huiyao jigao*, fasc. 127.4998a-c; cited in Eichhorn 1968, 35; cf. Takao 1975, 66-67, and Gernet 1995, 34-35).²⁵

However, neither the 1145 or 1154 law nor any earlier source mentions public vinaya monasteries. It seems that this category only appeared in the thirteenth century, and public vinaya monasteries were never very numerous.²⁶ According to the Japanese founder of the Soto Zen WM school, Dogen MA (1200-1253), who visited China from 1223 to 1227, public vinaya monasteries were associated with a lineage claiming descent from the famous Chinese vinaya master Daoxuan M[^] (596-667).²⁷ The Song Vinaya school has not been well studied and it is unclear when it took shape, although it seems that the monk Yuanzhao AM (1048-1116) was instrumental in the early stages of its formation (see Getz in this volume). However, it is certain that references to vinaya monasteries in Northern Song sources do not imply the existence a Vinaya school at the time.

Conclusion

Government policies had a profound impact on the shape and development of Buddhism during the Song, when monastic Buddhism experienced a tremendous growth. What especially characterizes the period is the proliferation of monasteries with public abbacies and the great success of the Chan school, which became the dominant school of monastic Buddhism in the Song and later. The rise of Chan can now be understood to a large degree as a result of the Song government's policies, or at least as a development that could not have taken place without these policies. No doubt the Song government had not directly aimed at advancing the Chan school. But because Chan from an early point had a special association with the system of public abbacies and the Song government saw an advantage in having monasteries become public, Chan monasteries flourished. Such policies allowed the Chan school to develop an institutional base and an independent identity that gave further validity to its claim as heir to a special transmission going

back all the way to the historical Buddha. This assertion probably contributed to Chan's popularity among the elite and further helped convince the Song government that the proliferation of Chan monasteries was beneficial to the state. In any case, it seems doubtful that Chan could have developed as an independent entity, with its distinct literature and carefully constructed history, if it had not been for the institution of public monasteries.

If the flourishing of the Chan school in the Song can only be fully understood in the context of the state's promotion of public monasteries, then the study of the Vinaya school can only be fruitful if the association of the term "vinaya" with hereditary monasteries is understood. The mention of vinaya monasteries in sources dating to the Song and earlier has long been taken to mean monasteries associated with a Vinaya school, and only T. Griffith Foulk (1993) has suspected the fallacy of this assumption. The evidence, however, clearly shows that the term "vinaya monastery" in Song sources usually refers to hereditary monasteries; only in cases where it is made clear that the institution in question was public can "vinaya monastery" be associated with the Vinaya school.

Notes

1. The regulations the Song government imposed on the Buddhist church and its clergy were also applied to monastic Daoism and were well in line with the rules that existed for the rest of Song society. For in-depth discussion of the social control exercised by the Song state, see McKnight 1992.

2. Thus in 778 an official proposed that all monasteries without plaques be destroyed (*Jiu Tang shu* fasc. 127.3579; cited in Gernet 1995, 45).

3. See *Nitto guho junrei koki* fasc. 4, year 844, 7th moon, 15th day (in Bai 1992, 446; cited in Weinstein 1987a, 126; cf. Gernet 1995, 45, 304).

4. The Latter Zhou occupied from 951 the area of China that stretched from Peking in the north to the Yangzi River in the south. It is said that during the repression 30,336 monasteries were destroyed and only 2,694 monasteries were spared (Chikusa 1982, 84).

5. According to Hansen (1990, 85), temples for popular gods under the Southern Song were not necessarily considered illegal even if they were not registered. Registration was a final measure of accreditation for a cult. It is possible that the situation for small Buddhist monasteries was similar.

6. These monasteries would, however, usually claim to have been established during earlier dynasties (Chikusa 1982, 100).

7. On the other hand, because the orders to dismantle plaque-less monasteries were seldom carried out, these smaller monasteries could continue their unofficial existence without being subject to government regulations and interference. Such unregulated monasteries seem to have become numerous by the end of the Song (Chikusa 1982, 103).

8. As in a family descent group, the dharma relatives in the tonsure family had inheritance rights to each other's personal property (*Classified Legal Articles*, fasc. 51.487a).

9. The Song system of the abbot as the single head of a monastery did not come into existence until, at the earliest, the end of the Tang. In the Tang and probably earlier, monasteries were governed by the "three supervisors": the dean (*shangzuo ij*), the abbot (*sizhu A^*)> and the overseer (*duweina ^IIS*). Among these it seems the dean was the most powerful. The abbot system may first have been instituted within the Chan school (Xie et al. 1990, 174; Gernet 1995, 8).

10. See the entry on the *Classified Legal Articles* by W. Eichhorn (in Hervouet, 1978, 180-181). The Buddhism and Daoism section of the *Classified Legal Articles* is reproduced and translated into German in Eichhorn 1968.

11. The proliferation of new monasteries in the Song may have been partly driven by the need to create new opportunities for those who were not likely to receive an abbacy by default, and many of the new monasteries were probably built as branches of existing ones.

