Praying for the Republic:

Buddhist Education, Student-Monks, and Citizenship in Modern China (1911-1949)

Lei Kuan Rongdao Lai
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
© Lei Kuan Rongdao Lai, 2013

Table of Contents

Contents

Abstract

This dissertation is a study of the emergence and impact of modern educational institutions in Chinese Buddhism. My aim is twofold: 1) to produce a history of modern monastic education in China; and 2) to investigate the intended outcomes of this new system of education as shown in the student-monks it produced. Focusing on identity formation, I examine the production of a collective identity – the student-monk – within and outside of the Buddhist academies (*foxueyuan*). Student-monks were those who identified with the imagined community formed around modern Buddhist academies and, more importantly, Buddhist periodicals that were widely circulated during the Republican period. I argue that this collective identity was indispensable to the young monks' creation of a distinctly Buddhist citizenship, which allowed them to engage and negotiate with the nation-state in a series of encounters. In other words, student-monks were both the products of a reformulated Buddhism-state relation and agents for that very transformation in twentieth-century China. I maintain that the emergence of student-monks as both an actual and imagined community is crucial to our understanding of the development of modern Chinese Buddhism.

Résumé

Cette thèse est une étude de l'émergence et de l'impact des institutions d'éducation moderne sur le Bouddhisme chinois. L'objectif de mon projet est en deux temps: 1) produire une histoire de l'éducation monastique moderne en Chine; et 2) étudier les résultats escomptés de ce nouveau système d'éducation tels que visibles chez les étudiants moines sortants. En me concentrant sur l'identité en formation, j'examine la production d'une identité collective, soit l'étudiant moine, au sein et hors des académies bouddhistes (foxueyuan). Les étudiants moines étaient ceux qui s'identifiaient avec la communauté imaginée qui se formait autour des académies bouddhistes modernes, et surtout, les périodiques bouddhistes qui étaient largement distribués lors de la période républicaine. Je soutiens que cette identité collective était cruciale à la création d'une citoyenneté distinctivement bouddhiste chez les jeunes moines, ce qui leur a permis de s'engager et de négocier avec l'État-nation lors d'une série de rencontres. En d'autres termes, les étudiants moines étaient à la fois les produits d'une relation Bouddhisme-État reformulée ainsi que les agents de cette même transformation dans la Chine du vingtième siècle. Je maintiens que l'émergence de ces étudiants moines en tant que communauté et véritable et imaginée est cruciale à notre compréhension du développement du Bouddhisme chinois moderne.

Acknowledgement

The completion of this dissertation would have been impossible without the unfailing support of my supervisors, Victor Hori and Robin Yates, to whom I owe my deepest gratitude. Victor Hori's clear analytical vision has helped steer my ideas into productive directions. His patience and dedication as a teacher will always remain an inspiration. Robin Yates gave me essential historiographical training. His sharp eye and careful reading of the drafts for this dissertation saved me from many embarrassing errors. I also thank members of my oral defence committee, Anastassios Anastassiadis, Kenneth Dean, Lara Braitstein, and Patricia Kirkpatrick, as well as my external reviewer, Miriam Levering, who provided invaluable feedback and insights. However, all remaining errors and mistakes are entirely my own.

The research and writing of this dissertation were generously supported by several institutions. In Taiwan, the Center for Chinese Studies hosted me as a visiting fellow during the early stage of my research. I also had the honor of being awarded a Sheng Yen Education Foundation dissertation fellowship. Back in Canada, I received funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in the form of an internal McGill SSHRC grant. I also thank the McBurney Family Foundation, the J. W. McConnell Family Foundation, and the Faculty of Religious Studies of McGill University for funding my research in its different stages.

I am grateful for the friendship and scholarship of my colleagues at McGill. Ken Dean opened my eyes to the fascinating world of Chinese religion. I thank Ellen Aitken, Lara Braitstein, and Davesh Soneji for graciously stepping in to provide help when needed, Gwen Bennett and Griet Vankeerberghen for their enthusiasm and insights for all things Chinese, and Grace Fong and Garth Green for their essential career advice. I am thankful for the companionship of and intellectual exchanges with my doctoral cohort. Melissa Curley never

failed to see through problems and help me regain perspective. I was repeatedly challenged to reframe my inquiries following Jessica Main's insights into Buddhism and modernity. Throughout the years, I have also benefitted immensely from Cindy Bentley's warmth, Melanie Coughlin's passion, Tom Troughton's sense of humor, and Philippe Turenne's calm. Lin Fan read through drafts and generously offered critical suggestions. Shital Sharma taught me how to transform anxiety into motivation.

I am likewise thankful to my Buddhist teachers, Venerables Xinwu, Juehui, Yinzhi, and Xinyi, who blessed a lone nun's pursuit of an academic career with their infinite kindness and compassion. Finally, I owe my gratitude to my extended family in New York and Malaysia, who could not quite understand why I was "still in school" yet took pride in what I do nonetheless.

Abbreviations and Conventions

I use *hanyu pinyin* for transliterations of all Chinese terms, except when the individual or organization is already commonly known by another spelling. For example, Chiang Kai-shek, Sun Yat-sen, KMT, and the Buddhist organization Tzu Chi.

For consistency, all book titles, including those published in mainland China, are given in Traditional Chinese characters.

Works cited by abbreviations:

HCY: *Haichaoyin* 海潮音.
MFQ: Huang Xianian 黃夏年, ed. *Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng* 民國佛教期刊文獻集成. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.
MFQB: Huang Xianian 黃夏年, ed. *Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng bubian* 民國佛教期刊文献集成補編. Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 2008.
TXN: Yinshun 印順. *Taixu dashi nianpu* 太虛大師年譜. In *Miaoyun ji* 妙雲集. Taipei: Zhenwen chubanshe, 1992.
TXQ: Taixu 太虛. *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書. Taipei: Shandaosi fojing liutongchu, 1980.
XDSQ: *Xiandai sengqie* 現代僧伽.
XFRC: Yu Lingbo 于凌波. *Xiandai fojiao renwu cidian* 現代佛教人物辭典. 2 vols. Gaoxiong: Foguang chubanshe, 2004.
YBSH: Liang Qichao 梁啟超. *Yinbingshi heji* 飲冰室合集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1932.
YRQ: Yang Wenhui 楊文會. *Yang Renshan quanji* 楊仁山全集. Hefei: Huangshan shushe, 2000.

Introduction
Modern Buddhist Education

In 1945, Zhenhua 眞華 (1922-2012), a young monk from a small hereditary temple[1] in the Northern province of Henan 河南 arrived at the prestigious Baohua Mountain 寶華山 for his full ordination. Approaching the end of the ordination session, one of the new ordainees announced that the famed reformist monk Taixu 太虛 (1890-1947) would set up a Buddhist Studies academy (*foxueyuan* 佛學院) at the Pilu Monastery (Pilu si 毘盧寺) in Nanjing. According to this news, classes would begin after the lunar New Year. Young monks were urged to enroll after their ordination and prepare to write the entrance examinations. Excited about the opportunity, nine newly ordained monks, including Zhenhua, decided to report to the Pilu Monastery together.[2]

They were kindly received by the guest prefect at Pilu Monastery. As they waited for school to start, several of them started to help out with the monastery's ritual services for the laity. At first they were complaining but over time seemed happy with the money they were making. Months passed, the New Year came and went yet there was still no sign of the new monastic school being set up. Zhenhua fell ill but had no money to see a doctor – he had been refusing to perform ritual services and funeral rites for the monastery. He left the monastery after he finally realized that there would be no Buddhist academy. It was probably just a plot by

[1] Buddhist temples were in general divided into large public monasteries (*shifang conglin* 十方叢林) and smaller, privately owned hereditary temples (*zisun miao* 子孫廟), both with many variations. See Holmes Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism, 1900-1950* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 129.

[2] Chen-Hua, *In Search of the Dharma: Memoirs of a Modern Chinese Buddhist Pilgrim*, ed. Chün-fang Yü, trans. Denis Mair (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1992), 65. For the Chinese original of Zhenhua's memoir, see Zhenhua 眞華, *Canxue suotan* 參學瑣談 (Taipei: Tianhua chubanshe, 1984).

monks at the Pilu Monastery to recruit young monks to help with its busy rites and rituals. Two years later he was enrolled at the Tianning Buddhist Academy (*Tianning foxueyuan* 天寧佛學院), where he entered the new world of learning that involved classrooms, blackboard, textbooks, and assignments. He was also fascinated by his lay teachers, who taught the English, history, and geography classes.[3]

This episode of Zhenhua's biography points to several features of Chinese Buddhism during the Republican period:

1) After the first modern Buddhist school that adopted the name *foxueyuan* was founded by Taixu in Wuchang in 1922, *foxueyuan* quickly became a prevalent feature in the Chinese Buddhist landscape. Also, new ones continued to be founded after the war ended in 1945.
2) Traditionally, a small number of elite monks who wanted to pursue further doctrinal learning would follow the career path of travelling across the country to attend lectures on the *sūtras* given by famous masters. Monks would be immersed in this system of apprenticeship for years until they became *dharma* masters themselves. A gradual change took place when, during the first decades of the twentieth century, an increasing number of ambitious young monks were aspiring to seek a more systematic education at the Buddhist academies. Although many recognized the challenges and shortcomings of the modern academies – underfunding, a lack of coherent structure and purpose, a shortage of qualified teachers, and discrepancies in students' intellectual capability – these young monks were nonetheless convinced that a modern education in Buddhist academies would prepare them for the task of sustaining Buddhism in the new era.

[3] Zhenhua was conscripted by the Nationalist army during the civil war and later relocated to Taiwan. After being discharged from the army in 1952, he was re-ordained and studied under the famous scholar-monk Yinshun 印順 (1906-2005). For a biographical account, see XFRC 1:880-881; Chun-Fang Yü, "Introduction."In *In Search of the Dharma*, 1-20.

3) Young monks at the *foxueyuan* shared certain ideals about their monastic identity. For example, they were almost univocally critical of the traditional practice of monks performing funeral rites for a living. Furthermore, as a substantial portion of Zhenhua's memoir shows, they also shared a dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs within the traditional Buddhist establishment, which they considered rigid, corrupt, and lacking in vitality. They therefore considered a thorough reform necessary to ensure the survival of their religion in the new republic.

A similar disposition can be seen in the biographies and works of many other monks in this period. In fact, the centrality of education in the discourse of Chinese Buddhist modernization has prompted me to ask the following questions: What did the new-style Buddhist schools mean for young monks like Zhenhua? As a new mode of education, how did the Buddhist academies change their students' self-understanding of what it meant to be a monk? How did that self-understanding change over time? How did students conceive of their relationship with their peers in the academy, who fell outside of the traditional Buddhist system of lineage relationship? Having a close link to the reform movement, what were the aims/agendas of these schools? What type of monks were the academies designed to produce? Did they always share the same aims? How did the student-monks relate to these aims? How did monks who were students at the Buddhist academies react to religious and secular issues compared to those who were not?

This dissertation project seeks to answer some, if not all, of these questions. It is a study of the emergence and impact of modern educational institutions in Chinese Buddhism. Focusing on identity formation, I examine the production of a collective identity – the student-monk – within and outside of the Buddhist academies. I argue that this collective identity was crucial to

the young monks' formulation of a uniquely Buddhist citizenship, which allowed them to engage and negotiate with the nation-state in a series of encounters.

Scholars of Buddhism sometimes consider all Buddhist teaching as a comprehensive system of ethico-religious education aimed at transforming individuals in their quest for complete enlightenment.[4] Instead of this broad definition, throughout this dissertation, I adopt a definition of Buddhist education in the narrow sense. That is, I focus on the institutionalized system of monastic education (*seng jiaoyu* 僧教育) developed during the Republican period, which aimed exclusively at training clergy members in Buddhism, although laypeople were sometimes admitted into the Buddhist academies. By "Chinese" Buddhism, I am referring to the Buddhist tradition practiced by the Han majority in China (*Hanchuan fojiao* 漢傳佛教). This is due to the reason that interactions with the forms of Buddhism practiced by the Tibetan, Mongolian, Manchu, and other ethnic minorities, such as the Dai Theravāda Buddhists in Yunnan,[5] fell under different governmental jurisdiction – that of minority affairs – in the twentieth century.[6]

In the study of modern Chinese Buddhism, Holmes Welch's magisterial trilogy remains to this day the most comprehensive treatment of the history, institution, and practice of the

[4] Han Huanzhong 韓煥忠, *Zijue jueta: fojiao jiaoyu guan* 自覺覺他: 佛教教育觀 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2006).

[5] For a study of Buddhist education among the Dai-lue minority in Sipsongpannā, Yunnan, in contemporary China, see Thomas Borchert, "Educating Monks: Buddhism, Politics and Freedom of Religion on China's Southwest Border" (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2006).

[6] In the People's Republic of China, over ninety percent of the population is classified as Han, while over fifty minority nationalities (*shaoshu minzu* 少數民族) are officially recognized. For a study of the discourse of race and the construction of a national identity in twentieth-century China, see Frank Dikötter, *The Discourse of Race in Modern China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992).

religion in the twentieth century.[7] Probably due to the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) and general pessimism about the fate of religions in communist China, the study of modern Chinese Buddhism was in a state of near dormancy for almost thirty years after the publication of Welch's books. We see a renewed interest in Chinese Buddhism toward the end of the twentieth century, driven by the revival of religions in mainland China and the growth of transnational Buddhist networks based on the island of Taiwan.

Recently, a steadily growing body of scholarship on different aspects of Chinese Buddhist life in the twentieth century has started to emerge. Among them, the reformers and their movement are the most well-represented subfield in Western scholarship today. Studies on the life and theology of prominent teachers such as Yang Wenhui 楊文會 (1837-1911),[8] Taixu,[9] Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽竟無 (1871-1943),[10] Tanxu,[11] and Yinshun[12] have deepened our understanding of the vitality, challenges, and complex changes that took place within the tradition. In one way or another, these thinkers can be seen as responding to the influx of

[7] Holmes Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism*; *The Buddhist Revival in China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968); *Buddhism Under Mao* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

[8] Gabriele Goldfuss, *Vers un bouddhisme du XXe sìecle: Yang Wenhui (1837-1911), réformateur laïque et imprimeur* (Paris: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 2001).

[9] Don Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism: Taixu's Reforms* (University of Hawai'i Press, 2001); Justin Ritzinger, "Anarchy in the Pure Land: Tradition, Modernity, and the Reinvention of the Cult of Maitreya in Republican China" (PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2010); Eric Goodell, "Taixu's (1890-1947) Creation of Humanistic Buddhism" (PhD Diss., University of Virginia, 2012).

[10] Eyal Aviv, "Differentiating the Pearl from the Fish Eye: Ouyang Jingwu (1871-1943) and the Revival of Scholastic Buddhism" (PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2008).

[11] James Carter, *Heart of Buddha, Heart of China: The Life of Tanxu, a Twentieth-century Monk* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[12] Po-yao Tien, "A Modern Buddhist Monk-reformer in China: The Life and Thought of Yin-shun" (PhD Diss., California Institute of Integral Studies, 1995); William Chu, "A Buddha-shaped Hole: Yinshun's (1906-2005) Critical Buddhology and the Theological Crisis in Modern Chinese Buddhism" (PhD Diss., UCLA, 2006); Marcus Bingenheimer, *Der Mönchsgelehrte Yinshun (geb. 1906) und seine Bedeutung für den Chinesisch-Taiwanischen Buddhismus im 20. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg: Edition Forum, 2004).

Western institutions and ideas into China. Their efforts are generally seen as leading to a revival of Chinese Buddhism. The revival thesis will be examined in Chapter 1.

Another group of scholars goes beyond individual masters in its attempt to illuminate the various visions of Buddhist modernity. Through their study of vegetarianism, Buddhist-inspired arts and music,[13] lay activism,[14] Buddhist engagement with the prevalent discourse of science,[15] and Buddhist print culture,[16] these scholars show that the Buddhists were very much significant actors in modern Chinese cultural and intellectual practices.

Most of the above mentioned works recognize the centrality of education in the Buddhist modernization project. Some devote chapters or sections to discuss the emergence of new Buddhist schools in this period, usually in relation to the reform instituted by individual Buddhist teachers.[17] However, there has yet to be a full-length study of Buddhist education in the early twentieth century. In addition, most of the available accounts of Buddhist education focus on Buddhist teachers and the educational institutions that they created. I argue that this only represents half of the picture of educational modernization in Chinese Buddhism. Except for brief references to the most prominent students, we do not know much about the students at the early academies.

---

[13] Francesca Tarocco, *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism: Attuning the Dharma* (London; New York: Routledge, 2007).

[14] James Brooks Jessup, "The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920-1956" (PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2010).

[15] Erik Hammerstrom, "Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China (1895-1949)" (PhD Diss., Indiana University, 2010).

[16] Gregory Scott, "Conversion by the Book: Buddhist Print Culture in Early Republican China" (PhD Diss., Columbia University, 2013).

[17] See, for example, Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, chapter 6; Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 55, 90-99, and passim; Aviv, "Differentiating the Pearl from the Fish Eye," 71-76; Chen Bing 陳兵 and Deng Zimei 鄧子美, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao* 二十世纪中国佛教 (Beijing: Minzu chubanshe, 2000), 204–212.

Building on Thomas Borchert's assertion that Buddhist education should be seen as not just teaching monks and nuns about Buddhism, but also a system aimed at producing a certain type of "religious actors who are also members of the community,"[18] this dissertation investigates the formation of student-monks as both religious actors and engaged citizens. Taking into account the larger social discourse of education as one of the most important modernization projects and the influence of the May Fourth student movement, this study seeks to position young Buddhist monks within the socio-political contexts of Republican China, when Buddhism was faced with a hostile secularist regime and every aspect of the Chinese society was politicized. I propose that this is important because a proper understanding of the Buddhist engagement with the modernizing nation-state will not be possible without taking into consideration the nascent concept of citizenship that is most visible among the young student-monks. In other words, modern *foxueyuan* became the location in which the Chinese Buddhists formulated a Buddhist citizenship in twentieth century China.

Student-Monks

The main thesis for this dissertation is that the emergence of student-monks as both an actual and imagined community is crucial to our understanding of the development of modern Chinese Buddhism. I attribute two levels of meaning to this term. First, the unambiguous definition for "student-monks" would be those who were students at the various Buddhist academies. Yet confining our discussion to this exclusive definition misses the point of the story this dissertation seeks to tell. I propose that, second, "student-monk" in the most inclusive sense refers to those who identified with the textual community formed around modern Buddhist academies, and, more importantly, Buddhist periodicals that were widely circulated during the republican period.

[18] Borchert, "Educating Monks," 37.

Put the other way, "student-monk" served as an ideal image of the modern monastic career for China's young and progressive monks.

According to this ideal, student-monks were educated in both religious and secular knowledge, had a rational and "scientific" approach to religion, were sensitive to contemporary issues in Chinese society, and shared a vision for modern China in which Buddhism would play an active role in society. In addition, student-monks in the early twentieth century were nationalistic and revivalist. They appropriated not only nationalist discourses in justifying a more engaged role in secular matters, but also the symbolic authority of leading reformist monks, such as Taixu, to legitimize their movement.

Student-monks sometimes self-identified as new monks (*xinseng* 新僧) or young monks (*seng qingnian* 僧青年). I argue that regardless of the self-labels, the ideal of the "student-monk" remained at the core of their identity production. This is also a process based on differentiation. By claiming a student-monk or new monk identity, these monks were attempting to distinguish themselves from the "old monks" – the elders who controlled the well-endowed public monasteries but did not support their reformist projects, especially educational modernization. Therefore, they constantly voiced harsh criticism of the "old monks," attacking their closed-mindedness and incompetence.

In his study of Buddhist participation in the anti-Japanese war, Xue Yu shows that the new or young monks, who were graduates of Buddhist colleges, were the "major force behind [the] Buddhist reform movement."[19] He further points out the tendency of these young monks to

[19]Xue Yu, *Buddhism, War, and Nationalism: Chinese Monks in the Struggle against Japanese Aggressions, 1931-1945* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 26-27. With reference to the larger national awakening (*minzu juexing* 民族覺醒) movement of self-strengthening following China's defeat in the Opium Wars (1839-1860), Xue Yu coined the term "Buddhist Awakening" to describe the revival of Chinese Buddhism in early twentieth century China. See ibid., 16.

promote a Buddhist nationalism that supported wartime mobilization. Yet he does not explain the internal development that made this identification of Buddhist reform and nationalism possible. This dissertation examines the convergence of identity and institution in a unique historical context, in which China's young monks adopted, negotiated with, and reformulated discourses on citizenship, education, and nationalism to craft a distinct student-monk identity.

This inclusive definition for the "student-monk" identity addresses one major issue in the study of modern Chinese Buddhism. Following the more traditional approach to religious kinship defined by tonsure, ordination, and *dharma* transmission lineages,[20] scholars often face great difficulty and confusion in determining the relationship between a Buddhist master and his purported student. And this is especially the case with attempts to delineate a lineage chart for the reformist Buddhists. Often, when evidence falls short of supporting a direct teacher-student relationship between a reformer and his students, scholars describe their activities as being inspired by the master. For example, in evaluating Taixu's legacy in contemporary Chinese Buddhism, Pittman comments that few of Taixu's tonsure disciples were capable of carrying on his reformist agendas. But after 1949, monks and nuns in the Chinese Buddhist worlds who were "appreciative of his legacy" were credited for popularizing and advancing his ideas.[21] None of the prominent Buddhist teachers cited by Pittman, who are the major advocates of Taixu's "Humanistic Buddhism" (*renjian fojiao* 人間佛教) in Taiwan, is a direct student/disciple according to the above-mentioned traditional kinship systems, although Yinshun 印順 (1906-2005) was a student-monk at the Minnan Buddhist Academy (Minnan foxueyuan 閩南佛學院).

[20] Welch, *Practice of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 403.

[21] Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 255.

While agreeing with scholars such as Pittman that "inspiration" is a meaningful way to examine the continuity of idea and practice, my dissertation focuses on the different actors, locales, and mechanisms in which such inspiration took place. It demonstrates that this less-than-apparent teacher-student relationship can be explained by the changes in the interpretation of the traditional master-disciple relationship that led to new ways of imagining Buddhist identity in the early twentieth century. These paradigm shifts, which are discussed in Chapter 3, took place as a result of the emergence of new-style Buddhist academies. However, it is important to point out that this new mode of imagining the teacher-student relationship only added to but did not replace the complex and fluid networks of dharma kinship and regional affiliation, which remain powerful both within China and in the diaspora until the present day.[22]

By expanding the definition of student-monks as possibly *anyone* who came across and identified with the ideals of a new self-understanding of the monastic career, I fully recognize its potential flaw. For example, one will no longer be able to quantify student-monks. I shall therefore state that this dissertation does not pretend to identify every student-monk or estimate their number during the period under consideration. Rather, I focus on the qualification process: What were the traits in the student-monk identity that later generations of China's young monks were drawn to? How did the meanings of this collective identity change over time? What were the internal tensions and conflicts as a growing number of monks claimed a student-monk identity?

[22] On transnational Chinese Buddhist networks, see Yoshiko Ashiwa, "The Globalization of Chinese Buddhism: Clergy and Devotee Networks in the Twentieth Century," *International Journal of Asian Studies* 2, no. 2 (July 1, 2005): 217–237. On the transnational religious network linking Southeast China and the Chinese diaspora in Southeast Asia, see Kenneth Dean and Zheng Zhenman, *Ritual Alliances of the Putian Plain, Volume 1: Historical Introduction to the Return of the Gods* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), chap. 9.

Furthermore, identification with abstract ideals personified by eminent monks is not entirely new in the history of Chinese Buddhism. In his study of the biographies of eminent monks (*gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳), John Kieschnick argues that instead of debating their historicity, one can approach these hagiographies as representations of certain Chinese Buddhist monastic ideals.[23] In addition, Gregory Scott observes that Chinese Buddhists in the twentieth century developed a great interest in late Ming reformers Yunqi Zhuhong 雲栖袾宏 (1535-1615) and Ouyi Zhixu 藕益智旭 (1599-1655) because they saw a similarity in the tumultuous socio-political situations between their own time and that of the late Ming and they identified with the regeneration of Buddhism represented by these figures.[24]

Yet, the student-monks were not just isolated individuals inspired by the ideals of a modern and progressive monastic career or individual reformist teachers. It was a structural, though fluid, community that started out from the small group of students in modern Buddhist academies and grew over time supported by the circulation of modern print media. Taking into account the undeniable stature of Taixu as the figurehead of the reform movement, this dissertation examines the exchange, interaction, and debate among the student-monks in search of new meanings for their identity.

Some of the student monks had a fairly direct connection with Taixu and his new-style academies. For example, Daxing 大醒 (1899-1952), Jichen 寄塵 (1885-1974), and Fafang 法舫 (1904-1951) were themselves graduates who became teachers at these academies. Their

[23] John Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997).

[24] Gregory Scott, "Conversion by the Book," 18. For the revival efforts of Zhuhong and Ouyi, see Chün-fang Yü, *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981); Beverly Foulks, "Living Karma: The Religious Practices of Ouyi Zhixue (1599-1655)" (PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2009).

leadership role in the student-monk community was legitimized through their association with the reformer and his academies. But a national student-monk community – in which a "vision of shared belonging"[25] was developed – was only formed when its participants across the country were interacting with one another, exchanging and debating ideas through the numerous periodicals that had started to be published.

In re-examining the role that texts, especially the canon, play in the education of novice monks in Sri Lanka, Jeffrey Samuels draws our attention to the importance of "action-oriented pedagogy"– in which monks learn through ritualized daily activities.[26] To adapt his idea to analyze the community of student monks in twentieth century China, I propose to expand the meaning of "doing" to include social and political engagement. In other words, the student-monk identity emerged when monks learned through an informal "action-oriented pedagogy" – by hearing, reading, and writing, and debating about the words and actions of Taixu and leading student-monks.

Modern Buddhist Print Culture

Given the pivotal role played by the Buddhists in the spread of print culture in medieval China,[27] it is peculiar that scholars have only begun to pay attention to modern Chinese Buddhist print

[25] Anne Blackburn, "Introduction," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 239.

[26] Jeffrey Samuels, "Toward an Action-Oriented Pedagogy: Buddhist Texts and Monastic Education in Contemporary Sri Lanka," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 72, no. 4 (2004): 955–971. For the larger conversation on the role that texts, particularly the Pāli canon, play in Theravāda Buddhism, see Charles Keyes, "Merit Transference in the Kammic Theory of Popular Theravada Buddhism," in *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry*, ed. E. Valentine Daniel and Charles Keyes (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 261–286; Anne Blackburn, *Buddhist Learning and Textual Practice in Eighteenth-century Lankan Monastic Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

[27] John Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 164–184; Timothy Barrett, *The Woman Who Discovered Printing* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

media in recent years. I argue that the new modes of reproduction and dissemination played an indispensable role in re-shaping the identity and representation of the Chinese Buddhists in the late-Qing and Republican periods.

The Chinese Buddhists have long engaged in the merit-generating activity of printing and spreading the Buddha's words. When mechanized print technologies were introduced into China in the late nineteenth century, they enthusiastically participated in this revolution that marked the transition of Chinese print culture from woodblock to mechanized moveable type printing.[28] Francesca Tarocco has noted the prominence of reading Buddhist texts in the conversion stories of Chinese elite during this period.[29] In his recent dissertation, Gregory Scott argues that print culture was "a catalyst for change among Buddhists in modern China."[30] Not only were canonical texts reproduced and circulated in the growing distribution networks based in the major urban centers, new types of media were also being invented. For my study on the identity formation among China's student-monks, the most relevant kind of new textual production is the various periodicals. I argue that along with the new Buddhist academies, these periodicals with clearly defined editorial positions became locations for the production of the collective student-monk identity that went beyond the confines of the modern *foxueyuan*.

A large number of Buddhist newspapers and periodicals appeared between the 1920s and 1930s. A variety of lay and Buddhist groups and associations founded periodicals to proselytize and advance their ideas and agendas. Sometimes the competition for voice and representation

[28] For a history of print capitalism in modern China, see Christopher Reed, *Gutenberg in Shanghai Chinese Print Capitalism, 1876-1937* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004).

[29] Tarocco, *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 46.

[30] Scott, "Conversion by the Book," 18. Scott's dissertation appeared toward the end of my writing of this dissertation. Therefore, I admit to have not been able to thoroughly incorporate and engage with his substantial arguments.

between different groups is also apparent in the periodicals. As Jan Kiely and Cynthia Brokaw have noted, the Chinese Buddhists devoted so much energy to the publishing business due to the conviction that to be an influential new-style Buddhist group meant having a newspaper or periodical.[31] Although some of these periodicals had a very short publishing life and are now completely lost, some estimate that over three hundred Buddhist newspapers and periodicals – annuals, quarterlies, monthlies, weeklies and the like – were published between 1912 and1936.[32] Scholars have noted that the frequent appearance of photographs in the periodicals strengthened the Buddhist imagination of a national Buddhist community.[33] Here I would like to further that argument by proposing that the periodicals themselves formed textual communities connecting Buddhists from across the country, in which educated readers and writers were engaged in discussion on the current events of the day. This allowed especially the activist student-monks to produce a religious citizenship that structurally connected Buddhism to the nation-state.

The impact of this new print culture has only recently begun to be evaluated by scholars. It is perhaps worth noting, for example, that the reformist ideas of Taixu and his periodical *Haichaoyin* were transmitted to Vietnam in the 1920s. Such transmission of idea and reform model inspired a series of reform movements there. Thich Nhat Hanh (1926-), generally considered the founder of the modern "Socially Engaged Buddhism" in advocating for a more

[31] Cynthia Brokaw and Jan Kiely, "Spreading the Dharma with the Mechanized Press: New Buddhist Print Cultures in the Modern Chinese Print Revolution, 1866-1949," in *From Woodblocks to the Internet: Chinese Publishing and Print Culture in Transition, Circa 1800 to 2008* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 204.

[32] Deng Zimei 鄧子美, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindai hua: bainian wenhua chongchuang yu jiaoliu* 傳統佛教與中國近代化: 百年文化衝撞與交流 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 1994), 188.

[33] Tarocco, *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 46.

socially and politically conscious Buddhism in the 1960s, coined the term by translating from the Vietnamese term *nhan gian phat giao*, or *renjian fojiao* 人間佛教 in Chinese.[34]

In the last several years, a large number of these periodicals were collected and reprinted in China. Compiled under the leadership of mainland scholar Huang Xianian 黃夏年, the *Complete Collection of Republican-Era Buddhist Periodical Literature* (*Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng* 民國佛教期刊文獻集成) and its supplement (*Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng bubian* 民國佛教期刊文献集成補編) include 295 volumes, with 8 volumes of indices.[35] These collections consist of 233 Buddhist periodicals published in the first half of the twentieth century, 150 of which are complete runs.

This dissertation project takes as its primary source the newly available Buddhist periodicals collected in the MFQ and MFQB, with a focus on those closely associated with the reformist activist student-monk community, such as the *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, *Xiandai sengqie* 現代僧伽, *Xiandai fojiao* 現代佛教, and *Renhaideng* 人海燈. Supplemented by other biographies, autobiographies, and collected works of various Chinese monastics and lay Buddhists, this approach allows for a more informed study of Buddhist life and activities in the twentieth century.

[34] Elise DeVido, "The Influence of Chinese Master Taixu on Buddhism in Vietnam," *Journal of Global Buddhism* 10 (2009): 436; Minh T. Nguyen, "Buddhist Monastic Education and Regional Revival Movements in Early Twentieth Century Vietnam" (PhD Diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2007).

[35] See Huang Xianian 黃夏年, *Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng* 民國佛教期刊文獻集成 (Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006) and its supplement Huang Xianian, *Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng bubian* 民國佛教期刊文献集成補編 (Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 2008). This collection and its supplement will be referred to in their abbreviations, MFQ and MFQB, respectively, hereafter. A searchable database of the over 140,000 articles in collection is provided by the Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies (http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/minguofojiaoqikan/).

Among the periodicals in circulation during this period, the *Haichaoyin*, founded by Taixu in 1920, is the longest running and most influential.[36] It served as the most important propaganda tool for the reform proposals of Taixu and his students. I will return to discussing the role of these periodicals in facilitating identity formation and Buddhist reaction to and protest against the government's religious policies in the body of this dissertation. But I will close this section by proposing that participation in the print culture represented a significant upward mobility for the student-monks during this period – many of them went on to serve as editors for the *Haichaoyin* or to found their own journals in the next decades. For example, Daxing and Fafang, both graduates of the Wuchang Buddhist Academy, founded the *Xiandai sengqie* in 1928 at the Minnan Buddhist Academy, where they were at the time teachers and chief administrators. Therefore, the periodicals became important venues for student-monks to apply what they had learned and to further their reform agendas. As actively participating readers and contributors for these periodicals, student-monks gradually formed an imagined national Buddhist community, in which ideas and ideals were enthusiastically debated, negotiated, and incorporated. This process is crucial to our understanding of the creation of Buddhist citizenship in the twentieth century.

Religion, Secularization, and the Modern State

The Revolution of 1911 brought an end to over two thousand years of dynastic rule in China. From the turn of the twentieth century, government officials and intellectuals were preoccupied with the question of how to build a strong and modern nation to resist and compete with the increasingly dominating foreign powers. A major theme for the study of state-building during this period is secularization. Although the classic sociological prediction of modernization – in which religion is relegated to the private sphere and declines in the process of modernization –

[36] The *Haichaoyin* ran interrupted from its founding up to 1949, and was resumed in Taiwan up until the present day.

has been criticized and largely abandoned in the past two decades, a more coherent theory of secularization in China has only begun to appear lately. The recent works of Ashiwa and Wank, Goossaert and Palmer, Ji Zhe, and Rebecca Nedostup mark an important step toward a more nuanced understanding of secularization as it applies to China.[37]

As a result of the emergence of religious movements and fundamentalism around the world since the 1970s, scholars of religion began to question the viability of the secularization thesis. Rather than rejecting secularization in its entirety,[38] José Casanova defends the secularization thesis and proposes that we approach secularization as three independent processes – the structural differentiation of secular spheres such as politics, economy, and science from the religious sphere, the decline of religious practices and beliefs, and the privatization of religion.[39] Yet Talal Asad reminds us that the notion of the secular emerged from the specific geographical and historical contexts of modern Western Europe and should not be seen as a universal category.[40] In other words, the "secular" was already embedded in the ideological framework for the understandings of religion that was transmitted to the non-Western world as a result of colonization. He argues that, as a political ideology in the modern nation-states in Asia, religion and the secular are mutually constitutive. This last point is especially

[37] Yoshiko Ashiwa and David Wank, eds., *Making Religion, Making the State: The Politics of Religion in Modern China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009); Vincent Goossaert and David Palmer, *The Religious Question in Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Ji Zhe, "Secularization as Religious Restructuring: Statist Institutionalization of Chinese Buddhism and Its Paradoxes," in *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, ed. Mayfair Mei-hui Yang (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 233–260; Rebecca Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes: Religion and the Politics of Chinese Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009).

[38] Rodney Stark and Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

[39] José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

[40] Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).

relevant to our discussion of religion and secularization in China as the differentiation of the religious from the secular sphere required the invention of "religion" as a political category. At the turn of the twentieth century, the creation of "religion" (*zongjiao* 宗教) and "superstition" (*mixin* 迷信) as legitimate categories in political discourse had serious repercussions for religious life.[41]

As Michael Szonyi has observed, secularization in modern China was a "dual movement of distinction and intervention."[42] The state distinguished religion from superstition and attempted to reconstitute religious life so that it could be beneficial to the nation-building project. The model for this reconfiguration was a pragmatic one, although heavily influenced by Christianity. According to this top-down model for recognized religions, a religion is pure as a spiritual and ethical tradition, well-organized under the respective national association, and useful to the modernization project of the state.[43]

The two recent books by Goossaert and Palmer, and Nedostup represent ambitious efforts to document this process of differentiation in secularism. While Goossaert and Palmer offer a comprehensive analysis of the transformation of religion in Chinese society in the last century, Nedostup focuses on the Nationalist Party's (KMT) religious policies and policy-making. Both works have shown that the differentiation process resulted not simply in the separation of religion and the state but in a reconfiguration of their relationship.

---

[41] Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

[42] Michael Szonyi, "Secularization Theories and the Study of Chinese Religions," *Social Compass* 56, no. 3 (2009): 317.

[43] Goossaert and Palmer, *The Religious Question in Modern China*, 58.

Building on the meticulous work of these scholars, this dissertation seeks to tell the story of the student-monk community as one of many groups of actors in the transformation of the religious landscape in modern China. I maintain that secularization in China did not lead to the privatization but to an institutionalization of Buddhism. In doing so, this study takes as its core the approach of Ashiwa and Wank, who argue for the importance of moving beyond the dichotomous frameworks that see secularization as the process in which the state imposed its power to which religion could either resist or conform.[44] Instead, they stress the agency of religious actors in this institutionalization process:

> The politics of modern "religion," therefore, is constituted by ongoing negotiations, among multiple actors, including state officials, intellectuals, religious adherents, and businesspersons, to adapt religion to the modern state's definition and rules even as they are continuously being transgressed. Religion can accommodate the state institutions as modern "religion" in order to ensure their existence in the new order while the presence of religion in state institutions shows that the state is a modern, enlightened state that acknowledges religion.[45]

This is especially illuminating in the study of student-monks who, though acknowledging the power of the state as the arbitrator, nonetheless saw themselves as *active* participants in a project that was not only beneficial but necessary for the survival of both Buddhism and the nation.

[44] Ashiwa and Wank, "Making Religion, Making the State in Modern China: An Introductory Essay," in *Making Religion, Making the* State, 5.

[45] Ibid., 8.

Structure of This Study

My aim for this dissertation project is twofold: 1) to produce a history of modern monastic education in China; and 2) to investigate the intended outcomes of this new system of education as shown in the student-monks it produced. Through a careful reading of samples of writing produced by these young monks, I focus on the issue of identity formation in the hope of shedding light on how they were both the products of a reformulated Buddhism-state relation and agents for that very transformation. This narrative begins with a national renewal project in which education was seen as the cure for China's myriad problems. Under the slogan "saving the nation through education" (*jiaoyu jiuguo* 教育救國) – Chinese intellectuals and politicians shared the conviction that a modern education combining the morality of a national culture, and the practical knowledge of Western science and technology would transform imperial subjects into selfless, dedicated citizens. Paradoxically, this educational modernity would be realized at the expense of religion – as seen in a series of "build schools with temple property" (*miaochan xingxue* 廟產興學) movements that spanned almost the entire first-half of the twentieth century. Faced with dire fiscal circumstances and a failing state, late Qing government officials proposed to expropriate temples with rich endowments as an immediate solution for the funding of a new national educational system.

The first wave of Buddhist schools founded in the last years of the Qing can be seen partially as the Buddhist effort to prevent confiscation. The Buddhist elite and reformers soon realized that a modern Buddhist education would revitalize their religion and ensure its survival under the tumultuous socio-political climate – hence the slogan "revitalizing Buddhism through education" (*jiaoyu xingjiao* 教育興教). Despite their humble scale and (for some) their short life, the modern Buddhist academies produced a community of student-monks who imagined a more

engaged role for Buddhism in every aspect of life in the new republic. In their vision, once rid of superstition and other undesirable elements – such as the closed-minded, unproductive conservative monks – Buddhism as a rational and global moral religion would be essential to the project of strengthening the Chinese nation. I intend to show that the activism and performing of citizenship by these student-monks were aimed at structurally connecting Buddhism to the nation-state, which is best described by the slogan "saving the nation with Buddhism" (*fojiao jiuguo* 佛教救國). This is how, I argue, the narrative ends where it begins – with the collective project of national salvation. But this time the Buddhists, armed with the legal, nationalist, and secularist rhetoric first imposed by the state, were negotiating with and resisting secularization and demanded a space in the public sphere.

Chapter 1 of this dissertation is an overview of Buddhism in the socially and politically tumultuous period between the last years of Qing and the early Republic. It focuses on the introduction of the new categories of religion and superstition, the growing interest in Buddhism among late Qing intellectuals, the proposal for a *miaochan xingxue* campaign, and the Buddhists' optimism when the new republic was founded. This chapter shows how the Buddhists responded to a shifting mode of interaction with the state. I argue that, contrary to the secularization thesis, the state's new mode of management and control of the religious sphere in fact opened up a discursive space for young and otherwise marginalized reform-minded Buddhists to pursue their vision for a renewed faith in modern China.

The second chapter in this study documents the history of modern Buddhist education in China, which I divide into three general stages: 1) the Sangha Education Societies (*seng jiaoyu hui* 僧教育會) that founded the various Buddhist schools (*sengxuetang* 僧學堂) between 1903-

1911; 2) Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage (Qihuan jingshe 祇洹精舍), which served as the prototype for modern Buddhist academies; and 3) the emergence of *foxueyuan* from the 1920s.

Although the *miaochan xingxue* of 1898 was regional in scope and had limited effect on temple property before the campaign was abandoned following the drastic end of the 1898 Reforms, it was resumed on a larger scale during the New Policy (*Xinzheng* 新政) period from 1901. It later intensified when a national school system was introduced in 1904 and the need to secure local financial resources increased.[46] The various *sengxuetang* founded between 1903 and 1911 are usually seen as a transitional and reactionary strategy on the part of the Buddhists to avoid confiscation that had a negligible impact in the overall development of modern Buddhist education. While I agree that although the Buddhists probably founded schools as a strategy to preserve temple property, this is a period that marked the transformation of the Buddhism-state relationship in which Chinese Buddhists had to learn a new way of organizing themselves in their interaction and negotiation with the state as it was being created. Furthermore, this period is also significant as it witnessed a nascent student-monk identity in formation.

Compared to the early Sangha Education Societies, it is probably easier to establish that Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage represents a milestone in the history of modern Chinese Buddhist education. With a curriculum dedicated exclusively to the scholastic study of Buddhist history, texts, and doctrine, the Jetavana Hermitage also produced for Chinese Buddhism some of the most prominent Buddhist teachers in the twentieth century, including Taixu and Ouyang Jingwu. I would only add that beside these achievements, the legacy of the Jetavana Hermitage lies in its innovative model of combining a Buddhist center of learning with publishing. As we

[46] The civil service examination would be abolished in 1905.

will come to see later, the impact of this model proved to be far-reaching in the development of modern Chinese Buddhism.

Founded by Taixu in Wuchang in 1922, the Wuchang Buddhist Academy was the model for new-style Buddhist schools in China. Aimed exclusively at the training of clergy, it represented a new way to imagine learning in Chinese Buddhism. With a comprehensive curriculum that included both Buddhist and secular subjects and a modern pedagogy that utilized textbook and blackboard, Wuchang and other *foxueyuan* became the location in which a new collective identity of student-monks emerged. Chapter 3 takes as its case study the institutional history of the Wuchang Buddhist Academy and closes with an analysis of the Wuchang legacy.

I identify three paradigm shifts, associated with the Wuchang Academy in particular and *foxueyuan* in general, that concretely influenced the practice of modern Chinese Buddhism. First, the vertical teacher-student dynamic at Wuchang led to a new understanding of the traditional master-disciple relationship in Buddhism. Teachers at Wuchang, rather than having absolute authority and responsibility, provided the ideological basis for its students' undertaking. This ideological underpinning was the basis for the second paradigm shift, namely, the construction of a new horizontal relationship among the students, which eventually manifested in the emergence of a student-monk collective identity. Lastly, Buddhist reformers and educators justified the founding of the new *foxueyuan* as a renewal rather than departure from the traditional public monastery (*conglin* 叢林) training. This reformulation of orthodoxy – the third paradigm shift – reinforced the role of the Buddhist academies and their students in the institutional transformation of Chinese Buddhism in the twentieth century.

In Chapter 4, I examine the ways in which the Chinese Buddhists crafted a distinctive form of citizenship by combining various dimensions of the existing discourse on legal rights,

political participation, and civic obligation, with re-interpretations of Buddhist soteriology to formulate the expression of a national identity firmly grounded in the language of Buddhism. I argue that in performing the collective student-monk identity, educated monks sought to develop their own notion of rights and obligations as members of the political community through their engagement and constant negotiation with the state and its numerous religious policies. Therefore, the Buddhist academies, the student-monks, and the various Buddhist periodicals were instrumental in the formation of an imagined community that was location for the creation of Buddhist citizenship in the twentieth century.

Chapter One
Buddhism in Early Twentieth Century China

In China, the twentieth century opened with a series of unprecedented challenges faced by both the ruling and the ruled. The 2000-year old dynastic political system was on the verge of collapse. The 1911 Revolution that overthrew the Qing dynasty was followed by attempts to found a republican state. Amid foreign threats, wars, and a deep sense of moral decay, Chinese intellectuals and reformers sought to define a Chinese nation through vastly diverse and often conflicting ideas of culture, history, and race.[47] The themes of reform, progress, and renewal hence permeated the works of intellectuals of the day.[48] Often conceptualized under the rhetoric of modernization, nation-building efforts and experiments that marked the first half of the twentieth century led to the politicization of almost every aspect of society including religion, which was seen as a hindrance for China's march toward modernity. The challenge faced by religion in this conjuncture was twofold. On the one hand, with imperial patronage gone with the demise of the last dynasty, the Buddhist and Daoist institutions had to find new ways for their survival. On the other hand, faced with the increasingly hostile religious policies of the republican government, religious leaders had to redefine their place in society vis-à-vis the secular nation-state.

This chapter offers a synopsis of the socio-political space which religion, specifically Buddhism, occupied in China in the first half of the twentieth century. It begins with an overview

[47] For the lives and ideas of prominent Chinese intellectuals during this "era of transition" – including Kang Youwei 康有爲 (1858-1927), Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929), Zhang Binglin 章炳麟 (1868-1936), and Liu Shipei 劉師培 (1884-1919) – see Hao Chang, *Chinese Intellectuals in Crisis: Search for Order and Meaning, 1890-1911* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

[48] For a comprehensive survey of reform and revolution in China in the twentieth century, see Peter Zarrow, *China in War and Revolution, 1895-1949* (New York: Routledge, 2005). It is interesting to note, as pointed out by Zarrow, that most Chinese did not conceptualize 1901 as the beginning of a new era marked by the beginning of a new century. According to the Chinese system of recording time in terms of imperial reigns, 1901, for example, was the 27th year of the reign of the Guangxu emperor.

of the state of Buddhism in late Qing, when new categories for imagining religion, such as religion and superstition, were created. Following Talal Asad's assertion that both "secular" and "religion" are ideological constructs that mutually generate each other in the process of the expansion of post-Enlightenment modernity,[49] I then look at the efforts of Buddhist leaders, both lay and monastic, in forging a new Buddhism-state relation in the midst of various antireligious and antisuperstition campaigns. The Buddhists' project aimed at not only ensuring the survival of Buddhism, but also at negotiating a place for Buddhism vis-à-vis the state in the newly founded republic. In fact, the Buddhist response to the state's changing attitude and policies towards religion during this period can be seen as a typical example of a religion's resistance of modernity.[50] Contrary to the widely accepted notion that secularization leads to the inevitable decline in the social significance of religion, Buddhism in early twentieth century China demonstrated great vitality. This was exemplified by a flourishing publishing industry, burgeoning lay Buddhism, and cosmopolitan Buddhist cultural practice. The multitude of new developments in Chinese Buddhism has attracted much scholarly attention recently, to the extent that they are often considered signs for a revival of Buddhism in modern China. This chapter also aims to revisit the revival rhetoric in the hopes of addressing the paradox in which Buddhism in this period faced harsh political repression on the one hand, while experiencing intriguing creativity and flourishing on the other.

In doing so, I follow a thematic rather than chronological approach to demonstrate that there was much continuity in the religious policies under different governments in early

[49] Talal Asad, "Religion, Nation-State, Secularism," 192.

[50] I have argued elsewhere that modern Buddhist social engagement is a structured anti-secularism, in which Buddhists resist the modern tendency to restrict religion to a private, interior experience. See Jessica Main and Rongdao Lai, "Rethinking 'Socially Engaged Buddhism' as an Analytical Category," *Eastern Buddhist Special Issue on Engaged Buddhism* (forthcoming).

twentieth century China, and to some extent, up to the present day. In other words, the various antireligious, antisuperstition, and *miaochan xingxue* campaigns that are characteristic of the 1920s and 30s trace their origins to the formation period of late Qing political discourse. I argue that, first, the Chinese Buddhists were not just passive subjects in this period of intense interference by the state. They, like all new social groups such as women, workers, youth, and merchants, actively demanded a political voice while adapting to the changing political landscape. Second, state management and reorganization of the religious sphere opened up a discursive space for young and otherwise marginalized reform-minded Buddhists to pursue their vision for a renewed faith in modern China. The impact of their numerous reform initiatives in shaping Buddhist discourse on citizenship and political participation will be discussed in Chapter 4.

A Tumultuous Century

China's nineteenth century is often labeled the century of dynastic decline. Issues that loomed larger and larger included defeat in wars with foreign powers, the expansion of Western imperialism in the country, and numerous local uprisings, including one which would eventually overthrow Manchu rule. For close to two millennia China had considered itself the Central Kingdom (*zhongguo* 中國) and the land it ruled was "all under Heaven" (*tianxia* 天下). It wasn't that China had not seen invading foreign powers in its history, but it seemed always able to incorporate them into the Chinese cultural world. This sense of cultural pride and confidence deeply rooted in the glories of the past was seriously challenged by the arrival of Western sea powers in the mid-nineteenth century, when the country was confronted with Western views in which China was but one among many competing states in the world.

Crises confronting the once powerful Qing Empire culminated in its humiliating defeat by Great Britain in the First Opium War (1839-1842) that marked the beginning of the treaty system in which China was forced to open its doors to imperial powers. Western merchants and missionaries began to settle in foreign concessions in a growing number of treaty ports where they enjoyed extraterritorial privileges. For Qing rulers as well as scholar-officials, the most urgent task for China was to find a solution to restore its vitality to compete with the foreign powers that had severely compromised its sovereignty. The historian Joseph Levenson has accordingly described this radical shift in the conception of national identity as the transition from "culturalism to nationalism," when leading intellectuals debated about the necessary changes to achieve the above-mentioned goal.[51]

The Self-Strengthening Movement (*ziqiang yundong* 自強運動) in the 1870s was promoted by officials who rationalized the adoption of Western technical knowledge by stressing its practical benefits. They argued that Western means (*yong* 用), especially military and ship-building technologies, needed to be learned in order to defend the essence of traditional Chinese culture (*ti* 體) from being destroyed by foreign powers.[52] Although the movement did not call for any institutional changes and was mostly provincial in scope, its supporters were able to build arsenals and shipyards, translate Western works on science and technology into Chinese, and establish mines and telegraph lines. However, whatever progress that led to any optimism was shattered by China's defeat in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895). The defeat in Korea by Japan, traditionally a tributary state to China, led radical reformers to believe that self-strengthening

[51]Joseph Levenson, *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate: A Trilogy*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 104. See also Luo Zhitian, *Quanshi zhuanyi: jindai Zhongguo de sixiang, shehui yu xueshu* 權勢轉移：近代中國的思想、社會與學術 (Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 1999).

[52] Levenson, *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate*, 59-75.

efforts of the past three decades had largely failed. They argued that more extensive and thorough reforms were urgently needed to save China from eventual demise. Between June and September 1898, after continuous petitioning by Kang Youwei and his protégé Liang Qichao, the Guangxu 光緒 emperor (1871-1908) launched a series of reforms known as the Wuxu Reforms (*wuxu bianfa* 戊戌變法).[53] It was a program aimed at radically transforming China's educational, economic, political, military, and cultural institutions. The reforms ended in a *coup d'état,* with Guangxu's aunt, the Empress Dowager Cixi (1835-1908), resuming authority. Most reform edicts promulgated by Guangxu were rescinded, leaders of the reform movements, including Tan Sitong譚嗣同(1865-1898), were executed, and those lucky enough to escape, such as Kang and Liang, fled the country.[54]

At the heart of the 1898 Reforms was an educational plan which would revamp the Imperial Examination system and establish a national school system. Reformers including Zhang Zhidong 張之洞 (1837-1901) and Kang Youwei proposed the expropriation of religious assets and landholding to support the new education system. This "Build Schools with Temple Property" (*miaochan xingxue* 廟產興學) movement, which will be explored below, had limited effect on institutional Buddhism in 1898 due to the short life of the reforms. But it was revived in 1901 during the New Policy Reforms (*xinzheng* 新政) and became especially widespread when the civil service examination system was abolished altogether in 1905. In addition, as the *miaochan xingxue* movement unfolded at the time when a new political discourse on religion was being produced, use of religious property for educational goals continued to be part of the official

[53] Also commonly known as the Hundred Days' Reform (*bairi weixin* 百日維新) – it lasted 103 days.

[54] Luke S. K. Kwong, *A Mosaic of the Hundred Days: Personalities, Politics, and Ideas of 1898* (Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1984).

religious policy in subsequent regimes. Lastly, although its devastation to Buddhism was sometimes exaggerated, *miaochan xingxue* provided a vital mobilization tool in the formulation of the "defending Buddhism" (*hujiao* 護教) rhetoric. It also prompted a series of Buddhist educational reforms led by prominent monastic and lay leaders such as Yang Wenhui, Taixu, and Ouyang Jingwu.

Buddhism in the Late Qing

Many scholars of Chinese Buddhism subscribe to the notion that post-Tang Buddhism fell into a state of decline after experiencing immense intellectual creativity and sophistication for a few centuries as seen in the founding of exegetical schools such as Tiantai 天台, Huayan 華嚴, and Faxiang 法相 – a period of development that some identify as the "Golden Age" of Chinese Buddhism.[55] The gradual trend of decline, according to this narrative, was finally reversed when lay and monastic elites started to bring about a "revival" in the late nineteenth century.[56] However, for there to be a revival, there has to be evidence that the tradition has gone through a prior period of deterioration – which is usually not convincingly cited by those very same scholars. For example, Sin-Wai Chan opens his chapter on Buddhism in the nineteenth century by stating, matter-of-factly, that Buddhism in this period was "continuing the decline begun in the late Ming dynasty." But instead of alluding to the corruption and decay that supposedly took place, he goes on to discuss the patronage granted (to both Han and Tibetan Buddhism) by several Qing emperors, as well as the completion of the Qianlong Tripitaka (*Qianlong*

[55] See Kenneth K. S Chen, *Buddhism in China, a Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).

[56] Shi Dongchu 釋東初, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi* 中國佛教近代史 (Taipei: Zhonghua fojiao wenhuaguan, 1974), 91–124.

dazangjing 乾隆大藏經 or *longzang* 龍藏).[57] In a similar vein, the Chinese scholar Wang Yonghui describes the state of Buddhism in the Ming-Qing period as "entering a state of decay but…continued to exhibit signs of growth." He also points out that the number of monks and nuns was actually growing in the Qing.[58] Sweeping, self-contradictory statements as such urge one to inevitably wonder: what exactly constitutes "decline" in these scholars' assessment of Buddhism?

The problem with any attempt for a meaningful response to the above question lies in the very fact that Qing Buddhism remains an understudied area in the field, although research on the topic has been growing recently. In general, we can say with certainty that there was much continuity in the religious policies from the Ming. The Qing court exerted tight control on religious activities in the empire, including the construction of temples and the ordination of clergy. For both Buddhism and Daoism, an appointed monk official maintained a registry of ordained clergy (Senglusi 僧錄司 and Daolusi 道錄司 respectively). Welch has observed that although there were laws in the Qing codes concerning monastic behavior, state control of the *sangha* was weak. Others blame the decline in the quality of monks on the laxity of government control.[59] But for the most part, scholars cannot seem to even agree on whether the restriction on ordination (one had to obtain official permission before being ordained) was harmful or beneficial for Buddhism, as both its enactment and annulment by Qianlong in 1774 are cited as factors leading to the deterioration in the Chinese *sangha*.

---

[57] Sin-wai Chan, *Buddhism in Late Ch'ing Political Thought* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1985), 13–14.

[58] Wang Yonghui 楊永會, *Zhongguo fojiao sengtuan fazhan ji qi guanli yanjiu* 中國佛教僧團發展及其管理研究 (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2003), 149.

[59] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 134-137; Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 33-34.

In addition, Tibetan Buddhism was lavishly patronized by Qing emperors. Traditionally, this is understood as a political move to maintain peaceful relations with the Mongols and Tibetans. Recently, however, scholars have begun to challenge that view by suggesting that as an important component in the creation of a distinct Manchu identity, Buddhism was very much part of the emperors' political ideology.[60] However, there is no record of Han Buddhism being persecuted or marginalized as a result of such patronage. In contrast, several Qing emperors are said to have shown deep insight into Chan practice and much reverence for Chan masters.[61] Citing Kangxi's 康熙 (1654-1722) visits to the Wutai Mountain (*Wutaishan* 五臺山) as an example, Natalie Köhle has also shown that Qing emperors continued to patronize monasteries of the Chinese traditions.[62] Epigraphic materials and gazetteers also show that the image of the Qing emperors as emanations of Manjusri was carefully propagated to the Chinese audience, and that Kangxi made equal donations and offerings to Tibetan and Chinese monasteries on Wutaishan. In other words, the "decline" thesis is difficult to sustain.

In a more nuanced account of the "revival" of Buddhism in modern China, Holmes Welch is uncertain, if not pessimistic, on whether the changes and developments he documents can be considered a "revival." In the conclusion of his monumental book on modern Chinese Buddhism, Welch admits to the difficulty in quantitatively measuring the overall health of the tradition based on available sources. Yet in assessing the state of Buddhism in the modern period he raises several qualitative questions, based on the assumption of a high level of doctrinal sophistication evident in Tang Buddhism and moral "purity" that was supposed to be upheld by

[60] Patricia Berger, *Empire of Emptiness Buddhist Art and Political Authority in Qing China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003).

[61] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 29.

[62] Natalie Köhle, "Why Did the Kangxi Emperor Go to Wutai Shan?: Patronage, Pilgrimage, and the Place of Tibetan Buddhism at the Early Qing Court," *Late Imperial China*, Vol. 29 No. 1 (2008): 84-87.

the *sangha*. And his answers to the questions are negative. More importantly, he attributes the growth in the Buddhist publishing industry, a burgeoning lay Buddhism, advances in Buddhist education, as well as Taixu's numerous reform efforts, to a secularizing trend within Chinese Buddhism:

> Most of what occurred was not a restoration of the past, but a series of innovations; not a religious revival, but a redirection from the religious to the secular…It concealed certain trends which, if they continued, would have meant not a growing vitality for Buddhism but its eventual demise as a living religion.[63]

His remarks above clearly show Welch's own bias toward what should constitute authentic Buddhist practice – any changes or innovations are therefore considered deviations and betrayals of the original message of the religion. In arguing against the opinion that Buddhism in the Song had lost all its vitality and entered into a stage of decline that lasted until the late imperial period, Peter Gregory points to three factors that led to the formation of the "decline" rhetoric: the rhetoric within the Chan tradition; the influence of nationalistic sectarian Japanese scholarship on modern Buddhist Studies; and the moral discourse of Chinese historiography and Confucian prejudice.[64] All three are evident in the scholarly and self-understanding of modern Chinese Buddhism. Furthermore, I argue that the Chinese Buddhists' self-understanding of the history of Buddhism closely resembles that of the repetitive dynastic cycles. In other words, the rhetoric of decline should be read as part of the repetitive construction of the history of Buddhism as "the

[63] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 264.

[64] Peter Gregory and Daniel Getz, *Buddhism in the Sung* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 3.

history of the constant movement between decline and revival."[65] It therefore legitimized the reform, reformulation, and reconfiguration of Buddhist doctrine and institution.

The questions of decline and revival aside, Chinese Buddhism in the early twentieth century did face severe challenges from influences both within and outside China, and it went through a vibrant period of adaptation, negotiation, and re-invention amid the new socio-political realities. In addition to the harsh criticism and negative portrayal by Christian missionaries who were aggressively proselytizing in China,[66] Chinese Buddhists in the nineteenth century also struggled to recover from the devastation of the Taiping 太平 Rebellion (1851-1864). The Taiping movement, which was led by Hong Xiuquan 洪秀全 (1814-1864), who claimed to be the son of God and younger brother of Jesus, was perhaps the most devastating rebellion in the Qing. Fueled by a messianic religious ideology, Hong and his followers envisioned the founding of a theocratic state. During the fifteen years of the rebellion, his army captured large parts of the Lower Yangzi region. Before it was finally crushed by the Qing government, millions, including Buddhist and Daoist monks, were killed, and most temples and shrines were destroyed or desecrated.[67] Perhaps in this sense, it is justifiable for the Chinese Buddhists to speak of a decline, or even an "end of dharma" (*mofa* 末法) age.[68]

---

[65] Blackburn, *Buddhist Learning and Textual Practice in Eighteenth-century Lankan Monastic*, 9.

[66] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, chapter 11; Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 35-40; Eric Reinders, *Borrowed Gods and Foreign Bodies: Christian Missionaries Imagine Chinese Religion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), especially chapters 6 & 7.

[67] For an impressive study on the rise and fall of the Taiping Movement, see Stephen Platt, *Autumn in the Heavenly Kingdom: China, the West, and the Epic Story of the Taiping Civil War* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2012). For an account of the devastation suffered by Buddhism, see Huang Yunxi 黃運喜, *Zhongguo fojiao jindai fanan yanjiu, 1898-1937* 中國佛教近代法難研究 (Taipei: Fajie chubanshe, 2006), 66–74.

[68] Jan Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline* (Berkeley, Calif.: Asian Humanities Press, 1991).

Toward the end of the century, just as the Buddhists were rebuilding their temples and monasteries destroyed by the Taiping armies,[69] their religion faced another crisis. This time, it was a top-down, and at times hostile, recategorization of the religious sphere as well as the *miaochan xingxue* movement that forcefully linked religion to the goal of pursuing progress into modernity for the entire nation. When terms such as "religion" and "superstition" became legitimate categories in the political discourse, religious leaders were compelled to position themselves and their religion in regard to this vocabulary. This has brought about a lasting impact on Chinese religious life, which I will discuss in greater detail below. I argue that, partially, the revival thesis arose from this repositioning, when not only a "laity" was created in Buddhism,[70] but the monastic community also found new ways to re-imagine their identity vis-à-vis the nation-state.

The Invention of "Religion"

> 国家在对待宗教信仰和迷信有明确的政策界限。国家实行宗教信仰自由政策，保障一切正常的宗教活动，坚决打击一切利用宗教进行的违法犯罪活动，以及各种不属于宗教范围的、危害国家利益和人民生命财产的迷信活动。
>
> The state has clear and definite policy limits in its treatment of religion and superstition. [It] implements freedom of religion in safeguarding all normal religious activities, [but] resolutely cracks down on any criminal activities in the name of religion, and various

[69] Xueyu cites the massive and lavish rebuilding projects of the largest monasteries after the Taiping rebellion as another sign that Buddhism in the late Qing was not in a state of degeneration as many scholars have claimed. See Xueyu 學愚, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi: kang Ri zhanzheng shiqi de Zhongguo fojiao* 佛教、暴力與民族主義：抗日戰爭時期的中國佛教 (Hong Kong: Zhongwen daxue chubanshe, 2011), 42.

[70] Brooks Jessup, "The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920-1956," PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2010.

> superstitious activities that exist beyond the limits of religion, as well as those which endanger national interest and people's lives and property.[71]

Much can be debated about the Chinese Communist Party's proclaimed policy on religion. I will just point out that a seemingly objective statement by an avowedly atheist state is in and by itself a *religious* statement. But my intention here is to highlight the ongoing struggles in the Chinese state's efforts to define, manage, and control religion throughout the twentieth and well into the twenty-first centuries. In fact, a proper understanding of the conflicts and contestations between religion and the state in modern China will not be possible without a wider context in which religion is created as an autonomous category in Chinese modernist secularism.

The idea of "religion" – people making a "personal choice" to a set of "religious beliefs" and have "exclusive affiliation" to a religious organization – was a very foreign idea in late imperial China. However, this does not mean we cannot speak of a coherent and all-encompassing religious life in traditional China. The three institutionalized religions are Buddhism, Confucianism, and Daoism, but there were only a very small number of clergy and lay people who identified exclusively with one of the three religions.[72] The three institutionalized religions remained distinct but often cooperated in rituals and devotions. The rest of the population practiced what C.K. Yang calls "diffused religion" associated with various local worshipping communities ranging from family and lineage halls, to communal village temples,

---

[71] "Differentiating Religion and Superstition," accessed Jan 22, 2012, http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64107/65708/66067/66082/4468773.html. This quote is taken from the *News of the Communist Party China*, the official website for the CCP to announce and interpret its various policies.

[72] Chen, Hsi-yuan. "Confucianism Encounters Religion: The Formation of Religious Discourse and the Confucian Movement in Modern China." PhD Diss., Harvard University, 1999; Yong Chen, *Confucianism as Religion: Controversies and Consequences* (Boston: Brill, 2013).

and temples dedicated to local heroes and deities.[73] These communities often employed monks or ritual specialists to perform rituals that very often drew heavily from the ritual and textual resources of all three religions. Later scholars simply refer to this "pluralistic and internally contested system" as "Chinese religion."[74]

At the imperial level, mandated by Heaven (*tian*天) to rule, the emperor was expected to maintain or restore social and cosmic harmony through his ritual role. He regularly made sacrifices to Heaven, cosmic deities, and imperial ancestors listed in the registry of state sacrifices (*sidian* 祀典). Sovereignty was derived solely from the balance between human society and the cosmological order. It was therefore the emperor's moral obligation to protect and patronize orthodoxy (*zhengjiao* 正教) and to intervene and suppress "heterodoxy" (*xiejiao* 邪教) and improper cults (*yinci* 淫祠).[75] In the early 1900s, however, this dichotomous formulation (*zheng vs. xie*) in the management of religion based on Confucian moral righteousness shifted to one that saw "its claims rest on a declaration of universal scientific truth."[76] Heavily influenced by the Christian model, this shift would later prove to have tremendous repercussions for religious communities and politics in modern China. The reformist

[73] C.K. Yang. *Religion in Chinese Society: A Study of Contemporary Social Functions of Religion and Some of Their Historical Factors* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 296-300.

[74] Vincent Goossaert, "1898: The Beginning of the End for Chinese Religion?" *The Journal of Asian Studies.* 65, no. 2 (2006): 310.

[75] For the complex relationship between the imperial court and local elites in ritual and state standardization, and the ongoing scholarly debate regarding the importance of ritual over belief in late imperial China, see James Watson, "Standardizing the Gods: The Promotion of T'ien Hou ('Empress of Heaven') Along the South China Coast, 960–1960," in *Popular Culture in Late Imperial China*, ed. David Johnson, Andrew Nathan, and Evelyn Rawski (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); Donald Sutton, "Ritual, Cultural Standardization, and Orthopraxy," *Modern China* 33, no.1 (2007): 3-21. For a history of the terms "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy" in China, see Kwang-Ching Liu and Richard Shek, "Introduction," in *Heterodoxy in Late Imperial China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004), 1-28; B. J. ter Haar, *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History* (New York: E.J. Brill, 1992).

[76] Rebecca Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes: Religion and the Politics of Chinese Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009), 9.

Liang Qichao, who fled to Japan with his teacher Kang Youwei after the failed Wuxu Reform, was among the first Chinese intellectuals to propagate a modernist discourse on religion. New words, usually coined by the Japanese during the Meiji Restoration (1868-1912) and (re)introduced to China, began to appear in Chinese intellectuals' discussion of religion, usually revolved around the relationship between religion and the state.[77]

The most important among these words included "religion" (*zongjiao* 宗教; Jap: *shūkyō*) and "superstition" (*mixin* 迷信; Jap: *meishin*).[78] The term *shūkyō* was coined by Meiji thinkers as the translation of the Western term "religion" to fulfill demands of American and European powers for proselytizing rights.[79] These neologisms are what Lydia Liu calls "return graphic loans" – terms coined in Japanese from classical Chinese characters that were readopted in China.[80] Yet these cross-cultural translations were not simply linear conversions of concepts from a guest to a host language. They were sites for negotiation and often new meanings and values were injected into the translation process. According to Anthony Yu, the term *zongjiao* in medieval China referred to Buddhism. He argues that this probably influenced the Meiji thinkers' decision in adopting the compound to translate the generic Western concept of "religion."[81] However, Francesca Tarocco, citing the example of the German missionary Karl Friedrich

[77] The importance of Japanese mediation in this process is noted by Chinese scholars. See, for example, various articles in Ge Zhaoguang, *Xichao you dongfeng: wanqing minchu sixiang, zongjiao yu xueshu shijiang* (Shanghai: Shanghai gu ji chu ban she, 2006).

[78] Yang, "Introduction," in *Chinese Religiosities*, 11-19. On the formation of these neologisms in Meiji Japan, see James Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution* (Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993), 42.

[79] Janine Sawada, *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004), 103.

[80] Lydia Liu, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity--China, 1900-1937* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995).

[81] Anthony Yu, *State and Religion in China: Historical and Textual Perspectives* (Chicago: Open Court, 2005), 5-15.

August Gutzlaff, who described (in Chinese) the Papal State in Italy as a "*jiao-zong*" state, posits that the term was first induced with new meanings in nineteenth century China rather than Japan.[82] One thing that is missing in Tarocco's argument is the semantic link between the compounds "*zongjiao* 宗教" and "*jiaozong* 教宗." *Jiaozong* literally means "patriarch of a religion (*jiao*)" and remains the designated Chinese translation for the Roman pontiff to this day. Nonetheless, she is right in highlighting the complexity in the cross-cultural conceptual translations and reciprocities in the process that took place between modern Japan and China.[83]

A comprehensive investigation of the origin of these neologisms in the modern Chinese lexicon is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but suffice it to say that, by the first years of the twentieth century, they had become increasingly popular categories to define and classify religious practices in China. A religion, in this new context, was understood to be a church-like system of doctrine separate from other realms of society, while "superstition" replaced "heterodoxy" as the unacceptable practices harmful to society that ought to be eradicated. This bifurcation laid the groundwork for all antisuperstition campaigns in the decades to come, when "whatever is not grounded in and strictly limited to the spiritual and moral self-perfection delineated by the theological scriptures of a world religion (Confucianism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism)" became the target of the state in cultural reform.[84]

With the introduction of the above-mentioned neologisms came another shift – the association of religious reforms with national progress. Although the post-reformation Christian

[82] Francesca Tarocco, "The Making of 'Religion' in Modern China," in *Religion, Language and Power*, eds. Mary Searle-Chatterjee and Nile Green (New York: Routledge, 2008), 45.

[83] For a thorough study of the "triangulated translation" of Japanese categories of knowledge into modern Chinese, see Liu, *Translingual Practice; The Clash of Empires: The Invention of China in Modern World Making* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004).

[84] Goossaert and Palmer, *Religious Question in Modern China*, 51.

influence is evident in the adaptation and evolution of concepts such as *zongjiao* and *mixin* in China, Goossaert has argued convincingly that such was not a project of atheist vs. believer, but a *religious* one in which intellectuals proposed competing religious visions in answering the question as to how could China enter the modern world of nations.[85] A telling example is Kang Youwei's advocacy of a national religion (*guojiao* 國教) based on elements of Confucianism that would be called "Confucian religion" (*Kongjiao* 孔教). In his opinion, this would transform Confucianism into the equivalent to Christianity in China – with a state-sanctioned but free-standing church system, whose membership was open to all citizens, based on the worship of Confucius.[86]

In 1902, Liang Qichao published several lengthy pieces in *Xinmin congbao* 新民叢報 (*New People Miscellany*) where he systematically expounded his views on religion, especially its relation to politics.[87] His attitude evolved from denouncing all Western religions as superstition to clearly distinguishing religion from superstition:

> 西人所謂宗教者, 專指迷信宗仰而言…故奉其教者莫要起於信…起信者, 禁人之懷疑, 窒人思想自由也。
>
> What Westerners call religion refers specifically to superstition and veneration … Therefore, to receive their religion one must develop faith … To have faith is to suppress doubt and suffocate freedom of thought.[88]

[85] Goossaert, "1898," 311.

[86] Hsi-yuan Chen, "Confucianism Encounters Religion," chapter 2.

[87] Liang founded the newspaper when he was in exile in Japan. It ran from 1902-1907.

[88] Liang Qichao, "Baojiao fei suo yi zun kong lun 保教非所以尊孔論," YBSH, vol. 1:9:52.

A few months later, he modified his view and opined that there was a clear demarcation between religion and superstition, and that intellectuals had to take a harsh stand against the latter:

> 宗教貴信, 信有正信，有迷信…宗教常與迷信相為緣故。一有迷信，則真理必掩於半面; 迷信相續，則人智遂不可得進，世運遂不可得進。故言學術者不得不與迷信為敵。
>
> Religion values faith, [but] there is right faith and superstition … Superstition often accompanies religion. Once there is superstition, truth cannot prevail. When superstition persists, progress in neither human knowledge nor the nation is possible. Therefore intellectuals also surely have to confront superstition.[89]

Aside from his role in popularizing concepts such as "superstition" in public dicourse, Liang also contributed an essential idea to the political campaigns to reform religion later, which is that religion could and should be stripped of harmful superstition.[90] Furthermore, his view on religion also shifted from speaking approvingly of a Confucian religion to later opposing the idea and promoting a role for Buddhism in building a modern nation-state. In her detailed study of the different stages in Liang's attitude toward religion and the origins of his usage of the term *zongjiao*, Bastid-Bruguière argues that Liang was not enthusiastic about Kang's project to create a state Confucian religion as religion did not become the focus of Liang's career until much later in his life.[91] It should be noted, however, that Liang published "On the Relationship between

---

[89] Liang Qichao, "Lun zongjiaojia yu zhexuejia zhi changduan deshi 論宗教家與哲學家之長短得失," YBSH, vol. 1:9:49.

[90] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 8; Deng Zimei, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 74.

[91] On the shift in Liang's opinion on religion as well as his eventual rejection of Kang's religious project, see Marian Bastid-Bruguière, "*Liang Qichao yu Zhongguo zongjiao wenti* 梁啟超與中國宗教問題," in *Liang Qichao, Mingzhi Riben, Xifang* 梁啟超，明治日本，西方 (Liang Qichao, Meiji Japan, The West), ed. Hasama Naoki (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2001), 410-457; Hao Chang, *Liang Ch'i-Ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890-1907* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971); Mori Noriko, "Liang Qichao, Late-

Buddhism and Governance," in which he enthusiastically affirmed the positive role and superiority of Buddhism in developing a strong nation, merely three years later, in 1905. In a section titled "Faith in Buddhism is rational, not superstition" (佛教之信仰乃正信而非迷信), he presented Buddhism as a rational religion grounded in an empirical meditative tradition:

> 至如各教者, 則皆以起信為第一義…佛教之最大綱領曰悲智雙修,自初發心以迄成佛, 恆以轉迷成悟為一大事業謂也…佛教之所以信而不迷, 正坐是也。
>
> All religions take faith as their first principle…The core teaching of Buddhism is the combined practice of wisdom and compassion. Transforming illusion into awakening is the main undertaking from the initial determination to seek enlightenment until attaining Buddhahood … Meditative practice is the reason why Buddhism is a faith without superstition.[92]

In discussing the most urgent task of governance in China, Liang affirmed the positive relation between religion and politics by suggesting that faith is required in governing a modern nation, and yet faith has to be grounded in a religion. He distinguished between rational faith (*zhixin*智信) in Buddhism and superstition in other religions and listed several other strengths that set Buddhism apart from them: the selfless cultivation of the Bodhisattva path; Buddhism promoted the common good, not just individual good; it emphasized seeking salvation in this world rather than a pessimistic escapism; and Buddhism stressed equality and reliance on self-power. He believed that Buddhism could provide the moral and religious motivation for people to participate in nation-building. He even concluded by suggesting that India was colonized

---

Qing Buddhism, and Modern Japan" in Joshua A Fogel, *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao's Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China* (Berkeley: University of California Berkeley, Center for Chinese Studies, 2004), 223–243.

[92] Liang Qichao, "Lun fojiao yu qunzhi zhi guanxi 論佛教與群治之關係," YBSH, vol. 2:10:46.

because it stopped adhering to Buddhism![93] Intriguingly, as much as all other world religions, including Christianity, were considered unsuitable for China, the criteria for his assessment of religion were nonetheless based on the rhetoric of "Protestant Buddhism" that stressed rationality.[94]

As a precursor in the construction of a "Buddhist modernism" in China, Liang's definition for "superstition" is representative of a generation of Chinese intellectuals who were not necessarily anti-religion *per se*, but displayed a fervent antisuperstitious tendency. Antisuperstition became the rhetoric that incorporated Enlightenment ideals such as rationality, free choice, public morality, citizenship, and nationalism. Buddhism, in Sin-Wai Chan's words, served as a "theoretical weapon" for the intellectuals to tackle the problems of their time – it was a religion with abstruse philosophy when stripped of superstitions, and it was legitimately an integral part of indigenous Chinese culture.[95] This view was shared by the majority of sympathizers and reformers of Buddhism, especially those associated with the intellectual revival of Buddhism in modern China.[96] All in all, Buddhism was in vogue among Chinese intellectuals, from Kang Youwei to Tan Sitong, Zhang Taiyan, and Yang Wenhui, in the late Qing, as noted

[93] Ibid., 45-52.

[94] By "Protestant Buddhism" I am referring to both: (1) a specific understanding of Buddhism in late nineteenth century Europe that saw Buddhism, stripped of rituals and myth, as the epitome of the Enlightenment, and (2) similar understand of Buddhism adopted by Buddhist modernizers in Sri Lanka and other parts of Asia in protesting against colonization and Christian missionaries. See Richard Gombrich and Gananath Obeyesekere, *Buddhism Transformed: Religious Change in Sri Lanka* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988). For the impact of similar understanding of Buddhism on the formation of Buddhist Studies in the West, see Donald Lopez, *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism Under Colonialism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

[95] Chan, *Buddhism in Late Ch'ing Political Thought*, 156.

[96]Ma Tianxiang 麻天祥, *Wanqing foxue yu jindai shehui sichao* 晚清佛學與近代社會思潮 (Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 1992); Goldfuss, "Binding Sutras to Modernity." See also the various essays in *Journal of Chinese Religions*, no. 39 (2011).

by Liang.[97] But they did not adopt Buddhism without reformulating and re-orientating it – with an emphasis on elements that were deemed politically and culturally useful. They saw in Buddhism a philosophy that could free Chinese politics and society from the constraints of Confucianism – an alternative to provide China with a renewed morality. Buddhism was subsequently portrayed as a modern religion that was not just comparable to but surpassed Western philosophy, psychology, and science. In other words, the Buddhism incorporated into the political thoughts of modern Chinese intellectuals was one that was demythologized, detraditionalized, and psychologised.[98] Their project was closely tied to their concern for renewing the morality of the citizenry so that it could actively participate in nation-building. It was also indicative of their search for a religious patrimony that would both legitimize reform and contribute to the formulation of a Chinese national character.

Although they were appreciative of Buddhist teachings and philosophy, these Chinese elites were not uncritical of the Buddhist establishment. Liang Qichao, for example, predicted that, despite it being "badly tainted with the poison of superstition," Buddhism would always be an essential system of thought in Chinese society. However, whether it would be harmful or beneficial to society depended "solely on whether new Buddhists appear." He did not explicate his vision for a "new Buddhism." But one point was clear: Buddhism had to rid itself of

[97] Liang Qichao , "Qingdai xueshu gailun 清代學術概論," YBSH, vol. 8:73. Citing Mary Wright's critical assessment of the compatibility of modernity and Confucianism, Sin-Wai Chan argues that the surge in popularity of Buddhism among cultural elites in nineteenth-century China was closely linked to the collapse of Confucianism. I do not intend to engage with ongoing debate on the possibility of a Confucian modernity, but recognize the appeal of Buddhism, as an "indigenous cultural tradition," when Chinese intellectuals were searching for a culturally rooted solution to the challenges posed by Western imperialism in China. See Mary Wright, *The Last Stand of Chinese Conservatism; the T'ung-chih Restoration, 1862-1874* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1962); Chan, *Buddhism in Late Ching Political Thought*, 2 and 137.

[98] McMahan, *Buddhist Modernism*, 23.

superstition or even those who treated its teaching and philosophy with utmost respect would be "tongue-tied and afraid to discuss it anymore."[99]

Scholars of Chinese religion generally agree that the new discourses on religion were more devastating to popular religion (spirit mediums, healers, fortunetellers, local cults, etc.) than to the institutional religions.[100] But these discourses, with their superimposed significance in the interaction of the political and the religious, had undoubtedly compelled Chinese Buddhists to internalize them in responding to the changing political climate – whether in defending Buddhism against negative missionary representation of their religion or in protesting against anti-religious government policies. Moreover, perhaps not surprisingly, the most aggressive criticism was often articulated within Buddhism. The outspoken reformist monk Taixu was representative of such "intra-religious antisuperstition discourse."[101] His proposal for an overhaul of the Buddhist institution – through a reinterpretation of its doctrine, reorganization of the *sangha*, and redistribution of monastic property – would restore Buddhism to a pure, rational religious teaching, stripped of superstitious misinterpretations, and sustained by a professionally-trained clergy. Evidently, his reading of the prevalent religious discourse of his time constituted the foundation of his efforts in the creation of and negotiation with the new religious space in modern Chinese political discourse. Writing about his understanding of religion in 1929, years after Liang Qichao, Taixu had more or less amplified Liang's earlier views. On the relationship between Buddhism, religion, and science, he remarks that:

---

[99] Liang quoted in Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 29–30.

[100] Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Rebecca Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*.

[101] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 13.

> [佛教]但雖是宗教，卻沒有其他宗教所崇拜的神，或神話迷信，故又可說不是宗教。科學重在實際經驗，不落玄想，佛學亦是腳踏實地漸次修證，不尚空談。佛學所說者，胥為從實際經驗中得來…要皆淨智所見；故佛學非科學而亦是科學。
>
> Although [Buddhism] is a religion, it does not have gods or superstitions and mythologies as in other religions. In this way one can say that it is not a religion. Science emphasizes real experience and does not fall into fantasies. Buddhism, too, is about the gradual advancement of cultivation and realization. It does not esteem empty talk. All Buddhist teachings are based on real experience…seen through pure wisdom. Therefore, Buddhism is not science but is also science.[102]

Taixu was addressing ongoing issues in: 1) the antireligious and antisuperstition movements in the 1920s; and 2) his debate with Ouyang Jingwu regarding the role of Buddhist Studies in modern China, which will be attended to in the second-half of this chapter and chapter 3, respectively. Nonetheless, the passage above clearly shows his eagerness in adapting and incorporating the rhetoric of scientific rationalism in redefining Buddhism. This fixation on "science" even in religious discourse is also reflective how the rhetoric has been elevated to an ideology after the May Fourth Movement.[103] Erik Hammerstrom has correctly pointed out that the Buddhist elite, including Wang Xiaoxu 王小徐 (1875-1948), did not try to prove that Buddhism was science because that would lead to the self-defeating logical conclusion that science would "eventually obviate the need for Buddhism."[104] To Taixu, as to many Chinese

[102] Taixu, "Shenme shi foxue 什麼是佛學," TXQ 1:262.

[103] He Jianming, *Fofa guannian de jindai tiaoshi* 佛法觀念的近代調適 (Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 1998), 206.

[104] Erik Hammerstrom, "Science and Buddhist Modernism in Early 20th Century China: The Life and Works of Wang Xiaoxu." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 39 (2011): 7.

intellectuals of his time, the prevalence of the discourse on science was actually good for Buddhism. It helped demonstrate the rationality and superiority of Buddhism.

Taixu's approach in negotiating a place for Buddhism in modern China was a pragmatic one: Buddhism had to modify its teaching according to the needs of its time (*qiji* 契機). [105] He denied that such was the approach of an opportunist but rather, it was in line with the Buddha's original teaching. Acknowledging that Chinese society in modern times was considerably different from that of the earlier age dues to external influences on politics, religion, science, and so on, Buddhism could no longer fulfill society's need as a belief system.[106] His Buddhism for Human Life (*rensheng fojiao*人生佛教) was this-worldly, practical, and action-oriented. He argued that for Buddhism to remain relevant in the modern world, it should play a *visible* role in society. As China entered the global era, Buddhism needed to change to remain relevant.[107]

This inclination is most discernible in post-war Buddhism in Taiwan, where Buddhists are actively engaging in social welfare, education, global outreach, and environmentalism. While I agree that there should be a more nuanced reading of the socio-political circumstances in Taiwan that gave rise to Buddhist social engagement on the island rather than simplistically attributing all modernization efforts to Taixu, his role in promoting this vision is unmistakable. Taixu's this-worldly Buddhism often met with opposition from both within and outside of the Buddhist community. One interesting example is Liang Shuming 梁漱溟 (1893-1988). Liang argued that Buddhism was a religion of ultimate transcendence and, therefore, could not and should not be reformed. He criticized Taixu for compromising the fundamental spirit of

[105] Luo Tongbing, *Taixu dui Zhongguo fojiao xiandaihua daolu de jueze* 太虚对中国佛教现代化道路的抉择 (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2003), 6.

[106] Taixu, "Jianshe shiying shidai zhi zhongguo fojiao 建设適應時代之中國佛教," TXQ 18:2.

[107] Yinshun, TQN, 41.

Buddhism, which focused on life beyond this world, in proposing reforms aimed at changing this world.[108]

By the 1930s, Chinese Buddhists, at least the reform-minded ones, seem to have firmly established the rhetoric that projected Buddhism as the epitome of rational faith. It would replace Christianity – which was criticized both for being uncivilized for its belief in a creator God, and for condoning wars that would lead to the eventual destruction of the world – as the only sensible religion for the future. In the monk Zhifeng's 芝峰 (1901-1971) words, the world needed to identify a religion that was "not superstitious and atheist." In his evolutionary critique of all religion, he concluded that Buddhism would be the ultimate religion that could withstand the challenge of science, and provide the inspirations for common prosperity and peace in the future world.[109]

In sum, the Buddhist struggle in negotiating with the newly conceived religious realm was twofold, especially during the KMT era when categories such as "religion" and "superstition" were adapted into the government's administrative framework. On the one hand, Chinese Buddhists had to attest that their religion fit the specific definitions of "religion" designated by the state in order to avoid persecution. But the pledge to return to the original purity described in the canonical tradition was conceivably not enough to shake off centuries of public perception of its otherworldliness. Hence, on the other hand, they also had to establish the social usefulness of their religion: that Buddhism did not exist only in isolation in the realm outside the public sphere but it actually had something to contribute to the nation-building process. Subsequent efforts in the reinterpretations and reinventions of Buddhist belief and practices in order to reform and

[108] Thierry Meynard, *The Religious Philosophy of Liang Shuming: The Hidden Buddhist* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), chapter 7.

[109] Zhifeng 芝峰, "Zongjiao xinyang de xuanze 宗教信仰的選擇," XDSQ, vol. 4, no. 3 (1931), MFQ 67:149-152.

"modernize" Buddhism in China were therefore ultimately subsumed under these two overlapping inclinations.

Miaochan xingxue

After China's defeat by Japan in the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, many intellectuals as well as scholar officials felt that the modernization agenda in the previous decades had largely failed and called for more aggressive reforms. Despite their short life span, Peter Zarrow asserts the 1898 reforms marked an important turning point in Chinese political culture when the "center of the polity moved from the dynastic house to the nation."[110] Although the reformers attempted to pursue their modernizing project by using the monarchy but not overthrowing it, there was a consensus that sovereignty for a modern polity lay in popular power (*minquan* 民權) and not in the hands of a small ruling circle. Therefore, paradoxically, the reform directly challenged and contradicted the legitimacy of the monarchy. As we will see in the eventual overthrowing of the Qing ruling house and the founding of the republic, the need to remake the people into the foundation of the nation became the underlying goal for China's educational modernity.[111]

There were intense debates between the "conservatives" and the reformers leading up to the 1898 reforms. Among the various proposals for modernizing Chinese society to improve its strength to compete with imperialist powers, two interlocking themes are significant for the purpose of this dissertation: religion and education. However, the association of religious and educational reforms proved to be a negative one for religion in China – as seen in the "Build

[110] Peter Zarrow, "The Reform Movement, the Monarchy, and Political Modernity." In *Rethinking the 1898 Reform Period: Political and Cultural Change in Late Qing China*, eds., Rebecca Karl and Peter Zarrow (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2002), 19.

[111] For an in depth study of the evolution of education policies in late Qing, see Huang Shijia 黃士嘉, *Wan-Qing jiaoyu zhengce yanbian shi* 晚清教育政策演變史, *1862-1911* (Taipei: Xinli chubanshe, 2006).