12. A note in the *Classified Legal Articles* (fasc. 50.476d) seems to indicate that a class of hereditary monasteries existed where there was no clear concept of an extended tonsure family and where the abbacy primarily was passed from master to disciple. Based on this passage Takao (1975, 74 n. 4) argues that a distinction must be made between *jiayi* (succession) monasteries, where each generation had to be exhausted before the abbacy could be passed on to the next, and *tudi* (disciple) monasteries, where the abbacy passed from master to disciple. I have not found any evidence for this use of terminology.

13. This is indicated in a 1332 inscription for a Daoist temple (*Liangzhe jinshi zhi* fasc. 17.9b-10, in *Shike shiliao xinbian* SMifAM, ser. 1.14; cited in Takao 1975, 63).

14. In the Southern Song another class of monasteries became common: private grave monasteries. These were owned by wealthy families and charged with looking after the family graves. It must be assumed that the abbots of such monasteries commonly were appointed by the family owning them (Chikusa 1982, 111-43; Huang 1989, 241-300).

15. There are indications that some monasteries had a system of public abbacies in the Five Dynasties period (see below), and throughout Chinese history there are reports of monks being appointed directly to monasteries by imperial command. Takao (1975, 61) states that public monasteries did exist in the Tang but does not elaborate. Foulk (1993) states that public monasteries began in the late Tang and were continued on a local level during the Five Dynasties period, but he offers no evidence. Song sources mention at least two monasteries that are said to have attained official public status under the Tang, but both cases can probably be discounted (Getz 1994, 134 n. 17, 154 n. 71).

16. The *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* does not specify the administrative level of the officials involved, but it would seem that it must have been prefectural, as in the *Classified Legal Articles*.

17. Ishikawa Shigeo (1988) maintains that from the beginning of the Song there existed a formal category of monasteries whose abbacies were filled only by imperial appointment. This he bases on the *Classified Legal Articles* (fasc. 50.476b), which states that abbacies which in the past had been appointed by imperial order

or proclamation can only be filled by first petitioning the central government; all others go through the prefectural authorities. However, at many monasteries the Song court only occasionally appointed the abbot, indicating that no formal system was in place, at least for most of the Song.

18. Thus the Chan master Zhenjing Kewen H A ^ A (1025-1102) is reported to have complained that in his day people would praise an abbot for not appropriating monastic property—as if that were something extraordinary (*Chanlin baoxun* #1, T 48.1021c).

19. The *Songshi* (30.10391; cited in Chikusa 1982, 162) tells of an official who, when he became prefect of Fujian in 1077, observed that monks were competing to become abbots at public monasteries and that bribes were common.

20. The Yanqing yuan is in other ways an unusual case. It had originally been turned over to Zhili and Yiwen by its previous abbots, apparently under the condition that it should henceforth be a public monastery devoted to Tiantai teachings (*Siming Zunzhe jiaoxing lu* B^W^JM, T 46.909a; cited in Getz 1994, 139). It is not clear how the previous abbots possessed the power to pass the monastery on to someone who was not in their tenuous family or decide it should be a public monastery.

21. For example, in the *Liangzhe jinshi zhi* (fasc. 10.50b, in *Shike shiliao xinbian*, ser. 1.14) we find a late-Southern Song stele entitled "Chongjian Jingshan Xingsheng wanshou chansi zhiji" SMff which records that in 1090 the prefect of Hangzhou changed the monastery at Jingshan into a public institution. There is no mention of anyone having petitioned for this.

22. Foulk (1993, 166) states: "The designation 'Vinaya monastery' in the Northern Sung did not apply to public monasteries and thus does not seem to have had anything to do with membership in a Vinaya lineage as such. The term simply refers to monasteries regulated by the Vinaya, that is, ordinary Buddhist monasteries where no particular precedence was given to Ch'an or T'ien-t'ai monks." Foulk, however, offers no evidence for this.

23. As Foulk (1993, 166) points out, this clearly is the meaning of the statement that Chan monks originally lived in Vinaya monasteries found in the "monastic rules" attributed to Baizhang Huaihai WA'IS^ (749-814). See the *Jingde chuandeng lu* •ffSM, T 51.251c.

24. Foulk (1987, 94, n. 6) notes that in the Tang, "Chan" in the name of a monastery did not imply any connection with the Chan school. However, this is also true during the Song.

25. Interestingly, monks in Chan monasteries were taxed less than the others. Kenneth Ch'en (1956) suggests, implausibly, that this was because they were thought to engage in productive labor and therefore not considered parasites to the degree other monks were.

26. See the chart in Takao 1975 (67), which shows that public Vinaya monasteries made up only a small fraction of the total.

27. See Dogen's diary from China, the *Hokyaki* (Kodera 1980, 244, translation p. 130). Dogen describes the division of public monasteries into Chan, teaching, and Vinaya, in addition to the hereditary "disciple" monasteries. He exclusively associates the teaching monasteries with the Tiantai school.