Schools with Temple Property" (*miaochan xingxue* 廟產興學) movement. A quick survey of existing scholarship shows that Zhang Zhidong and Kang Youwei were the earliest advocates for *miaochan xingxue,* but they belonged to opposing factions in the late Qing political landscape. Zhang, the governor-general (*zongdu* 總督) of Hunan and Hubei from 1890 to 1907, is often considered an important member of Cixi's "conservative" camp that brought the 1898 reform to an abrupt end. Kang, on the other hand, was an ardent supporter of constitutional monarchism who was the mastermind for the Guangxu emperor's radical reforms in 1898. Perhaps the fact that their opinions were similar enough that they could be described as *miaochan xingxue* shows the urgency felt by Chinese scholars and government officials in identifying financial resources for the national education system that China badly needed. Two types of potential sources can be distinguished in the Qing government's policy to expropriate religious property to fund popular education: 1) Buddhist and Daoist temples and monasteries with their landholdings; 2) places of worship associated with popular religion – village temples, local shrines, temples and festival funds related to lineages, guilds, and territorial communities. The government's attitude toward the latter was fairly consistent – they had to be abolished and their assets redirected toward modernizing purposes – whereas it was more ambiguous toward the former. At first it was left to the discretion of local officials, and later, as a reaction to prevent Japanese interference, an edict to protect monasteries was issued in 1905.

Zhang Zhidong's widely-read essay "An Exhortation to Build Schools" (*Quanxue pian* 勸學篇) was written in the third month of 1898. Aside from his famous *ti-yong* formula for Chinese and Western learning, Zhang also expounds in the *Quanxue pian* his proposed plan for a new school system. Acknowledging that the country lacked the financial resources required to implement a thorough educational reform, Zhang proposes:

> 可以佛道寺觀改之，今天下寺觀何止數万…皆有田產, 其物業皆由布施而來, 若改作學堂, 則屋宇、田產悉具, 此亦權宜而簡易之策也。……大率每一縣之寺觀取十之七以改學堂, 留十之三以處僧道; 其改為學堂之田產, 學堂用其七, 僧道仍食其三…則萬學可一朝而起也。
>
> [Schools can be converted from] Buddhist and Daoist monasteries. The number of monasteries in the country is in the tens of thousands…each having landed property from donations received. If they are converted into schools, then all the building and landholdings [needed to establish schools] will be complete. Such will be an expedient and straightforward plan. Approximately seventy percent of all monasteries in each county will be converted to schools, thirty percent remains for clergy's residence. Seventy percent of the [rent and harvest] from land expropriated will be used by the schools, the remaining for sustaining the livelihood of the clergy...Then ten thousand schools will be established in one day![112]

He considers Buddhism and Daoism as being in a state of decline nonetheless. Therefore, if Confucianism could be revitalized as a result of educational reform, Buddhism and Daoism would also be benefited. The emperor was so pleased with the essay that he ordered copies to be made and distributed among educational commissioners (*xuezheng*學政) in each provincial administration.[113] It is said that millions were in circulation within a very short time.[114]

---

[112] Li,Zhongxing 李忠興 ed., *Quanxue pian: zhongti xiyong de qiangguo ce* 勸學篇: 中體西用的強國策 (Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1998), 120.

[113] A *xuezheng* oversaw scholarly life in each region.

[114] Wang, *Zhongguo jindai fanan yanjiu*, 76. Ayers claims that pirated copies also quickly appeared in circulation in Shanghai. See *Chang Chih-tung and Educational Reform in China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), 150.

A few months later, Kang Youwei, in his *Qingchi gesheng gai shuyuan yinci wei xuetang zhe* 請飭各省改書院淫祠為學堂摺 (A Memorial Requesting the Transformation of Academies and Heterodox Temples into Schools), proposed that:

> 查中國民俗，惑於鬼神，淫詞遍於天下。以臣廣東論之，鄉必有數廟，廟必有公產。若改諸廟為學堂，以公產為公費…則人人知學，學堂遍地。
>
> In observing Chinese popular customs, [I see that the people are] misled by [the belief] in gods and spirits. Heterodox cults are ubiquitous. For example, in my [home province] Guangdong, every village has several temples, each temple has communal property…if these temples were changed into schools, communal property into public expenditure … then everyone will seek to learn, schools will be everywhere.[115]

The emperor subsequently decreed that all temples, except for those in the registry of state sacrifices (*sidian*祀典), be transformed into schools. The major difference in Zhang Zhidong and Kang Youwei's propositions, as far as the Buddhists were concerned, is that Zhang specifically targeted Buddhist and Daoist monasteries, whereas Kang, critical of heterodox religious practices, wanted to convert only those belonging to "immoral cults" (*yinsi*) into modern schools. In his chronological autobiography, he clarified that he did not have Buddhist monasteries in mind when he proposed to convert temples to schools, and that his proposal was abused by the local gentry who were taking advantage of the situation by extracting temple resources for their own profit.[116]

---

[115] Liang Qichao, "Qingchi gesheng gai shuyuan yinci wei xuetangzhe 請飭各省改書院淫祠為學堂摺." In *Zhongguo jindai jiaoyushi ziliao huibian: Wuxu shiqi jiaoyu* 中國近代教育史資料彙編: 戊戌時期教育, ed. Tang Zhijun 湯志鈞, (Shanghai: Shanghai jiaoyu chubanshe, 2007), 54.

[116] Kang Youwei, *Kang Nanhai ziding nianpu* 康南海自訂年譜 (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1972), 54. For Buddhist complaints about abuse by the local elite (*shenshi* 紳士) in educational reform, see Shuxin 書新, "Kaiguo shiqi de fojiao yu fojiaotu 開國時期的佛教與佛教徒," in *Minguo fojiao pian: Zhongguo fojiaoshi zhuanji zhi qi* 民

They also differed in their justification for their proposed temple confiscation: for Zhang, the Buddhists and Daoists did not earn their land and property – they were donations from the public. In addition, he proposes in his essay that those who voluntarily surrender their monasteries be rewarded accordingly by the emperor. To expropriate temple property for a common cause was hence more than reasonable. Kang Youwei's proposal, however, was as much about eliminating heterodox influences as it was about financing education. Immoral cults were holding China back from modernization, so why should they not be confiscated for a national education project? His proposal is therefore an attempt for a "religious reform" very much in line with his vision for a modern state Confucian religion.[117]

Many scholars share the view that Zhang Zhidong's *miaochan xingxue* was not an anti-religion campaign but only a pragmatic and technical approach to swiftly solve the greatest challenge – financial – to establishing a national school system. Some contend that the devastation and violence caused by the movement was unintended.[118] However, a close reading of the above passage shows that Zhang Zhidong held a fundamentalist Confucian view with regard to Buddhism and Daoism – that their over-endowment was a burden to society and needed to be controlled and regulated. Although the 1898 temple confiscation edict had a limited immediate effect, it had a concrete impact in shaping elite opinion on religious issues while also setting into motion many more temple confiscation campaigns later. A new vocabulary to discuss religion, which formed the basis for antisuperstition movements later, began to appear shortly

---

國佛教篇: 中國佛教史專集之七, ed., Zhang Mantao 張曼濤 (Taipei: Dasheng, 1976), 2. For the increasingly important role played by the gentry in China's educational modernization, see Marianne Bastid, *Educational Reform in Early Twentieth Century China* (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Chinese Studies, Univ. of Michigan, 1988), 15-19; Sally Borthwick, *Education and Social Change in China: The Beginnings of the Modern Era* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University, 1983), 93 and 99.

[117] Goossaert, "1898," 313.

[118] Huang, *Zhongguo jindai fanan yanjiu*, 76.

after 1898. In Buddhist historiography, it marks the beginning of a crisis – when the very economic foundation of institutional Buddhism was shaken – that would come back and haunt Chinese Buddhism for the entire twentieth century.[119] It also led Chinese Buddhists to contemplate promoting their own education reform often encapsulated in the rhetoric of "defending Buddhism."

The 1898 reforms ended in a conservative backlash – the Guangxu emperor was made a virtual prisoner confined in a palace on a lake in the middle of the Forbidden City, the reformers were brutally crushed, all edicts were annulled. On the surface, it looked like a total victory for the Empress Dowager Cixi and her supporters in court. But deeper trouble was brewing – in 1900, in the hopes of countering Western powers, the court actively encouraged the anti-foreigner Boxer Rebellion; that effort ended with those same Western powers occupying Beijing and making even harsher demands.[120] 1901 marks the beginning of the New Policy (*xinzheng*新政) Reforms that would last until the collapse of the dynasty in 1911. Cixi, now recognizing the need to change, embarked on a series of reforms to modernize the country and to secure the rule of the Qing court. Many of the reforms in this period mirrored those in 1898. The call for extending education to the wider populace came from influential provincial officials including Zhang Zhidong and Yuan Shikai 袁世凱 (1859-1916).[121]

In his "Memorial for Rules and Regulations for [New] Schools" (*Zouding xuetang zhangcheng*奏定學堂章程) in 1903, Zhang Zhidong's proposition to finance national education

[119]Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi,* 74.

[120] Paul Cohen, *History in Three Keys: The Boxers as Event, Experience, and Myth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997) remains one of the most sophisticated studies of the uprising.

[121] Paul Bailey, *Reform the People: Changing Attitudes towards Popular Education in Early Twentieth-Century China* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), 27–31. For Yuan Shikai's education reform in Shandong, see also Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation*, 96-98.

was consistent with his ideas in the *Quanxue pian.* Unlike 1898, the New Policy edicts on education reform set off relentless attacks on religion throughout the country. As pointed out earlier, unlike temples associated with unrecognized popular cults which clearly were to be confiscated, the various edicts promulgated in this period were rather vague on the guideline for Buddhist and Daoist monasteries – their properties could be "leased" or "borrowed" to be used as schools.[122] However, with the support of the provincial governments, local elites jumped on the opportunity to seize Buddhist and Daoist temple properties – usually the most conspicuously endowed in each region – in the name of building primary and middle schools. There were also protests against illegitimate confiscation for local officials' personal gain. A detailed account of the confiscation, conflicts, and violence in each province would prove repetitive as it is already meticulously documented by other scholars.[123] In brief, a wave of temple confiscation shocked the Chinese Buddhist community as new schools, police stations, and local government offices were set up on temple premises. Furthermore, income from temple landholdings was extracted and became revenue for local schools and government administration. This sent the Chinese Buddhists struggling to find ways to resist the "displacement of power"[124] and protect their collective resources from the expansion of the state, which increased in scale and intensity for the decades to come. In the process, some thought they could use help from their Japanese counterparts proselytizing in China.

---

[122] Xu Yue 徐躍, "Qingmo miaochan xingxue zhengce de yuanqi he yanbian 清末廟產興學政策的緣起和演變," *Shehui kexue yanjiu* 社會科學研究 4 (2007): 154.

[123] Huang, *Zhongguo jindai fanan yanjiu*, 80-101 and appendix 2, 310-378. Huang draws his information from the voluminous *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 and various local gazetteers. For cases in Shanghai alone, see Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 75-76.

[124] Duara, 98

The Jōdo Shinshū Ōtani-ha (Higashi Honganji) began to send proselytizing missions to China as early as 1876.[125] After Japan's victory in the Sino-Japanese war, the activity of Higashi Honganji priests expanded from the lower Yangzi regions to Guangdong, Fujian, and Hunan. Itō Kendō 伊籐賢道 arrived in China in 1904, when the *miaochan xingxue* movement was at its height. In meeting Chinese monks and learning about their anxiety, he tried to persuade them to promote modern education under the wing of Higashi Honganji, and promised that the Japanese consulate, in exercising its extraterritorial privilege, would protect their property from confiscation if they put up a "Japanese Buddhist School" (*Riben shishi xuetang* 日本釋氏學堂) name plaque at their temples. The first to respond was monk Songfeng 松風 of Baiyi Temple (*Baiyisi* 白衣寺) in Hangzhou, who opened a monastic school in his temple. It is said that in 1905, thirty-six temples in Hangzhou registered themselves as branches of Higashi Honganji in China hoping to receive protection.[126] The incident caused an uproar in public opinion – with Chinese elites expressing their anger in newspaper editorials, provincial officials memorializing the throne, and prominent monks such as Xuyun 虛雲 (1840-1959) and Jichan 寄禪 (1851-1912)[127] petitioning the throne to intervene in Beijing.[128] After repeated negotiation with the

[125] For the activities of Ogurusu Kōchō (1831-1905) in Shanghai and Beijing, see Chen Jidong, "The Transmission of the Jōdō Shinshū Doctrine to China: The Discovery of the 'Nanjingyu Shuojiao' and Its Significance," *Eastern Buddhist* 40, no. 1–2 (2009): 139–150. For a comprehensive study of Japanese Buddhists active in modern China, see Xiao Ping 肖平, *Jindai Zhongguo fojiao de fuxing: yu Riben fojiaojie de jiaowanglu* 近代中國佛教的復興：與日本佛教界的交往錄 (Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 2003).

[126] Ge Zhaoguang, "Shiji chu de xinqing: 1905 nian de Hangzhou fengbo 世紀初的心情: 1905 年的杭州風波," in *Xichao you dongfeng*, 68; Huang, *Zhongguo jindai fanan yanjiu*, 109; Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 12. The number of temples given by Ge is 35, while Huang writes that there were 36 of them. I have not been able to verify the figure.

[127] Jichan is his courtesy name. His name dharma is Jing'an 敬安. He is also commonly known as "Eight Fingers" (Bazhi toutuo 八指頭陀) – he burnt off two fingers as an offering to the Buddha. For a biographical account of Jichan, see Yu Lingbo 于凌波, *Minguo gaoseng zhuan sanbian* 民國高僧傳三編 (Taipei: Huiming wenhua, 2001), 23–35.

Japanese consulate, the court managed to have Higashi Honganji remove the Chinese temples from its registry. Itō Kendō was deported and banned from entering China for three years.

Thirty years later, speaking in Taiwan, Itō Kendō insisted that it was Jichan's idea to seek protection with the Japanese (the two had met at a social occasion prior to the incident) but Chinese Buddhist historians and sympathizers such as Huang Yunxi contend that Jichan was "used" as his original intention in meeting Itō Kendō was to learn about Buddhist education in Japan. Ding Gang also claims that monks in Hangzhou were using Jichan's name as the abbot of Tiantong Monastery (Tiantong si 天童寺) without his knowledge. Infuriated by this, Jichan decided to go to Beijing to petition the court. The contradictory accounts for the incident, nationalistic sentiment, and Jichan's reputation as one of the most prominent monks in China all add up to the difficulty in unraveling the story. One fact that can be confirmed is that Jichan did have encounters with Itō Kendō, and the equally controversial, Sōtō Zen-turned-Jōdo Shinshū monk Mizuno Baigyō in 1904.[129]

In the third month in 1905, the Qing court issued an edict ordering provincial governments to protect monastic properties and encouraged monasteries to promote education by establishing sangha educational societies (*sengjiaoyu hui*僧教育會).[130] As a result, aggressive confiscation of monastic properties temporarily subsided, but only to return a few years later. In short, *miaochan xingxue* was consistently implemented from the late Qing into the Republican era. While there was undoubtedly a political dimension to it – we see the expansion of the modern nation-state into every aspect of Chinese society – the religious dimension should not be

---

[128] Xu Yue, "Qingmo miaochan xingxue zhengce de yuanqi he yanbian," 155-156.

[129] See Ge, "Shiji chu de xinqing," 73; Huang, *Zhongguo jindai fanan yanjiu*, 109; Ding Gang 丁鋼, *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu: Ru fo dao jiaoyu bijiao yanjiu* 中國佛教教育：儒佛道教育比較研究 (Chengdu: Sichuan jiaoyu chubanshe, 1988), 195.

[130] Yinshun, TQN, 36.

overlooked. Many saw that a religious reform was urgently needed to help China break away from the backward past time, represented by various "superstitious" cultural practices, before it could emerge as a strong modern nation. The underlying impulse for *miaochan xingxue* was rooted in its necessity and legitimacy. Under the discourse of modernity and progress, the fiscally weak state *had* to identify potential recourses to finance broad educational reform; whereas the antisuperstition discourse that evolved around this time made religion *the* logical target for expropriation. The process also necessarily exposed the tension between modernization and secularization – when religion, supposedly excluded from the public sphere, was expected to play a morally positive role in contributing to the modernization process.

For the Chinese Buddhists, the *miaochan xingxue* movement was significant as it marked the beginning of their own attempt to break away from the past by promoting a new Buddhist education and seeking better ways to organize and represent themselves in the new nation – as seen in the founding of monastic schools and numerous national associations, as well as the power struggle that followed. This meant the competition and constant negotiation for not only resources but different visions of modernity between the government and religious institutions continued.

Forging a New Buddhism-State Relation in Republican China

The 1911 Revolution overthrew the Qing dynasty after almost 270 years of continuous rule. On New Year's Day 1912, Sun Yat-sen, the newly elected provisional president of the Republic of China, was officially inaugurated in Nanjing. In the same month, Taixu travelled to the new capital to organize a Society for the Advancement of Buddhism (*Fojiao xiejin hui* 佛教協進會)

at the Pilu Monastery (*Pilu si* 毗盧寺).[131] Through a Chinese Socialist Party member, Taixu, who was 23 at the time, managed to meet Sun and obtain permission from his office to form a new Buddhist organization.[132] However, what seemed like the beginning of a modernist Buddhist organization under the leadership of a promising young monk came to an abrupt end in the most controversial and infamous episode in Taixu's reformist career – which I will translate here as the "Jinshan Conflict" (*danao Jinshan* 大鬧金山).[133]

As Taixu was beginning his organizational effort for the Society for the Advancement of Buddhism, Renshan 仁山 (1887-1951), a classmate from his time as a student at Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage, came to Nanjing to submit a proposal to the Ministry of Education to transform Jinshan Monastery, one of the most prestigious Chan monasteries that had an ample income from its large landholdings, into a modern school for monks. Upon hearing about Taixu's plans, he convinced the former to hold the inaugural meeting for the Society for the Advancement of Buddhism at Jinshan and to take part in his monastic education program. Two to three hundred monks and three to four hundred lay people, the majority of them local Socialist Party members, were reported to have attended the meeting in which Taixu was elected to serve as the president. Tension started to escalate when Renshan, in responding to the verbal attacks of another monk, began furiously criticizing the authoritarian administration at Jinshan. Furthermore, he called for the take-over of all the assets of Jinshan to turn it into a Buddhist

[131]Ibid., 50-51.

[132]Taixu's biographer and his own recollections of the encounter are ambiguous about whether he actually had a conversation with Sun. He was probably greeted by Sun but they did not have a conversation beyond that. See Yinshun, TXN, 50 and Taixu, "Taixu Zizhuan 太虛自傳," TXQ 29:200.

[133] Holmes Welch, being consistent in his general distaste of Taixu's reform, translates the term as the "Invasion of Jinshan." See Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 28. Justin Ritzinger, however, opts to translate it as the "Uproar at Jinshan," which, in my view, is closer to the term's original meaning in Chinese. See Ritzinger, "Anarchy in the Pure Land," 79.

university. The abbot and attending Jinshan monks objected and tried to physically assault Renshan but were booed and beaten back by others in attendance. The majority of the attendees, according to Taixu, enthusiastically cheered for and overwhelmingly supported the proposal. Taixu and Renshan were nominated to take charge of the school. Taixu returned to Nanjing after the meeting and left Renshan in charge of the follow up work at Jinshan.[134]

One night thereafter, the deposed abbot and a few dozen hired men armed with clubs and knives broke back into the monastery, injuring Renshan and a few others. When the case was taken to court, the abbot and his helpers were sentenced to several months to several years in prison, but the court also ordered the Society for the Advancement of Buddhism and the monastic school to cease operation.[135] Upon hearing about the incident, the Chinese Buddhists were shocked to learn that an intrareligious *miaochan xingxue,* where revolutionary monks (*geming seng* 革命僧) forcefully seized temple property in the name of education, might be unfolding. The historical prestige of Jinshan probably also added to the fury.

In reflection on the significance of the event in his career, Taixu says that, "My reputation as a Buddhist revolutionary started to spread from this point. People would look at me with respect, fear, disgust, or pity."[136] Taixu and his biographer Yinshun tried to downplay his role in the affair by suggesting that it was a poorly-implemented plan despite the worthy intention. Various scholars, although agreeing that available accounts are too contradictory to recount exactly what happened at Jinshan, have offered different readings of the incident and its

[134]Taixu, TXQ 29:201-202.

[135]Yinshun, TQN, 202.

[136] Taixu, "Wo de fojiao geming shibai shi 我的佛教革命失敗史," TXQ 29:60.

implications in the history of modern Chinese Buddhism.[137] One point that is clear, nonetheless, is that to the monks of the Jinshan Monastery, the incident was contentious because a group of outsiders, led by Renshan and Taixu, came to confiscate their temple in the name of education. In the nonstop temple confiscation campaigns during this period, sometimes violence was involved when religious communities fought back. But this time it was an attempt led by one of their own kind.

The "Jinshan Conflict" is of particular significance to our story about religion and education for several reasons. First, the incident highlights the fragmentation and internal struggle for central authority that were intensifying within the Buddhist establishment at the founding of the new Republic. This can be seen as the direct manifestation of the confusion and competition among Chinese Buddhist leaders in responding to the state's imposed paradigms of the political management of religion based on the "Christian normative model."[138]

Welch claims that the great majority of the Chinese *sangha* were indifferent to Taixu's call for revolution and reform and hence he did not win the support of most Buddhist establishments of his time.[139] In addition, factionalism in modern Chinese Buddhism was too complex to simply be viewed as the struggle between the "progressive" and the "conservative." However, the contest between these opposing voices continued well into the late twentieth

[137]For an in-depth discussions of the incident, see Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 91-99; Eric Goodell, "Taixu's Youth and Years of Romantic Idealism, 1890–1914," *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* no. 21 (2008): 110–113; Jiang Canteng, *Taixu dashi qianzhuan*太虛大師前傳, *1890 - 1927* (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1993), 97–104; Pittman, *Toward A Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 74-77; Ritzinger, "Anarchy in the Pure Land," chapter 1; Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 28-33.

[138]Vincent Goossaert, "Republican Church Engineering: The National Religious Associations in 1912 China." In *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, ed. Mayfair Mei-hui Yang (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 213.

[139]Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 53.

century, especially in Taiwan.[140] I will propose that, in addition to the continuity in the debate over the nature and future of the Chinese Buddhist institution, these contestations also created a discursive space in which new identities emerged for the next generation of Chinese monks at the dawn of the republic.[141] Inspired by Liang Qichao's ideas of the *xinmin* 新民 (New People),[142] monks who identified their mission as revitalizing their religion and saving the nation referred to themselves as *xinsheng* 新僧 (New Monk) or *seng qingnian* 僧青年 (Young Monk) as opposed to "traditional monks" (*jiuseng* 舊僧). Hence, internal conflict and tension in institutionalized Buddhism was from then on framed by a new set of discursive tropes – new vs. old, progressive vs. conservative, and so forth.

Second, as growing numbers of people became involved in the educational debate in the aftermath of the 1911 Revolution, the "Jinshan Conflict" brought the issue of education to the forefront of Buddhist discussion of its relationship with the nation-state. Unlike the reactionary measures of establishing their own schools to preserve monastic property from confiscation during the *miaochan xingxue* movement in late Qing, many Chinese Buddhists were convinced that there existed a crucial connection between educational reform and the survival of their religion in the new republic. Under the slogan of "revitalizing Buddhism through education" (*jiaoyu xingjiao* 教育興教), reformist monks such as Weifang 葦舫 (1908-1969) sought to emphasize the urgency of educational reform by associating it with the fate of Buddhism in modern China:

[140]Charles Jones, *Buddhism in Taiwan*, chapters 4 and 5.

[141]On the creation of the "religious space" in modern China, see Ashiwa, "Positioning Religion in Modernity." In Ashiwa and Wank, *Making Religion, Making the State*, 43-73.

[142]Zarrow, "Introduction." In *Imagining the People*, 17.

> 況且廣東一帶，把所有僧寺財產，通同都沒收了。若想將來的圖存，則非辦教育別無良策。同時又因我國自改元以來，厲行教育，如軍政工商業等，莫不有專門學校。故其知識皆在一班僧侶之上，彼此之間，相形見拙，故欲生存今後的社會，主持佛教，則非辦僧教育造就弘法利生人才不可。
>
> All Buddhist properties in the Guangdong region were confiscated. In order to survive, [Buddhism] has no other solution but [develop] education. At the same time, since adopting the new reign, our nation has been vigorously carrying out [reform in] education. For example, the military, government, industry, and commerce all have their respective specialized schools. As a result, their knowledge has surpassed that of the monks. The contrast is obvious – Buddhism lost by comparison. Therefore, in order to survive in future society and sustain Buddhism, [we must] establish *sangha* education in order to produce talent to spread the Dharma and benefit sentient beings.[143]

The urgency to produced better educated monks who could withstand the challenge of the time is obvious in Fafang's voice. According to Welch's estimate, there were seventy-one Buddhist academies in operation between 1912 and 1950, producing around 7,500 graduates.[144] This made up only less than two percent of the Chinese *sangha*, which numbered about half a million. However, a large number of these self-identified "new monks" were passionately engaging in and sustaining the movement advocated by Taixu and other reformers. Many of them stayed to teach in Buddhist academies or went on to found other monastic schools after graduating while others worked in publishing newspapers, magazines, and periodicals. Some even went abroad to further their studies.

---

[143] Weifang 葦舫, "Shiwunian lai zhi sengjiaoyu 十五年來之僧教育" HCY, vol. 16.1 (1935), MFQ 189:280.

[144] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 287.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, is how the Jinshan incident illuminates aspects of Buddhist modernism that are often overlooked by scholars. There is no doubt that modernity, through the formation of the nation-state, bureaucratic governance, and global capitalism, compelled changes in the religious sphere. Chinese Buddhists, as I have shown above, were deeply concerned that their religion would become obsolete in the modernization of their country. Yet we certainly miss the dynamism of religious traditions if we reduce them to passive subjects that are *forced* to change, adapt, or reject their "traditional" aspects in order to become full members of the modern society.

In emphasizing the vital role of Buddhism in the nation's pursuit of public morality, Renshan stated that, in order to realize republicanism, China needed to educate its people in citizenship, but the rise of citizenship would not be possible unless the Buddhist ideal of compassion flourished among the people.[145] Drawing on Justin Ritzinger's theory of a "pull model" that "approached modernity as a source of attraction rather than compulsion," I interpret the embrace of reformist ideas by the Chinese Buddhists as an example in which people were attracted by the ideal of a modern and independent nation where citizens – sharing legal, moral, and social rights and obligations – participate in the life of the nation.[146] The founding of the Republican state had, therefore, offered Chinese Buddhists an opportunity in which they could appropriate different elements of modernity in imagining a distinctive Buddhist modernity. In brief, the highly controversial incident of Jinshan might be a rare instance of "intrareligious temple confiscation" that had gone violent, but it was very influential in shaping the Chinese

[145]Renshan, "Lun cishan wei hequn zhi yaozhi 論慈善爲合群之要旨," *Fojiao yuebao* 佛教月報 no. 1 (1913), MFQ 5:41-42.

[146]Ritzinger, "Anarchy in Pure Land," 12. For a similar approach that views "religion" as enacted by religions themselves, that is, when religious elites are attracted to the modern discourse of religion – see Ashiwa and Wank, "Introduction," in *Making Religion, Making the State.*

Buddhist discourse on modernity. It exposed how education became the defining feature in the collective identity for some Chinese monks who had both high hopes and deep fears for the new era for their nation.[147]

On March 11 1912, the provisional government in Nanjing passed the Provisional Constitution for the Republic of China (*Zhonghua minguo linshi yuefa* 中華民國臨時約法). It proclaimed that all citizens of the republic are equal regardless of race, class or religious distinction. More importantly, it guaranteed "freedom of religion" for all citizens.[148] It did not take long for the Buddhists to realize that such constitutional rights did not necessarily translate into actual protection for their properties. News about the appropriation of Buddhist temples by local officials continued to emerge even after the founding of the republic. Apparently, the toppling of the Manchus did not change the socio-economic reality that China faced – the government simply lacked the resources needed to create a modern mass education system envisioned by the intellectual elite as the only means for the country to emerge as a wealthy and strong nation that could resist colonial powers.

Upon hearing about the "Jinshan Conflict," Taixu's teacher Jichan was angered by the ruthlessness of his action. He persuaded Taixu to terminate his Society for the Advancement of Buddhism and travel to Shanghai to assist him in founding the General Buddhist Association of China (*Zhongguo fojiao zonghui*中華佛教總會).[149] At the inaugural meeting, Jichan was elected the president by representatives from seventeen provinces. The Association adopted two resolutions – calling for the government to protect temple properties and calling for monks and

[147]Renshan 仁山, "Jinggao woguo zengqie 警告我國僧伽," HCY, vol. 12, no. 8 (1931), MFQ 178:475.

[148]Shen and Zhang, *Zhonghua minguo xianfa shiliao*, 17-18.

[149]Yinshun, TQN, 53. For an in-depth discussion of the formation of national religious associations and their historical significance, see Goossaert, "Republican Church Engineering," in Yang, ed., *Chinese Religiosity*, 209-232.

nuns to make financial contributions to the military. They received no answer from the government in Beijing[150] months after submitting its charter. In the meantime, news emerged that temples had been illegally confiscated in several places. In November 1912, Jichan decided to go to Beijing to lobby for official recognition for his organization. Jichan died the morning after he had a meeting with Du Guan 杜關, the director of the Bureau of Propriety and Custom at the time, who reportedly humiliated the old monk by shouting at him.[151] The death of Jichan received broad media coverage. Under public pressure, Yuan Shikai's government approved the charter for the General Buddhist Association of China and issued an order prohibiting the confiscation of temple properties. Shortly after, however, the government once again promulgated regulations that subjected temple properties to the control of local officials. This would continue for the next several decades.

In October 1915, Yuan Shikai's Beiyang government issued the "Rules for Temple Management" (*Guanli simiao tiaoli* 管理寺廟條例) in thirty-one articles, which gave local government officials the right to appropriate temple properties for "education and charitable" purposes and to request abbots to resign if they were deemed incapable of performing their duties or were lax in discipline. One of the rules delivered another severe blow to the Buddhist establishment as it dismantled the General Buddhist Association.[152] The rules went through several revisions and amendments between 1919 and 1929, but the general policies in the political management of religion during the republican era remained largely the same – while

[150] Sun Yat-sen agreed to Yuan Shikai being the new president of the republic in exchange for the latter's arranging for the emperor's Puyi's abdication. Yuan established the capital in Beijing in 1912.

[151]For a discussion on the speculations surrounding the cause of Jichan's death, see Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 104.

[152]Huang, *Zhongguo fojiao jindai fanan yanjiu*, 225.

promising to protect temple properties, the government attempted to tightly control the religious space by requiring temples to register with the government, pay property taxes, and accept supervision from government oversight committees on issues ranging from operational budget to appointment of abbots.[153]

In March 1928, news was spreading that a revival of the late Qing *miaochan xingxue* movement at the national scale might be unfolding – the Minister of Interior, Xue Dubi 薛篤弼 (1892-1973), would submit a formal proposal at the upcoming National Conference on Education (*Quanguo jiaoyu huiyi* 全國教育會議) to completely nationalize temples for education. At the same time, it was rumored that Tai Shuangqiu邰爽秋 (1896-1976), who was teaching at the National Central University at the time, would submit a detailed plan to achieve Du's goal at the meeting. The news set off a huge wave of protest and petition by prominent monks, such as Dixian 諦閑 (1858-1932), Yinguang 印光 (1861-1940), and Yuanying 圓瑛 (1878-1953), with the support of affluent lay people like the businessman Wang Yiting 王一亭 (1867-1938) and the governor of Guangdong, Li Jishen 李濟深 (1885-1959).[154] Facing such public outcry, Du immediately dismissed the rumor and clarified that he distinguished between "superstitious," which ought to be destroyed, and "formal religion," which was protected by the constitution. On the other hand, Tai did submit a proposal during the conference calling for the use of religious lands for mass education but it was not adopted by the assembly.[155] However, the event was considered by Buddhist historians as the first of a series of *miaochan xingxue*

[153] For discussions on the rules on temple managements and different waves of temple confiscation campaign, see Chen Jinlong 陳金龍, *Nanjing guomin zhengfu shiqi de zhengjiao guanxi: yi fojiao wei zhongxin de kaocha* 南京國民政府時期的政教關係：以佛教為中心的考察 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2011), 81-102; Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 67-108.

[154] Chen, *Nanjing Guomin zhengfu shiqi de zhengjiao guanxi*, 82.

[155] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 39-42.

movements during the Republican period and Tai became an easy target for Buddhists critical of the government's religious policy.

The Buddhist reaction to a series of *miaochan xingxue* during the Republican period will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4. In brief, for nearly forty years after the first proposal of *miaochan xingxue* in 1898, Chinese Buddhists struggled to deal with a hostile government in ensuring the very survival of their religion. And yet this hostility and instability also opened up a discursive space for them to continue to re-imagine and negotiate for a place vis-à-vis the secular nation-state.

Chapter Two
Revitalizing Buddhism through Education

China's twentieth century opened with educational reform as one of its most dominant discourses. Prevalent in this official discourse of education was the neologism "*guomin* 國民" (citizen). There was optimism shared by reform-minded government officials and intellectuals that a modern educational system, aimed at transforming imperial subjects into Republican citizens indoctrinated by a modern and national culture, would solve China's myriad problems and social ills. For subsequent political regimes, therefore, efforts to modernize China's educational system were conjoined with the pursuit of nationalism and progress – a mission that can be summed up in the slogan "saving the nation through education" (*jiaoyu jiuguo* 教育救國).

The relation between this modernization project and Buddhism, or religion in general, was a negative one: the pursuit of educational modernization was often done at the expense of religion. This chapter is a history for the development of modern Buddhist education in China in the first two decades of the twentieth century. It is a history of how the Chinese Buddhists, when faced with the prevalent discourse of the day as well as hostile government policies in the numerous *miaochan xingxue* campaigns, struggled to create a modern education in order to revitalize Buddhism (*jiaoyu xingjiao* 教育興教). Recognizing that one cannot speak meaningfully about "modern" education without first qualifying what "non-modern" means, I begin with a synopsis of Buddhist learning in pre-modern China. I then examine the evolution of modern Buddhist education in China in three stages: 1) the Sangha Education Societies (*seng jiaoyuhui* 僧教育會) that founded the various Buddhist schools (*seng xuetang* 僧學堂) between 1903-1911; 2) Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage (Qihuan jingshe 祇洹精舍), which served as

the prototype for modern Buddhist academies; and 3) the emergence of Buddhist Studies academies (*foxueyuan* 佛學院) from the 1920s. I argue that *jiaoyu xingjiao* was a Buddhist response to the prevalent rhetoric of *jiaoyu jiuguo*. Once these Buddhist education institutions became established, they became the locale in which a network for a unique student-monk identity, which connected Buddhist monks in different parts of the country, was formed. This collective identity, reinforced through not only the education within the academies but also outside of them through the circulation of the various periodicals, allowed a Buddhist citizenship discourse to emerge and flourish in the decades to come, which eventually led to the Buddhist formulation of the "saving the nation through Buddhism" (*fojiao jiuguo* 佛教救國) rhetoric.

Traditional Buddhist Education

> Buddhism, with greater popular appeal, might be thought a more likely vehicle for the educational uplift of the masses, yet it appears that much of what we think of as education in the secular order was not of great interest to those institutions, whether monastic, eremitical, devotional, or charitable, serving to propagate Buddhism itself.[156]

I begin this section fully recognizing the difficulty in defining Buddhist education in the Chinese context. If, as stated in the quote above by de Bary and Chaffee in their discussion of Tang-Song education, we conceive of education as concerned exclusively with the "more mundane areas of popular instruction,"[157] then one would be hardpressed to speak of a Buddhist education system in imperial China. Neither was Buddhism ever a "state teaching" like Confucianism. Unlike its Theravāda and Tibetan counterparts, where temporal, secular power was traditionally embedded

[156] W. Theodore de Bary and John Chaffee, "Introduction," in *Neo-Confucian Education: The Formative Stage*, eds. W. Theodore de Bary and John Chaffee (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 4.

[157] Ibid.

in a Buddhist worldview and formal education had been intrinsically religious,[158] secular education in China had been historically monopolized by Confucianism. Therefore, I take as my starting point here the fact that Buddhist education in imperial China was primarily a system of religious instruction and moral training. The first component of this system of "transformation through education" (*jiaohua* 教化) consisted of training in liturgy, code of conduct, and meditative techniques for ordained monks and nuns. Intellectual inquiries and textual studies were only a part of this all-encompassing religious training with an ultimate soteriological goal. Secondly, we can also speak of Buddhist education in the broader sense – the educational dimension of the *sangha's* reciprocal interaction with the laity. In return for receiving material support, monks and nuns offered spiritual advice and moral guidance to the laity. This dissertation is a study of the former, that is, the institutionalized processes of religious teaching, training and learning aimed exclusively at producing a group of religious specialists – the *sangha* – distinct from the rest of society.[159]

Since the introduction of Buddhism into China during the Han (206 BCE-220 CE) period, translation centers served as the place of initial contact and exchange between foreign monks and the Chinese elites, where they collaborated to render into Chinese (in both literary and cultural forms) the unfamiliar ideas and worldviews the monks brought. Toward the end of the fourth century, translation bureaus, sponsored by the court or ruling princes, were set up to more effectively translate *sūtras* into Chinese.[160] Factors such as the meticulous division of labor in

[158] For a study of the relationship between the Buddhist *sangha* and the state in Thailand, see Stanley Tambiah, *World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976). For case studies in other parts of Southeast Asia, see the various essays in Ian Harris, *Buddhism, Power and Political Order* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

[159] See, for example, Peter Harvey, *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values, and Issues* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 62.

[160] Chen, *Buddhism in China*, 367.

the translation process and lavish patronage aside, the large number of participants point to one aspect of the translation centers that is often overlooked – their function as centers for Buddhist learning.[161] For example, participants and students at Kumārajīva's (334-413) translation bureau in Chang'an 長安numbered in the hundreds.[162] These students took notes, asked questions, produced commentaries, and became important agents in the transmission and flourishing of Buddhist teaching in China.[163] Robert Sharf has argued against the portrayal of Chinese Buddhism as a product of an encounter between the ancient civilizations of India and China. Speaking of the limited exposure to South Asian clerics and Sanskrit texts in medieval China, Sharf posits that "the Chinese 'encounter' or 'dialogue' with Buddhism took place almost exclusively among the Chinese themselves, on Chinese soil, in the Chinese language."[164] Although I am not completely disagreeing with his position, what I would like to highlight here is the interaction between the Chinese and foreign – be it Indian or Central Asian, Buddhists at least when Buddhist texts were translated. Sharf's argument for the sinification of Buddhism as something that took place as an "isolated" process, very much independent of Indian Buddhism, is more appropriate for understanding later development in the exegetical tradition.

Growing out of the translation centers, a uniquely Chinese Buddhist sermon ritual (*jiangxi* 講席) went through a period of standardization during the Northern-Southern dynasties (420-589) and eventually consolidated into a firmly established system in the Tang (618-907).

---

[161] For a detailed account of the translation mechanism and techniques involved in the Tang, see Tang Yongtong 湯用彤, *Sui Tang fojiao shigao* 隋唐佛教史稿 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), 74–77.

[162] Ding, *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu*, 52.

[163] Tang Yongtong, *Han Wei Liang-Jin nanbeichao fojiaoshi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 (Beijing: Zhonghuashuju, 1983), 210.

[164] Robert Sharf, *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Story Treatise* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 2.

This ritual for Buddhist instruction had three components: the chief lecturer (*zhujiang* 主講or *fashi* 法師) was responsible for expounding the meaning of a passage in the scripture and answering questions, aided by an assistant lecturer (*dujiang* 都講) who first recited the concerned passage and raised questions to help clarify difficult technical and conceptual points.[165] The entire sermon would later be repeated by a lecturer-in-training (*fujiang* 復講), usually on the following day. The chief lecturer and assistant lecturer positions were considered highly prestigious and yet complementary roles which traced their origins to the Buddha's sermons recorded in the *sūtras*. The lecturer-in-training, on the other hand, had responsibilities similar to that of a teaching assistant in modern day university. He had to repeat, clarify, and sometimes interpret, based on his own understanding, the content of the chief lecturer's sermon.[166] *Fujiang* remained a salient feature in monastic education well into the twentieth century.[167] Monks have also been known historically to travel between teaching monasteries to attend sermons by famous Dharma masters. In short, by the Tang period, the sermon had become highly ritualized, complete with the sounding of a bell announcing the beginning of the sermon, the lecturers ascending the teaching platform, prostration, and the chanting of verses.[168]

Erik Zürcher has shown that the Chinese *sangha* was one of the most educated groups among the populace by Sui-Tang times. He attributes the high degree of literacy, which was not only limited to the elite scholar-monks but included any average monk, to the Tang court's introduction, for the first time in Chinese history, of the clerical entrance examinations. Monks

[165] Dao'an 道安, "Xu Gaoseng zhuan xu 續高僧傳序." T2060:428.

[166] Ding, *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu*, 80-84.

[167] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 109.

[168] Mario Poceski, "Chan Rituals of the Abbots' Ascending the Dharma Hall to Preach," in *Zen Ritual: Studies of Zen Buddhist Theory in Practice*, eds. Steven Heine and Dale Wright (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 83–112.

were required to pass an examination –which varied from reciting a few hundred scriptural pages to being tested on scriptural exegesis – before they were issued ordination certificates.[169] In 747, the court furthered tightened entrance to the *sangha* by inaugurating an official ordination system – only monks who were ordained at ceremonies sponsored by the state were granted ordination certificates.[170] Those monks would thereafter be exempted from land taxes and military conscription. The connection between the state-imposed entrance examination and literacy within the *sangha*, however, was not always definite. The imperial courts in subsequent dynasties repeatedly utilized the sale of ordination certificates to raise money in financially difficult times.[171]

In tightly controlling entry, the Tang court's intention to control the size of the *sangha* is apparent. But the Confucian influence in selectively admitting talent into the Buddhist institution, which by this time was thoroughly incorporated into the state bureaucracy, also should not be overlooked. Furthermore, the mutual influence and adaptation between Buddhism and Confucianism was not limited to the clerical examinations. For example, Buddhist influence in the formation of Neo-Confucian academies (*shuyuan* 書院) in the Song – from their general

[169] Erik Zürcher, "Buddhism Education in T'ang Times," in de Bary and Chaffee, *Neo-Confucian Education*, 28 and 32-35. Zürcher also notes that monks were usually required to memorize parts of the *Lotus Sutra* in the entrance examination.

[170] Chen, *Buddhism in China*, 243.

[171] For an example in the Tang dynasty after the An Lushan rebellion, see Tang, *Sui Tang fojiao shigao*, 57. For the Song, see Chen, *Buddhism in* China, 391. For the systematic sale of ordination certificate endorsed by the Ming court, see Jiang Canteng 江燦騰, *Ming Qing Minguo fojiao sixiang shilun* 明清民國佛教思想史論 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1996), 50.

layouts to the curricula, pedagogy, and regulations for communal living – has also been widely recognized by scholars.[172]

Entering the Song (960-1279), training for Buddhist clergy was further institutionalized in the public monastery (*conglin*) system.[173] In a meticulous study of the construction of the myth in which Chan Buddhism was portrayed as a unique, iconoclast, and an independent tradition that took shape during the "golden age" of Buddhism in the Tang, Griffith Foulk has convincingly argued that: 1) this myth served to justify the designation of prominent Buddhist establishments as Chan lineage monasteries in the Song, whereas 2) most monastic practices that the Chan school claimed as its inventions were actually "the common heritage of the Chinese Buddhist tradition."[174] It is the second part of his argument that serves as the foundation of my observation of Buddhist education in late imperial China. Despite the vehement Chan claim that its origin as an independent tradition, which arose from "a separate transmission outside of scripture," that could be traced to the revolutionary founding of the first Chan monastery by Baizhang百丈 (720-814), we can hardly speak of an independent Chan monastery in the Tang. In addition, there were unambiguous continuity from the previous times and commonalities with other "non-Chan" establishments in the Song Chan institution.

---

[172] See Linda Walton, "Southern Sung Academies as Sacred Places," in *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, eds., Patricia Ebrey and Peter Gregory (Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993), 335–363; Ding, *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu*, chapter 5.

[173] The technical term for public monasteries was *shifang cha* 十方刹 or *shifang conglin* 十方叢林, which is roughly translated as "public monasteries of the ten directions." These monasteries were public in the sense that residency, as well as abbacies, were open to all monks. They were also granted recognition and/or patronage by the state. See Morten Schlutter, *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute Over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-dynasty China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008), 45–49.

[174]Griffith Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," in Ebrey and Gregory, *and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, 150.

Song sources distinguish between three types of monasteries in the empire: Chan monasteries (*chansi* 禪寺), Teaching monasteries (*jiangsi* 講寺 or *jiaosi* 教寺), and Vinaya monasteries (*lüsi* 律寺).[175] Among them, Chan monasteries were the most influential, enjoying a long period of material prosperity and imperial patronage. Despite the Chan self-image as a tradition that did "not rely on words and letters," Chan monks in the Song were involved in fervent literary activities, producing a substantial amount of religious writing. Aside from the various "discourse records" (*yulu* 語錄) – records of acts and words during encounters between masters and students – and "records of the transmission of the lamp" (*denglu* 燈錄) consisting of Chan genealogies, various Chan monastic codes of conduct known as "rules of purity" (*qinggui* 清規) appeared in this period. The most influential among them was the *Chanyuan qinggui* 禪院清規 (Rules of Purity for Chan Monasteries) compiled by the Chan monk Changlu Zongze 長蘆宗賾 (?-1107) in 1103, also the earliest surviving indigenous Chinese monastic code of conduct.[176] The *Chanyuan qinggui* is a comprehensive set of guidelines for almost every aspect of communal life in a Chan monastery. It offers detailed prescriptions for rituals and ceremonies, the duties and power of every office in the monasteries' administrative hierarchy, and social deportment and etiquette for monks in their day-to-day life within the monasteries.

Without getting into the debate on the authenticity of the Baizhang story and the creation myth of Chan Buddhism,[177] the point that I would like to stress here, one which most scholars

[175] There were also small hereditary temples (*zisun miao* 子孫廟) that were not part of this public monastery system.

[176] For an annotated translation of the *Changyuan qinggui*, see Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China an Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002). For a comparative study of the *Changyuan qinggui* and other "rules of purity," see Griffith Foulk, "*Chanyuan qinggui* and Other 'Rules of Purity' in Chinese Buddhism," in *The Zen Canon Understanding the Classic Texts*, eds., Steven Heine and Dale Wright (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 275–312.

[177] Scholarship on this is too numerous to list. See Yifa, and various articles by Foulk, Alan Cole.

involved in the debate seem to agree with, is that the *Chanyuan qinggui* became immensely popular and was adopted by all public monasteries.[178] This has led to the standardization in the organization and operation of Chinese public monasteries in late imperial China. In other words, the difference in monastic life between the various types of monasteries was not as distinct as much Chan literature claimed. Rather, regulations for communal living, as well as the organizational hierarchy and structure were pretty much the same across the board. In terms of monastic learning and training, they only differed in content but not structure. For example, training at Chan monasteries would utilize the various *yulu* and *denglu* as teaching devices, whereas monks interested in studying the *sūtras* or the *vinaya* would seek training at the respective public monasteries.[179] Welch observes that this system of teaching and learning was practiced at the major Chinese monasteries in the Republican period.[180]

This intensely formalized and ritualized monastic training system would come to be known later under the generic term "public monastery education" (*conglin jiaoyu* 叢林教育), which was often critically scrutinized and compared to the modern school system in the Buddhist discourse on monastic education during the republican period. In analyzing the cause for the lack of spiritual vigor and doctrinal creativity in late imperial Chinese Buddhism,[181] scholars often point to the stagnant ritualism and the deemphasized scriptural learning associated with Chan in

---

[178]Griffith Foulk, "*Chanyuan qinggui* and Other 'Rules of Purity' in Chinese Buddhism," 275.

[179]Chün-Fang Yü, "Ch'an Education in the Sung," in de Bary and Chaffee, *Neo-Confucian Education*, 82.

[180]Holmes Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism, 1900-1950* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 310–314. This book also offers a valuable account of monastic life in early twentieth century China, covering the administration, training, regulations, and religious practice of monasteries and temples of various sizes.

[181] See Chapter 1 for a discussion on the rhetoric of decline in Chinese Buddhism.

the public monasteries' pedagogy.[182] But it is important to note that the proposal for Buddhist educational reform in the late Qing-Republican period was not always univocal – not even among the so-called "reformists." I would argue that the call for a new Buddhist education by reformist monks in modern China was not a wholesale rejection of traditional training. Rather, they lamented the demise of the pure *conglin* and its failure to live up to its own model as the place that fostered enlightenment.[183] A case in point is Dongchu's defense of the *conglin* education:

> 以往主持僧教育者，都責備叢林寺院不辦教育，以致佛教人才短缺。其實，叢林寺院未嘗沒有教育，並且有一套完善的教育制度 … 叢林制度，不僅維持了千餘年來佛教的慧命，它所栽培的人才也最多 … 只是晚近以來，叢林制度變了質，主持不得其人，以致叢林教育失敗，精神萎縮。
>
> Those in charge of [modern] *sangha* education always blamed the shortage of talent in Buddhism on public monasteries' unwillingness to develop education. In fact, they not only had an education [system], it was also a well-rounded one. The public monastery system has sustained the Buddha dharma for over a thousand years and has produced the greatest number of talents…but lately the *conglin* institution has deteriorated. This has led to the failure in its education and the withering of its spirit.[184]

In affirming the historical significance of the *conglin* in Buddhist education, Dongchu is clearly being cautious in distinguishing between the ideal glorious monasteries of the past and the

---

[182]Guo Peng 郭朋, *Ming Qing fojiao* 明清佛教 (Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1982), 7; Jiang Canteng, *Ming Qing minguo fojiao sixiang shilun*, 89-91.

[183] For a vivid biographical account for monastic training and criticism of the abuse and laxity at public monasteries during the Republican period, see Chen-Hua (Zhenhua), *In Search of the Dharma.*

[184]Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 197.

corrupt ones in the present age that could no longer live up to its historical purpose. His remarks on the respective advantages and disadvantages of *conglin* learning and modern *foxueyuan* can be read as a hint of his concern that the rise of modern Buddhist education has led to the rapid collapse of *conglin* learning but fell short of adequately replacing it as a comprehensive training system for the religious vocation.

Dongchu's opinion reflects the conservatism and skepticism about modernity among even the keenest supporters of modern Buddhist education. He contends that the revival of the c*onglin*, in the creation of a *conglin*-cum-*foxueyuan* education would provide the solution for the dilemma faced by Chinese Buddhism.[185] I would argue that this impulse to modernize by integrating modern schooling into the traditional *conglin* system has been the guiding principle since Dongchu's own teacher, Taixu, began his project. After all, Taixu's first attempt at Buddhist education was to reform and modernize *conglin* learning at Jinshan Monastery, one of the most prestigious public monasteries of his time, although failure to do so drove him to resort to more radical proposals to build new-style *foxueyuan*, sometimes *outside* the confines of traditional monasteries.[186] In short, in seeking a suitable way to train the *sangha* for the modern world, Chinese Buddhists strove to discover a new or to re-invent the existing system through experimentation. When they spoke harshly of the "old ways," they were not always denouncing the system *per se* but were merely justifying the need for change. Nevertheless, the *miaochan xingxue* movements as well as the founding of the new republic marked a turning point in the history of Buddhist education in China as numerous new-style Buddhist schools sprang up across the country, which I will now turn to. But I will close by pointing out that the debate on *conglin*

[185]Ibid., 219.

[186] For example, his Wuchang Institute of Buddhist Studies (*Wuchang foxueyuan* 武昌佛學院) was located in a building purchased with donation from the laity. More details in chapter 3.

vs. *foxueyuan* was far from over. One can even say that it has shaped the way Chinese Buddhists talk about education up to the present day.[187]

New Buddhist Education

Many of the programs in the Xinzheng edict of 1901 resembled those put forward in 1898.The Qing government introduced a series of reforms that included the convening of provincial assemblies and a national parliament, as well as the creation of a national army. Education once again occupied a central place in this program of practical reform – a national hierarchy of schools was to be created, and the imperial examination abolished. A court decree in 1904 instructed provincial governments to promote modern education by converting provincial academies into higher level schools and establishing primary and middle schools at the local level. New subjects, such as mathematics and science, were also supposed to be included in the curriculum of these new schools.[188] Assessment for the promotion of local officials was to take into account their success in implementing the educational plan.

The *miaochan xingxue* campaign of 1898 was regional in scope and probably affected a small number of temples. But after 1904, it became much more prevalent as officials and local gentry across the country began to solicit donations or seize temple property in the name of educational reform. The founding of new schools was largely undertaken by government officials in the earlier year. But the new schools regulations of 1904 placed considerable stress

[187] Education in contemporary Chinese Buddhism lies outside the scope of this dissertation. See the following for various contemporary organizations and teachers that consider modernizing Buddhist education their mission: Stuart Chandler, *Establishing a Pure Land on Earth: The Foguang Buddhist Perspective on Modernization and Globalization* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004); Changhui 常慧, *Shengyan fashi fojiao jiaoyu lilun yu shijian* 聖嚴法師佛教教育理論與實踐 (Taipei: Fagu wenhua, 2004).

[188] Paul Bailey, *Reform the People: Changing Attitudes towards Popular Education in Early Twentieth-Century China* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), 27.

on the consultation and cooperation of the gentry (*shenshi* 紳士)[189] in the management of educational affairs. Acknowledging that it could not implement its orders without the support of the local gentry, the court encouraged their active participation in the educational reform through their roles in the disposal of county taxes, collection of local levies, and even fund raising.[190] When there was a lack of funds to start new schools, or when income fell short of supporting the expenses, the local elites, who were more informed about local temples and their endowment, turned their eyes to temple property.[191] This sent the Buddhists into a panic mode and they began to look for ways to protect and secure their property. In sharp contrast to Burma, where the Buddhists refused to teach modern subjects such as mathematics and geography during the colonial education reform,[192] the Chinese Buddhists viewed a new Buddhist education that incorporated secular subjects as an effective move to resist temple confiscation. All in all, the *miaochan xingxue* movements had major repercussions on the trajectory of modern Buddhism: Chinese Buddhists realized that they had to better organize and represent themselves in order to protect their interests in a rapidly changing political landscape, and the *foxueyuan* that emerged as a result became the model for *sangha* education in modern Chinese Buddhism.

---

[189] The gentry were essentially the local elite. It consisted of two groups of people: *shen*, retired and active officials, and *shi*, holders of degree and academic titles, although Bastid acknowledges that it became more complicated with the rise of the "modern gentry" – merchants and professionals. See Bastid, *Educational Reform in Early 20th-Century China*, 16-17.

[190]Borthwick, E*ducation and Social Change in China*, 93.

[191] Local communities sometimes engaged in armed violence in their resistance to the appropriation of temple resources and forced financial contribution. Sometimes conflicts ended with schools being destroyed and students killed. For more on "destruction of education" (*huixue* 毀學) in this period, see Shao Yong 邵勇, "Qingmo miaochan xingxue yundong yu huixue minbian 清末廟產興學運動與毀學民變," *Qinghai shehui kexue* 清海社會科學 no. 7 (2006); Bastid, *Educational Reform in Early 20th-Century China*, 97.

[192] Juliane Schober, "Colonial Knowledge and Buddhist Education in Burma," in *Buddhism, Power and Political Order*, ed. Ian Harris (New York: Routledge, 2007), 53. Such refusal is widely seen as a Buddhist resistance towards colonial threat to monastic authority and autonomy.

Besides the Buddhist monks who set up new Buddhist schools, the laity also played a significant role in shaping the discourse on modern Buddhist education.[193] Both Zhang Taiyan and Yang Wenhui condemned the ruthlessness of temple confiscations,[194] but acknowledged that the Buddhists needed to correctly respond to them by advocating their own educational reform. In an open letter addressed to all Buddhists in China, Zhang fiercely criticized the *conglin* system as existing in name only as it failed to educate and inspire. He urged the Buddhists to view the current crisis as an opportunity to revive and improve Buddhism, as the Japanese Buddhists had done. Speaking specifically about temple confiscation, he told them that to rely on and seek help from the wealthy and the powerful would only further endanger Buddhism as the problem arose internally in Buddhism – Buddhism was in a state of degeneration due to the laxity and ignorance of its monks. Therefore, the creation of modern *sangha* education was what Buddhism urgently needed.[195] Yang Wenhui, on the other hand, posited that, although reform was the trend of the day, seizing temple property to fund secular education would not appease the people. He hence proposed using the resources to build a Buddhist education that would incorporate modern learning,[196] as *sangha* education was the only chance to turn around the declining trend.[197]

I identify three stages in the development of new Buddhist education that took place from the last years of the Qing dynasty to the first-half of the twentieth century: 1) the Sangha

[193] Aviv attributes the growing role of the laity in twentieth-century Chinese Buddhism to the changing role of religion and Buddhism globally, as well as the historical and social dynamisms in modern China. See Aviv Eyal, "Ambitions and Negotiations: The Growing Role of Laity in Twentieth-century Chinese Buddhism," *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies* 1 (2011): 39–59.

[194] Zhang Taiyan, "Gao zaiguan baiyi qi 告宰官白衣啟," HCY, vol. 8, no. 8 (1927), 311-314.

[195] Zhang Taiyan 章太炎, "Jinggao shifang fo dizi qi 儆告十方佛弟子啓," HCY, vol. 2, no. 2, MFQ 150:113-117. Others also identify Su Manshu as the co-author for both *Jinggao shifang fo dizi qi* and Gao zaiguan baiyi qi. See Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu zhongguo jindaihua*, 106.

[196] Yang Wenhui, "Zhina fojiao zhenxing ce yi 支那佛教振興策一," *YRQ*, 332.

[197] Yang Wenhui, "Bore boluomiduo hui yanshuo yi 般若波羅蜜多會演說一," *YRQ*, 340.

Education Societies responsible for founding the various Buddhist schools between 1903-1911; 2) Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage that served as the prototype for modern Buddhist academies; and 3) the emergence of Buddhist Studies academies, the most famous ones being those associated with Taixu, that were active until 1949.

Sangha Education Societies

This section takes a closer look at the formative period of 1903-1911, during which the earliest modern Buddhist schools emerged. Previous scholarship pays little attention to the first wave of modern Buddhist schools. It is commonly understood as a transitional, reactionary strategy to avoid confiscation that had a negligible impact on the overall development of modern Buddhist education – as Welch puts it, "none lasted long enough to be important in itself."[198] Sometimes the names of schools and monks involved are mentioned in passing as evidence for the argument that the earliest schools were nothing more than the monks' disingenuous efforts in promoting modern education, whereas their real motive was to escape temple confiscation.[199] There is a consensus that the *miaochan xingxue* movement served as a wake-up call for the Chinese Buddhists to contemplate their own efforts to reform Buddhist education. But modern Buddhist education in China, according to this line of argument, did not begin until the more "serious" schools emerged.[200] In fact, the influence of the *sangha* schools seems to be rather modest when juxtaposed to the relative success and attention the later *foxueyuan* have achieved. However, I

[198] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 13 and fn 36.

[199] He Jianming 何建民, "Cong qihuan jingshe dao Wuchang foxueyuan 從祇洹精舍到武昌佛學院," *Jindaishi yanjiu* 近代史研究 no. 4 (1998): 114; Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 78; Xue Yu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu*, 58; Taixu, "Yi fojiao banxue fa 議佛教辦學法," TXQ 17:466.

[200]Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 108-109.

would argue that we do not know enough about Buddhist participation in educational affairs in this period, as related activities are not as well documented as the later Buddhist schools. This formation period is historically significant in the story of Buddhist modernity in China as it sowed the seeds for two of the most significant developments in Chinese Buddhism in the twentieth century: 1) the change in the administrative structure and self-understanding of Buddhism through the founding of various national associations, though their actual control over *all* Buddhist temples is debatable; and 2) the emergence of a new discourse on Buddhist participation in nation-building projects, manifested in their involvement in the national educational reforms.

The first attempt to establish modern Buddhist schools took place in 1903, when Jichan sent the Japanese monk Mizuno Baigyō 水野梅曉 (1877-1949) to travel to Changsha, Hunan, and to visit Liyun 笠雲 for *dharma* instruction.[201] After their meeting, Liyun was convinced that Chinese Buddhism had to follow the footsteps of its Japanese counterpart in order to survive and thrive in the modern age. With Mizuno Baigyō's assistance, and partial funding from the Higashi Honganji, he set up the first modern Buddhist school, the Hunan Sangha School (Hunan seng xuetang 湖南僧學堂), in Kaifu Monastery (Kaifusi 開福寺). According to Xiao, Liyun was uninterested in maintaining the school after the property of his temple was secured from confiscation. The teaching and operation of the school was therefore left to Mizuno Baigyō for the next several years until some suspicious official forced him to leave the province.[202] The following year, Jichan and Songfeng planned to set up similar schools in Hangzhou, but it ended in a diplomatic feud between China and Japan. It was claimed that Songfeng died from poisoning

[201] Hunan, where Zhang Zhidong was the governor general, saw widespread temple confiscation at this time.

[202] Xiao, *Jindai Zhongguo fojiao de fuxing*, 246.

by monks who resisted the creation of *sangha* schools at their temples.[203] An account of the "Hangzhou Incident" is presented in Chapter One. Given the evidence, I would suggest that Jichan did in fact seek help and protection from Itō Kendō in founding his proposed schools, although he might not have approved of the temples in Hangzhou registering as branches of the Higashi Honganji in China. The subsequent imperial decree to preserve temple property, issued in 1905, temporarily stopped temple confiscation in theory but it continued in reality, especially after the abolition of the civil service examinations in 1905.

In 1905, monk Juexian 覺先 went on a study tour to Japan to survey the various schools founded by Buddhist monasteries. He was reportedly so impressed by the success of Japanese Buddhism and its educational institutions that upon his return to Beijing, he instantly submitted a petition to the Bureau of Education Affairs (*Xuewu chu* 學務處) to form a Chinese Buddhist Education Office (Zhongguo fojiao xuewu gongsuo 中國佛教學務公所) to oversee the creation of Buddhist-funded primary and vocational schools.[204] Juexian's school opened in the same year offering free schooling to around fifty students, which included monks and children of lower income families.[205] The curriculum consisted of subjects from arithmetic to physical education but Buddhism was not taught. Besides raising funds for his schools in Beijing, Juexian also toured regions in the Lower Yangzi to promote his initiative. He won the support of many monks

[203]He, "Cong Qihuan jingshe dao Wuchang foxueyuan," 118.

[204]"Zongjiao: Gesheng jiaowu huizhi 宗教：各省教務匯誌," *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 vol.2, no. 7 (1905).

[205]Zuo Songtao 左松濤, "Jindai Zhongguo fojiao xingxue zhi yuanqi 近代中國佛教興學之緣起," *Fayin* 法音 no. 2 (2008): 35.

there. Concurrently, Buddhist schools were founded in Zhejiang 浙江, Jiangsu 江蘇, and Fengtian 奉天 due to Juexian's influence.[206]

A new Ministry of Education (Xuebu 學部) was created by the court in 1905 to manage national education. It promoted a coherent national educational system complete with general, specialist, vocational schools and their respective bureaucratic hierarchy. Under the ministry were provincial education commissioners (*tixue* 提學) presiding over the provincial Education offices.[207] In 1906, the Ministry of Education promulgated the "Regulations for Education Societies" (*jiaoyuhui zhangcheng* 教育會章程) ordering all local educational organizations to restructure: there were to be general education societies in each provincial capital collaborating with local education societies at the prefecture and county levels. At the same time, all Buddhist schools were instructed to reorganize under the new banner of the Sangha Education Society (*Seng jiaoyu hui* 僧教育會).The same legislation warned against collaborating with and seeking protection from "foreign Buddhists" that would jeopardize China's sovereignty.[208] As a result, Buddhist education societies started to appear throughout the country in larger numbers. Most of them offered subsidized primary education to the general populace while also admitting monks. Some, such as the Ningbo Education Society headed by Jichan, also operated separate schools for the monastics.

Another noteworthy Buddhist school was the Yangzhou General Sangha School (*Yangzhou putong seng xuetang* 揚州普通僧學堂) founded by Wenxi文希in 1906 at the

[206] He Jinlin 賀金林, "Qingmo seng jiaoyu hui yu siyuan xingxue de xingqi 清末僧教育會與寺院興學的興起," *Anhui shixue* 安徽史學 no. 6 (2005): 31-32.

[207] Bailey, *Reform the People*, 37.

[208]He, "Qingmo seng jiaoyu hui yu siyuan xingxue de xingqi," 31.

Tianning Monastery 天寧寺, which was one of the most prestigious monasteries in the Zhenjiang-Yangzhou region. It was a school designated for *sangha* education whose curriculum included Buddhist Studies as well as English and Japanese. About twenty young monks, including Renshan 仁山 [209] and Zhiguang 智光 (1889-1963), were enrolled at its inauguration. The Japanese language was taught by a layman from Japan named Daoyang (Daoyang *jushi* 道楊居士),[210] who later convinced Wenxi to travel to Japan for a tour of its Buddhist schools. The night before Wenxi's departure for Japan, some monks reported to the police about his alleged connection to the revolutionaries in exile in Japan. He was arrested immediately and later given a life-sentence. He was not released until after the 1911 revolution and the school he founded came to a tragic end.[211]

In addition to the above-mentioned schools, in the year between 1906 and 1911, a number of Sangha Education Societies with their respective schools were founded by monastic leaders such as Yuexia 月霞 (1858-1917), Dianxian 諦閑 (1858-1932), Qiyun 栖雲, and Yuanying 圓瑛 (1878-1953) in Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Fengtian, Beijing, Hunan, Sichuan, Anhui, and Hubei. Young monks who attended these schools included Taixu, Renshan, and Zhiguang, who went on to become active advocates of modern Buddhist education in subsequent decades. Scholars of modern Chinese Buddhism are right in pointing out the ephemeral existence and the lack of a coherent structure and purpose demonstrated by these early Buddhist schools. However, a brief history of these schools provides an indispensable context to understand the emergence of modern Buddhist education in China. Several observations will hence shed light on the

[209] Monk Renshan should not be confused with Yang Wenhui, the layman with the courtesy name Renshan.

[210] Japanese name unknown.

[211] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 79.

inclination and challenges that continued to influence the development of Buddhist education in the next decades. First of all, a history of these schools illuminates a unique feature of China's modernization process – the inclination to look to Japan, the first Asian nation to modernize while resisting Western imperialism, for inspiration. In the realm of education, Chinese educators borrowed heavily from the Japanese model especially in educational theories.[212] It is also noteworthy that a large number of Chinese educators were trained in Japan and Japanese teachers were hired in China during this time.[213] Chinese officials and intellectuals shared a common admiration for their neighbor as they attributed the rise of Japan in the Meiji period to its success in implementing a universal education. More importantly, they also shared the assumption that what had worked in Japan would work in China.[214] Meanwhile, for the Buddhists, there was the shared (mis)conception that Buddhism was a major contributor in Japan's pursuit of wealth and power in modern times, disregarding the persecution suffered by Japanese Buddhism during the Meiji Restoration (1868-1912).[215] Daxing 大醒 (1900-1952), who went on a month-long trip to Japan in 1936, wrote about the active role played by Japanese Buddhists in social work, and the advanced state of Japanese Buddhist education.[216] It is therefore logical, at least to the Chinese Buddhists at this time, to have sought inspiration and protection from Japan.

---

[212] See Bailey, *Reform the People*, passim.

[213] For Japanese teachers in China, see Hiroshi Abe, "Borrowing from Japan: China's First Modern Educational System," in *China's Education and the Industrialized World: Studies in Cultural Transfer*, eds., Ruth Hayhoe and Marianne Bastid (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1987), 57-80.

[214]Borthwick, *Education and Social Change in China*, 67.

[215] See, for example, Judith Snodgrass, *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), chapters 5 and 6.

[216]Xiao, *Jindai zhongguo fojiao de fuxing*, 310-312.

Secondly, we are able todiscern the political aspects of modern Buddhist education by looking at the development of Buddhist education in the late Qing. Just as in the new civic education system, the gentry played an increasingly significant role in Buddhist education during this period. Top leadership of the Sangha Education Society was put in the hands of two chairmen – one monk and a member of the local elites, who was usually nominated by the government. The societies were charged with the task of preparing and presenting a budget for setting up and maintaining new schools to member temples or monasteries under their jurisdiction. Then each temple would pledge a fixed quarterly contribution.[217]According to Taixu, the appointment of the "gentry chairman" (*shen huizhang* 紳會長) legitimized the Sangha Education Societies as organizations created under the mandate of the government:

> 僧教育會的組織成功，雖然是由各寺院長老的聯合，但僧教育會的會長卻有兩個：一是當地德高望重的出家長老，一是地方上有名望而熱心教育的紳士，而紳士也不一定是佛教的信徒。這是受政府明令所成的教育組織，又有紳士在中協助，故能與當地的官廳發生密切的聯繫。經費由各寺院分擔，如有不願捐款或不送幼僧入學的行為，得由政府差人催索或強迫入學。
>
> Although the successful creation of the Sangha Education Societies was due to the joint effort of the elders from various monasteries, they had two chairmen – an eminent local *sangha* leader, and the other was a respected member of the local elites who was enthusiastic about education. The gentry chairman was not necessarily a lay Buddhist. These are organizations mandated by the government and aided by local gentry. Therefore [they were able] to maintain close ties with the local government. [Their]

[217] He, "Qingmo seng jiaoyuhui yu siyuan xingxue de xingqi," 31.

> expenses were covered by local temples. If someone refused to make a financial contribution or send young monks to schools, then the government could send officials to collect the dues and pressure young monks to enroll.[218]

To the Chinese Buddhists, therefore, the local elites were considered representatives of the government whose duty was to supervise the proper implementation of education reform. If a temple refused to pay its dues or to send its school-age monks to schools, the gentry chairman could interfere. In addition, as the gentry also served as the liaison between the Buddhist community and the government, they were the conduit for closer collaboration between the Buddhists and various government organs. Taixu also testified to the corruption in the Sangha Education Societies that he had himself experienced, where the local elites manipulated the system to make profit for themselves.[219] Nonetheless, the various Sangha Education Societies represent a turning point in the Qing government's changing attitude toward Buddhism and the Buddhists – it was willing to negotiate and guide their participation rather than denounce or persecute them in the name of modernization. But this should not be seen as a comprehensive and coherent policy for the management of religion, or anything in the ailing empire for that matter. It was a legislation that largely depended on the willingness of government officials to take part in the formulation of a modern Buddhist education system. The officials' attitudes varied greatly. Some showed fierce hostility toward the idea, while others considered it a non-priority.[220] There were also officials who simply did not want to get dragged into the power struggle between different monks for control over the Sangha Education Societies.

---

[218]Taixu, "Wo de Fojiao gaijin yundong shi 我的佛教改進運動史," TXQ 29:71.

[219]Ibid., 73. See also Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 36.

[220] "Lun tichang fojiao 論提倡佛教," *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 vol.2, no. 7 (1905); "Zongjiao: Gesheng jiaowu huizhi 宗教：各省教務匯誌," *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 vol.2, no. 7 (1905).

Internally, from their inception, the tension and struggle between the Sangha Education Societies and local temples over the process and purpose in the creation of Buddhist schools were intense. The pessimistic tone of Jichan, in his letter to a certain education commissioner, reveals the predicament many Chinese monastic leaders found themselves in:

> 僧學堂之設，承學界諸公多表同情，弟佛教總共所及民僧小學堂，尚未所得。而我輩頑固黨亦多，皆坐懷觀望，恐亦難以成立。
>
> Many educators are sympathetic [to my proposal for] the *sangha* school. The plan for the Chinese Buddhist Education Office and primary school has not been realized. The *sangha* is full of the stubborn kinds who just wait-and-see. I am afraid it might not come through after all.[221]

It seems that as soon as the threat of confiscation was over, Chinese monks were less than enthusiastic about promoting education with their temple property. This is often interpreted as the struggle between the conservatives and the modernists. I would suggest that it was not so much an ideological issue as it was materialistic and political. It was largely a contestation over voice and power – who had the authority over monasteries and their landholdings – and some temples' resistance to the attempted redistribution of power that came with the creation of Buddhist schools. Taixu's initiative to convert the wealthy Jinshan Monastery into a Buddhist school, discussed in Chapter One, is a good case in point for the power struggle typical in intra-Buddhist interaction at this time.

Another reason the Sangha Education Societies failed to turn into a well-organized, centralized institution was the limitation imposed by the government. The Ministry of Education

---

[221]Jing'an 敬安, "Zhi shifan xuexiao jiandu shu 致師範學校監督書"*Bazhi toutuo shiwen ji* 八指頭陀詩文集 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1984), 482.

dictated that there was no hierarchical relationship between the provincial and local education societies. This led to discrepancies in policies and tension between different societies.[222] Yet despite changing government policies, unsympathetic officials, and internal resistance, the Sangha Education Societies offered the Buddhists an opportunity to cultivate a power-relation with the state through negotiation. They gradually came to realize the necessity to move beyond the traditional network of lineages and monasteries by seeking to represent the interest of Buddhism through a new organization. In other words, modernity and secularization, rather than deinstitutionalized religion, could produce a different kind of institutionalization.[223]

Lastly, Chinese Buddhist educators at this time were also debating the appropriate content and forms of education offered by the Sangha Education Societies. At the beginning, the so-called "Buddhist schools" were no more than "schools founded by the Buddhists," although monks were enrolled in some of them. In Taixu's opinion:

> 除仁山居士所設者外，其動機多在保存寺產，仿照通俗所辦之學校而辦，用圖抵制，絕少以昌明佛教造就僧寶為旨者。故其教學科目，亦多屬普通學校之性質，間或講授佛學，亦僅以點綴，未嘗重視；且多數辦理不久，旋即廢止，故殊少成績可言。
>
> Except for the layman [Yang] Renshan's school, most Buddhist schools were concerned primarily with protecting temple property. They followed the secular school model in order to resist confiscation, and rarely considered the prosperity of Buddhism and the training of the *sangha* their goals. The curricula mirrored those of the regular schools. There were occasional Buddhist classes, but only as supplements and never the focus.

[222] See He, "Qingmo seng jiaoyuhui yu siyuan xingxue de xingqi," 33.

[223]Zhe Ji, "Secularization as Religious Restructuring: Statist Institutionalization of Chinese Buddhism and Its Paradoxes," in *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, ed. Mayfair Mei-hui Yang (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 234.

> Most of them were abolished not long after their founding. Therefore, we can hardly speak of their result.[224]

Later on, however, there was a gradual shift to focus exclusively on Buddhist education for the *sangha*, as exemplified by Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage, which is the focus of the next section. In summary, when the 1911 Revolution broke out, the Chinese Buddhists were struggling to create the Buddhist equivalent of a modern education system, seeking stronger voice and representation through the founding of nationwide Buddhist associations, and debating about the most efficient way to train their clergy members amid the rapidly changing political landscape. In addition, although small in number, the first generation of Buddhist monks educated in the modern schools, who embodied the nascent collective identity as student-monks, went on to either found or attend the newer Buddhist schools.

Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage

> 故晚清所謂新學家者，殆無一不與佛學有關系，而凡有真信仰者率皈依文會。
>
> Among the intellectuals who were associated with New Learning in late Qing, virtually everyone was connected to the study of Buddhism, and those who possessed true faith flocked to follow [Yang] Wenhui.[225]

This remark by Liang Qichao shows how Yang Wenhui was held in high regard by prominent Chinese intellectuals of his day. Often regarded as "the father of the [Chinese Buddhist] revival,"[226] Yang was credited for introducing lost Buddhist texts back to China by printing and

[224]Taixu, "Yi fojiao banxue fa 議佛教辦學法," TXQ 17:466.

[225] Liang Qichao , "Qingdai xueshu gailun," YBSH, vol. 8:73.

[226] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 2.

distributing them through his Nanjing Scriptural Press (Jinling kejing chu 金陵刻經處). Much has been written about Yang Wenhui and his contribution to modern Chinese Buddhism as a prominent lay person. My focus here is his pioneering efforts in the realm of Buddhist education through the founding of his Jetavana Hermitage, which, I argue, served as the prototype of modern Buddhist education.

Yang Wenhui, courtesy name Renshan 仁山, was born into a gentry family in Shidai 石埭, Anhui 安徽, in 1837. He started to show a keen interest in Buddhism in his early twenties. Though recognized as a man of extraordinary intellectual promise, he was not interested in taking the civil service examinations or holding public office.[227] For a living, he had an early career leading engineering and construction projects under Zeng Guofan 曾國藩, Li Hongzhang 李鴻章, and others.[228] Yang had lived in Europe twice, as a counselor to the Chinese ambassador, between 1878-1881, and 1886-1889. It was during his tenure in London that he met Nanjō Bunyū 南條文雄 (1849-1927), who was studying with Max Müller at Oxford at this time.[229] He was accordingly exposed to Orientalist and philological scholarship in Europe, which stressed the importance of Sanskrit in the study of Buddhism. Through Nanjō Bunyū, he was able to

[227]Zhang Hua 張華, *Yang wenhui yu Zhongguo jindai fojiao sixiang zhuanxing* 楊文會與中國近代佛教思想轉型 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chuban she, 2004), 41. It seems pretty obvious that he held anti-Manchu sentiment. He was said to have told Zeng Guofan, whom he helped suppress the Taiping Rebellion, that one should not sacrifice oneself to prolong the corrupt Manchu rule. See Yang Buwei 楊步偉, *Yige nuren de zizhuan* 一個女人的自傳 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1987), 82 and 91.

[228] For detailed biographical accounts of Yang, see Gabrielle Goldfuss, "Binding Sutras to Modernity: The Life and Times of Chinese Layman Yang Wenhui (1837–1911)," *Studies in Central and East Asian Religions* no. 9 (1996): 54–74; Zhang, *Yang wenhui yu Zhongguo jindai fojiaosixiang zhuanxing*, chapter 1; Chin Keito 陳繼東, *Shinmatsu Bukkyō no kenkyū: Yō Bunkai o chūshin to shite* 清末仏教の研究: 楊文会を中心として (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin, 2003).

[229]Goldfuss is of the opinion that, while in Paris, Yang was probably introduced to Eugene Burnouf and Stanislas Julien. See Goldfuss, "Binding Sutras to Modernity," 64.

collect Buddhist texts that had disappeared in China but were preserved in Japan.[230] In return, he sent texts that were not included in earlier Japanese editions of the *Tripitaka* to Nanjō Bunyū. The two kept up a life-long correspondence, in which they exchanged ideas and information about Buddhism in each other's country, until Yang's death in 1911. What he learned about Buddhist Studies in European universities and sectarian Buddhist education in Japan was crucial in shaping the plan for his school later. Yang quit his official position upon his return to China in 1889. He would go on to dedicate his time exclusively to publishing and teaching for the rest of his life.

In 1895, Anagarika Dharmapala stopped in Shanghai on his way back from the World's Parliament of Religion in Chicago. He came to China to promote and solicit support for his initiative to restore pilgrimage centers and revive Buddhism in India.[231] He was reported to be disappointed by the Chinese monks' lack of interest in his project. Later, the Baptist missionary Timothy Richard (1845-1919) introduced him to Yang Wenhui. There was no record of their conversation during the meeting. Otto Franke claims that Yang initially did not think it was realistic to send Chinese monks to India. Rather, he told the Ceylonese layman to send Indians to China to learn the language and translate Buddhist texts back into their mother tongue if they wished.[232] Knowing that Dharmapala had been in Japan prior to his visit to China, Yang mentioned their meeting in one of his letters to Nanjō, asking whether the Japanese Buddhists

[230] The various texts Yang re-introduced into China has led to a revival of Yogācāra Buddhism in the Republican period. See Eyal Aviv, "Differentiating the Pearl from the Fish Eye: Ouyang Jingwu (1871-1943) and the Revival of Scholastic Buddhism" (PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2008), 37-39; Hammerstrom, "Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China," 36; Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, chapter 6.

[231] Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*,81.

[232] Franke quoted in Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 7.

had plans to send a mission to India.[233] Although he did not commit to participating in Dharmapala's project, Dharmapala's view of Buddhism as a world religion probably shaped Yang's own thinking about Buddhist education. Yang hesitated because he was fully aware of the limitations faced by the Chinese Buddhists:

> 今春同志諸君，聞知印度有佛法振興之機，彼土人士，欲得中華名德，為之提倡。但兩地語言文字，難以交通，明道者年既長大，學語維艱。年少者經意未通，徒往無益，遂議建立祇洹精舍，為造就人才之基。
>
> This spring, we learned that there was an opportunity to revive Buddhism in India. People there desired to invite eminent [Buddhist] teachers from China to support their cause. But there is much difficulty with communicating in the languages of our countries. Those learned about the *dharma* are too old to learn [a new] language; while the younger ones are not yet versed in the meaning of the scripture so their travel to India would not be helpful. That is why I propose to set up the Jetavana Hermitage – to serve as the base for training talent.[234]

This shows that he started to embrace the idea of Buddhism as a world religion prior to his founding of the Jetavana Hermitage. His plan was an ambitious one – his school would not only produce *dharma* teachers in and for China, but they would later go on missions overseas to spread Buddhism. Hence, instruction at the proposed Jetavana Hermitage was divided into three large headings: Buddhist Studies, Chinese, and English. According to this plan, the school

[233] Yang Wenhui, "Yu riben nantiao wenxiong shu shisan 與日本南條文雄書十三," *YRQ*, 491.

[234] Yang Wenhui, "Yu shi shihai shu 與釋式海書," *YRQ*, 430.

would be highly selective, admitting a maximum of only ten students, and supported by donations.[235]

At the height of the *miaochan xingxue* movement in the early 1900s, Yang argued that the declining trend of Chinese Buddhism could only be turned around by promoting education:

> 中國之有儒、釋、道三教，猶西洋之有天主、耶穌、回回等教，東洋之有神道及儒、佛二教。東西各國，雖變法維新，而教務仍舊不改，且從而振興之 … 我中國何獨不然？今日者，百事更新矣。議之者，每欲取寺院之產業以充學堂經費。於通國民情，恐亦有所未愜也。不如因彼教之資，以興彼教之學，而兼習新法。如耶穌、天主教之設學課徒。
>
> Just as Catholicism, Christianity, Islam and other religions in the West, and Shinto, Confucianism, and Buddhism in Japan, China has Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism. Although countries and the East and West have all gone through reforms, their religious activities have not changed – they have even been revived … Why would China alone be different? Nowadays, reform is the trend of the day. Those who participate in the dialogue often attempted to seize temple property to pay for the expenses for the [new] schools. I am afraid this will not appease the people. We shall instead utilize the religious property to build religious education that incorporates New Learning [in the curriculum], just as does clerical education in Catholicism and Christianity.[236]

---

[235] Yang Wenhui, "Yu Li Xiaoyun (Guozhi) shu er 與李小芸(國治)書二," *YRQ*, 440. In his letter to a man who was not identified, Yang wrote that both sincere laymen and monks were welcome to enroll in his school. Yet they should be extremely intelligent or they could not benefit from his education. See "Yu moujun shu 與某君書," *YRQ*, 468.

[236] Yang Wenhui, "Zhina fojiao zhenxing ce yi 支那佛教振興策一," *YRQ*, 332.

The Western and Japanese influence is apparent in Yang Wenhui's approach to Buddhist education. His years of living abroad as well as his interaction with Nanjō Bunyū had convinced him that in order to ensure the survival of Buddhism into the modern age, the religion needed professionally educated monastic members. He went on to propose the use of half the property of each temple to set up new schools that would be divided into Buddhist and secular sections (*jiaonei* 教内and *jiaowai* 教外 classes).[237] However, he never in his lifetime tried to instigate an intra-religious temple confiscation, which, in my opinion, is peculiar given his prestige within Buddhist circles and the obstacles he faced in financing his school. Yet in proposing to use temple property for Buddhist education, his view was more or less in line with the reformers.[238]

Yang Wenhui set up the Jinling Scriptural Press[239] in his family home in 1866.[240] The printing projects went uninterrupted even during his years abroad.[241] After his return from Europe, an increasing number of young men attracted to Buddhism came to study and stay with him.[242] As a result, as early as 1904, he decided to dedicate a separate building that could house

[237] Ibid.

[238] Others read his writing literally and conclude that he had actually petitioned the government to promulgate a law that required temples to invest half of their property in Buddhist schools. See, for example, Li Xiangping 李向平, *Jiushi yu jiuxin: Zhongguo jindai fojiao fuxing sichao yanjiu* 救世與救心：中國近代佛教復興思潮研究 (Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe, 1993), 26. I have not been able to find evidence to support this claim.

[239]Jinling was the former name for the city of Nanjing 南京. It first came into use during the Tang dynasty.

[240] There are sources that suggest Yang first set up the Press at a different location in Nanjing, and later moved it to his home due to some property disputes at the original location. See Ma, *Wan Qing foxue yu jindai shehui sichao*, 287.

[241] For study of the Press, see Luo Cheng 羅琤, *Jinling kejing chu yanjiu* 金陵刻經處研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai shehui kexueyuan chubanshe, 2010); Jinling kejingchu, *Wensi: Jinling kejingchu 130 zhounian jinian zhuanji* 聞思：金陵刻經處 130 周年紀念專輯 (Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 1997); Ma, "Wan Qing foxue yu jindai shehui sichao," 284-291; Anonymous, "Jinling kejingchu mukan dazing qi 金陵刻經處募刊大藏啓," *Foxue congbao* 佛學叢報 no. 8 (1913), MFQ 3:227-268.

[242] According to his granddaughter, their family home occupied a massive 17 *mu*, with 132 rooms! See Yang, *Yige nuren de zizhuan*, 87.

about twenty students at the school, which he named the Jetavana Hermitage.[243] It took him several more years to admit the first cohort of students. During this time, he asked Nanjō to collect information and curricula from Japanese Buddhist schools of various sects as references.[244] He also edited introductory textbooks to be used in his classes. When the school finally opened in 1908, it aimed at producing "guiding teachers of Buddhism" (*foxue daoshi* 佛學導師)[245] who would be charged with the important missions of reviving Chinese Buddhism and proselytizing it in the world. According to Taixu, the first students included monk Renshan, Huimin, Kaiwu, Qiu Xuming, Zhiguang, Guangtong, Qiyun, Liaowu, Shanliang, and Taixu.[246] A ground-breaking innovation of the Jetavana Hermitage was that there were both lay and monastic instructors as well as students. It was not unusual for temples to hire lay teachers to teach "secular" subjects such as classical Chinese, but this may be the first time in Chinese history when laymen taught Buddhist doctrine and texts to monks.[247]

The school closed down in less than two years. Most scholars attribute the closure of the Jetavana Hermitage to financial difficulty. But given Yang's family wealth and the fact that the Jinling Scriptural Press remained in operation, one has to wonder if there were reasons beyond financing. Xiao claims that Yang was frustrated by the students' lack of progress in terms of both learning the English language and Buddhist scholarship. According to Ouyang Jingwu, who once asked Yang about the reason why he closed down the school, the latter answered that there were

[243]In Indian Buddhism, Jetavana was the second monastery donated to the Buddha by the famous layman Anāthapiṇḍada. The Buddha gave many sermons there.

[244] Yang Wenhui, "Yu riben Nantiao Wenxiong shu ershiqi 與日本南條文雄書二十七," *YRQ*, 507.

[245] Yang Wenhui, "Yu li xiaoyun (Guozhi) shuer 與李小芸(國治)書二," *YRQ*, 440.

[246]Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan 太虛自傳," TXQ 29:196. Ouyang Jingwu probably visited occasionally but was not a formal student; he did not move to Nanjing until 1910.

[247] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 9.

difficulties recruiting students.[248] Therefore, I suggest that Yang was probably disappointed by the discrepancies between the vigorous demands of his school and the students' actual abilities. Following the closure of the Jetavana Hermitage, Yang Wenhui founded the Society for Buddhist Studies (Foxue yanjiu hui 佛學研究會) in 1910. It now had a different approach to Buddhist education – it focused exclusively on scholastic Buddhism and its membership consisted primarily of lay intellectuals. The Society met once a month, with Yang giving weekly lectures in between monthly meetings. The prominent lay Buddhist Ouyang Jingwu, who took over the Jinling Scriptural Press after Yang's death and founded the renowned China Inner Studies Institute (Zhina neixue yuan 支那内學院), moved to Nanjing to study with Yang in the same year. As a result, the Buddhist Studies Society and the Scriptural Press amalgamated into an institution dedicated specifically to the study, publication, and distribution of Buddhist texts, with a heavy emphasis on Yogācāra thought.[249] This development also marked the beginning of the identification of the Jinling Scriptural Press, and the Inner Studies Institute later, as a dominant center for the lay Buddhist movement in modern China.

The Jetavana Hermitage differed from other Buddhist schools in this period in three aspects. First of all, its founding was self-motivated. Unlike most temples that had to set up Buddhist schools to avoid confiscation, Yang's Jinling Scriptural Press was *not* a temple and therefore was not subject to the *miaochan xingxue* government policies. Concerned that there was yet to be a modern Buddhist school in China, Yang aspired to create a Buddhist institution of higher learning that would lead to a revival of Buddhism in China. I suspect perhaps the fact that Yang Wenhui's school fell outside of the traditional Buddhist institution contributed to the

[248]Xiao, *Jindai Zhongguo fojiao de fuxing*, 227.

[249] For a study of Ouyang Jingwu and his brand of scholastic Buddhism, see Eyal Aviv, "Differentiating the Pearl from the Fish Eye."

difficulty in recruiting students, as some monks might have been reluctant to enroll in a school where they would receive Dharma instruction primarily from a lay teacher. Furthermore, perhaps initially there was no competition intended, but the Jetavana Hermitage was inevitably competing with a growing number of monastic schools founded by prominent monks across the country during this period.

Secondly, the Jetavana Hermitage differed from other Buddhist schools in this period in terms of its focus. Since the school had been a private undertaking from its inception, Yang Wenhui did not have to justify it as something "useful" that would immediately improve social conditions in China. Although foreign language and secular subjects were included in the curriculum, it was a school aimed specifically at providing a comprehensive religious education. On the contrary, most of the *seng xuetang* were similar to civic primary schools offering education to improve basic literacy. The third and arguably the most distinctive way the Jetavana Hermitage differed from other Buddhist schools was that it had a clearly defined goal and a meticulously planned curriculum. This became an invaluable asset inherited by later Buddhist teachers, including Taixu and Ouyang Jingwu, in conceiving their respective schools.

In his preliminary planning for the school, Yang spoke of the training for monks in three levels corresponding loosely to primary, middle, and university-level education. The designated length for each level was three years. According to this proposal, monks were only allowed to seek full ordination after graduating from the middle level and abbacy would only be granted to those who received the full nine-year training in the doctrinal, *vinaya*, and commentarial traditions. Those who failed to graduate from the primary level had to leave the *Sangha*.[250] He did not specify which level in his initial plan the Jetavana Hermitage corresponded to when it

[250] Yang Wenhui, "Shishi xuetang neiban kecheng chuyi 釋氏學堂內班課程芻議," *YRQ*, 333-334.

took in the first cohort of students. But it is quite obvious that the curriculum for the first class was designed for the middle school level in his overall plan.

Students at the Jetavana Hermitage followed a rigorous schedule: there were six one-hour classes every day, two of which were dedicated to Buddhist Studies. The other four covered subjects that included Chinese, history, geography, arithmetic, Sanskrit, English, Japanese, and the Primer of Buddhism for Beginners (*Fojiao chuxue keben* 佛教初學課本)[251] compiled by Yang himself. This made up "General Learning" (*putong xue* 普通學) for the first three years. From the fourth year on, in "Specialized Learning" (*zhuanmen xue* 專門學), students could choose to concentrate on one of more schools or texts for a number of years. Given that the school was closed down before it was able to graduate its first three-year class, the significance of Yang's conception of specialized Buddhist Studies can only be seen in the emergence of scholastic lay Buddhism, which is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is noteworthy to point out that the division of Chinese Buddhism into distinct schools or sects (*zong* 宗), probably a Japanese influence through Yang's contact with Japan, began to take hold in the Chinese Buddhists' self-understanding of their tradition. (For the full curricula, see Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix 1).

A quick glance at the curriculum reveals several distinct features of Yang Wenhui's educational thought. First, language instruction was the predominant aim of the program. It reflects Yang's commitment to propagate Chinese Buddhism in the West. He was committed to send students to study Sanskrit with Nanjō Bunyū in Japan. After that, some of them would travel to India to participate in the restoration of Buddhism there. Another factor that shaped his

[251] The Primer was compiled to be used specifically as a Buddhism textbook, which was a new idea at that time. But it followed a traditional format – Buddhist teaching and history were presented in the form of the Three-Character Classic (*Sanzi jing* 三字經) intended to be memorized. See Scott, "Conversion by the Book," 70.

view on the importance of language learning came from his own experience living in Europe. In his correspondence with Nanjō from London, Yang lamented his lack of language skills to teach Buddhism to others.[252] As for the Japanese language, Yang displayed deep admiration for the state of Buddhist Studies in the country. In his view, learning Japanese would allow the Chinese Buddhists to participate in the global formation of the field of Buddhist Studies that valued comparative Buddhist thought as well as Buddhist philology.

Furthermore, it is without a doubt that Yang was dedicated to creating a comprehensive education that would produce a generation of Chinese Buddhist teachers who would possess the required knowledge of Buddhism and secular matters to lead Buddhism into the future age. But the idealism and over-ambition in his plan is also hard to miss. In Zhang Taiyan's harsh criticism of the ignorance of the *sangha*, he accused half of them for not being able to even write their own names.[253] Even if we assume that Zhang was probably exaggerating, as we know that illiteracy was rare among Chinese monks and nuns, very few received more than primary school education. [254] In addition, it might be true that the Buddhist *sangha* had a higher literacy rates compared to the general population at this time,[255] but except for a talented few, they were most likely only nominally literate while being able to memorize some Buddhist texts for daily use. Therefore, it should not be surprising that some monks might find the highly scholastic program

[252] Yang Wenhui, "Yu riben liyuan yanshou, nantiao wenxiong shu 與日本笠原研壽、南條文雄書," *YRQ*, 472.

[253] Zhang Taiyan, "Gao zaiguan baiyiqi," 312.

[254] Welch, *Practice of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 257-258.

[255] Citing the Chinese Yearbook (1926), Pittman estimates that about 80 percent of Chinese monks were literate in the mid 1920s, whereas literacy rate in the general populance was at 20 percent. See Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 54. Gender should be taken into account here. For example, Evelyn Rawski estimates that in the late Qing, 30 to 45 percent of men, but only 2 to 10 percent of weomen, knew how to read and write. See Evelyn Rawski, *Education and Popular Literacy in Ch'ing China* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1979), 140.

at the Jetavana Hermitage overwhelming. Such a program would easily daunt a modern day university student!

Lastly, more of a missing link to the story than a distinctive feature of the Jetavana Hermitage, surprisingly little is known about the teaching staff. We were told that Yang himself lectured on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, while Dixian gave instruction on Tiantai doctrines. The Confucian scholar Li Xiaotun 李曉暾taught Chinese language and literature.[256] In addition, there were at least three different English teachers, including the controversial poet-monk Manshu 曼殊 (1884-1918).[257] Therefore, we can assume that the difficulty in recruiting students aside, Yang Wenhui also faced a challenge in identifying and retaining experienced teachers to embark on such an ambitious Buddhist educational project.

Welch asserts that, although, as the "father of modern Buddhist revival" in China, Yang Wenhui did not start the first scriptural press, nor was his Jetavana Hermitage the first modern Buddhist school, his importance "lies not so much in the earliness of his efforts as in their influence."[258] His Jinling Scriptural Press produced over a million copies of Buddhist texts that consisted of over three thousand titles.[259]The Jetavana Hermitage, despite its short life, has in many ways shaped the views of the leading monastic and lay figures in modern Chinese Buddhism. Yang may have had to give up on his experiment on a modern education system to restructure the tradition that he considered to be deep in decline, but his school both set the standard and remained an inspiration for the next generation of Buddhist educators. I would add that those achievements aside, his historical significance lies in his ground-breaking Jetavana

[256]Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 82.

[257]Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan 太虛自傳," TXQ 29:196.

[258] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 10.

[259] Liu Chengyou 劉成有, *Jinxiandai jushi foxue yanjiu* 近現代居士佛學研究 (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2002), 55.

Hermitage model that combined Buddhist education with publishing, which had a far-reaching impact on the trajectory of modern Chinese Buddhism. This is evident in, for example, Taixu's academies and their associated publishing efforts. The inter-connectedness of the two components contributed to their respective strength and sustainability. On the one hand, the newspaper and periodicals published by these institutions, such as *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, *Xiandai sengqie* 現代僧伽, *Renhai deng* 人海燈, just to name a few, became important vehicles for spreading reformist ideas far beyond the walls of the academies. In addition, as I will demonstrate in the following chapters, the publications were also essential to the formation of a collective student-monk identity among the young monks. On the other hand, the academies helped ensure that the periodicals were staffed by enthusiastic monks fluent in the discourses of the time. A similar pattern can be also detected at Ouyang Jingwu's Inner Studies Institution and the Jinling Scriptural Press. After all, to decide which texts to print and what classes to teach involved constant critical reflection and negotiation with the Chinese Buddhists' vision of Chinese Buddhism as a modern world religion. To return to my argument earlier, a Buddhist school is a pedagogical institution that embodies the blueprint for creating a Buddhist modernity in China.

The Buddhist Academies (*Foxueyuan*)

Entering the Republican era, faced with new possibilities and the urgent need to seek political representation, both lay and monastic Buddhists competed to establish a nationwide Buddhist Association.[260] Jishan's General Chinese Buddhist Association (Zhonghua fojiao zonghui 中華

[260] On the founding of national Buddhist associations, see Goossaert, "Republican Church Engineering," 216-218; Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 29-74; Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 23-50.

佛教總會), founded in 1912, sought to consolidate control of the Buddhist establishment through its plan to convert all Sangha Education Societies into local chapters of the Buddhist Association. Although educational reform was high on the agenda of the association, its leaders such as Jichan were preoccupied with seeking government recognition and protecting temple property from the confiscation that continued into this period.[261] Additionally, as demonstrated in the Jinshan Incident, the struggle for power and representation intensified in the early years of the republic.

It would take another decade before either Taixu or Ouyang Jingwu was able to establish their modern Buddhist academies modeled after Yang Wenhui's prototype. However, new schools continued to be founded by prominent monks during this period, most of which focused on reviving the *conglin* training system. In 1914, the Avatamsaka University (Huayan daxue 華嚴大學) was founded by Yuexia, assisted by Zongyang 宗仰 (1865-1921).[262] For the first semester, it was housed at the famous Hardoon Garden (Hatong huayuan 哈同花園), the residence of the prominent Shanghai businessman Silas Hardoon whose wife, Luo Jialing 羅迦陵, a.k.a. Liza Roos, (1864-1941) was a devout Buddhist. It later moved to the Haichao Temple 海潮寺in Hangzhou.[263] Its classes consisted extensively of lectures on the Avatamsaka Sūtra given by Yuexia. In 1916, the school closed down after the graduation of its first class of sixty students that included Chisong 持松, Zhiguang 智光, and Changxing 常惺.[264]

---

[261]Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 98-100.

[262]Miaoran 妙然, *Minguo fojiao dashi nianji* 民國佛教大事年紀 (Taipei: Haichaoyin zazhi she, 1995), 70.

[263] The move was said to be sparked by Luo Jialing allegedly demanding all teachers and students to bow to her on the new moon and full moon days each month – a ritual reserved for the elders in Buddhist monasteries. See XFRC 1:146.

[264]Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 204.

In 1920, Dixian set up a monastic school at Guanzong Monastery (Guanzong si 觀宗寺) in Ningbo, where he was the abbot. The school was given the name Guanzong Study Society (Guanzong xueshe 觀宗學社). At its founding, it had around forty students divided into the preparatory class (*yuke* 預科) and the general class (*zhengke* 正科). The classes, for which Dixian was the primary instructor, focused mostly on Tiantai doctrine.[265] Student life was very similar to that at a traditional *conglin* – the Dharma master would ascend the teaching platform in his red robe daily to formally expound a passage from the scripture; students from the two classes would obediently listen to the preaching, which was preceded and followed by regular daily devotions, meditation, and communal rituals.[266] A prominent graduate of the Guanzong Study Society was monk Tanxu 倓虛 (1875-1963), who sent some of the first monks to proselytize in North America.[267]

Despite political instability and the widespread iconoclasm of the May Fourth Movement, Buddhism experienced fervent growth in the 1920s. Buddhist education, exemplified by the dozens of *foxueyuan* founded, was one of the areas in which this growth was most visible. After his failed attempt at Jishan and Jichan's death, Taixu suffered from a strong sense of defeat and pessimism. He decided to enter a three-year sealed retreat (*biguan* 閉關) at a Chan temple in Putuo Mountain (Putuo shan 普陀山) from 1914-1917. During this period, he was absorbed in intensive reading. His reading list included not only Buddhist scriptures and commentaries, but

[265]XFRC 2:1623.

[266]Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 107-110.

[267] For an interesting study of Tanxu and his nationalistic activism, see James Carter, *Heart of Buddha, Heart of China: The Life of Tanxu, A Twentieth-century Monk* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). For a study on the Cham San Monastery founded by Tanxu's disciples in Toronto, see Tannie Liu, "Globalization and Modern Transformation of Chinese Buddhism in Three Chinese Temples in Eastern Canada," in *Wild Geese: Buddhism in Canada*, eds.,Victor Hori, John Harding, and Alexander Soucy (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010), 270–294.

also books on Western science, history, and philosophy, as well as works by prominent Chinese intellectuals and various periodical and newspapers. In the tranquil environment of his seclusion, he was able to contemplate on how to better carry out his reform plans and formulate Buddhist responses to the challenges of the day. As a result, he wrote prolifically on a broad range of topics. For example, his thought on how to systematically reorganize the *sangha* in order to eventually create a united, centralized Buddhist church was elucidated in his famous *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* 整理僧伽制度論.[268]

When he emerged from seclusion in 1917, he had the opportunity to visit Japan after being invited to teach in Taiwan. The next year, with support from several laypeople including Zhang Taiyan, Chen Yuanbai, and Wang Yiting, he founded the Bodhi Society (Jue she 覺社) in Shanghai. The proclaimed purposes of the Bodhi Society included the propagation of Buddhism, publishing, and guiding the practice of Buddhism among the laity. Membership of the society, which consisted mainly of lay people, grew rapidly along with Taixu's reputation as a prominent Buddhist teacher. The *Jueshe congshu* 覺社叢書, the precursor for the longest running Chinese Buddhist periodical *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, was also founded in 1918. This innovative periodical not only served as a vital avenue for spreading Taixu's reformist ideas, it was also meant to be a forum in which Buddhists and non-Buddhists, monastic and the laity could discuss, critique, and raise questions about Buddhism.[269] The Bodhi Society and its periodical are significant to our story of Taixu's Buddhist educational reform as they show that Taixu was relying primarily on a

[268] For a detailed account of this period in Taixu's life, see Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 81-90; Eric Goodell, "Taixu's (1890-1947) Creation of Humanistic Buddhism" (PhD Diss., University of Virginia, 2012), 73–106; Canteng Jiang 江燦騰, *Taixu dashi qianzhuan* 太虛大師前傳*(1890-1927)* (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1993), 125–145.

[269]Hong, *Taixu dashi fojiao xiandaihua zhi yanjiu*, 103.

lay following when he tasted the first major success in his reform movement. The next story will once again prove that he had to consistently seek support outside the Buddhist establishment to instigate changes within it. This strained relationship with the majority of the Chinese monastic institutions remained throughout his career.

Feeling that the conditions were right to try his hand again at Buddhist education, Taixu soon proposed the establishment of a Buddhist university that took Yang Wenhui's Jetavana hermitage as its model with the addition of Tibetan and Mongolian to its five-year program. In the proposal was also the dispatch of missions to Mongolia, Tibet, Europe, and America to transmit and translate Buddhist texts. He initially had the support of the respected educator Zhang Jian 张謇 (1853-1926), but the planning came to a halt later as Zhang found out that Ouyang Jingwu's preparatory work for the founding of the Inner Studies Institute in Nanjing was near completion. On the ground that "the two schools do the same thing and cooperation is better than division," Zhang withdrew his support to "speed-up the founding of the Inner Studies Institute."[270] This was probably a face-saving expedient by Taixu and his biographer to give an explanation for losing the support of the prominent social elite. In fact, Jiang Canteng was right in his assessment of Taixu's emotion after this incident: Taixu was deeply disappointed and from this point on considered Ouyang and his school a rival.[271] Perhaps this was one of the reasons why Taixu was quick to criticize when he found out, when visiting the preparatory office of Ouyang's institute in Nanjing, that the goal of the institute as stated in its charter was "to nurture talent to spread the *Dharma* and benefit the world, not self-benefitting monastics."[272] In

[270]Taixu, "Taixu xuanyan 太虛宣言," HCY, vol. 1, no. 1(1920), MFQ 147:15.

[271] Jiang, *Taixu dashi qianzhuan*, 177.

[272]Taixu, "Guanyu zhina neixue yuan wenjian zhi zhaiyi 關於支那內學院文件之摘疑," HCY, vol. 1, no. 1(1920), MFQ 147:97.

criticizing Ouyang for being misguided, Taixu argued that the *sangha* was the foundation of Buddhism and hence should not be excluded from any Buddhist educational project. Although Ouyang later responded by claiming that it was only a "misunderstanding" and rephrased the institute's charter to be more inclusive,[273] this marked the beginning of the life-long rivalry between arguably the most pivotal monastic and lay figures in twentieth-century Chinese Buddhism, often manifested as debates on doctrinal and institutional grounds.[274]

Competition from the laity could be the reason that drove Taixu to attempt, once again, to pursue his plan for education by reforming existing Buddhist monasteries. In 1921, Taixu was installed as the abbot of Jingci Monastery (Jingci si 淨慈寺) in Hangzhou. The monastery carried immense historical prestige as the center where Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904-975) taught the syncretism of Chan and Pure Land practices. But it was now badly in debt. With donations and loans from his monastic friends and lay followers to resuscitate the monastery, Taixu's intention was to reorganize the monastery according to the *conglin* standard by getting rid of those with opium addiction and those who did not follow communal living rules, and eventually set up a monastic school.[275] Although he was no longer the radical young monk of the Jinshan Incident and this time he had the authority as the abbot to introduce reforms, his tenure at the Jingci Monastery still ended in much controversy and dispute. Monks from the monastery, backed by some local officials and gentry leaders, filed a lawsuit in the same year to remove him

---

[273]He, "Cong Qihuan jingshe dao Wuchang foxueyuan," 123.

[274] For an example, see Taixu and Ouyang's debate regarding the authenticity of the *Awakening of Faith* in Aviv, "Differentiating the Pearl from the Fish Eye," chapter 4, especially 157-161. For an intriguing discussion on how the debate between the two schools was beyond the claim for truth, see Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光, *Ge Zhaoguang zixuan ji* 葛兆光自選集 (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1997), 216–223.

[275]Taixu, "Taixu zhizhuan," TXQ 29:249-250.

from the abbacy.[276] The next year, with invitation from lay people in Wuhan 武漢, Taixu quit the abbacy at Jingci Monastery amid the pending lawsuit. This incident highlights the resistance from the Buddhist establishment that Taixu faced in his attempt to experiment with his ideas in the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*. The main points of contention seemed to have lain in his proposed use for monastic property and his refusal to pay proper respect to senior monks whom he did not think deserved it. More importantly, however, it highlights Taixu's inability to expand his sphere of influence into the traditional network of regional and lineage alliances that was the backbone of Chinese Buddhist kinship.[277]

In stark contrast to his experience in Hangzhou, Taixu was received enthusiastically by his lay students in Wuhan. Upon learning about his ideals for modern Buddhist education and the hardship he faced in Hangzhou, prominent laymen such as Li Yinchen 李隱塵 and Chen Yuanbai 陳元白passionately started a fundraiser among the political and business elites in Wuhan. A board of directors was formed shortly with over thirty laymen identified as the co-founders of Taixu's school. Together they decided to purchase a property in Wuchang 武昌 to house the school.[278] The school was named the Institute of Buddhist Studies (Foxueyuan 佛學院), the first to adopt the name in China.[279] Gradually, it became the standard designation for almost all academies in Chinese Buddhism. The term is still in use to refer to training schools for monastics in the Chinese Buddhist world today. The Wuchang Buddhist Academy followed a

[276]Yinshun, TQN, 125.

[277] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 51. On Buddhist networks, see Ashiwa and Wank, "Globalization of Chinese Buddhism."

[278]Yinshun, TQN, 134, 138. At its founding, the school was simply known as Foxueyuan. Later, to distinguish itself from other Buddhist academies which have adopted the name *foxueyuan*, it began to be called the Wuchang Academy, or sometimes in its abbreviated form Wuyuan 武院.

[279]Ibid., 142.

similar curriculum as the Jetavana Hermitage and admitted both lay and monastic students – this will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

By relocating to Wuchang, which was unquestionably the stronghold for his reform movement, Taixu uprooted himself from the Buddhist heartland of Jiangnan. In addition, by setting up his school in newly purchased premises rather than attempting to transform existing monasteries, Taixu avoided resistance from the traditional Buddhist establishment by going around it. Perhaps somewhat ironically, his efforts to "revitalize Buddhism through education" got its jumpstart *outside* of the very institution that he tried to revitalize. Lastly, assuming that it was unintended, the Wuchang Academy took in the first class of students before Ouyang's Inner Studies Institute.[280]

In sum, a history of Buddhist education in the first two decades of the twentieth century can be seen as a history in which the Chinese Buddhists struggled to imagine an educational system that would revitalize their religion and culminated in the rhetoric of *jiaoyu xingjiao* 教育興教, which, I argue, was a Buddhist response to the prevalent rhetoric of this time: *jiaoyu jiuguo* 教育救國. Once these Buddhist education institutions became established, they became the locale in which a network for a unique student-monk identity, which connected Buddhist monks in different parts of the country, was formed. Lastly, this collective identity, reinforced through not only the education within the academies but also outside of them through the circulation of various Buddhist periodicals, allowed unique Buddhist nationalistic and citizenship discourses to emerge and flourish in the decades to come.

[280]Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 205.

Appendix 1

Table 1: Three-Year General Training Program at the Jetavana Hermitage[281]		
	Formal Instruction	Recommended Readings
Year 1	1. *Sūtra of Forty-Two Sections* 四十二章經 2. *Fo yijiao jing* 佛遺教經 3. *Ba daren jue jing* 八大人覺經 4. *Primer of Buddhism for Beginners* 佛教初學課本 5. *Shijiao rulai chengdao ji* 釋迦如來成道記 6. *Nianfo jiaotuo* 念佛伽陀 7. *Yogācāra Bodhisattva Prātimoksa* 菩薩戒本經 8. *A Vow to Gain Rebirth in the Western Pure Land* 西方發願文 9. *The Awakening of Faith* 大乘起信論 10. *Thirty Verses on the Vijñapti-mātra Treatise* 唯識三十論 11. *Nyāyapraveśa* 因明論 12. *Verses on the Structure of the Eight Consciousnesses* 八識規矩頌 13. *Heart Sūtra* 心經 14. *Amitābha Sūtra* 阿彌陀經 15. Morning and Evening Liturgy 晨昏課誦	1. *Mahāyāna śatadharmā-prakāśamukha śāstra* 百法明門論 2. Six Mysterious [meditative] Dharma Gates 小止觀六妙門
Year 2	1. *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* 楞嚴經	1. *Dacheng zhiguan* 大乘止觀
Year 3	1. *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* 圓覺經 2. *Diamond Sūtra* 金剛經 3. *Vimalakīrti Sūtra* 維摩經 4. *Contemplation Sūtra* 十六觀經 5. *Qifo ji* 七佛偈 6. *Xinxin ming* 信心銘	1. *Ksitigarbha Sūtra* 地藏經 2. *Xianmi yuantong chengfo xinyao ji* 顯密圓通[成佛心要集] 3. *Yuanren lun* 原人論 4. *Biographies of Eminent Monks* 高僧傳 5. *Shi shi jigu lüe* 釋氏稽古略

[281] Based on Yang Wenhui, "Shi shi xuetang neiban kecheng 釋氏學堂內班課程," *YRQ*, 334-335. In translating these titles, I try to retain in Chinese the titles of texts for which no Sanskrit equivalent is known, with reference to Charles Muller, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/.

	7. *Song of Enlightenment* [of Master Yongjia] [永嘉大師] 證道歌 8. *Dinghui xiangzi ge* 定慧相資歌 9. *Wanshan houji* 萬善後偈 10. Verses on the Vow of Rebirth 願生偈	

Table 2: Advanced Training Program at the Jetavana Hermitage[282]	
School (*zong*)	Assigned Texts
Abhidharma-kośa 俱舍宗	1. *Abhidharma-kośa* 俱舍論 2. Commentary on the *Abhidharma-kośa* by Puguang 普光記 3. Commentary on the *Abhidharma-kośa* by Fabao 法寶記
Satyasiddhi 成實宗	1. *Chengshi lun* 成實論
Vinaya 律宗	1. *Brahmajāla Sūtra* 梵網經 2. *Sifelü xingshichao zichi ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記 3. *Pini zhichi* 毘尼止持 4. *Pini zuochi* 毘尼作持 5. *Pini guanyao* 毘尼關要 6. *Pini jiyao* 毘尼集要
Tiantai 天臺宗	1. Lotus Sūtra 法華經 2. *Miao*[*fa lianhua jing*] *xuan [yi] jieyao* 妙[法蓮華經]玄[義]節要 [283] 3. *Niepan jingshu* 涅槃經疏 4. *Shanding zhiguan* 刪定止觀 5. *Shichan boluomi* [*cidi famen*] 釋禪波羅蜜 6. [*Tiantai*] *sijiaoyi jizhu* [天臺]四教儀集注 7. *Jiangguan gangzong* 教觀綱宗
Xianshou (Huayan) 賢首宗	1. *Huanyan shuchao xuantan* 華嚴懸談疏鈔 2. *Xingyuan pin shuchao* 行願品疏鈔 3. *Huanyan zhushu jiyao* 華嚴著述集要 4. *Fajie wu chabie lunshu* 法界無差別論疏 5. *Da zongdi xuanwen benlun* 大宗地玄文本論 6. *Shi moheyan lun* 釋摩訶衍論
Ci'en/Faxiang 慈恩宗	1. *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論 2. [*Weishi*] *shuyao* [唯識]樞要 3. *Xiangzong bayao* 相宗八要 4. *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* 瑜伽師地論

[282] Ibid., 336-337. In translating these titles, I try to retain in Chinese the titles of texts for which no Sanskrit equivalent is known, with reference to Charles Muller, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/.

[283] I try, to the best of my knowledge, to provide the full titles for abbreviations. Originally omitted words are provided in brackets. For example, I identify *Miaoxuan jieyao* as the *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanyi jieyao* 妙法蓮花經玄義節要, a commentary on the Lotus Sūtra by the Ming monk Ouyi Zhixu.

	5. Dao/dunlun's Commentary on the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* [瑜伽師地論]倫記 6. *Hetuvidyāśāstra* 因明論疏 7. *Fayuan yilin zhang* 法苑義林章 8. *Jie shenmi jing* 解深密經 9. *Miyan jing* 密嚴經 10. *Weishi kaimeng* 唯識開蒙
Sanlun 三論宗	1. *Madhyamaka-kārikā* 中論 2. *Śata-śāstra* 百論 3. *Dvādaśanikāya-śāstra* 十二門論 4. *Zhaolun* 肇論 5. *Dazhi du lun* 大智度論 6. *Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義 7. *Sanlu youyi* 三論遊意 8. *Baozang lun* 寶藏論
Chan 禪宗	1. *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* 楞伽經 2. [*Lengqie*] *huiyi* [楞伽]會譯 3. *Siyi jing* 思益經 4. *Wudeng huiyuan* 五燈會元 5. *Platform Sūtra* 六祖壇經 6. *Chanyuan zhu quan ji* 禪源諸全集 7. *Zong jing lu* 宗鏡錄 8. *Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集 9. *Zongfan* 宗範 10.*Chanlin sengbao zhuan* 禪林僧寶傳
Esoteric 密宗	1. *Da Piluzhena chengfo shenbian jiachi jing* 大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經 2. *Supohu tongzi jing* 蘇婆呼童子經 3. *Suxidi jieluo jing* 蘇悉地羯羅經 4. *Shishi puzhu* 施食補注
Pure Land 淨土宗	1. Huiyuan's Commentary on the *Sūtra of Immeasurable Life* 無量壽經義疏 2. *Wuliangshou rulai hui* 無量壽如來會 3. Zhuhong's Commentary on the *Amitābha Sūtra* 彌陀疏鈔 4. Peng Jiqing's Commentary on the Three Pure Land Sūtras 無量壽三經論 5. *Wangsheng lunzhu* 往生論注

	6. *Jingtu shiyao* 淨土十要 7. *Anle ji* 安樂集 8. *Wangsheng ji* 往生集

Chapter Three
Modern Buddhist Education: Paradigm Shifts

Having established the "revitalize Buddhism through education" (*jiaoyu xingjiao* 教育興教) rhetoric, discussed in the previous chapter, Buddhist education in China went through a period of fervent growth in the 1920s and 30s. This chapter begins with an analysis of Taixu's education thought. The second section delineates the institutional history of the Wuchang Buddhist Studies Academy – which, despite its short life, remains a significant institution in the history of modern education in Chinese Buddhism. I argue that the Wuchang Academy occupies a special place in the collective imagination of modern Chinese Buddhists because it marks three paradigm shifts that had a long lasting impact in the practice of modern Chinese Buddhism: (1) the re-interpretation of the teacher-student relationship; (2) the imagining of a modern Chinese Buddhist community; and (3) the reformulation of orthodoxy. This enabled Chinese Buddhists to generate a citizenship discourse that connected the modernization project of Buddhism to that of the nation – through the rhetoric of "saving the nation with Buddhism" (*fojiao jiuguo* 佛教救國), which is the focus of chapter 4.

Taixu's Educational Thought

Any attempt to understand Taixu's[284] career will inevitably run into a disjuncture: On the one hand, he seems so pervasive and dominant in the Buddhist life of twentieth-century China. He

[284] Given the extensive work on Taixu, a biographical account would be superfluous. See, for example, Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 63-90; Goodell, "Taixu's Youth and Years of Romantic Idealism, 1890–1914"; Yinshun, TXN.

published widely and was frequently quoted in Buddhist periodicals and newspapers.[285] Often referred to as the "Martin Luther of China,"[286] his monastic and lay followers passionately responded to his call to systematically reform Chinese Buddhism to make it more compatible with modern times. Sometimes their enthusiasm was beyond his control.[287] On the other hand, his lifelong effort to introduce structural changes in Chinese Buddhism was marked by constant failure– failure that he himself acknowledged.[288] Within the traditional Buddhist establishment consisting of networks of prestigious monasteries and prominent monks, Taixu was a marginalized figure – he was never part of the influential core. This remained a persistent challenge throughout his career. For example, he always had difficulty securing a major monastery as the base for his reform movement. In other words, he was extraordinarily gifted in producing overarching theories and plans for reform and yet weak in his ability to implement them. But perhaps it was this marginality that allowed him to go back and forth between his reform-minded following and traditional Buddhist circles. I would suggest that his appeal, therefore, lay in his ability to negotiate a different way to imagine a modern Buddhist identity.

Taixu's reform proposals placed a heavy emphasis on Buddhist education.[289] Among the three "Buddhist Revolutions" (*fojiao geming* 佛教革命) that he proposed in1912,[290] the

[285] A search for "Taixu" as the keyword in the author field returned 2526 hits in the Catalog Database of Republican Era Buddhist Journals (http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/minguofojiaoqikan/), which includes the MFQ and MFQB indexes.

[286] Darui Long, "An Interfaith Dialogue between the Chinese Buddhist Leader Taixu and Christians," *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 20, no. 1 (2000), 167.

[287] The incident in 1923, in which the journal *Fohua xinqingnian* 佛化新青年 launched personal attacks on a number of elder monks, is a good example. This will be explored in-depth below.

[288] Taixu attributed his failure to his own temperament as well as external circumstances. See Taixu, "Wo de fojiao geming shibai shi 我的佛教革命失敗史," TXQ 29:63.

[289] Guo Peng 郭朋, *Taixu sixiang yanjiu* 太虛思想研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1997), 349.

reorganization of the *sangha* took education as its guiding principle. Education was also an area in which Taixu was most successful in implementing, to some extent, his reform plan. He founded the first *foxueyuan*, the Wuchang Buddhist Academy, as well as the Minnan Buddhist Academy (Minnan foxueyuan 閩南佛學院) in Xiamen 廈門and the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies Institute (Han Zang jiaoliyuan 漢藏教理院) in Chongqing 重慶. Graduates from these schools went on and founded a dozen others in different parts of China.[291] Between the 1920s and 40s, these "new monks" who were affiliated with Taixu's academies were either administrators or teachers in at least fifty Buddhist academies in China.[292] His plan remained the most comprehensive and hence a source of inspiration for the next generation of the Chinese *sangha*. Yet he faced constant challenges in his effort to maintain these Buddhist academies as they were ultimately linked to an aspect of his career which was his weakest – the implementation of structural reorganization of the Buddhist institution.

Taixu had received no formal education prior to his enrolment at Yang Wenhui's Jetavana Hermitage, which he considered his first and only exposure to modern *sangha* education.[293] In 1908, Zhuangnian 奘年 (1874-?)[294] and Yuanying[295] recommended that he

---

[290] Taixu, "Wo de fojiao gaijin yundong lueshi 我的佛教改進運動略史" TXQ 29:77. Taixu's proposal drew some furious responses from the Buddhist community. Pu Yicheng 濮一乘, the editor for the *Foxue congbao*, accused Taixu of spreading heterodox ideas and called him the reincarnation of Devadatta. See "Jichan shangren zhuidaohui jishi 寄禪上人追悼會紀事," *Foxue congbao* no. 4 (1913), MFQ 2:92; Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 149-150.

[291] Taixu, "Sanshi nian lai zhi Zhongguo fojiao 三十年來之中國佛教," TXQ 29:50-51.

[292] Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 97.

[293] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," TXQ 29:196.

[294] Zhuangnian was Taixu's grand-master (the teacher of his tonsure master) who gave Taixu his name. For a biographical account, see XFRC 1:819-820.

spend time in the Meditation Hall at Jinshan Monastery, but as his "thought was already leaning toward New Learning," he decided to go to Nanjing instead.[296] His decision to travel to Nanjing to attend the Jetavana Hermitage marked his departure from the traditional *conglin* training system, of which he had extensive experience by this time. Hong Jinlian considers this a turning point in Taixu's career, one in which he departed from the traditional career path and entered into the unpredictable world of new Buddhism.[297] Two principles of the Jetavana Hermitage that informed Taixu's educational thought included its modern pedagogy and Yang Wenhui's ideal to create a Chinese Buddhism that would be a contributing member of world Buddhism. Therefore, it can be said that when Taixu emerged from his 3-year retreat in 1917, he was armed with both a profound knowledge of traditional Buddhist training and doctrinal literature, as well as a preparedness and determination to engage in the modernization project of Chinese Buddhism.

Reorganizing the *Sangha*

In the quietude of his Putuo Mountain retreat, Taixu was able to read widely and write prolifically. A quick glance at the titles of books and articles he composed during the three-year period reveals his broad, yet somewhat random, interest and opinions. Jiang Canteng critiques that many of Taixu's works lack depth and academic sophistication, with the exception of his "On Reorganizing the Sangha System" (*Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* 整理僧伽制度論).[298] So,

---

[295] Taixu had a close friendship with Yuanying in his early days but the two fell out later on due to differences in their positions on Buddhist modernization and struggle over leadership of the Chinese Buddhist Association. See Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 130-133; Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 806-811.

[296] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," TXQ 29:196.

[297] Hong, *Taixu dashi fojiao xiandaihua zhi yanjiu*, 29.

[298] Jiang, *Taixu dashi qianzhuan*, 131.

what exactly in this work, which seems equally vague and unrealistic as many of his other works,[299] led Jiang to his conclusion?

According to Taixu, his reform career can be summarized as one that was "aimed at the reorganization and propagation of the *sangha* and the Right Faith [lay] Society, guided in action by the *Yogācāra Prātimoksa.*"[300] Taixu considered the winter of 1915 the new beginning of his reformist career – when he contemplated on his past experience, failure included, and his vision for a new Buddhism and wrote the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*.[301] He held high hopes for the newly founded republic, anticipating that it would mark the beginning of a democracy in China.[302] He stressed the urgency of *sangha* reorganization to produce a Buddhism that China needed. Realizing that Buddhism was faced with a hostile political environment, an increasingly influential lay Buddhist community, and the competition from Christian missionaries, Taixu's *sangha* restructuring was aimed at improving its virtue, education, and ability to manage worldly affairs.

The *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* is divided into four sections. The first defines the target of his proposed reorganization – the estimated 800,000 Han Buddhist monks and nuns of the eighteen provinces in China proper. Taixu excluded Tibet and Mongolia because their respective societies practiced theocracy, so it would not be possible to separate religious reform from a political one.[303] Yinshun dismisses the accuracy of the estimated *sangha* population based on a

---

[299] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 52.

[300] "*Zhizai zhengxing fojiao senghui, xingzai yuqie pusa jieben* 志在整興佛教僧 會, 行在瑜伽菩薩戒本." See Taixu, "Zhixing zishu 志行自述," TXQ 17:186.

[301] Taixu, "Wo de fojiao gaijin yundong lueshi," TXQ 29:81.

[302] Taixu, "Da moushi shu 答某師書," TXQ 28:84.

[303] Taixu, "Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun 整理僧伽制度論," TXQ 17:5.

census dating back to Qianlong's reign in the Qing dynasty. He also claims that given the situation in China, it would not be possible to attain a separation of religion and the state, and therefore, the only section of reference value in the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* is the third – the systematic reorganization of the monks and nuns.[304] However, Taixu obviously did not base his calculation on the Qianlong era data alone. He estimated that there were two monks per 1,000 people in the population, which was thought to be around 400 millions.[305] More importantly, amid the *miaochan xingxue* campaigns and the new intellectuals' criticism of Buddhist monks as an unproductive, parasitic group, he argued that such a small percentage of Buddhist monastics would not affect the overall productivity of the nation. In addition, he was trying to show that even in the current situation, Buddhism possessed enough property and resources to support the livelihood of its monks so that they could serve as the moral inspiration for the citizens of the new nation. Lastly, Chen and Deng point out that Taixu was influenced by Zhang Taiyan's "On Establishing Religion" (*Jianli zongjiao lun* 建立宗教論) in separating the clergy and the laity in his reorganization plan.[306] I would add that, more importantly, he was trying to affirm the authority of the *sangha*, which faced severe competition from the lay elites for representation.

The second section of the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* deals with the propagation of the different schools in Chinese Buddhism. Taixu identified eight indigenous Chinese Buddhist schools (*zong* 宗): the Huayan 華嚴, Tiantai 天臺, Sanlun 三論, Weishi 唯識, Pure Land 淨土, Zhenyan 真言, Chan 禪, and Vinaya 律 schools. He affirmed that each of these schools, founded during the Sui-Tang period, completely embodied the entirety of the Ultimate Truth –

[304] Yinshun, TXN, 81-82.

[305] Taixu did, in fact, get his facts right. It was estimated that China had a population of about 430 millions by 1850. See Ping-ti Ho, *Studies on the Population of China, 1368 - 1953* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 281.

[306] Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 65.

the undifferentiated and undiscriminating One Buddha Vehicle (*yi focheng* 一佛乘). Hence, he stressed that they should be equally emphasized in the new Buddhist education system. He proposed assigning an existing monastery as the headquarters for each of these schools. Buddhist monks were to start with specializing in the doctrine of one school and gradually learn the interconnectedness of all of them. Yinshun attributes Taixu's designation of the eight indigenous schools to the influence of Ouyi Zhixu 藕益智旭 (1599 -1655).[307] However, one significant influence in Taixu's formulation of the eight schools that should not be overlooked is Yang Wenhui's introduction of the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* (*Bazong gangyao* 八宗綱要; Jap: Hasshū Kōyō) by the Kamakura Kegon monk Gyōnen 凝然 (1240-1321). The eight schools in the Hasshū Kōyō include the *Kusha* 倶舎, *Jōjitsu* 成實, *Ritsu* 律, *Hossō* 法相, *Sanron* 三論, *Tendai* 天臺, *Kegon* 華嚴, and *Shingon* 真言 schools, with the *Zen* 禪tradition discussed as the ninth popular school in Japanese Buddhism.[308] Yang Wenhui added Chan and Pure Land to the initial eight and wrote *The Essentials of the Ten Schools* (*Shizong lueshuo* 十宗略說).[309] However, Lan Richang has shown that the term "Sanlun" did not exist between the Tang and Qing period in China. In fact, the discussion about the various "schools" in Buddhism only became prevalent among Chinese intellectuals since the late Qing as a result of the introduction of certain Japanese Buddhist texts, primarily by Yang Wenhui.[310] It can therefore be concluded that Taixu's designation of the eight schools was at least partly influenced by this intellectual

[307] Ibid., 80.

[308] Gyonen et al., *The Essentials of the Eight Traditions* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1994).

[309] Yang Wenhui, "Shi zong lueshuo 十宗略說," *YRQ*, 149-155.

[310] Lan Richang 藍日昌, "Zongpai yu dengtong: lun Sui Tang fojiao zongpai guannian de fazhan 宗派與燈統: 論隋唐佛教宗派觀念的發展," *Chengda Zongjiao Yu Wenhua Xuebao* 成大宗教與文化學報 no. 4 (2004): 28.

trend to "recover" the Buddhist schools of the Buddhist "Golden Age" of the Sui and Tang. In the text, he mentioned the re-introduction from Japan of several essential texts that belonged to the various schools.[311] In addition, he named eight instead of ten (or more) schools, clearly leaving out the *Abhidharma-kośa* (Jushe 俱舍) and *Satyasiddhi* (Chengshi 成實) as these were the "Hinayāna" schools that "the lay and monastic Chinese Buddhists feel ashamed to discuss!"[312]

Here he also raised another important concept about Buddhist instruction: except for the esoteric and Chan schools, for which a close teacher-disciple relationship was the prerequisite, students of Buddhism could gain insight into the essence of the respective teachings of the eight schools through studying their texts. Direct instruction from a teacher was not a precondition of spiritual insights.[313]

This seems like an unmistakably modern approach to Buddhism which emphasized the centrality of canonical texts and de-emphasized the master-disciple relation.[314] However, I argue that here Taixu was not so much concerned with removing the clergy as intermediaries for individuals seeking ultimate religious goal.[315] His reform, after all, was to ensure the centrality and survival of the monastic institution in modern Chinese Buddhism. Yet by highlighting the study of texts, Taixu was involved in the reformulation of the monastic institution and its intellectual practices in the creation of a "textual community," which altered the way that

[311] Taixu, "Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun," 38 and 41.

[312] Ibid., 44.

[313] Ibid., 30.

[314] McMahan, *Buddhist Modernism*, 7.

[315] "Spiritual egalitarianism" is identified by Gombrich and Obeyesekere as one of the defining characteristics of "Protestant Buddhism." See Gombrich and Obeyesekere, *Buddhism Transformed*, 215.

Chinese Buddhists "understood the texts and practices most deserving of their attention," in Anne Blackburn's words.[316] Furthermore, the intellectual trends of this time, as well as a rapidly growing Buddhist print culture,[317] both contributed to this reformulation of orthodoxy. This highly empowering reformulation of orthodoxy would prove to be an important characteristic of new Buddhist education in China, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

In the third section of the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*, Taixu discussed the structural reorganization of monasteries and *sangha* members in the nation. The 800,000 Han monks and nuns should be represented and organized under a centralized national body, with respective local level administrations. He drew multiple charts, tables, and application forms in illuminating his plan. Following late imperial administrative structure, he divided Buddhism in the country into provinces (*sheng* 省), circuits (*dao* 道), and counties (*xian* 縣), each with a designated number of public monasteries, temples offering ritual services, teaching facilities, Lotus Societies (for the laity to practice Buddha recitation), Buddhist hospitals, orphanages, and nurseries. They would all be administered by the central Buddhist organization in the capital called the Buddhist Vihāra (*fo fa seng yuan* 佛法僧園). There should be factories and a central Buddhist bank, which would oversee the financial aspects and allocate resources for all constituents of the organization, within the Buddhist Vihāra. In classifying all monks and nuns, he offered detailed descriptions for their education requirements, ranks and responsibilities, along with admission requirements and application forms for anyone who wished to seek ordination. He also designed strict regulations for communal living, property ownership, ritual

[316] Blackburn, *Buddhist Learning and Textual Practice in Eighteenth-century Lankan Monastic Culture*, 5.

[317] Scott has argued that the Buddhist print culture was a "catalyst for change in religious thought and practice" in this period. See Scott, "Conversion by the Book," 38.

schedule, and even monastic robes for various occasions.[318] Lastly, this section also offered careful planning for all levels of monastic education, from general education to specialized training in each of the eight schools.

In the last and fourth section, Taixu outlined a 15-year plan in three 5-year phases to realize his *sangha* reorganization. In 1915, Yuan Shikai's Beiyang government, in an attempt to bring religion under state control, promulgated the Rules for Temple Management (*Guanli simiao tiaoli* 管理寺廟條例), which also disbanded the General Chinese Buddhist Association founded only two years earlier.[319] Taixu was well aware of the fear once again taking over the Buddhist community even in his retreat.[320] Therefore, the hostile government policy was in large part an impetus for his writing of the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*. The plan to gradually consolidate all Buddhist property and transform it into the public property shared by all members of the *sangha*, and to create universal education for all monks and nuns remained the underlying projects for all three phases. For the second of the three 5-year phase, he proposed the creation of a Buddhist Studies Society and a proselytizing bureau that would eventually culminate in the lay-based Right Faith Society (Fojiao zhengxin hui 佛教正信會). The Right Faith Society would then serve as the intermediary in negotiating with the government for the independence of Buddhism from the state. Its first task would be the abolition of the Rules for Temple

[318] Taixu, "Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun," 170-174. Contrary to the impression one gets from a photograph of Taixu wearing a robe of his own design in Welch, Taixu did not propose any re-designed monastic garbs in the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*. Misled by Welch, Pittman also claims that Taixu "designed his own system of modern garb…with a secular cut." See Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 53; Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 232. However, Taixu and some of his students later got involved in a controversy when they proposed to modernize and simplify the Chinese monastic robes. See Dongchu, "Gaige sengchuang yu tigao lifu 改革僧裝與提高禮服," HCY, vol. 27, no. 4 (1946), MFQ 202:383-386.

[319] See Goossaert and Palmer, *Religious Question of Modern China*, 59; Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindai shi*, 113.

[320] Taixu, "Taizu zizhuan," 212. There were rumors that the rules were issued based on Dixian's request, who was invited to give lectures in Beijing by Yuan. Taixu wrote letter condemning Dixian from his retreat.

Management. Taixu argued that only then could Buddhism focus on a thorough internal reorganization. Except for criminal laws and taxation, the Buddhist establishment would be completely autonomous in managing its own affairs. He further proposed the creation of a Buddhist Fund (Fojiao jijin tuan 佛教基金團) that would raise money through the issuance of saving bonds targeted at monastics and the Buddhist laity.[321] Management of the fund would be placed in the hands of lay people working for the Buddhist bank and profit from its investment would go toward funding the expenditure of the Buddhist Vihāra as well as its various propaganda, charity, and educational organs.

Reflecting on his reform career, Taixu claimed that his *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* was aimed at "creating a new Buddhism fitted for the present time, with a firm grounding in Han Chinese Buddhism."[322] Clearly, if his plans were realized, there would be a Buddhist Vatican in the Chinese capital! This is probably why both his critics, such as Welch, and sympathizers, such as Yinshun, dismiss his proposal as grandiose but impractical.[323] Others, probably in line with tradition and out of respect for his reputation as one of the most prominent great masters in modern Chinese Buddhism, opt to either paint it in broad strokes[324] or mention it along his other more "realistic" plans that led to immediate results,[325] which, I argue, only points to the significance of this earlier plan. In fact, Taixu himself realized that such an ambitious plan would need the readiness of both the government to fully recognize religious freedom and the monasteries to surrender their property. Therefore, he stressed that it should not be ruthlessly

[321] Taixu, "Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun," 181.

[322] Taixu, "Wo de fojiao geming shibai shi," TXQ 29:62.

[323] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, and Yinshun, TXN, 82.

[324] Luo, *Taixu dashi dui Zhongguo fojiao xiandai hua daolu zhi jueze*, 132.

[325] See Hong, *Taixu dashi fojiao xiandaihua zhi yanjiu*, Chapter 4.

attempted and that it could only be achieved through patient elucidation, sincere dialogue, and careful study.[326] It was this last point that was the focus of his reformist career – he spent the rest of his life trying to convince both the government and his fellow Buddhists that a reformed Chinese Buddhism would be mutually beneficial. For Taixu, the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* was more about a vision for the future of Buddhism than an imminent plan. He would not have written it otherwise - by this point, he had had enough insight into the state of Buddhism in China to realize that his plan was unrealistic. But perhaps the fact that he was not an heir to any prominent lineage made him more willing to consider an inclusive approach – he did not owe allegiance to any monastery or lineage.[327] As ambitious and unrealistic as it might have been, the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* was a meticulous piece of work written with attention to the smallest details – the piece is 185 pages long. Furthermore, it served as the guiding principle for Taixu's subsequent attempts to reform Chinese Buddhism, although he did come up with modifications and revisions according to situations on the ground.

On Secular Education

Taixu's views on secular education had also greatly shaped his plans for Buddhist education. He was harshly critical of the education during the Republican period. First of all, he saw China's constantly changing education policies, which tended to imitate those in Japan and the West,[328] as the primary cause for social disorder as such policies lacked a comprehensive plan and

[326] Taixu, "Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun," 185.

[327] Taixu, "Xin yu rongguan 新與融貫," TXQ 1:447.

[328] On the changing model for education during the Republican period, see Suzanne Pepper, *Radicalism and Education Reform in 20th-century China: the Search for an Ideal Development Model* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), chapter 5.

guiding principles.[329] He called modern schools the destroyer of citizens' morality and the creator of warlords, thugs, and communists:

> 與其廟產興學，倒不如學產興廟。興廟雖消極的不能為善，而興學卻積極的很能為惡。
>
> Rather than promoting *miaochan xingxue*, we might as well confiscate schools to build temples. Even though temples are passively not committing good, building schools is actively committing evil! [330]

He saw the problem in the failure of Chinese educators in creating a system that suited China's needs according to its social conditions. Lacking recourse to traditional elite status after the abolition of the imperial examinations, many saw modern education as the only path to achieve the status of gentry-officials. Once they have been to school, argued Taixu, young people become unproductive – their only career opportunities were to become government officials or teachers – and unable to reintegrate into their family. [331] But China had an agrarian economy. Once young people left their farms behind and rushed to the cities but could not find satisfying jobs,[332] they not only added to the burden of the farmers in the countryside but became a destabilizing force in society. Taixu blamed the educators, most of them urban elites, for failing

[329] Taixu, "Shijiamouni de jiaoyu 釋迦牟尼的教育," TXQ 23:1440.

[330] Taixu, "Cong di'erci miaochan xingxue shuodao disanjie quanguo fojiaotu daibiao dahui 由第二次廟產興學運動說到第三屆全國佛教徒代表大會," TXQ 17:420.

[331] It is estimated that by the 1930s, only about 20% of the population have received some form of elementary education. See Pepper, *Radicalism and Education Reform in 20th-century China*, 77.

[332] On the problem of underemployment for school graduates, including those who returned from abroad, during the Republican period, see Thomas Curran, *Educational Reform in Republican China: The Failure of Educators to Create a Modern Nation* (Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press, 2005), 311–340.

to understand the life and needs of people outside the urban centers. He argued that the education system that China needed was one that could actually improve the life of its people.[333]

Taixu must have taken all this into consideration when he designed his new Buddhist education. Although his reform movement benefited greatly from the *foxueyuan* graduates who went on to teach in other schools or work in Buddhist publishing, he clearly did not see that as the ultimate goal for his educational plans. Blaming most Buddhist schools for reproducing the old mentality of cultivating a "literati class," he urged students at his academies to cultivate morality and virtue through the performance of menial labor at the monastery. He realized that most students could not return to their temples and reintegrate after having attended modern academies. He was worried that if it continued, then the day when Buddhist education was completely popularized would be the day when Buddhism was destroyed.[334] Hence, he told his students at Wuchang in 1924, China needed a well-rounded *sangha* that could "combine knowledge, action, and skills" [335] in promoting Buddhism and benefitting the world.

Reflecting on the influence of Darwinism and other Western ideas in Chinese education, Taixu was concerned that they would only foster unnecessary combatativeness, which he identified as the cause of endless violence and warfare in the West. Seeing Buddhism as the most superior form of moral and spiritual education that could lead the country to true wealth and prosperity, he expected his students to perfect their own bodhisattva path so that they could serve as the moral exemplars and spread Buddhism among the populace.[336] He stressed the importance

---

[333] Taixu, "Cong Zhongguo de yiban jiaoyu shuo dao seng jiaoyu 從中國的一般教育說到僧教育," TXQ 23:1421, 1425.

[334] Taixu, "Xiandai seng jiaoyu de weiwang yu fojiao de qiantu 現代僧教育的危亡與佛教的前途," TXQ 18:90.

[335] Taixu, "Zhishi xingwei nengli zhi sanzhe nengfou yizhi 知識行為能力之三者能否一致," TXQ 27:137.

[336] Taixu, "Lun jiaoyu 論教育," TXQ 23:1411.

of developing a uniquely Buddhist educational system rather than simply imitating the secular system. Therefore, it can be said that an ideal *sangha* education for Taixu was one that would produce monks who were not only well versed in Buddhist doctrine, but were also able to live a self-sufficient life while having the necessary skills to propagate Buddhism to benefit society. What kind of an educational system then, one may ask, did he propose to cultivate a *sangha* that could live up to these expectations?

An Ideal Sangha Education

Taixu was critical of existing Buddhist schools in China. He accused most of them of being concerned only with protecting monastic property from government confiscation. These schools lacked a systematic plan and comprehensive curriculum. Many simply borrowed the curriculum and textbooks of secular schools. He doubted if those schools could even be called Buddhist. He was equally pessimistic about other monastic schools founded by renowned Buddhist masters aimed at producing *dharma* teachers (*fashi* 法師) who were only trained in the doctrine of one school or lineage. By "schools fostering *dharma* teaching" (*fashi yangchengsuo* 法師養成所) he was referring to Yuexia's Avatamsaka University and Dixian's Guanzong Study Society:

> 這在僧教育的立場來批評，他們所辦的佛教教育，不是為整個佛教情形所需要的來辦的，不是為信解行證全部佛教來辦的，不是普及佛教教育的，這都是古時代階級式的教育遺痕。
>
> From the point of view of *sangha* education, the founding of their schools is not based on the overall need of Buddhism. Their pedagogy is not according to the four stages of faith,

understanding, practice, and realization in Buddhist cultivation. They are also not aimed at popularizing Buddhist education. This is reminiscent of feudal education in the past.[337] Such training, he argued, was incapable of producing a *sangha* that could "lead and sustain Buddhism in the modern age."[338] In describing the type of Buddhist leaders China needed, he often employed the term "*sangha* character" (*sengge* 僧格) – the moral character which was also the most basic quality for anyone to be considered a member of the *sangha*. One who possessed *sengge* was one who had solid faith in the Three Jewels and was fully dedicated to the selfless practice of the six *pāramitās*.[339] It can be said that his entire reform career was aimed at creating monks who possessed the moral qualities to contribute to a modernizing China while remaining true to the spirit of Mahāyāna Buddhism. In Don Pittman's words, Taixu was an "ethical pietist" who emphasized that action was at the very heart of religious transformation, and that wisdom could not be attained apart from compassionate action in this world.[340]

Taixu had a chance to visit Taiwan and Japan shortly after he re-emerged from his retreat in 1917.[341] Before he reached Japan, he met a Sōtō monk who was teaching at a government school in Taiwan, from whom he learned about the organizational structure, education, and training for monks in Japanese Buddhism. While in Japan, he visited various Buddhist monasteries and schools, including Ōtani University, where he collected information about their

[337] Taixu, "Xiandai seng jiaoyu de weiwang yu fojiao de qiantu," TXQ 18:89.

[338] Taixu, "Seng jiaoyu zhi mudi yu chengxu 僧教育之目的與程序," TXQ 17:475.

[339] Taixu, "Jianseng dagang 建僧大綱," TXQ 17:201-205.

[340] Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 8.

[341] A monk from Taiwan, which was a Japanese colony at his time, invited Yuanying to give teachings in Taiwan. Yuanying recommended Taixu instead. See Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," TXQ 29:221.

Buddhist Studies program.[342] He was eager to compare what he saw with his plans in the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*. Two points are worth noting in Taixu's account of his trip to Japan. First of all, he was carefully observing the practice of Japanese Buddhism and was clearly inspired by what he saw. Yet he was rather reserved in his account – he did not enthusiastically praise Buddhism in Japan. He probably shared the mixed feeling with many of his contemporaries: on the one hand, Chinese Buddhists looked to Japan for inspiration as Japanese Buddhism was perceived to have successfully resisted the challenges of imperialism and government persecution. On the other hand, however, many Chinese Buddhists still held a strong sense of cultural superiority and nationalistic pride as Japanese Buddhism was, for centuries, seen as an offshoot of Chinese Buddhism. During his encounter with Kumagai Taiju熊谷泰壽 in Taiwan, he even criticized Japanese monks for being no different from lay people because they "did not renounce their family name, were allowed to get married and eat meat."[343]

Nonetheless, he felt deeply encouraged when he learned that the structural organization for Japanese Buddhist sects resembled that in his *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* – each having a registry for the clergy and lay households, a distinct hierarchy for temples, secular and religious schools, and cultural and charitable missions. He was at this point more convinced about the need to reorganize the Chinese *sangha*. Secondly, despite the similarities he saw between his proposed *sangha* reorganization and Japanese Buddhist institutions, he thought his system was superior with a nationwide Buddhist authority. If reorganized according to his plan, he argued, Chinese Buddhism would have the strength of developing various schools but not the weakness of the segregation and division as in Japanese Buddhism. Therefore, when he set up the

[342] Taixu, "Dongying caizhen lu 東瀛采真錄," TXQ 29:354.

[343] Ibid., 354.

Wuchang Buddhist Studies Institute, he claimed that the school's curriculum was based on that of Buddhist universities in Japan while its management was consistent with the tradition of the public monastery.[344]

Later on in his life, his plan in *sangha* reorganization went through two significant modifications. In 1927, he greatly reduced the ideal number for the *sangha*, from 800,000 to 200,000. There was a heavy emphasis on labor – in order to be self-sufficient, the majority of monks and nuns would work in farms and factories while only a small number among them would dedicate full time to the study of Buddhism and modern knowledge.[345] In 1930, Taixu further reduced the ideal number of monastics in China to 4,000 as he began to doubt whether monks and nuns could still be considered members of the *sangha* if they spent their time only on manual labor.[346] Here we see a gradual move toward an elitist approach to Buddhist education, perhaps out of necessity. The socio-political factors should not be overlooked in Taixu's change of mind. After the country was unified by the National Revolutionary Army during the Northern Expedition (1926-1928), the KMT government in Nanjing began to expand its control of every aspect of the Chinese society. During the National Education Conference in 1928, Nanjing educator Tai Shuangqui put forth a proposal for the nationalization of all temples in the country to fund mass education. Although the conference did not adopt Tai's proposal after discussing it, the Buddhists feared that this could be the omen for the worst confiscation campaign they would ever see. The promulgation of the Temple Management Rules (*Simiao guanli tiaoli* 寺廟管理條例) in 1929 further threatened to legalize the government's attempt to regulate religious life and

[344] Taixu, "Wo de fojiao gaijin yundong lueshi," 84 and 93.

[345] Taixu, "Sengzhi jinlun 僧制今論," TXQ 17:195-200.

[346] Taixu, "Jianseng dagang," TXQ 17:201-205.

expropriate temple property. [347] It alerted the different factions within Buddhism to put aside their differences and found the Chinese Buddhist Association (Zhongguo fojiao hui 中國佛教會) in Shanghai to represent all Buddhists in the nation.

This sense of imminent threat from the government forced Taixu to rethink the structure and purpose of Buddhist education. He was eager to show that the Buddhists were capable of managing their own affairs and educating their clergy for the ultimate purpose of benefitting society. Therefore, he proposed to reorganize the *sangha* into three categories: (1) the student-monks (*xueseng* 學僧), who should receive twelve years of formal religious training in stages. They would then be assigned to work at preaching halls, Buddhist schools, hospitals, orphanages, and printing presses as (2) Bodhisattva-monks (*zhiseng* 職僧 or *pusa seng*). Into their old age, they would earn the rank of (3) Elder-Monks (*deseng* 德僧 or *zhanglao seng* 長老僧) who could choose a monastery or hermitage to focus on deepening their religious practice of choice, or serve as mentors for young monks in training. Taixu's proposed twelve-year mandatory training program for student-monks was made up of two years of training in discipline and conduct (*lüyi* 律儀), four years in general Buddhist Studies, three years in advanced Buddhist Studies, and three years cultivating "experiential knowledge" (*xiuzheng* 修證) at centers for religious cultivation (*xiulin* 修林).[348] Only those eighteen years of age and above and had at least a high school education should be admitted as novices into the two-year basic training. And full ordination should only be granted to those who had successfully completed the training in basic monastic discipline and conduct. Such would be an education program to ensure that Buddhist

[347]Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 42 and 50.

[348] Pittman, *Toward A Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 236.

monks had a firm foundation in the Three Trainings of virtue, meditation, and wisdom. He claimed that even if a small percentage of monks could successfully complete the twelve-year program, Buddhism would be blessed with enough virtuous leaders for the next generation.[349]

Due to the lack of enthusiasm from his Buddhist colleagues and fierce competition from the state for the control and disposal of religious property, he gave up the idea of reestablishing monasteries that ought to be exclusively associated with one of the eight schools. He also dedicated a lot more emphasis on the education for the laity in what he called the "Buddhafication" movement (*fohua yundong* 佛化運動) as the means to popularize Buddhism among the citizens.[350] Even if it all worked out the way Taixu planned, asks Welch, what would happen to the rest of the Chinese *sangha*?[351]

For those not qualified to enter Buddhist academies as student-monks or serve within the Buddhist establishment as Bodhisattva-monks, Taixu proposed study classes that could last between one to four years where they would acquire the most basic doctrinal knowledge and secular skills. These monastics could then enter the rank of the Bodhisattva-Monks.[352] In fact, given the harsh reality that Buddhism faced at this time, Taixu did expect many of them to be asked or to choose to return to lay life. Yet he stressed that it was essential to provide them with support and counseling to help them re-integrate into society so that they could remain Buddhist and contribute as active members of the Right Faith Society. He urged the public to not discriminate against those who chose to return to lay life as Buddhism allowed those who could

[349]Taixu, "Fojiao ying ban zhi jiaoyu yu seng jiaoyu 佛教應辦之教育與僧教育," TXQ 17:486.

[350] Taixu, "Jianseng dagang," TXQ 17:201-207.

[351] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 52.

[352] Taixu, "Jianshe xiandai Zhongguo fojiao tan 建設現代中國佛教談," TXQ 17:266.

not observe the *vinaya* to disrobe.[353] He also encouraged these former monastics to organize self-support groups to continue to promote and preserve Buddhism.[354]

Of the three groups of monastics in his reorganizing proposal, Taixu was only able to gain a following among the student-monks. And even in the training of student-monks, for which he is thought to be most successful, he was only able to realize two of the four levels of the ideal training – the general and advanced Buddhist Studies programs – at the Buddhist academies he founded. A synopsis of his educational thought shows that beginning from the writing of the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*, *sangha* education occupied a central place in Taixu's reform effort. Throughout his life, he was at times forced to come to terms with reality and was not hesitant to revise his plans – the reason many accuse him for being capricious and inconsistent. For instance, Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People (*Sanmin zhuyi* 三民主義) were incorporated into Taixu's discussion of Buddhist education in the 1920s and 30s, a period in which every sphere of society was politicized.[355] In addition, many were impartial to his proposal for a Buddhist political party and monks running for public office – a hotly debated issue among his students, as I will show Chapter 4. Yet at a closer look, there are elements in his earlier proposal that remained unchanged which served as the guiding principle for the reform. For example, he insisted that both the laity and the *sangha* needed to be organized to ensure the visibility of Buddhism in the socio-political settings of the Republican era and took every opportunity to make that a reality. His relentless effort to create a multi-faceted *sangha* education is evident in his work at the Wuchang, Minnan, and Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies Institute. The practical aspect of his plan also should not be overlooked. Aside from requiring his students to participate

[353] Taixu, "Zunzhong sengjie huansu ren 尊重僧界還俗人," TXQ 17:627.

[354] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jiandaishi*, 218.

[355] See, for example, "Dui Zhongguo geming seng de xunci 對於中國佛教革命僧的訓詞," TXQ 17:601.

in the day-to-day running of the monastery, he wanted them to go out and make a difference in the world – either in the form of giving public lectures, organizing charitable works, or engaging in prison ministry. One other point worth mentioning is that he never gave up on *conglin* education, although the center of his proposed education would shift from the monasteries to the academies. In other words, despite the modifications, the basis of his educational plan remained consistent. A list of his education-related works is provided in Table 1 of Appendix 2 below.

The founding of the Wuchang Buddhist Academy was significant because Taixu was finally able to put some of his ideals into practice. Despite the hardships in maintaining the school and its short life, the Wuchang Academy is arguably one of the most important Buddhist schools in modern China, in both physical and symbolic senses. It was the inspiration and model for the next generation of Buddhist academies. Beyond the physical confines of the school, the "Wuchang networks" have had a real world influence on how Chinese Buddhists imagine their identity. Taixu's followers – usually young and educated monks who were often more critical of the "old" system than he was – were the ones who carried Taixu's vision and spread it. They did so either through setting up or teaching at other monastic schools across China, or through the conceptual creation of a collective "student-monk" identity that would be used as a discursive tool in negotiating for a unique Buddhist citizenship discourse in the decades to come. Taixu's educational philosophy was the most systematic, comprehensive, and ambitious for his time. He directly associated *sangha* education with the structural reorganization of the Buddhist institution. Because of that, the actual changes he was able to make were limited as it would have involved a complete revamp of the Buddhist establishment, something he was not able to command much influence on during his lifetime. And yet his overall influence on the practice of modern Chinese Buddhism continues to fascinate. Therefore, given the voluminous existing scholarship on his

life and thought, I argue that there are still aspects of his work that need to be explored to shed light on overlooked issues in the past.

A Model *foxueyuan*: The Wuchang Buddhist Studies Academy

> 本院之建設，與從前之辦僧校迥異。彼為抵禦侵佔計而模仿學校制，余痛學校之惡習、與不能注重學識普及之叢林，始有佛學院之產生。佛學院創辦之唯一宗旨：一、仿照叢林制度，組織普及僧俗修習佛法之學院；二、仿照學校課程，使容易造成適應現代宏法之人才。然而僧俗群居，賴以保持秩序，訓練精神，唯在規則；故本院管理，統取嚴格。又學佛者，首在戒奢侈，故本院衣食住三，均取清苦淡泊之風。此為佛學院取法叢林，期改良現今學校放肆之風尚，而亦恢復固有之簡單生活也。如是遵循進行，始有行解相應之希望，宏法利生之能力；否則、為社會之蝥賊，佛門之獅蟲而已！
>
> The founding of our academy is different from the Buddhist schools in the past. They imitated the [secular] school system to avoid confiscation. I despise the bad customs of these schools, and the public monasteries that did not emphasize universal learning. That was how the *foxueyuan* came into being. There is only one [*sic*] purpose for founding the *foxueyuan*: One, to create an academy that popularizes the study of the Buddha Dharma among the monastics and laity, based on the system of the *conglin*; two, to follow the curriculum of [modern] schools in order to produce talent that can propagate the Dharma in modern times. However, when monks and laymen share a communal living, they depend on rules to maintain order and train their spirit. Therefore, the administration of our academy is strict. In addition, the first thing a Buddhist should refrain from is over-

> indulgence. So the clothing, food, and accommodation at our academy tend to be austere and simple. This is how the *foxueyuan* learns from the *conglin* in the hope of correcting unruliness, which is the trend for schools today, and to return to the original simple lifestyle. Only if we progress in this way can there be hope to achieve the unity of practice and understanding, as well as the ability to spread the Dharma to benefit sentient beings. Otherwise, we are just like pests for society and worms in the body of the lion[356] for Buddhism.[357]

Speaking to the second incoming class of the Wuchang Buddhist Studies Institute in the fall of 1924, Taixu was clear about his goal in establishing the school – the first to adopt the name *foxueyuan* in China. At its founding, it was simply known as the *Foxueyuan*. Later on, to distinguish it from other Buddhist academies, it began to be referred to as the Wuchang Buddhist Academy, [358] or its abbreviated form Wuyuan 武院.[359] Critical of both the modern school system and existing Buddhist centers of learning, Taixu saw his school as one that adopted the best of both worlds: a modern pedagogy rooted in the ideal system of the traditional *conglin* yet without any of their shortcomings. But his tone was harsh – he had come to realize, a year after the founding of the school, that the road to creating his ideal *sangha* school was not without twists

[356] Worms in the lion's body is a common analogy in Buddhism for Buddhists who destroy the Buddha Dharma from within the religion, just as worms born from the carcass of the lion devour the lion. It is often told alongside Ānanda's dreams associated with the Buddha's prophecy about the signs for the End of Dharma (*mofa* 末法) age. See *A'nan qimeng jing* 阿難七夢經, T494.

[357] Taixu, "Dui xueren zhi xunci 對於學人之訓辭," TXQ 18:58.

[358] The earliest record that I can find which refers to it as the Wuchang Buddhist Academy is dated to 1924. However, "Wuchang" here seems to refer only to the location of the school. See "Wuchang foxueyuan jiangyi jiamu ji bianjiren yilanbiao 武昌佛學院講義價目及編輯人一覽表," *Fohua xinqingnian* 佛化新青年 vol. 2, no. 3 (1924), MFQB 3:326.

[359] "Zhongguo xuesenghui zai Wuyuan kai choubei huiyi 中國學僧會在武院開籌備會議," HCY vol. 17, no. 8, MFQ 194:365; Yinshun, TXN, 153.

and turns. This section traces the history of the rapid rise and fall of the Wuchang Academy and evaluates its place in the history of modern education in Chinese Buddhism.

Founding

If the young student-monks were Taixu's hope for creating a modern Chinese Buddhism that could meet the spiritual needs of the new era, the newly emerged lay Buddhist networks were the only source of support that he could rely on. Without the backing of the traditional monastery network, the student-monks and lay urban elites were crucial in keeping Taixu's agenda in motion and pushing it forward.

When Taixu returned from Japan in 1917, he was convinced that he had the answer for bringing Chinese Buddhism up-to-date with a series of proposals he drafted in his retreat. But he needed to cultivate a support base – large monasteries seemed like a less than ideal choice because of his strained relationship with them since the Jinshan incident. In addition, the eminent monk Jichan, who was Taixu's mentor and had helped smoothen his relationship with the elders, had passed away.

Around this time, lay Buddhist activism was emerging in Shanghai and, to a lesser extent, other Chinese urban centers. Members of the lay Buddhist networks were collectively identified as "householders" (*jushi* 居士). Although not a new term in Chinese Buddhism, Jessup claims that the term "householders" adopted new layers of meaning in the early Republican period. Unlike the common worshippers who occasionally visited religious sites, the *jushi* made a formal commitment to Buddhism yet maintained their status as regular members of society. More importantly, the term usually denoted social prestige and religious attainment in early twentieth

century urban culture.[360] The *jushi* were the entrepreneurs, professionals, government and military officials who organized themselves into study societies and activist religious communities in cities across China. For these political and business elites, their membership in religious communities also gave them moral authority. Furthermore, faced with fierce competition from cheap foreign imports and a deep sense of humiliation from a series of unequal treatises with foreign powers, (nationalist) public sentiment in Chinese urban culture expressed itself in campaigns to buy national goods (*guohuo* 國貨)[361] and revive "national learning" (*guoxue* 國學).[362]

To the urban elites, therefore, Buddhism provided both a spiritual and a nationalist option amidst political uncertainties, economic industrialization, and constant warfare. In facing fundamental changes in Chinese society and culture, their participation in Buddhism went beyond the traditional practice of making donations to and sponsorship for temples and their ritual activities.[363] The social elites were eager to participate as Buddhists in the cultural, educational, and social spheres. In the "householder groves" (*jushilin* 居士林), they were active in organizing public lectures, study and practice groups, as well as various charitable activities. They were also setting up Buddhist presses to print and distribute Buddhist periodicals and non-

[360] Jessup, "The Householder Elite," 10.

[361] On "national goods" campaigns in the 1920s and 30s, see Wen-Hsin Yeh, *Shanghai Splendor: Economic Sentiments and the Making of Modern China, 1843-1949* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 71.

[362] Tze-Ki Hon, "National Essence, National Learning, and Culture: Historical Writings in Guocui Xuebao, Xueheng, and Guoxue Jikan," *Historiography East and West* 1, no. 2 (2003): 242–286. On Japanese influence in Liang Qichao's formulation of *guoxue*, see Sang Bing, "Japan and Liang Qichao's Research in the Field of National Learning," in *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao's Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China*, ed. Joshua Fogel (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2004), 177–202.

[363] Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao*, 129.

scriptural texts.[364] Though not necessarily anticlerical, they did at times launch intense criticism against the monastic community and perceived their own role as important players in the spread of the true Dharma. In brief, these groups were deploying considerable financial and social capital and were, for the most part, independent of the monastic community. Therefore, there existed an inevitable tension and competition for voice and authority with the monastic establishment.[365]

In 1918, Taixu met Chen Yuanbai 陳元白, who would remain a primary supporter of his various reform projects. Chen was a commander of the Guangxi army that helped lay siege to Nanjing during the 1911 Revolution. He went to Japan after the failed attempt to overthrow Yuan Shikai. There he developed an interest in spiritual matters and studied philosophy and meditation.[366] Through Chen, Taixu also met Jiang Zuobin 蔣作賓 (1884-1941), who studied in Japan where he was active in Sun Yat-sen's Tongmenghui 同盟會, and Huang Baocang 黃葆蒼 (1884-1923), who had once served in the military. He later became a monk under Taixu, who gave him the *dharma* name Daci 大慈.[367] They were initially active in the redemptive society Tongshan she 同善社 [368] but were said to have been converted to Buddhism and took the Three Refuges under Taixu.[369] Shortly after, they traveled to Shanghai with Taixu, and, in consultation

[364] Jessup, "The Householder Elite," 6.

[365] For a study of prominent lay Buddhists in modern China, see Liu Chengyou 劉成有, *Jinxiandai jushi foxue yanjiu* 近現代居士佛學研究 (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2002).

[366] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 2:517.

[367] Huang's older brother was a wealthy merchant in Shanghai and Hunan. See Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 226, and XFRC 1:45.

[368] On the Tongshanshe, see Goossaert and Palmer, *Religious Question in Modern China*, 100-101.

[369] Jiang, *Taixu dashi qianzhuan*, 140.

with Zhang Taiyan and the prominent layman Wang Yiting 王一亭 (1867-1938),[370] founded the Jueshe 覺社 (Bodhi Society) in Shanghai. The goals for the Jueshe were to publish monographs and periodicals, organize public lectures, and form practice groups.[371] Perhaps the most significant undertaking of the Jueshe was in publishing: in October 1918, it published the first issue of the quarterly *Jueshe congshu* 覺社叢書, which eventually changed its name to *Haichaoyin* after the first five issues.[372] Naturally, many of Taixu's works appeared in the *Jueshe congshu* and it helped promote both his ideas and reputation among the urban readership as the periodical was published by the commercial publisher Zhonghua Book 中華書局, which had an established distribution network.[373]

While Taixu was busy strengthening his ties with the Buddhist elites in Shanghai, he was also travelling between other Chinese cities to give lectures and encouraging lay Buddhists to form Buddhist Studies societies. One place where he was particular successful was in the Wuhan 武漢area.[374] On the invitation of Chen Yuanbai and Li Yinchen 李隱塵, he started to teach in Hankou as early as 1918. In the spring of 1922, he travelled there again to lecture on the *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*. More than a hundred lay people, along with a few hundred monks and nuns, attended the event. At this time, Taixu was caught in the middle of his lawsuit with the

[370] On the significant role of Wang in the Shanghai social networks, see Kuiyi Shen, "Wang Yiting in the Social Networks of 1910s-1930s Shanghai," in *At the Crossroads of Empires: Middlemen, Social Networks, and State-Building in Republican Shanghai*, ed. Nara Dillon and Jean C Oi (Stanford, CA: Standford University Press, 2008), 45–64. For a biographical account of Wang, see XFRC 1:152-154.

[371] Yinshun, TXN, 97.

[372] The complete run of the *Jueshe congshu* is reprinted in MFQ 6-7 and MFQB 1.

[373] Scott, "Conversion by the Book," 169.

[374] Wuhan was the conglomeration of the three cities Wuchang 武昌, Hankou 漢口, and Hanyang 漢陽. For a history of Wuhan as a regional, national, and international trade center, see William Rowe, *Hankow: Commerce and Society in a Chinese City, 1796-1889* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1984), and *Hankow: Conflict and Community in a Chinese City, 1796-1895* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1989).

Jingci Monastery in Hangzhou. Upon hearing his aspiration to create a new Buddhist school, the Wuhan lay elites enthusiastically supported the idea and collectively decided that they would purchase a property to house the school. Over thirty lay people, including Chen Yuanbai, Li Yinchen, Wang Senfu 王森甫 (1881-1934),[375] and Hu Zihu 胡子笏 (1876-1943),[376] pledged to contribute at least $400 a year each to support the *foxueyuan* as co-founders.

Soon after, they found a property in the residential area within the city wall of Wuchang. The property was previously the residence of Li Shaoping 黎少屏, who agreed to sell it at a lowered price of $15000 and was willing to receive the payment in installments as the lay people could not raise the full amount immediately.[377] Construction work to transform the three buildings on the premises into a school hence began. In addition, a preparatory committee was set up, during which Li Yinchen was elected as the chairperson. Hu Ruilin 胡瑞林 and Pi Jiannong 皮劍農 were charged with task of drafting the charter for the institution according to Taixu's ideas. On the Buddha's Birthday in the fourth month of 1922, in an elaborate ceremony, Taixu formally accepted the invitation by the co-founders to serve as the founding principal of the *foxueyuan*. The school was also registered with the Hubei 湖北 government.[378]

The charter for the *foxueyuan* (*foxueyuan zhangcheng* 佛學院章程) is noteworthy for our purpose here because of its comprehensiveness. Divided into fifteen chapters, it is a compendium

[375] Wang Senfu was an affluent textile merchant in Hankou. He supported the 1911 Revolution by lending material support to the revolutionaries. Before he became a committed Buddhist, he was already active in organizing charity work. He was president to the Hankou branch of the Red Cross. See XFRC 1:181-182; Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 2:518-519.

[376] Hu graduated from Meiji University in economics and politics. He was a leading industrialist in Wuhan. Later, he became a practitioner of Tibetan Buddhism and a student of Taixu's disciple Dayong 大勇. See XFRC 1:780-783 and Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 2:705-707.

[377] Taixu, "Foxueyuan zhi yuanshe ji 佛學院置院舍記," TXQ 31:1138.

[378] Yinshun, TXN 138.

of regulations covering: the founding principles, admission requirements, curriculum, schedule, breaks and holidays, fees, evaluations, graduation, withdrawal, job descriptions for each administrative office and its power, rules for communal living, merit and disciplinary procedures, etiquette, fee waivers, expansion, and supplementary articles.[379] The founding principles, admission requirements, and curriculum were consistent with Taixu's earlier proposal. They stressed that the academy was founded to prepare both lay and monastic Buddhists to proliferate the *Dharma* and benefit sentient beings. The curriculum was evenly divided to cover the doctrinal and commentarial tradition of each of the eight schools. Secular subjects such as Western ethics, psychology, biology, philosophy, and sociology were to be taught every semester. Additionally, language instruction would alternate among English, Japanese, Sanskrit, and Tibetan. (See Table 2 of Appendix 2 below for a complete curriculum for the three-year general Buddhist Studies program.) The strict and detailed rules and regulations for communal living also resembled those at a public monastery.

In the seventh month of the same year, all preparation and construction work were completed. Taixu moved into the school, monk Kongye 空也 (1885-1946), laymen Shi Yiru 史一如 (1876-1925), Du Hansan 杜漢三, and Chen Cibo 陳濟博 were hired as teachers. Shi Yiru also took over as the editor for the periodical *Haichaoyin*, which was now moved to Wuchang. Li Yinchen invested in a Right Faith Press (Zhengxin yinshuguan 正信印書舘) for publishing textbooks and other scriptural materials.[380] The preparatory committee, which had now accomplished its mission, was therefore dissolved. All co-founders automatically became members of the board of directors, and an election was held to select its executives. At this time,

[379] "Foxueyuan zhangcheng 佛學院章程," HCY, vol. 3, no. 5, MFQ 153:305-321.

[380] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 261.

Liang Qichao was invited to lecture at the Zhonghua University 中華大學 so he visited the new school and made a financial contribution to become a co-founder. He was elected to chair the board of directors but politely refused. Upon the insistence of those in attendance, he agreed to accept the title with the understanding that Chen Yuanbai would serve as the acting chair.[381] In September, the school opened its doors to about seventy lay and monastic students, which included some of Taixu's most loyal followers in the years to come, such as monks Shufang 漱芳, Nengshou 能守, Mo'an 默庵, Huijue 慧覺, Guankong 觀空, Yanding 嚴定, Fazun 法尊, Fafang 法舫, as well as laymen Zhang Zongzai 張宗載 and Ning Dayun 寧達蘊.[382]

Ostensibly, Taixu now had the organizational tools that he had long wished for – the *Haichaoyin* as the mouthpiece for his reform movement, the academy filled with young student-monks[383] as his base, and the generous support of affluent social elites. It was also an institution that was in large part autonomous, being free from the constraints of the relatively conservative monastic establishment. Ideally, it would have been an advanced Buddhist teachers' school whose graduates would set up more Buddhist academies across the country.[384] Yet as we will come to see, this system was not without its vulnerability. Relying solely on lay support, he had nothing to fall back on when a consensus on which direction to steer the organization could not

[381] Taixu, "Foxueyuan yuandong lueshi 佛學院院董會略史," TXQ 29:65.

[382] Yinshun, TXN, 142. A female division of the academy opened in 1924. See Yuan Yuan, "Chinese Buddhist Nuns in the Twentieth Century: A Case Study in Wuhan," *Journal of Global Buddhism* no. 10 (2009): 375–412.

[383] Of the 54 students in the first graduating class, only three were over the age of thirty. The rest were in their twenties except for one in his teens. See "Xueren tongxunchu: xian biyezhe 學人通訊處: 現畢業者," *Foxueyuan tongxuelu* 佛學院同學錄, MFQB 4:407-412. Robert Culp has observed that a significant proportion of secondary school students between 1912 and 1937 were young adults, who were in their late teens and early twenties, rather than adolescents. Assuming that a good number of the students at Wuchang had received some form of secondary school education before enrolling, I say that they were "young" by the standard of their time. See Culp, *Articulating Citizenship*, 25.

[384] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 262.

be reached. As much as Taixu was the guiding master of the institution, he completely depended on the good will and continued support of the laity. And as I have pointed out earlier, the laity was growing increasing aware of its collective identity as an autonomous agent in Buddhist activism, demanding that its voice be heard. Furthermore, the May Fourth student movement was taking over the young minds of the country, and student-monks at his academy were no exception. Taixu's wish was to organize and mobilize the student-monks as the harbingers of his Buddhist reform. But he did not always have full control over their thought and activities. The radical Buddhist New Youth movement, which will be discussed in the next section, is a good example for this.

Development

In the first two years, the academic and proselytizing activities of the Wuchang Academy were at their peak. Students spent 5-6 hours in class and another 3-4 on reading and school works. The meals, as well as morning meditation and evening chanting, were conducted in a fashion similar to those at the *conglin* – the only difference being the chanting of the *Ascent Sūtra of Maitreya* (*Mile shangsheng jing* 彌勒上生經) and the recitation of Maitreya's name with merit dedicated to rebirth in the Tushita Heaven rather than the standard Amitābha Pure Land liturgy.[385]

The curriculum in the first semester was designed to prepare students in cultivating fundamental faith in Buddhism and to teach them the basics of Buddhism. The course lineup was the same as given in the charter, except for Taixu's *Fa puti xinlun* 發菩提心論 and the *Zhenshiyi pin* 真實義品chapter of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, which he taught in place of the *Awakening of*

[385] Jiang claims that Taixu tried to distinguish his school from the conservative monastic establishment, while Ritzinger argues that this actually marked the beginning of Taixu's formulation of a new Maitreya cult. See Jiang, *Taixu dashi qianzhuan*, 182 and Ritzinger, "Anarchy in the Pure Land," 179.

Faith. He also compiled a textbook from his class on the various Buddhist schools and their origins (*Fojiao zhi zongpai yuanliu* 佛教之宗派源流). The *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* was taught by Kongye. Shi Yiru[386] lectured on Hinayāna Buddhism using textbooks he translated from Japanese – the *Introduction to Hinayāna Buddhism* (*Xiaocheng foxue gailun*小乘佛學概論) and *Lectures on the Abhidharmakośa* (*Jushesong jianghua* 俱舍頌講話).[387] He was also the instructor for Buddhist logic and Indian Philosophy. In addition, students were divided into several levels according to their proficiency in the Chinese, English, and Japanese classes.[388]

Zhang Huasheng 張化聲 (b. 1880) and Tang Dayuan 唐大圓 (1890-1941)[389] joined the faculty in the second semester. The curriculum for this semester was primarily focused on the Sanlun school. Zhang taught *Zhonglun* and Chinese, whereas Taixu lectured on the *Śata-śāstra* and *Dvādaśanikāya-śāstra*. Shi continued his classes from the last semester. Kongye was the instructor for the *Wenshu bore jing*. When Tang Dayuan arrived later in the semester, he started a new class on Chinese philosophy. The academy also ran an attached primary school where classes were taught by some of its students.[390] Taixu spent the majority of his time during the

[386] Shi, a scholar of Buddhist logic, studied in Japan and was accordingly very fluent in Japanese. He was known to have translated several important works of Japanese Buddhism into Chinese. See XFRC 1:199-200.

[387] These compiled and translated textbooks were also made available for purchase by mail. For a list, see "Wuchang foxueyuan jiangyi jiamu ji bianjiren yilanbiao 武昌佛學院講義價目及編輯人一覽表," *Fohua xinqingnian* 佛化新青年 vol. 2, no. 3 (1924), MFQB 3:326.

[388] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 262-263.

[389] Tang, a scholar of Yogācāra thought, played a prominent role in the Wuchang School's debate with Ouyang Jingwu on the authenticity of the *Awakening of Faith*. For a biographical account, see XFRC 1:809-811.

[390] None of the sources I have encountered is clear about who were the students at the primary school at this time. However, when it was revived in 1929, the *Haichaoyin* published a complete charter for the school. It was a secular school whose curriculum included party ideology, Chinese, mathematics, arts, music, and physical education. Students were from impoverished families in the surrounding neighborhoods. There were about 40 boys and girls enrolled. Therefore, it can be assumed that the Wuchang attached primary school in 1922 had similar structure. See "Wuchang foxueyuan fushe pingmin xiaoxue gaikuang 武昌佛學院附設平民小學校概況," HCY, vol. 10, no. 7 (1929), MFQ 173:175-176.

first two years at the academy, except for a few lecture tours. The first school year was marked by relative success. Taixu travelled up and down the Yangzi giving public lectures, attracting hundred of listeners at a time. On the Buddha's Birthday in the summer of 1923, Taixu and his students participated in a solemn ceremony at the Zhonghua University, where over a thousand people took the Three Refuges under Taixu.[391] However, the school year was not without incident. First of all, Kongye was caught in some dispute with students and left the academy. Later in the summer, Shi Yiru left for Shanghai claiming health reasons. He died within a few months. The editorial responsibility for the *Haichaoyin* was transferred to Tang Dayuan.

Entering the second year, some students left the academy. Taixu began to think that *conglin* management was not effective in optimizing students' learning. He was not satisfied with the performance of some students, especially those who were not making much progress in their language classes. On top of that, he had trouble finding and keeping the teaching staff. The departure of Kongye and, especially, Shi Yirou was a big loss for the vitality of the teaching environment at the academy. He was also unable to find a suitable Dean of Students (*xuejian* 學監), which, in his view, was the cause for the frequent conflict and tension between the teachers and students. Therefore, he decided to compress the program for the last two years into one and graduate the first class one year sooner. The academy did not take in new students in the second year. In the meantime, he went back to the drawing board contemplating on the ideal *sangha* education system. He wrote "The Complete Structure for My Newest Ideals for Buddhist Academies" (Wo xinjin lixiang zhong zhi foxueyuan wanquan zuzhi 我新近理想中之佛學院完全組織), in which he proposed a 24-year comprehensive plan starting from primary schools to

---

[391] *Fohua xinqingnian* 佛化新青年 vol. 1, no. 3 (1923), MFQ 13:340.

specialized Buddhist universities and research institutions. He estimated that it would cost at least four million *yuan*. At the end of the brief article, he recommended that the logical first step was to raise one-tenth of the amount needed through setting up a Buddhist bank – another sign that he was still thinking within the framework of the *Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun*.

Classes in the second year focused primarily on Yogācāra thought. Doctrines of the other schools, which were originally assigned for year 3, were now only nominally taught. Taixu lectured on the *Cheng weishi lun* and gave introduction to selected works in the Tiantai, Huayan and Chan traditions. Tang Dayuan taught the *Jie shenmi jing* while finishing his other course on Chinese philosophy. Zhang Huasheng gave a class on Western philosophy and continued his *Zhonglun* class. Chen Jibo offered no new classes other than those from the previous semester. During the last semester, Taixu lectured on the fundamentals of the Pure Land and Vinaya schools on top of the *Cheng weishilun*. The newly arrived monk instructor Miaokuo 妙闊 taught the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. In addition, the monk Dayong 大勇 (1893-1929),[392] who had just returned from studying Esoteric Buddhism at Mount Kōya in Japan, gave a class based on the *Mizong gangyao* 密宗綱要.[393] Before the summer, students took a graduation examination in which over 50 of them passed.[394]

[392] Dayong, a Sichuan native, was a civil and military official before he received tonsure from Taixu in 1919. On Taixu's recommendation, he went to Japan to study esoteric Buddhism. He is associated with the revival of both Japanese Esoteric Buddhism (Dongmi 東密) and Tibetan Esoteric Buddhism (Zangmi 藏密) in the Republican period. See XFRC 1:44-48.

[393] The *Mizong gangyao* was translated from Gonda Raifu's 權田雷斧 (1846-1934) *Mikkyō kōyō* by Gonda's Chinese student Wang Hongyuan 王弘願 (1876-1937). See XFRC 1:159-162.

[394] Both Taixu and his biographer Yinshun claim that there were more than 60 students who graduated from the first class. But the year book shows that there were only 54. See Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 269; Yinshun, TXN 169, "Xueren tongxunchu: xian biyezhe," MFQB 4:407-412.

After the graduation, the board of directors met to discuss recruitment and restructuring for the next year. Taixu proposed some fundamental changes to the school: (1) twenty promising students from the graduation class would get admitted into the newly created research department; (2) the school would only admit 40 monastic students who had received full ordination; (3) the dormitory would be remodeled to resemble the Chan Hall in the public monastery; and (4) education at the academy, following Taixu's *Zhengli sengqie zhidulun*, would begin with discipline and conduct. The board, which was now chaired by Tang Xiangming湯薌銘, voted down all his proposals except for the first one. As a result, the academy recruited its second class of students according to its charter. Together with students from the first class who were now in the research department, there were 40 lay and monastic students. They included monks Daxing, Jichen, Yihuan 亦幻 (n.d), Mochan 墨禪 (n.d), and layman Lu Foxin 虞佛心 and so on. When school started in the fall, Taixu hired Shanyin 善因 (n.d) as the Dean of Academic Affairs, and left all the teaching to Shanyin, Tang Dayuan 唐大圓 (1890-1941), and Zhang Huasheng 張化聲 (1880-?), while he himself only supervised students in the research department. [395] Two months into the school year, citing health reasons, Taixu quit his position by leaving behind a resignation letter for the lay patrons. He did not gather the teachers and students to make the announcement until half-an-hour before his departure.

One must ask why? It took Taixu a decade after the Jinshan incident to be able to create a school of his own. What was the strong impulse that caused him to abandon his school only two years after its founding? According to Taixu, his health was quickly worsening so he needed to rest. In addition, he felt "less enthusiasm and responsibility" having to run the academy

[395] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 282-283.

"following others' ideas."[396] According to Yinshun, Taixu was also disappointed that the lay supporters were not passionate about the grand scheme for *sangha* education he raised the year before.[397] He also cites the gradual loss in lay support – many of them were turning to esoteric Buddhism – as the reason why Taixu eventually decided to leave Wuchang.[398]

Around this time, Tibetan and Japanese esoteric Buddhism[399] were rising in popularity among China's Buddhist monastics and laity.[400] Ironically, however, Taixu is often credited as one of the Buddhist teachers who started this trend. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, many Buddhists started to see their traditions as sharing a common heritage with other Asian Buddhists. Yang Wenhui is well-known for introducing many Japanese esoteric Buddhist texts in China. Taixu, who shared Yang Wenhui's vision for a global Buddhism, considered the inclusion of other Buddhist traditions essential to his new education system. He encouraged several monks, including Dayong and Chisong, to travel to Japan to learn with famous Japanese Shingon masters and later to Tibet in order to bring about a revival of the esoteric school (*mizong* 密宗) in China.[401] In fact, when Dayong returned from his study of Shingon in Japan, Taixu persuaded him to teach at the Wuchang Academy. Dayong was also reported to have held initiation ceremonies and set up a practice altar for the laity and monastics within the Wuchang Academy

[396] Ibid., 282.

[397] There is no evidence that the board ever discussed or voted on Taixu's 24-year plan. But he did publish it in the HCY. See "Wo xinjin lixiang zhong zhi foxueyuan wanquan zuzhi," HCY, vol. 4, no. 9, MFQ 157:131-133.

[398] Yinshun, TXN 186.

[399] Or "Buddhist Mysticism," as Wing-tsit Chan calls it. See Chan, *Religious Trends in Modern China*, 72.

[400] On the revival of esoteric Buddhism in Republican China, see Ester Bianchi, "The Tantric Rebirth Movement in Modern China." *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 57, no. 1 (2004): 31-54.

[401] Gray Tuttle, *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 81.

compound.[402] In 1924, Dayong left Wuchang to start the Tibetan Language Institute (Zangwen xueyuan 藏文學院) in Beijing. Several Wuchang graduates, including Fazun 法尊 (1902-1980) and Fafang 法舫 (1904-1951) went to study with Dayong.[403] Quite a few members of the Wuchang Academy board of directors, after having received initiation from Dayong, also offered financial support for his new school. Yinshun claims that this reduced the income of the Wuchang Academy.[404] Hong Jinlian, following Daxing's account, identifies another competition that Taixu faced in Wuchang – Chisong's Baotong Monastery 寶通寺, which had turned into a major center of esoteric Buddhism when Chisong returned from Japan and was appointed as its abbot.[405]

All of the above – losing lay support, competition from other teachers and institutions – were probably the partial reasons why Taixu abruptly quit the school that he founded only two years earlier. He was also facing other challenges in realizing his goal to create an education system that could produce monks to lead Chinese Buddhism into modern times. The same obstacles also had a huge impact on the fate of most *foxueyuan* in the first-half of the twentieth century. First, he lacked consistent financial support to maintain his schools long enough to lead to any immediate result. Second, his schools, as well as others, seemed to have great difficulty hiring skilled teachers. They usually relied solely on a few learned laymen or monks, whose leaving often had devastating consequence to the very existence of the schools. This situation would eventually improve, as an increasing number of graduates from the earlier *foxueyuan* took

[402] Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 270.

[403] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 410-411.

[404] Yinshun, TXN, 186.

[405] Hong, *Taixu dashi fojiao xiandaihua zhi yanjiu*, 205; Daxing, "Cong Shijie foxueyuan tandao Wuchang foxueyuan 從世界佛學院談到武昌佛學院," XDSQ 37-38, MFQB 39:152.

over leadership roles. Lastly, the great difference in the quality of students added to the difficulty in maintaining the quality of instruction and keeping up with the curriculum. The rapid growth in the number of *foxueyuan* in the 1920s and 30s meant that a larger number of schools were competing for both students and teachers.

All these challenges notwithstanding, one is still left pondering: were these the real reasons why Taixu left Wuchang? How could he draft educational plans that could last ten or twenty years but not have the patience to stick to them for a year or two? In addition, given his plan to produce Buddhist teachers who would travel across China to found other academies, how did graduating less-than-satisfactory students sooner than planned help solve the problem? Perhaps he was not just being modest when, reflecting on the "failure" of his reformist career, he confessed that it was due to him being "good with theory but not practice, skilled in inspiring but not leading" and his temperament which was not "steadfast, adamant, and persistent."[406] I would suggest that it was also due to the disillusionment between ideal and reality that he continued to produce and revise his plans to modernize Chinese Buddhism. This is why generations of Chinese Buddhists find inspiration in him. As I hope to show below, the tension between ideal and reality also led to much creativity on the part of the student-monks, inspired by Taixu's ideals, in forging a new collective identity.

After Taixu left, the Wuchang Buddhist elites sent him earnest requests asking him to return. Although Taixu agreed to serve as the principal for the academy once again in 1925, he did not dedicate full time to the school again – he would only go back on short trips to give lectures.

[406] Taixu, "Wo de fojiao geming shibaishi," TXQ 29:62-63.

Between 1925 and 1949, the school operated on and off – it had to cease operation a few times due to warfare. In 1926, it had to close as the National Revolutionary Army occupied the majority of its buildings as barracks during the Northern Expedition. It reopened in 1932 but closed again two years later due to the Second Sino-Japanese War. During these times, it was run primarily by Taixu's students, the majority of whom had not received direct instruction from him. After 1928, the Wuchang Academy was organized as a division of Taixu's World Buddhist Institution (Shijie foxueyuan世界佛學苑) – at the beginning as a member school, and later on as its library and research center.[407] Beyond Wuchang, Taixu was also appointed the principal for the Minnan Academy (Minnan foxueyuan 閩南佛學院) between 1929 and 1933,[408] and founded the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies Institute (Han Zang jiaoliyuan 漢藏教理院) in Chongqing in 1932.[409] Graduates from these schools either taught at or founded many other Buddhist schools across China. Some of them went on to serve as abbots at temples.

Despite its short life and sporadic activity, just like many other institutions in the society at large in the 1920s and 30s, the Wuchang Academy occupies a highly significant place in the collective imagination of modern Chinese Buddhists. Writing in 1935, Weifang called the Wuchang Academy the "Buddhist Whampoa."[410] In his evaluation of Buddhism in China in early twenty-first century, Raoul Birnbaum writes that

> Taixu's dream of a network of Buddhist studies academies for monks and nuns, with a fairly consistent curriculum that highlights intellectual training in Buddhist philosophy,

[407] See Gao Zhennong 高振農, *Fojiao wenhua yu jindai Zhongguo* 佛教文化與近代中國 (Shanghai: Shanghai shehui kexue yuan chubanshe, 1992), 69–80.

[408] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 110-114.

[409] Gray Tuttle, *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*, 194-204.

[410] Weifang 葦舫, "Shiwunian lai zhi sengjiaoyu 十五年來之僧教育," HCY, vol. 16, no. 1 (1935), MFQ 188:283.

> has been fulfilled…While in the past some *foxue yuan* were instituted to forestall takeovers of monastic property for use as secular schools, ironically the result has been a kind of takeover from the inside, in which this mode of study now dominates.[411]

There were undoubtedly other Buddhist schools that were more longstanding – such as the Minnan and Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Institute – and more academically successful like Ouyang Jingwu's Inner Studies Institute, but Wuchang is often singled out as *the* modern school in the discussion of monastic education in China, by scholars and Buddhists alike. The question to raise, then, is: in what ways is the Wuchang Academy significant in modern Chinese Buddhism? What impact did it have in shaping, in a narrow sense, the development of Buddhist education, and, in a broader sense, the formulation of Buddhism modernism, in China? Obviously, to say that it was important because it was the first *foxueyuan* in China does not take us very far in understanding the changes that were taking place within Chinese Buddhism in the early twentieth century. I suggest viewing the Wuchang Academy as the origin for not just a network of schools and graduates, but a modern lineage whose identity was constantly shaped and reshaped by its participants in responding to situations both within and outside of Buddhism.

I argue that the Wuchang Academy marks three paradigm shifts that had a long lasting impact in the practice of modern Chinese Buddhism: (1) the re-interpretation of the teacher-student relationship; (2) the imagining of a new student-monk identity; (3) the reformulation of orthodoxy. In other words, Taixu and his educational thought provided new ways of imagining what it meant to be Buddhist in the modern times. The physical schools and, more importantly, the various periodicals made possible by modern print technologies, were the locale for the articulation and negotiation of a new Buddhist identity – which we can call the student-monk

[411] Raoul Birnbaum, "Buddhist China at the Century's Turn," in *Religion in China Today*, ed. Daniel Overmyer, *The China Quarterly Special Issues* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 134.

(*xueseng* 學僧), the new monk (*xinseng* 新僧), or the young monk (*seng qingnian* 僧青年). This new identity manifested itself in a fluid network, alongside other Buddhist networks of dharma kinship and regional affiliation, which connected their members across the country. These informal networks as the Buddhist norms for affiliation were certainly not new – they are considered by many as the common feature of Chinese Buddhism.[412] Therefore, it was in the tensions and clashes between their network and other networks that a reformulation of orthodoxy took place among the student-monks. This collective identity, as I will show in chapter 4, was an essential component in the emergence of a citizenship discourse in the interaction between Chinese Buddhism and the modern nation-state.

The Paradigm Shifts

The Wuchang Academy is often considered the prototype for new-style Buddhist Studies academies in China for its comprehensive curriculum and modern pedagogy. Following a carefully constructed curriculum, the doctrines and philosophy of all Buddhist schools as well as secular subjects were taught in a classroom setting that utilized blackboard and textbooks. There were frequent assignments and evaluations, and students who had successfully completed the program were granted diplomas at their graduation. Much can be said about this new system of learning. Here I will examine the pedagogical goals and agendas of the Wuchang Academy, and modern *foxueyuan* as a whole. I argue that in providing an ideologycal basis for the identity formation of the students, the Wuchang legacy should be seen as a discursive tool for student-monks to negotiate and redefine their place in the new social order. Therefore, the outcomes of

[412] See Welch, *Practice of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 403, and Jessup, "The Householder Elite." For transnational Chinese Buddhist networks, see Yoshiko Ashiwa, "The Globalization of Chinese Buddhism."

an educational institution – the types of students it produces, is as important as its curriculum and pedagogy, although they are not unrelated.

Teacher-Student Relationship

Scholars have long recognized that, due to the lack of a centralized authority, Chinese Buddhism has historically been held together by informal networks of affiliation that were centered on religious kinship, charismatic monks, and regionalism.[413] At first glance, the vertical teacher-student relationship between Taixu and his students was not dissimilar to these systems of affiliation – he was surrounded by his tonsure disciples, students at his academies, lay followers who took the Refuges from him, and those who revered him for his charisma. Like other charismatic monks such as Yinguang, Yuanying, and Xuyun, his activities were often reported in Buddhist periodicals, which also published his correspondence with Buddhists across the country.[414]

The point of departure from the traditional norms of affiliation lies in the message of Taixu's teaching – he called on people to participate in the world as a form of Buddhist activism. Sometimes people identified with him and his message without prior personal contact. Returning to the story of Zhenhua at the beginning of this dissertation: upon hearing the news that Taixu was going to set up an academy at the Pilu Monastery in Nanjing, he immediately rushed to Nanjing and waited in eager anticipation.[415] This story shows how monks first adopted the

[413] Welch, *Practice of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 403.

[414] Reports of Taixu's activities and his correspondence with others are too numerous to list. They can be found in almost every issue of the *Haichaoyin*, sometimes with photographs.

[415] Chen-Hua, *In Search of the Dharma*, 74.

collective student-monk identity, which will be discussed in the next section, before they actively sought out a certain teacher-student relationship.

In addition, sometimes people had established a teacher-student relationship with Taixu but it was his ideology that served as the basis for the organizations that were founded outside of his direct control. The Buddhist New Youth (Fohua xinqingnian 佛化新青年) is a good example for this. The 1920s was an intense period of youth radicalism marked by the rejection of traditional cultural norms and the call for the creation of a new Chinese culture through a selective adoption of Western ideals. Some young students saw in Buddhism an ideal for creating an egalitarian, free and just world. The first Buddhist Youth group, called the New Buddhist Youth League (*Xinfohua qingniantuan* 新佛化青年團) was founded in Beijing in 1922 by a group of university students led by Zhang Zongzai and Ning Dayun, where they also published the *New Buddhafication Quarterly* (*Xinfohua xunkan* 新佛化旬刊). Before discovering Buddhism, both Zhang and Ning were student activists during the May Fourth Movement.[416] Inspired by Taixu's Buddafication movement and the emphasis he placed on youth in his reform, Zhang and Ning moved to Wuchang to attend Taixu's new school in 1922. Thus Taixu served as the spiritual leader for the group.[417] Zhang and Ning recruited members from both the academy and the Hankou Buddhist Society, a lay group associated with Taixu. There, the youth society as well as its journal (now a monthly) were renamed as the Buddhist (or

[416] Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu jindai Zhongguo*, 156.

[417] Jingguan 靜觀, "Zhonghua quanguo fohua xinqingnianhui xiaoshi 中華全國佛化新青年會小史," *Foyin* 佛音 4 (1926), MFQ 11:22;

Buddhafied) New Youth,[418] modeling itself on Chen Duxiu's (1879-1942) *New Youth* and the YMCA.

The Buddhist New Youth had an anarcho-socialist approach to Buddhism – it promoted the realization of a class-free, distinction-free world through labor, social service, and mutual aid. Zhang Zongzai also stressed the necessity of a revolution to create a "new Buddhism" to realize this "Pure Land in the World."[419] In spreading its message, the Buddhist New Youth Society organized public lectures[420] and various Buddhafication campaigns. Propaganda teams (*xuanchuan dui* 宣傳隊) were sent to smaller cities and townships to proselytize Buddhism. The group grew rapidly between 1923 and 1927. There were local Buddhist New Youth chapters in Xiamen, Shanghai, Nanjing, Chongqing, Guangzhou, Chengdu, and overseas in Taiwan, Japan, and Southeast Asia. Its membership was about 4,000 which included prominent intellectuals, politicians, and Buddhist monks.[421]

Soon members of the Buddhist New Youth Society started to launch attacks on traditional Buddhist monasteries in their journal, urging "conservative" monks to use their resources to create Buddhist education and other social services. They also distributed flyers criticizing famous monks such as Yinguang and Dixian. But what caught the attention of the mainstream Buddhist establishment was the publication of the group's missions in an open letter

[418] Taixu recalled having given the group its new name, but according to the inaugural issue of the journal, the name change was the result of a general assembly for representatives from different branches. See Taixu, "Taixu zizhuan," 266 and "Fohua xinqingnian hui zai Wuhan chengli xuanyan 佛化新青年會在武漢成立宣言," *Fohua xinqingnian* vol.1, no. 1 (1923), MFQ 13:19.

[419] Zhang Zongzai 張宗載, "Xin fojiao zhi liangyi yu qingnian jiushi zhi fangzhen 新佛教之兩翼與青年救世之方針," *Foyin* 7-8 (1926), MFQ 11:379-383.

[420] Their most famous public lecture event was one by RabindranathTagore in Beijing in 1924. See Wang Jianchuan 王見川, "Zhang Zongzai, Ning Dayun yu Minguo shiqi de fohua xinqingnian hui 張宗載、甯達蘊與民國時期的'佛化新青年會,'" *Yuanguang Foxue Xuebao* 圓光佛學學報 no. 3 (1999): 336.

[421] Wang, "Zhang Zongzai, Ning Dayun yu Minguo shiqi de fohua xinqingnian hui," 331 and 335.

addressed to all Buddhists in 1924. They included the eradication of the "corrupt practices of old Buddhism to realize the spirit of a true, new non-religious Buddhism" and to "destroy all idols of all religions."[422] The original telegraph copy of the letter listed Taixu as one of the signees. Infuriated, some monks in Beijing published a letter in *Haichaoyin* to "remind" Taixu that the Buddhist New Youth had used his name in making a proclamation that could lead to the end of the dharma, and that all monks in Beijing were "unanimously against it."[423] This forced Taixu to react by urging the young Buddhists to restrain themselves and respect the elders. They should be humble and sincere, he said, even in pointing out fault lines and offering their suggestions.[424] The Buddhist New Youth movement came to an abrupt end when, in 1926, Zhang Zongzai was imprisoned for months by Hunan governor general Tang Zhisheng's 唐生智due to his attack on superstitious religious practices that allegedly offended Tang's teacher Gu Jingyuan顧淨緣.[425]

Scholars have different opinions on Taixu's actual role in the Buddhist New Youth controversy. Among Taixu's own students, Dongchu posits that the eight missions were the work of some radical lay people.[426] While Yinshun is sympathetic to their cause, he is critical of the ruthlessness of the moves, and maintained that it could have led to a very different outcome had Taixu been more involved.[427] Jiang Canteng sees Taixu as the mastermind behind the movement because its critique of the monasteries was consistent with Taixu's view, and most of the active

---

[422] "Fohua xinqingnianhui duiyu shijie renlei tongbao suofu de bada shiming 佛化新青年會對於世界人類同胞所負的八大使命," *Fohua xinqingnian* vol. 2, no. 4 (1924), MFQB 3:388.

[423] Hong, *Taixu dashi fojiao xiandaihua yanjiu,* 111.

[424] Taixu, TXQ 17:605.

[425] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi,* 1:312.

[426] Ibid., 310.

[427] Yinshun, TXN 234.

players of the movement were his students at the Wuchang Academy.[428] To this end, I will add that the teachers and students at Wuchang, such as Tang Dayuan, Huijue, Daxing, and Jichen were not just members of the Buddhist New Youth Society, but also active contributors to the journal. Furthermore, the journal *Fohua xinqingnian* was published by the Right Faith Press, the official publisher for the Wuchang Academy. Wang Jianchuan, however, argues that Taixu's role is often overestimated. Despite Zhang and Ning's reverence for Taixu, the Buddhist New Youth was an autonomous group and Taixu's role in the movement was nominal.[429]

In my view, all of the above are sound interpretations but the difficulty in sorting out the complex relationship between Taixu and his students is due to the shifting conceptualization of that very relationship in this period. Following traditional norms of the teacher-student relationship, the *sangha*'s first reaction was to hold Taixu, the teacher, responsible for his students' behavior. For the students, they were inspired by Taixu's words and actions, but their organization was autonomous. As for Taixu, he was probably pleased to see his ideals put into practice, but was aware that he had limited influence in the course of that initiative. In this sense, I think Wang is right in pointing out that Taixu only had less-than-formal association and little authority over the group. Therefore, I argue that the relationship between teacher and students shifted from one in which the teacher had absolute authority and responsibility to one in which the teacher was seen as the provider of the ideological foundation for his students' undertakings. That was why the attack on conservative monastic establishment continued to intensify among Taixu's monastic students, as seen in the journal *Xiandai sengqie* 現代僧伽 based in the Minnan Academy.

[428] Jiang, *Taixu qianzhuan,* 206.

[429] Wang, "Zhang Zongzai, Ning Dayun yu Minguo shiqi de Fohua xinqingnian hui," 330.

In addition, it is also important to consider the multiple teacher-student relationships in a Buddhist academy. Students were in multiple classes taught by different teachers. Unlike the traditional preaching sessions, students at Buddhist academies learned in a classroom setting – with textbooks, blackboards, and more interactions with the teachers. Therefore, it can be said that there was a multiplicity of voice and authorities that both the teachers and students had to negotiate with.

Deeply embedded in the emergence of a new collective student-monk identity and the reformulation of orthodoxy, this shift in the teacher-student relationship greatly influenced how networks and affiliation were conceived in modern Chinese Buddhism, although one should be reminded that this new mode of interaction only added to but did not replace the complex configuration and dynamic between the different networks in Chinese Buddhism.

Student-Monk Community

The second shift that took place at the Wuchang Academy, and other *foxueyuan* at this time was the construction of a horizontal relationship between the students that led to the emergence of a collective identity. This is also arguably the most significant influence of the *foxueyuan* on the overall practice and self-identity of modern Chinese Buddhism.

The 1920s saw the emergence of a group of young monastics, who thought of themselves as members of a unique community distinct from the rest of the Chinese *sangha*. At a time when the socio-political discourse was dominated by ideas such as democracy, freedom, liberty, equality, and republicanism, these young monks were eager to demonstrate that they, too, were capable of becoming "new monks" for the nation. According to Xue Yu, these young monks, who were "largely graduates of Buddhist colleges," were critical of the conservative monks'

unwillingness to change and respond to the needs of the time. They called themselves "new monks," and declared that it was their responsibility to revitalize Buddhism and defend the nation.[430] In defining "new monks," Tanbo 曇缽 asks:

> 怎樣的成爲新僧？新就是振興刷新。謂對於惡劣的習慣，痛加刪改，不良的制度，力事改革，務使整個衰敗不堪的佛教，振興起來，煥然一新，這樣的僧伽，方叫新僧.
>
> How does one become a "new monk?" "New" means to revive and renew, it means to eliminate bad habits and reform undesirable institutions in order to revive Buddhism from its degenerated state and give it a bright new look. A monk as such is called a "new monk."[431]

But it is still not an easy task to define who exactly the new monks were. This is due to the fluidity of this identity – young monks often invoked different aspects of their collective identity in response to different situations. For analytical purposes here, however, I will call this group the "student-monks" – they attended modern Buddhist academies, paid close attention to socio-political issues; regularly voiced harsh criticisms of the traditional Buddhist establishment, and constantly articulated their ideas for revitalizing Buddhism in newspapers and periodicals. Therefore, the locale for the production of this collective identity was often associated with, but not limited to, the Buddhist Studies academies.

[430] Yu, *Buddhism, War and Nationalism*, 27.

[431] Tanbo 曇缽, "*Xin jiu sengqie de chongtu* 新舊僧伽的衝突," HCY, vol. 14, no.1 (1933), MFQ 183:86.

According to Dongchu, the discourse of new monks first emerged as an offshoot of the Buddhist New Youth movement. In 1925, Daxing 大醒 (1899-1953),[432] Jichen 寄塵 (n.d), and Jialin迦林 (n.d), started to promote the idea and published a journal of the same name.[433] At the same time, a student society (*tongxuehui* 同學會) was founded at Wuchang as early as 1925, which can be considered the first step toward the creation of a student-monk community. Not much is known about the student society at this point other than the charter published as an appendix to the 1925 yearbook, citing its purpose as maintaining correspondence between Wuchang graduates.[434] A financial report for the student society was also published in the *Haichaoyin* in the same year. From the report, it seems like the society was involved in some small-scale publishing activities – monies were spent on a special issue (*tekan* 特刊).[435] What is interesting to note here is the gradual formation of an identity outside of the traditional networks of monastery, tonsure and regional lineages. Students also showed signs of self-governance in managing their own finances (they received a subsidy from the academy), publishing, and charitable activities.

The student-monk identity and its voice became further consolidated when Daxing, then teaching at the Minnan Academy in Xiamen, launched the *Modern Sangha* (*Xiandai sengqie* 現代僧伽) in March 1928. The *Modern Sangha* was the most vocal in advocating modern *sangha*

[432] Daxing was one of Taixu's most important students, and the only one who received a courtesy name from Taixu without having received tonsure from him. He taught at several of Taixu's academies, and was most famous for founding the journal *Xiandai sengqie* and *Xiandai fojiao*. See XFRC 1:56-58.

[433] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 1:311.There is no surviving copies of the journal that I am aware of. It is not included in the MFQ or MFQB.

[434] "Foxueyuan tongxuehui jianzhang 佛學院同學會簡章," *Foxueyuan tongxuelu* 佛學院同學錄, MFQB 4:416.

[435]"Wuchang foxueyuan tongxuehui shouzhi baogao fu zhixie 武昌佛學院同學會收支報告附致謝," HCY, vol. 6, no. 10 (1925), MFQ 163:370. The money probably went toward publishing the yearbook.

education while criticizing the public monasteries and elder monks for their disinterest in Buddhist modernization projects. In its inaugural issue, its goal was defined as "responding to the needs of the time and speaking for all *sangha* members in China."[436] I will return to the issue of authority below. For now, I will focus on the discussion of the new vs. old, or "modern" vs. "backward" as a common denominator for the identity of student-monks. The student-monk identity was one that emerged out of differentiation – young monks distinguished themselves from the backward, ignorant, closed-minded and corrupt *conglin* system. I would like to stress here that being fully aware of the complexity of the labels "reformist" and "conservative," I am treating the dichotomy new vs. old as a rhetorical tool on the part of the student-monks in defining their identity rather than as definitive, qualitative terms. Student-monks saw themselves as new monks (*xinseng* 新僧or *xinpai* 新派), who were acutely aware of the contemporary challenges that Buddhism faced in contrast to the old or conservative monks (*jiuseng* 舊僧 or *jiupai* 舊派) who were only interested in defending the status quo and holding on to the massive resources that Buddhism possessed.[437]

Naturally, modern *sangha* education became the deciding factor for the old vs. new dichotomy. Student-monks saw Buddhist educational reform as an opportunity to pursue a structural reorganization of Buddhism. For example, in responding to the threat of Xue Dubi's temple confiscation proposal, Fachuang 法幢 suggested lobbying the government to intervene so that a Buddhist revolution to introduce universal *sangha* education could be accomplished.[438] They argued that all monasteries since the Buddha's time were educational institutions – the

[436] "Chuangkanci 創刊辭," XDSQ, vol. 1, no. 1 (1928), MFQ 139:336.

[437] Jichen 寄塵, "Jinri Zhongguo zhi sengqie 今日中國之僧伽," XDSQ 2 (1928), MFQ 139:367.

[438] Fachuang 法幢, "Zhengli fojiao de jihui daole 整理佛教的機會到了," XDSQ 4 (1928), MFQ 139:408.

foxueyuan of the day were not functionally different from the *conglin* of the past. Therefore, Fafang urged the abbots of rich monasteries to recognize that times were changing and that the only way to preserve Buddhism was through participating in the modern education reform.[439] Furthermore, the young monks' attack on conservative monks was not limited to their unwillingness to contribute to modern Buddhist education. In their numerous letters and articles, student-monks mocked the commercialization of ritual services, life at prestigious public monasteries that had lost its vitality, and the corruption of monks. Sometimes criticism was aimed at prominent lay elites who supported the conservative monks. Daxing, for example, was reported to have caused an outrage within the Buddhist community for describing the clique of prominent monks and laymen as "pig-headed elders and maggot-like laymen."[440]

Aside from the harsh attack on others, self-critical student-monks also took their writing as an opportunity to reflect on their own shortcomings. Weifang told his fellow young monks that although they had been able to make much progress in monastic education, they should avoid feeling arrogant. Seeing the project to produce future leaders of Chinese Buddhism as a lengthy and difficult one, he suggested that students should feel grateful to the academies and masters who strove to provide an innovative education despite all hardships, and that they should unite and remain steadfast to their belief.[441]

Considering that the new identity only added to but did not replace existing Buddhist networks of kinship, it is therefore worth asking another question: Did other types of network become weaker when one became stronger? For example, did the self-identification of student-

[439] Weifang 葦舫, "Shiwunian lai sengjiaoyu zhi fanxing 十五年來僧教育之反省," HCY, vol. 16, no. 1 (1935), MFQ 188:302.

[440] Yinshun, TXN, 251.

[441] Weifang, "Shiwunian lai sengjiaoyu zhi fanxing," 304-305.

monk pull one away from other networks? Or did it spread and lure other networks into the student-monk network?

The new vs. old rhetoric had also allowed student-monks to conceive of their identity with much pride and romanticism. They often wrote to describe the joy of learning in the classroom, the inspiration from their teachers, the company of like-minded student-monks, and they called on other young monks to join them.[442] In the process of constructing a unique identity produced within the Buddhist academies, Taixu and the Wuchang legacy were often invoked.[443] The new understanding of the teacher-student relationship, in which Taixu was considered the figure-head of the new lineage, was hence incorporated into the creation of an "imagined community" that extended beyond the academies associated with Taixu. In an attempt to further expand the inclusiveness of the horizontally connected community of the student-monks in the broadest sense, Daxing told the young monks that they ought not to think of student-monks as only those who went to Buddhist academies. In fact, he said, anyone who was on the path before attaining complete enlightenment could be called a student-monk.[444]

In arguing that being a member of the modern *sangha* meant to be aware of the needs and problems of contemporary society, the young monk writers were also vocal critics of government religious policies. A large amount of their writing was dedicated to responding to government regulations and defending Buddhism from aggressive temple confiscation. During the war, they were fervently debating about monks' participation in the defense of their nation. I argue that the creation of a collective identity enabled these young monks to formulate a Buddhist citizenship

[442] See, for example, Juecheng 覺成, "Women ketang li de shenghuo 我們課堂裏的生活," *Renhaideng* 人海燈 9 and 10 (1934), MFQ 69:289.

[443] Weifang, "Shiwunian lai zhi sengjiaoyu," 283.

[444] Daxing, "Tan xueseng tiandi 談學僧天地," *Xueseng tiandi* 學僧天地 no. 1 (1948), MFQ 56 :391.

discourse to negotiate with the nation-state. This will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

Lastly, it is also worth pointing out that in this community that consisted of both the physical component – the Buddhist academies – and an abstract one – the various periodicals – members were constantly engaged in the debate on its future outlook. Therefore, it was in the continuous competition, tension, clashes, and negotiation that young monks in China generated a vision of collective belonging. In the study of modern Chinese Buddhism, there has been a heavy emphasis on the "great teachers" – be they "progressive" or "conservative." I argue that the young monks behind them were at least as important in shaping the trajectory of modern Chinese Buddhism. Thomas Borchert has argued for the importance of taking into consideration their pedagogical agendas in the study of Buddhist educational systems – the purpose of Buddhist education should not and cannot be separated from the society and the concerns of the actors who founded these systems. [445] Along similar lines, I would add that it is also important to view the students in these systems as active agents in defining the agendas. The student-monks at modern Chinese Buddhist academies were passionate about their newfound identity, were acutely aware of their social and religious responsibilities, and did not hesitate to defend their religion against external influences. At the same time, they were also self-critical and yet optimistic about their role in remaking their religion for the future. In doing so, I claim, they inevitably participated in reformulating orthodoxy – which I will now turn to.

[445] Thomas Borchert, "Training Monks or Men: Theravada Monastic Education, Subnationalism, and the National Sangha of China," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 241–272.

Reconstructing Orthodoxy

In his study of the rise of the non-Geluk commentarial school model in Tibetan monastic education, Georges Dreyfus has shown that the representation of a certain model as unique has much to do with the competition for authority and prestige.[446] In a similar vein, the defenders of modern Buddhist education in China stressed that: (1) their model was a renewal rather than departure from the traditional *conglin* system; and (2) its prestige rested on its ability to adopt and adapt to the needs of changing times. In defining his "new" Buddhism, Taixu claimed that what he meant was a newness that was firmly grounded in the history of Buddhism in China, while incorporating the strength of other traditions, such as Japan and Tibet, based on China's current situation. This approach, he said, would produce a renewed Chinese Buddhism that could contribute to the revitalization of the Chinese nation.[447] This redefinition of orthodoxy served as the basis for the educational modernization project that was essential to the institutional transformation of Chinese Buddhism in the twentieth century.

Drawing on Taixu's position, Zhifeng predicted that, if reformed accordingly, this new Chinese Buddhism would benefit not just China but all humanity. He considered a global educational system informed by Buddhism the prerequisite for world peace.[448] Therefore, Buddhist educators and young monks derived their authority and legitimacy from the renewed Chinese Buddhism. And it goes without saying that the Wuchang legacy was central to this re-imagination of Chinese Buddhist orthodoxy. In an open letter to all Buddhists in the country, Jichen placed education at the center of the Buddhist revival movement and, furthermore, lauded

[446] Dreyfus Georges, "Where Do Commentarial Schools Come From?: Reflections on the History of Tibetan Scholasticism," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 273–297.

[447] Taixu, "Xin yu rongguan," 452.

[448] Zhifeng 芝峰, "Sengqie yu jiaoyu 僧伽與教育," XDSQ 43-44 (1930), MFQB 39:218.

the Wuchang model as the ideal system for monastic education.[449] Others simply referred to the Wuchang Academy as the progenitor of modern Chinese Buddhist education.[450] Returning to my argument earlier, the prolific writings of young monks were instrumental both in transmitting the ideal of the Wuchang model and in generating a unique student-monk identity.

External to the monastic establishment, young monks also reminded the laity that the longevity of the true Dharma depended on their appropriate support for Buddhist institutions. For example, Gusong lamented that some laypeople were devoted to financially supporting their monk teachers regardless of whether that would promote the Buddha Dharma; while others were only interested in studying the Dharma but had no links to the Buddhist institution:

> 前者是護僧而忘了法，後者是護法而忘了僧，佛法僧是有連環性的 … 所以僧法偏護都不是保護整個佛法的正當方法。
>
> The former preserves the Sangha but has forgotten about the Dharma, whereas the latter preserves the Dharma but not the Sangha. There exists a correlation between the Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha … The inclination to only support one or the other is not the appropriate manner to preserve Buddhism.[451]

Faced with competition from every aspect, young monks in China were eager to represent themselves as the vanguard of orthodoxy that deserved the material as well as moral support of the laity. In this respect, the reformulation of orthodoxy provided a discourse that granted student-monks the authority to represent their religion. And their ultimate goal, according to

---

[449]Jichen, "Wei Wuchang foxueyuan gao quanguo fojiaotu shu 為武昌佛學院告全國佛教徒書," HCY, vol. 7, no. 12 (1927), MFQ 166:468.

[450] Cihai 慈海, "Wuchang foxueyuan zhi jinkuang 武昌佛學院之近況," HCY, vol. 11, no. 2 (1930), MFQ 174:555.

[451] Gusong 孤松, "Women jushi yinggai zenyang hufa 我們居士應該怎樣護法," XDSQ, vol.4, no. 1 (1931), MFQ 66:478-479.

Daxing, was to unify all student-monks in the nation to establish and lead a modern Buddhism for the benefit of society and the world.[452] I hope by this point it is clear that discourse formation was as important as formal learning in a classroom setting in generating a unique identity for the student-monks in modern Chinese Buddhism. Furthermore, the student-monks' agency in transforming their education into spiritual capital to represent Chinese Buddhism also should not be overlooked.

Conclusion

Similar to mass educational reform throughout the country, Buddhist educational reform also expressed a grand vision for China's future – one in which Buddhism would revitalize and thrive. And just as in secular mass education, modern Buddhist schools embodied the more general collective dream of a peaceful and prosperous nation. Entering the Nanjing decade, Chinese young monks shared a trans-regional network in which the vertical relationship with their spiritual leader was as strong as the horizontal relationship with other members in the network. This was also a network grounded in a reformulated orthodoxy that would enable the young monks to further develop a Buddhist citizenship discourse in negotiating with the pervasive nation-state. In the following chapter, I will demonstrate the ways in which the Chinese Buddhists crafted a distinctive form of citizenship by combining various dimensions of existing citizenship discourse on legal rights, political participation, and civic obligation, with re-interpretations of Buddhist soteriology to formulate the expression of an identity firmly grounded in the language of Buddhism. In other words, the pedagogical agendas of the modern *foxueyuan* should not be overlooked in our study of modern Buddhist education. The goal of these modern

[452] Daxing, "Zhi quanguo xueseng de gongkaixin 致全國學僧的公開信," XDSQ, vol.5, no. 1 (1932), MFQ 67:379.

Buddhist schools was as much about producing a particular type of Buddhist citizens as it was about the teaching of religious doctrines.

Appendix 2

Table 1: Taixu's Works on Buddhist Education[453]		
Title	Year	TXQ
New View on Education 教育新見	1915	23: 1333-1407
On Reorganizing the Sangha System 整理僧伽制度論	1915	17: 1-185
On the Redefining Labor and Buddhism for the New Monks 人工與佛學之新僧化	1920	18: 163-166
Charter for the Ciji Monastery in Hangzhou and the Yongming Hermitage 杭州西湖淨慈寺與永明精舍大綱及章程	1921	17: 506-512
My Ideal Organizational Structure for Buddhist Academies 我新近理想中之佛學院完全组織	1923	17: 460-464
On Education 論教育	1924	23: 1408-1411
A Speech to New Students 對於學人之訓辭	1924	18: 58-61
On Administering Ordination 論傳戒	1924	17: 621-626
On Running Buddhist Schools 議佛教辦學法	1925	17: 465-472
The Cultivation of Sangha Character 僧格之養成	1925	17: 192-194
An Exhortation for New Monks 箴新僧	1925	17: 605
On Sangha Organization 僧制今論	1927	17: 195-199
New Developments of the Shanghai Buddhist Vihāra 上海佛法僧園法苑之新建設	1927	17: 513-526
A Letter for [Buddhist] Followers 告徒眾書	1927	17: 584-596
A Proposed Bill for the National Education Conference 全國教育會議提議案	1928	23: 1417-1419
A Plan of the World Buddhist Studies Institute to Protect the	1928	17: 527-530

[453] Based on the Complete Works of Master Taixu (TXQ). Page numbers and years listed are according to the TXQ. I have also listed some of his works on civic education as they have shaped his view on *sangha* education.

Sangha 世界佛學院建設計劃救僧运动		
A Pledge Submitted to the Fifth Central Meeting of the Control Committee of the Nationalist Government 呈五次中央執監會國民政府請願文	1928	17: 661-663
The Methods and Goals for Studying Buddhism 研究佛學之目的及方法	1929	18: 42-50
Appropriate Attitude for the Present Student-Monks 中國現時學僧應取之態度	1929	18: 139-147
Thoughts on Eshan Sangha Self-Governance Society 峨山僧自治蒭議	1930	18: 167-177
An Outline on Establishing the Sangha 建僧大綱	1930	17: 200-212
The Purpose and Goal for Buddhist Studies 佛學之宗旨和目的	1930	18: 51-54
Sangha Education Has to Build on the Observance of Monastic Precepts 僧教育要建築在僧律儀之上	1930	18: 61-62
Purpose for Sangha Education 僧教育之宗旨	1930	28: 313-314
An Outline for Establishing a Modern Chinese Sangha that Preserves Buddhism 建立中國現代佛教住持僧大綱	1930	17: 213-217
A Letter for All Abbots Nationwide 告全國僧寺住持	1931	17: 424-431
The Essentials and Guidelines for the Training of Student-Monks 學僧修學綱宗	1931	18: 67-78
Placement for Modern Student-Monks Post-Graduation 現代學僧畢業後的出路	1931	18: 148-151
Goals and Program for Sangha Education 僧教育之目的與程序	1931	17: 473-480
Education and Sangha Education that Buddhism Should Create 佛教應辦之教育與僧教育	1931	17: 481-488
The Education of Buddha Sakyamuni 釋迦牟尼的教育	1931	23: 1434-1442

From Chinese General Education to Sangha Education 從中國的一般教育説到僧教育	1931	23: 1420-1433
Tranquil, Peaceful, Wise, and Diligent [Motto for the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Institute] 澹寧明敏	1932	18: 79-86
Programs for All Levels in Buddhist Educational System 佛教教育系統各級課程表	1932	17: 543-574
Sangha Education at-stake and the Future of Buddhism 現代僧教育的危亡與佛教的前途	1932	18: 87-92
On the Internal Ministry's Response on Creating Monastic Education 論教育部為辦僧學复內政部咨文	1933	17: 489-491
On the Development of Modern Chinese Buddhism 建設現代中國佛教談	1935	17: 219-279
An Exhortation for Youth Student-Monks 勉青年學僧	1938	18: 152-154
How to Establish Sangha Education in China 中國的僧教育應怎樣	1938	17: 492-497
A Sangha Education for This Age 現在需要的僧教育	1938	17: 498-501
Sincere Solidarity and the Restructuring of Buddhism 精誠團結與佛教之調整	1940	17: 631-640
An Exhortation for All 勗諸生	1941	18: 132
Be Selfless and Persevering for the Public 走私戒懶為公服務	1941	18: 113-117
An Education that Integrates Learning and Labor, Self and Others, and Theory and Practice 文武群己事器一致之教育	1941	18: 103-112
A Speech to the Preparatory Committee for the Society of the Master's [Taixu] Students 對大師學生會籌備员之訓勉	1942	18: 129-131
A Petition to the Executive Yuan on Preserving Buddhist Temples and Monastics 呈行政院維護佛教寺僧	1942	17: 664-667
Each Needs to Work Hard at Her Position 各人要在自己的	1943	18: 118-126

崗位上努力		
Practice and Study 修持與研究	1945	18: 134-136
A Speech to [Student of] Sangha Talent Training Course 僧材訓練班訓辭	1945	18: 137-138
Placement for Educated Young Monks 知識青年僧的出路	1946	18: 155-156
Learn the Doctrine at Jiaoshan and Practice Meditation at Jinshan 焦山學教與金山研禪	1946	17: 502-506

Table 2: Three-Year Program for the Wuchang Buddhist Studies Institute[454]	
Semester 1	
Subject	Frequency
Awakening of Faith 大乘起信論	1 hr per 2 days
Śūraṅgama Sūtra 大佛頂首楞嚴經	1 hr per 2 days
An Introduction for Hinayāna Buddhism 小乘佛學概論	2 hrs per 2 days
Buddhist Schools and Their Origins 佛教之宗派源流	1 hr per 2 days
Commentary on the Introduction to Logic 因明入正理論疏	1 hr per 2 days
Composition or Reading 作文或讀文或讀經論	1 hr per day
Practice 行持	1 hr per day
Semester 2	
Śata-śāstra, Madhyamaka-kārikā, and *Dvādaśanikāya-śāstra* 百論, 中論, 十二門論	2 hrs per 2 days
Heart Sūtra, Diamond Sūtra, and *Wenshu bore jing* 心經, 金剛經, 文殊般若經	2 hrs per 2 days
History of Indian Buddhism 印度佛教史	1 hr per 2 days
Introduction to Indian Religions 印度外道概略	1 hr per 2 days
Composition, Practice, and Tibetan[455] 作文及行持與藏文等	1 hr per 2 days
Semester 3	
Cheng weishi lun, and *She dacheng lun tianqing shi* 成唯識論, 攝大乘論天親釋	2 hrs per 2 days
Jie shenmi jing, *Lankāvatāra Sūtra,* and *Mile shangsheng jing* 解深密經, 楞伽經, 彌勒上生經	2 hrs per 2 days
History of Chinese Buddhism 中華佛教史	1 hr per 2 days
Western Ethics and Introduction to Psychology 西洋倫理及心理學概略	1 hr per 2 days
Composition, Practice, and Tibetan 作文及行持與藏文等	1 hr per 2 days
Semester 4	
Jiaoguan gangzong, Shi bu'er men zhiyao chao, Dacheng zhiguan 教觀綱宗, 十不二門指要鈔, 大乘止觀	2 hrs per 2 days
Vimalakīrti Sūtra and Lotus Sūtra 維摩經, 法華經	2 hrs per 2 days
History of World Buddhism 各國佛教史	1 hr per 2 days
Psychology and Introduction to Biology 西洋心理學及生物學概略	1 hr per 2 days
Composition, Practice, and Tibetan 作文與行持及藏文等	1 hr per 2 days
Semester 5	
Huayan yicheng jiaoyi zhang, Wuyun guan, Wangjin huanyuan guan, Sansheng yuanrong guan, Fajie guan	2 hrs per 2 days

[454] "Wuchang foxueyuan chengli zhi jingguo (yi): Foxueyuan zhi yuanqi ji zhangcheng 武昌佛學院成立之經過 (一): 佛學院緣起及章程," HCY, vol. 3, no. 5 (1922), MFQ 153: 308-309.

[455] The languages taught were English, Japanese, Sanskrit, and Tibetan

華嚴一乘教義章, 五蘊觀, 妄盡還原觀, 三聖圓融觀, 法界觀	
Huanyan shidi pin and Commentary 華嚴十地品及論	2 hrs per 2 days
Chinese Thought and Philosophy 中華老孔諸子及晉宋玄學宋明理學	1 hr per 2 days
Introduction to Western Philosophy 西洋哲學概略	1 hr per 2 days
Composition, Practice, and English 作文與行持及英文等	1 hr per 2 days
Semester 6	
Qifo (ji), Sanshi'er zu ji, Xixin ming, Platform Sūtra, and *Yongjia ji* 七佛與三十二祖偈及信心銘, 六祖壇經, 永嘉集	2 hrs per 3 days
Brahmajāla Sūtra and *Yoga Prātimoksa* 梵綱經及瑜伽菩薩戒學處	2 hrs per 3 days
Amitābha Sūtra, Contemplation Sūtra, and *Wangsheng lun* 彌陀經, 十六觀經, 往生論	1 hr per 2 days
Shizhu xinlun 十住心論	2 hrs per 2 days
Religious Studies and Introduction to Sociology 宗教學及社會學概略	1 hr per 2 days
Composition, Practice, and English 作文與行持及英文等	1 hr per 2 days

Chapter Four
Toward a Buddhist Citizenship

> Chinese Buddhism is not, and never has been, nationalistic. It did not contrive to become a state religion. It did not identify itself with Chinese culture or the Chinese race. It was not a war issue. It is amazing that while modern China has become nationalistic in more ways than one, the Buddhist religion has remained aloof from nationalism.[456]

By portraying the tradition as completely otherworldly and Buddhist identity as unchanging over time, Wing-tsit Chan's description of Chinese Buddhism above is a classic example of how religions and religious actors are often written out of a national narrative. While acknowledging that there was a reform movement that took place at the turn of the twentieth century, Chan claims that it was "almost exclusively intellectual in character."[457] This chapter shows that, quite contrary to this view, Chinese Buddhists in the twentieth century actively sought to construct a "modern Buddhism" that would contribute to the nationalist agenda. Although Chinese Buddhism did not produce a nationalism equivalent to that in Japan, where Buddhist groups were explicitly supporting an expansionist military agenda,[458] reformers and student-monks in China defined Buddhism as an integral element of Chinese culture, reformulated a Buddhist identity to

[456] Chan, *Religious Trends in Modern China*, 59.

[457] Ibid. Writing ten years earlier, Arthur Wright also expresses a similar view about the "apolitical character" of Chinese Buddhism, which he identifies as the reason for its failed modernization. See Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History*, 117.

[458] Daizen Bryan Victoria, *Zen at War* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006); Christopher Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen's Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009); Hwansoo Ilmee Kim, *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877-1912* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

justify Buddhist participation in nation-building and national defense, and produced a Buddhist citizenship discourse that allowed them to engage and negotiate with the developing nation-state.

From the beginning of the twentieth century, western paradigms for church and state were introduced and quickly became immensely influential in China.[459] In the name of nation-building, the state attempted to create a realm in which religions could manage their own affairs while being controlled and regulated. Hence, religions had to negotiate with these paradigms to redefine their place in the new social order. I argue that such turning points in state policy toward religion also provided Chinese Buddhist reformers with opportunities to promote their own project of revitalizing their tradition, and in doing so, these reformers were quite successful in altering the trajectory of modern Chinese Buddhism. The Buddhist negotiation with the newly conceived political realm was twofold. On the one hand, they had to prove that their religion fit the specific definitions of "religion" designated by the state in order to avoid persecution. This resulted in the reconfiguring of the Buddhist institution and a new kind of relationship vis-à-vis the state. On the other hand, an entire generation of reformist Buddhist leaders and young monks were also eager to demonstrate not only that Buddhism did not exist in isolation in a realm outside of the public sphere, but also that it actually had something to contribute to the nation-building process. This desire manifested itself in various creative interpretations and reinventions of Buddhist belief and practices in the decades to come.

According to Ernest Gellner, the emergence of the modern nation-state was characterized by a state-controlled mass educational system through the centralization of resources. This

[459] Timothy Brook has shown that in the Republican period, compilers of local gazetteers replaced the traditional category of the "two Masters" (*ershi* 二師) in describing Buddhist and Daoist activities with the newly conceived term *zongjiao*. See Timothy Brook, "The Politics of Religion: Late Imperial Origins of the Regulatory State," in *Making Religion, Making the State: The Politics of Religion in Modern China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009), 22–42.

gradually led to the homogenization and secularization of culture.[460] Although others have challenged Gellner's optimism regarding the universal success of the homogenization,[461] it is perhaps no exaggeration to suggest that China's twentieth century opened with educational reform as one of its most dominant national projects. Prevalent in this official discourse of education was the neologism "*guomin*國民" (citizen). There was optimism shared by reform-minded government officials and intellectuals that a modern educational system, aimed at transforming imperial subjects into Republican citizens indoctrinated by a modern and national culture, would solve China's myriad problems and social ills. For subsequent political regimes, therefore, efforts to modernize China's educational system were conjoined with the pursuit of nationalism and progress – a mission that can be summed up in the slogan "saving the nation through education" (*jiaoyu jiuguo*教育救國). Such was a project that would produce the economically independent and intellectually enlightened people that China needed to modernize and to defend herself from foreign powers.

In his recent study of civic education in lower Yangzi secondary schools in the Republican period, Robert Culp argues that through the "articulation" of discourses of national identity, political participation, socio-economic membership, and cultural expression, Chinese youth sought to represent themselves as pivotal and independent members of society.[462] They drew strategically from competing forms of civic education to create their own social identities and forms of civic activism. However, students were not the only group to use the language and practice of citizenship to enter public life in Republican China. Especially in urban areas, civic

[460] Gellner, *Nation and Nationalism*, 37-38.

[461] Van Der Veer and Lehmann, *Nation and Religion*, 5.

[462] By invoking Stuart Hall's idea of "articulation," Culp argues that various citizenship discourses mutually reinforced one another in forming a coherent, complex discursive structure. See Culp, *Articulating Citizenship*, 9-11.

and political rituals, professional associations, native-place organizations, and chambers of commerce all became sites where the nature and limits of citizenship were debated and negotiated.[463] My dissertation attempts to expand the scope of current scholarship on the discourse and practice of citizenship by adding to the discussion the Chinese Buddhists and Buddhism as both the actors and arena in which confrontation between the "old" and the "new" was most apparent in the pursuit of modernity. In a process of subject-formation through what Duara calls the "prereflexive traffic" between religion and the secular,[464] Chinese Buddhists crafted a distinctive form of citizenship by combining various dimensions of existing citizenship discourse with this-worldly interpretations of Buddhist soteriology to warrant the expression of an identity firmly grounded in the language of Buddhism.

In reacting to the religious policies of a secularist regime, reformist Buddhists called for the creation of a modern monastic educational system that would produce a "new *sangha*" – citizen-monks of the new republic who were well-educated in religious and secular subjects. In the last chapter, I have argued, that although most of them were small and short-lived, the founding of new monastic schools led to the emergence of a new group identity – that of the "student-monk" – in the first-half of the twentieth century. Student-monks attended modern *foxueyuan*, paid close attention to social and political issues, and regularly voiced harsh criticism of the traditional Buddhist establishment in Buddhist periodicals. This chapter shows how, in

[463] Henrietta Harrison, *The Making of the Republican Citizen: Political Ceremonies and Symbols in China, 1911-1929* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Xiaoqun Xu, *Chinese Professionals and the Republican State: The Rise of Professional Associations in Shanghai, 1912-1937* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); James Carter, *Creating a Chinese Harbin: Nationalism in an International City, 1916-1932* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002).

[464] Duara argues that the religious and secular spheres were constantly reconstituted in twentieth century China as both religious groups and the state challenged the boundaries separating them. See Duara, "Religion and Citizenship" in Yang, ed., *Chinese Religiosities*, 45. On the relationship between the modern nation-state and religious subjectivity, see Ven Der Veer and Lehmann, *Nation and Religion*.

performing the collective student-monk identity, educated Buddhist monks strove to develop their own notion of rights and obligations as members of the political community, despite the fact that the legal content of citizenship changed over the course of the century.

In doing so, they eclectically drew from various strains of ideologies to formulate their own definition of citizenship while reconciling the performance of citizenship with their Buddhist piety. I argue that Chinese Buddhists actively performed citizenship in Republican China through constant negotiation and compromise with discourses on the right to the protection of property, through participation in political activities such as voting and running for office, and by assuming the obligation to defend the nation especially during the Sino-Japanese War. Each of these three aspects of Buddhist citizenship discourse loosely corresponded to a different phase of interaction between Buddhism and the state. Although one aspect of this Buddhist conception of citizenship might be more dominant than others in a specific socio-political context, they were intertwined with and reinforced one another in generating a distinctively Buddhist citizenship discourse. In examining the formulation of the Buddhist citizenship discourse among the student-monks, I hope to shed light on the delicate connection that Chinese Buddhists sought to establish between "revitalizing Buddhism through education" (*jiaoyu xingjiao* 教育興教) and "saving the nation through Buddhism" (*fojiao jiuguo* 佛教救國). By highlighting the formulation of the modern "student-monk" identity, I am not claiming that it was the only sphere in which the construction of a Buddhist citizenship discourse took place. Rather, I claim that, due to the lack of a centralized, national authority in Chinese Buddhism, this new community of young, educated, and politically passionate monks was an important player in shaping Buddhist citizenship discourse in the twentieth century.

Coming to Terms with the Nation

Since its introduction in China, Buddhism was confronted with a vastly different socio-political context and had to reconcile with an existing imperial bureaucracy in China. In fact, forging a favorable relation with the state while seeking recognition for the *sangha* as a distinct social group has been an ongoing struggle throughout its history. The history of Buddhism-state relations can be summarized by the tension between two opposing inclinations articulated by the famous Eastern Jin (317-420) master Dao'an 道安 (312-385) and his student Huiyuan慧遠 (334-416). Living in a politically tumultuous time when Buddhism was gaining firm support in the court, Dao'an was convinced that the "Buddha Dharma could not establish itself without relying on the rulers."[465] Furthermore, by introducing the custom of monks and nuns adopting the religious surname *Shi* (釋, for 釋迦牟尼 Śākyamuni), Dao'an succeeded in removing the foreignness of the *sangha's* social identity by recasting it according to the familiar Chinese kinship system.[466] This became universally accepted and remains a general practice in Chinese Buddhism today.

Huiyuan, on the other hand, defended the autonomy of the *sangha* in his famous treatise *Shamen bujing wangzhe lun*沙門不敬王者論 (*On Monks Not Paying Respect to Rulers*). He argued that, as those who have "left the household" and whose aspirations were directed toward unworldly ends (*fangwai* 方外), Buddhist monks were not subject to temporal law and worldly power. Hence, they ought not to be expected to pay respect to the rulers. However, he also

[465] This famous statement, *biyu guozhu ze fashi nanli* 不依國主，則法事難立, is often quoted in discussions of Buddhism-state relations both by traditional and contemporary writers. See *Gaoseng zhuan*, T2059.50.352. It is even quoted in the state-approved patriotism textbook for clerical education. See Guojia zongjiao shiwuju 國家宗教事務局, *Aiguo zhuyi jiaocheng* 愛國主義教程 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2005), 298.

[466] Erik Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*, 3rd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 189, 281.

argued that, as monks lived apart and yet their cultivation benefitted the world, the rulers had a moral obligation to sustain the *sangha*.[467] On the surface, the positions of Dao'an and Huiyuan may seem to be at different ends of the spectrum in defining the relationship between Buddhism and worldly authority. But on a closer examination, one finds an underlying common concern – the sense of urgency to position the *sangha* vis-à-vis the state while acknowledging the need to justify how Buddhism could be beneficial to the realm – that remained a characteristic of Buddhism in China.

Whatever autonomy Huiyuan, through his correspondence with the ruler Huan Xuan 桓玄(369-404), was able to achieve, it was soon eroded as the *sangha* gradually came under the bureaucratic control of the state. Through the system of monastic officials (*sengguan* 僧官), clergy registration, and the issuance of ordination certificates, Buddhism was incorporated into the imperial bureaucracy in subsequent dynasties under an office overseen by court appointed monks or members of the gentry.[468] By late imperial times, the Chinese Buddhists had accepted not only the bureaucratic religious paradigm of patronage, prohibition, and regulation,[469] but also the state's religio-ethical framework for moral orthodoxy. In other words, if it did not pose any threat to the interest of the state and the stability of the public order, their religion would be tolerated. Furthermore, it was assumed that the emperor's moral obligation was to protect and

[467] The treatise began as a series of correspondences with Huan Xuan 桓玄(369-404), a warlord of the Jin dynasty who demanded that monks should bow to the ruler, and attempted to implement measures to limit entrance to the *sangha* through compulsory examination and the registration of the clergy. It is not clear if Huiyuan's letters were the reason why Huan Xuan changed his mind in demanding that monks pay respect to rulers. See ibid., 237, 257-260.

[468] For a history of the monastic official bureaucracy in imperial China, see Xie Chongguang 謝重光 and Bai Wengu 白文固, *Zhongguo sengguan zhidushi* 中國僧官制度史 (Xining: Qinghai renmin chubanshe, 1990) and Wang, *Zhongguo fojiao sengtuan fazhan ji qi guanli*, chapters 1-3.

[469] Timothy Brook, "The Politics of Religion: Late Imperial Origins of the Regulatory State," in Ashiwa and Wank, *Making Religion, Making the State*, 23.

patronize orthodoxy, and to intervene and suppress “heterodoxy” and improper cults. Buddhism, or religion in general, had to remain on the good side of the court to avoid persecution. It is important to note, however, that central imperial management did not necessarily mean an institutionally unified *sangha*. For example, there was never a national, unified *sangha*. Institutional Buddhism was organized around networks of ordination and regional lineages. Therefore, by the late Qing, Chinese Buddhism had very much internalized this configuration characterized by the impetus to secure imperial patronage while developing its own networks of kinship.

This would all change following the fall of the Qing dynasty. The fall of the Qing dynasty signified not only the end of dynastic rule but also the collapse of the state-imposed system of moral orthodoxy that had persisted from the Han to the Qing. But this should not be seen as a complete rupture as the state continued to control and regulate religion. With most intellectuals and government officials in the early twentieth century being preoccupied with the modernization project, their engagement with the issue of religion was framed in a different language and discourse compared with those in the imperial era.

Although this is a period marked by disorder and uncertainty, there was a consensus that the emperor-subject system had to be replaced by a new way to imagine the relationship between individual citizens and the state. New terms such as “republicanism,” “democracy,” “progress,” and “science” dominated political writing of this period. It was believed that for China to become a wealthy and strong nation in a world of competing nation-states, it needed the creation of a new citizenry who shared equal rights and duties and who considered the nation (*guo* 國) as their collective identity. Therefore, it can be said that citizenship in China took nationalism as its

foundation.[470] Furthermore, as sovereignty shifted from the divine power (*shenquan* 神權) of the imperial ruling house to popular power (*minquan* 民權) of the people, many intellectuals were convinced that China needed a moral reorientation.

In the political cosmology of imperial China, public interest (*gong* 公) was represented by the emperor and a small group of morally refined scholar-officials educated in the Confucian classics. The shift in the understanding of sovereignty took place when reformers and revolutionaries, while continuing to emphasize the importance of public interest, associated it with popular participation instead.[471] Liang Qichao, for example, was famous for his very influential view on the understanding of citizenship in China in his serial essay *The New Citizen* (*Xinminshuo* 新民說). He criticized Confucianism for inspiring the cultivation of personal morality (*side* 私德) over civic or public morality (*gongde* 公德).[472] He saw the lack of a sense of obligation as the root cause for China's ills and proposed to renew the people by educating them in citizenship which emphasized public morality. He considered private and public morality not as opposing but complementary virtues.[473] In developing his theory of civic nationalism, he claimed that public morality should revolve around the collective interest of the nation composed of a people (*minzu* 民族). By transforming imperial subjects into citizens (*guomin* 國民), a nation-state would be formed when each individual member of the group (*qun*

[470] Goldman and Perry, "Introduction: Political Citizenship in China," 6.

[471] Peter Zarrow, "Constitutionalism and the Imagination of the State: Official Views of Political Reform in the Late Qing," in *Creating Chinese Modernity: Knowledge and Everyday Life, 1900-1940*, ed. Peter Zarrow (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 81.

[472] Liang Qichao, *Xinminshuo* 新民說, YBH, vol. 8, 12; Hao Chang, *Liang Ch'i-Ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China*, 151.

[473] Liang Qichao, *Xinminshuo*, 118.

群) was united by the underpinnings of nationalism (*minzu zhuyi* 民族主義).[474] It is important to note, as pointed out by Goldman and Perry, that although Liang was convinced that it was the right of each citizen to participate in the modern nation-state, he acknowledged that China was not yet ready for Western-style democracy and therefore required an authoritarian government in the transitional period. [475] Such a view was shared by government officials throughout the twentieth century.

As I have shown in Chapter 1, there was often a religious dimension in the thought of late Qing reformers. Many imagined modernization to be a moral awakening in which the nation developed by combining Western technology and a national essence (*guocui* 國粹). Often religion was viewed as the unifying principle in the creation of a national identity. From Kang Youwei's campaign to develop Confucianism as the state religion to Liang Qichao, Zhang Taiyan and Tan Sitong, who saw Buddhism as a superior religion grounded in rationality that could play a positive role in renewing the Chinese nation, late Qing intellectuals turned to and affirmed the role of religion in formulating their project for national survival. Furthermore, their political project was also a religious one. Insofar as they were critical of traditional religious practices, which they ferociously denounced as superstitious, their project was aimed at introducing a spiritual reform that China desperately needed.[476] In his study of Protestant churches in Fuzhou during the first two decades of the twentieth century, Ryan Dunch has shown that, despite their foreign origins, these churches were successful in winning the support of the local elite. This was because of their emphasis on moral education that was aimed at "molding

[474] Zarrow, "Citizenship in China and the West," 17-18.

[475] Goldman and Perry, "Introduction: Political Citizenship in China," 6.

[476] Goossaert, "1898," 311.

the Chinese people into a nationally conscious and public-spirited citizenry."[477] This was possible also because the new party-state had not yet developed after the disintegration of the imperial order. As the Nationalists consolidated power in the 1920s, Christianity would come to be rejected by the elite as a form of imperialism.

Although this religio-political reform eventually gave way to secular nationalism and mobilization politics, especially during the Nanjing decade of Nationalist (KMT) rule, religion remained a dominant issue in state-building throughout the twentieth century. By imposing the newly conceived categories of religion and superstition, as well as the corporatist model for managing religion, the Nationalist regime conceived of most religious practices as superstition that was a hindrance for both the nation-building and modernization projects. The secular nationalist project aimed at defining, managing, and separating religion from the realm of public life on the one hand, while persecuting and eradicating superstition on the other. Although national law guaranteed the freedom of religion, Nationalist leaders could not agree on where to bureaucratically place state-recognized religious organizations. Nor were they clear about how religion should function in society.[478] I argue that the Chinese Buddhists creatively appropriated all of the above – by presenting Buddhism as a unifying moral force compatible with the political ideology of the republic, differentiating Buddhism from superstition, and invoking constitutional rights and freedom of religion as citizens – as discursive tools in reorienting and negotiating a place for Buddhism in the new nation-state.

Following Gellner, Hobsbawm has argued that the "nation" should not be viewed as an unchanging entity. It is nationalism that makes the state, not the other way around. Yet, his view

[477] Ryan Dunch, *Fuzhou Protestants and the Making of a Modern China, 1857-1927* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), xviii.

[478] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 50-51.

differs from Gellner in that nation-making is not only a top down process but should be analyzed from below.[479] By looking at the ways in which the Chinese Buddhists, especially the young student-monks who had received a modern education, engaged with the discourse of nation and nationalism, I hope to shed light on one aspect of this view from below. Another argument of Hobsbawm that is relevant to our discussion of the Buddhist appropriation of nationalist discourse is the multiplicity of identifications that existed alongside national identity.[480] In reconciling their Buddhist identity with that of the nation, Chinese Buddhists not only viewed religion as an indispensable component in the formation of a nation, but also did not hesitate to assert a national identity deeply rooted in Buddhism:

> 民族構成之要素為生活語言血統宗教風俗習慣五种，由此是見宗教關係與國家民族很密切的重要的…我國過去政府不明瞭宗教為國家民族的興亡關鍵所在…沒有識察到佛教不興中華民族則永不能復興，佛教不立中華民國永不能自由獨立。
>
> The five primary components of a nation are livelihood, language, ethnicity, religion, and custom. From this, religion is clearly seen as important and intrinsically related to the nation-state. In the past, our country's government did not understand that religion was the key to the rise and fall of a nation-state. [It] did not realize that the Chinese nation would never be rejuvenated if Buddhism did not thrive, [and] the Republic of China would never be free and independent if Buddhism was not established.[481]

---

[479] E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 10–11.

[480] Ibid., 11.

[481] Yanqi 延祺, "Fojiao yu Zhongguo 佛教與中國." *Miaofalun* 妙法輪, vol. 1, no. 1 (1943), MFQ 97:338. For similar arguments by other young-monks, see also Fanfang, "Juantouyu 卷頭語." HCY, vol. 17, no. 4 (1936), MFQ 193:143-148; Cangjiang 滄江, "Lun Fojiao yu guomin zhi guanxi 論佛教與國民之關係." *Foxue congbao*, no. 1 (1912), MFQ 1:53.

Considering that Buddhism, and religion in general, was faced with the government's persistent attack on religion during this period, such a blunt assertion might seem curious. Yet it is exactly this fluidity and creativity in associating the fate of Buddhism with that of the nation that points to the argument I want to make: in adopting the language and discourse imposed on them by the state, Chinese Buddhists turned nationalist propaganda into a potent weapon for resisting the secularizing impulse and justifying their place in the modern nation-state. This "view from below" shows the complexity of the nation-building process. In addition, the Buddhists' skilled deployment of nationalist and citizenship discourse in defending their religion prompts one to rethink the simplistic understanding of the efficacy of the state's secular nationalist approach to religion.[482]

In providing justifications for the assertion above, which was representative of the Buddhists' self-understanding of their relation to the state during this period, the young-monks argued for the capacity of Buddhism as a unifying moral force, as well as compatibility between a modern Buddhism and the nation. It is important to also note that in arguing for the centrality of religion in the modern nation, the Christian West was often cited as an example.[483] Buddhism, as an integral element of Chinese culture, needed to be revitalized alongside the nation to counter the challenge of Christianity represented by the numerous foreign powers in China. Cihang, in discussing the importance of public morality in ensuring a stable and prosperous nation, opined that Buddhism, whose foundational teaching was the elimination of the three poisons of greed,

[482] This is not only true about Buddhism in the early twentieth century but similar developments can be seen in post-Mao China, where the national Buddhist Association, originally sanctioned by the Communist state to exert control over the Buddhists in the country, has paradoxically transformed into the structural foundation for the Buddhists to represent their interests and negotiate with the state. See Ji Zhe, "Secularization as Religious Structuring: Statist Institutionalization of Chinese Buddhism and Its Paradoxes." In Yang, *Chinese Religiosities*, 233-260.

[483] Taixu, "Minguo yu fojiao 民國與佛教," TXQ 22:1247.

hatred, and ignorance, could contribute greatly to the virtue education for citizens.[484] This view was echoed by Yimo, for whom creating the nation and establishing Buddhism were one goal with two names as there was no better religion than Buddhism to serve as the unifying force in the moral order for the nation.[485]

The revolutionary monk Zongyang 宗仰 (1865-1921) also argued that Buddhism was the only solution to China's moral dilemma, while educational and legal reforms could only address the symptoms but not the root cause.[486] Such a claim by Zongyang is especially illuminating for the optimism and high hopes for the republic shared by China's new monks. Zongyang, together with Cai Yuanpei and Huang Yanpei, were the co-founders of the Chinese Education Society (*Zhonghua jiaoyu hui* 中華教育會) in the late Qing, which aimed at bringing about political changes through educational reform. Having escaped to Japan after the revolutionary newspaper *Subao* 蘇報 was suppressed by the Qing government, he became a close associate of Sun Yat-sen, raising funds for the latter's numerous efforts to overthrow the Qing. He was also a founding member of the Tongmenghui. Having turned down Sun's invitation to join the government in Nanjing, he withdrew to the monastery and focused on reviving the Qixiashan Monastery 栖霞

[484] Cihang, "Lun minde wei liguo zhiben 論民德為立國之本," *Foxue banyuekan* 佛學半月刊, vol. 3, no. 23 (1933), MFQ 49:4.

[485] Yimo 儀模, "Jianguo yu jianjiao 建國與建教," *Juequn zhoubao* vol. 2, no. 31 (1947), MFQ 101:454. Yimo attended the Wuchang Academy and later returned to lay life. He was one of the Wuchang graduates lobbying for the reopening of the academy in 1994.

[486] Niaomu shanseng 鳥目山僧 (Zongyang),"Lun zunchong fojiao wei jinri zengjin guomin daode zhi qieyao 論尊崇佛教為今日增進國民道德之切要," *Foxue congbao* 4 (1913), MFQ 2:11-16.

山寺 in the later parts of his life. In acknowledging his contribution to the revolution, Sun sent a 10,000 *yuan* donation for his temple reconstruction fund.[487]

With the collapse of the dynastic rule came the crumbling of the Confucian moral order. By adopting a nationalistic tone, these young monks presented Buddhism as an integral component of Chinese culture – something that would have been impossible under Confucian hegemony – that was to be protected and developed to counter the threat of Christianity. Therefore, despite the secularist religious policies, Chinese Buddhists during this period also saw this as an opportunity to reposition Buddhism as both a uniquely Chinese answer to imperialism, as well as a superior source for the state's effort to rebuild the moral order. By linking Buddhism to the development of the state, they sought to increase the prominence and legitimacy of Buddhism in the new republic.

In addition, the founding of the new republic brought about a conceptual transformation in the Chinese imagination of their relationship to the nation, and the Buddhists were no exception. The Buddhists often invoked the ideals of republicanism and Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles (*Sanmin zhuyi* 三民主義) in stressing the compatibility between Buddhist teachings and the new republic. In speaking of democratic republicanism, in which citizens shared equal rights, Chinese monks likened that to the Buddhist ideals of compassion, egalitarianism, and Buddha-nature, which teaches that every sentient being possesses the full potential to achieve perfect enlightenment.[488] Comparing the republic to previous imperial regimes, they claimed that:

---

[487] For a biographical account, see XFRC 1:567-571. For an account of the dispute between the Qixiashan Monastery and local elite during the temple confiscation campaign in the Nanjing decade, see Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 159-165.

[488] Fushan 福善, "Gonghe zhengzhi yu fojiao 共和制治與佛教." Zhang Mantao, *Fojiao yu Zhengzhi*, 56.

> 國體專制，其教只能及於少數信仰之人，國體共和，其教可遍全國。何也？正以共和之旨，即佛教平等慈悲之道。人民既趨向於共和，則教藉政以顯。
>
> In an autocratic polity, religion can only reach a small number of believers. In a republican polity, it can spread to the whole nation. Why? That is because the principle for republicanism is the same as the Buddhist teaching of compassion and equality. If the people are inclined to republicanism, then Buddhism can shine through politics.[489]

The Buddhists were quick to react to the promulgation of the provisional constitution of 1912, which placed sovereignty in the people, as well as guaranteed the equality of the citizens regardless of race, class, and religion. It also included a clause that grants the "freedom of religion" (*xinjiao zhi ziyou* 信教之自由). Although the constitution went through several drafts between the founding of the republic and the 1940s, it did not diverge from this earlier path, which included religious freedom as one of the basic rights guaranteed to Chinese citizens.[490] Needless to say, there was optimism that the founding of the republic meant that the rights of the Buddhists would be protected by the constitution.

In contemplating how to relate to the new polity in 1916, Taixu drew a parallel between the Yogācāra understanding of the nature of the self and the nature of the nation. Describing any ego as merely the coming together of the five aggregates (*wuyun* 五蘊), he considered the Republic of China as a result of the accumulation of the consciousness of its people – an "ultra illusory ego" (*da huanwo* 大幻我) which, apart from its compositional elements – the individual

[489] Lingjiang 菱江, "Fodan jinian dahui yanshuo 佛誕紀念大會演說," *Fojiao yuebao* 2 (1913), MFQ 5:342.

[490] Qu Haiyuan 瞿海源, *Zongjiao, shushu yu shehui bianqian: jidu zongjiao yanjiu, zhengjiao guanxi yanjiu* 宗教,術數與社會變遷: 基督宗教研究, 政教關係研究, vol. 2 (Xindian, Taipei: Guiguan, 2006), 199.

citizens, did not possess any unchanging existence.[491] Rather than merely pointing out the illusionary nature of the nation, I think he was stressing its fluidity and transient nature to offer a Buddhist explanation for the re-imagining of the collective identity of the new nation. Each citizen, by this definition, would be the basic constituent of the nation and the cause and condition for its existence. Therefore, the individual mind and actions of the citizens mattered as they would directly lead to effects on the entire nation.

Scholars have acknowledged that the symbolic significance of Sun Yat-sen as the founding Father of the Republic (*guofu* 國父) only surged after his death. This is closely associated with the Nationalist creation of a new narrative for the nation surrounding Sun and the KMT during and after the Northern Expedition. It has also led to the "partification" (*danghua* 黨化) of politics during the Nanjing regime, in which the symbols of the party were identified with the symbols of the nation. Of specific importance to our discussion here is Sun's deathbed message, which consolidated the legitimacy of Sun as a national leader, and set up his Three People's Principles (*sanmin zhuyi*三民主義)[492] at the center of the KMT's political ideology. Written in vague language, there was no consistent view of Sun's will and it was subject to different interpretations. However, its symbolic importance increased with the Nationalist regime's expansion of power. Soon, the armed forces and school children were holding weekly ceremony during which they reverently bowed to Sun's portrait and chanted his will.[493]

---

[491] Taixu, "Shi Zhonghuo minguo 釋中華民國," TXQ 22:1225.

[492] Namely, the Three People's Principles are nationalism, democracy, and livelihood of the people – doctrines at the core of Sun's political philosophy to transform China into a modern nation. See Marie-Claire Bergère, *Sun Yat-sen*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 352. *Sanmin zhuyi* is often directly translated as Sanminism.

[493] Henrietta Harrison, *The Making of the Republican Citizen: Political Ceremonies and Symbols in China, 1911-1929* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 157–158. Harrison has also pointed out that the will was not even penned by Sun himself. On his deathbed, Sun was presented with the testament prepared by Wang Jingwei 汪精衛

The Buddhists almost univocally praised Sun's doctrine by claiming that it was in complete harmony with the teachings of Buddhism. They claimed that, "Buddhism is ultimately *sanmin zhuyi*, and *sanmin zhuyi* is Buddhism in practice."[494] Zhifeng urged his fellow new monks to rise up to the responsibility of bringing about a moral awakening for modern China:

> 現在中國的政體，已從君主專制入于民主自治的時代；也就成爲中山先生所創的三民主義的國民黨黨治的時代 … 所以我們要救活我們的佛教，必須將我們佛教偉大的精神表現出來，必須將我們佛教的真道德發揮出來。對於全人類，應當負起全權的責任來！同時做我們現代中國國民的行爲道德的基礎，成功為我們中國國民偉大精神的國魂，以促進民主政治的現代中國。
>
> The polity in China now has changed from previous despotic monarchism to enter a time of democracy. This is also the time of Nationalist party rule according to the Three People's Principles founded by Mr. [Sun] Zhongshan … Therefore, to revitalize Buddhism, we have to demonstrate the great spirit of Buddhism and develop its true morality. [We] have to take up responsibility toward all of humanity! At the same time, [we need to] serve as the moral foundation for the conduct of modern Chinese citizens, and successfully [become] the great national spirit for our citizens to promote a modern China under democratic politics.[495]

---

with five other members of the left, including the communist Li Dazhao 李大釗, who served as Sun's entourage to Beijing to negotiate with the chief of the Beijing government, Duan Qirui 段祺瑞. Sun fell ill and died in Beijing in 1925. See ibid., 136.

[494] Xinsheng 心聲, "Foxue yu san minzhuyi 佛學與三民主義," *Fohaideng*, vol. 2, no.1(1936), MFQB 51: 377. See also Dakong 達空, "Fofo yu Sanmin zhuyi 佛法與三民主義," *Renjian fojiao* 人間佛教 1, MFQ 100:355.

[495] Zhifeng, "Xiandai fojiao yu xiandai Zhongguo 現代佛教與現代中國," *Xiandai fojiao* vol. 5, no.1(1932), MFQ 67:305-306.

In an age when the doctrine of Sun, the semi-mythical national hero, was enthusiastically studied, quoted, and interpreted by all players on the socio-political field, perhaps it is not at all surprising that the Buddhists would cite Sun to support their position. Chen Jinlong has observed that by the 1930s, Buddhist academies had started to promote party education (*dangyi jiaoyu* 黨義教育) by including the Three People's Principles in their curriculum. Also, the KMT central propaganda unit was distributing its *Central Daily News* (*Zhongyang ribao* 中央日報) in the Buddhist academies.[496]

At around the same time, several Buddhist periodicals started to publish the "Deathbed Teachings of the Premier" (*zongli yijiao* 總理遺教). What is interesting about the Buddhist version of the *Zongli yijiao* is that, rather than Sun's will, it consisted of excerpts of Sun's remarks about religion in general and Buddhism in particular. They were given in point form: (1) Religion was a mighty force in the creation of nations; (2) There were three types of benevolence which shared the quality of universal love: saving the world, saving humanity, and saving the nation. Saving the world was the benevolence of a religion such as Buddhism, which taught self-sacrifice for the sake of sentient beings; (3) Buddhism could make up for what science lacked.[497] Later on, Sun's affirmation of the role of Buddhism in his formulation of a nationalist discourse became the cornerstone of many discussions and petitions put forth by the Buddhists on issues ranging from property rights to political participation and Buddhist patriotic education.

---

[496] Chen, *Nanjing guomin zhengfu shiqi zhengjiao de guanxi*, 13, 177. As early as 1928, the Minnan Buddhist Academy had included Sanminism in its curriculum. See Changxing and Taixu, "Minnan Foxueyuan xuzhao xueseng jianzhang 閩南佛學院續招學僧簡章," HCY, vol. 9, no. 7 (1928), MFQ 170:558.

[497] "Zongli yijiao 總理遺教," *Zhongguo fojiaohui yuekan* 中國佛教會月刊 46-48 (1933), MFQB 29:2. There are variations that include Sun's will (*Zongli yizhu* 總理遺囑) and a photograph of him. See, for example, "Zongli yixiang, zongli yizhu, zongli yijiao 總理遺像、總理遺囑、總理遺教," *Zhongguo fojiaohui huibao* 中國佛教會會報 1 (1936), MFQB 30:106.

Henrietta Harrison has argued that by manipulating the image of Sun as a national symbol, Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist government were able to portray themselves as the legitimate representatives for the masses. In other words, by infusing national symbols, which also included a national flag and anthem, with the ideology of the KMT, legitimacy was transferred from the citizens as a whole to the party.[498] However, the Buddhist appropriation of Sun as a symbol shows that they were not just passively repeating the nationalist discourse imposed by the party-state. By infusing Buddhism into the symbol of Sun and his legitimacy, they were laying claim to a positive national identity as patriotic citizens. They also attempted to link Buddhism to politics or even to politicize Buddhism by adopting the changing concepts of the nation in the formulation of a Buddhist nationalist discourse. Given the power struggle in the political realm that went on for the first decades of the republic and subsequent anti-religious policies of the Nanjing government, the freedom of religion and constitutional rights that the student-monks so passionately engaged with in their writings might have been only ideals that could not be realized in reality. Yet these ideals were powerful ones nonetheless. They resulted in the reconfiguration of the monks' identity as Buddhists as well as a new understanding of their place in the nation-state as Buddhist citizens.

Another characteristic of the young monks' self-understanding of their relationship with the state was the association of nationalism with progress. In a self-critical reflection on the lack of national consciousness among the Chinese Buddhists, monk Jiying 寂英 contended that Chinese monks still held onto the ancient concept of placing religion above the state. This had led to the escapist mentality in which monks and nuns would only focus on their practice of chanting the Buddha's name and keeping a vegetarian diet. Comparing Buddhism to other

[498] Harrison, *The Making of the Republican Citizen*, 242 and passim.

"modern" religions such as Christianity and even Japanese Buddhism, he observed that these religions embodied a strong nationalist impulse. Therefore, he concluded, no religion could exist outside of the laws and constitution in a modern nation-state.[499]

The teleological understanding of modernity is definitely noteworthy here. These monks seemed to have shared the Enlightenment view of history in which modernization would culminate in the evolutionary transformation of medieval divine kingship/autocracy into modern nation-states. But what I would like to highlight here is the monks' optimism about Buddhism's ability to generate appropriate new forms. Time and again, we encounter young monks who were acutely aware of the changing conditions in their country yet had a strong faith in the capacity of Buddhism to adapt accordingly. This inclination can be summed up in the phrase "in accordance with the doctrine and external conditions" (*qili qiji* 契理契機), which was prevalent among Chinese reformers in this period. It is a conviction, based on the Mahāyāna doctrine of emptiness, that justifies the doctrinal reinterpretation according to the needs of the historical moment. James Ketelaar has observed similar strategies by the Japanese Buddhists during the Meiji period.[500] In other words, in countering the criticisms of Buddhism, the Buddhists tended to stress the capacity of Buddhism to express itself appropriately according to the needs of the current time while remaining a universal truth that transcended differentiations.

At the same time, the young student-monks, such as Daxing quoted above, were aware that simply identifying with the state was not enough to ensure the relevance of Buddhism in the new nation. In fact, they argued that reforms internal to Buddhism were necessary for Buddhism to fulfil its mission as a modern, ethical religion for national advancement. Assuming that to be

[499] Jiying 寂英, "Sengxun ji qita 僧訓及其他," *Fojiao yu foxue* 佛教與佛學, vol. 2, no. 19 (1937), MFQ 79:87.

[500] Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, 174 and passim.

modern was to be free of superstition, reformers and young student-monks were quick to differentiate themselves from the the uneducated ignorant monks who, in order to generate profit, installed many statues to confuse and deceive equally ignorant worshipers:

> 於是不問是佛是仙，是菩薩是神道，一見了偶像就燒香禮拜…誰知所拜的都不是佛菩薩，而是不屬於佛教的仙和神！枉費精神枉費錢，乃至由盲從而入於迷信，是真可笑而又可憐！
>
> So [they] burn incense and bow to any statue they see without questioning whether these are Buddhas, immortals, Bodhisattvas, or Daoist deities.…They do not know that these are not Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, but non-Buddhist immortals and deities. [They are] wasting energy and money and go from blindly following to superstition. Alas, how laughable and pathetic![501]

As much as the harsh tone against superstition is apparent, it is important to note that these young monks were not iconoclastic *per se*. Indeed, they were denouncing the worship of the *wrong* deities branded as superstition. Therefore, these arguments should be seen as "definitional strategies," to borrow James Ketelaar's term,[502] in which the student-monks appropriated the language originally used to attack their practice in order to defend their religion and justify reform within. These young monks were not trying to "get rid of the buddhas and bodhisattas," in Birnbaum's words,[503] but to advocate for reform and the restructuring of the Buddhist establishment according to new expectations for religious practices. In fact, I have encountered no evidence for even the most radical reformist monks who attempted to destroy statues or

[501] Jichen, "Cong siyuanli gaicao qi 從寺院裡改造起," *Haochaoyin*, vol. 17. No. 4 (1936), MFQ 193:199.

[502] Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*.

[503] Birnbaum, "Buddhist China at the Century's Turn," 129.

eliminate rites and rituals from their practice. Taixu was definitely critical of monks who made a living solely by performing funeral rites. He was concerned that this would lead to the Buddhists' irrelevance in the modern world. He encouraged the design of various modern Buddhist ceremonies and officiated the first Buddhist wedding, an act which was highly controversial among the Chinese Buddhists at the time.[504] Other scholars have noted his creation of a new ritual cult surrounding Maitreya and his involvement in popularizing the nation-protection dharma assembly based on the *Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra for Humane Kings Protecting Their Countries* (*Renwang huguo bore boluomiduo jing* 仁王護國般若波羅蜜多經), which was often lavishly patronized by eminent monastic leaders as well as by the prominent political and cultural elite.[505]

The same can also be said about the "Humanistic" Buddhist organizations in Taiwan, which are often considered the spiritual heirs of Taixu's reform. Without repeating the details about the historical development of Buddhism in the modern period,[506] I would just point out that most of these organizations are erecting grandiose monastery compounds, regularly holding elaborate rituals, and inventing new rituals to redefine and strengthen the sense of loyalty and identity of their respective members.[507] In other words, the socio-political context in which the

[504] Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 249.

[505] See Ritzinger, "Anarchy in the Pure Land" and Scott, "Buddhist Nationalism of Dai Jitao," respectively.

[506] For a study of the historical development of Buddhism in Taiwan from the Qing to the 1990s, see Charles Brewer Jones, *Buddhism in Taiwan Religion and the State, 1660-1990* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999).

[507] For the centrality of ritual in the Taiwanese Tzu Chi movement, see C. Julia Huang, *Charisma and Compassion: Cheng Yen and the Buddhist Tzu Chi Movement* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009). On the Foguangshan movement, see Stuart Chandler, *Establishing a Pure Land on Earth: The Foguang Buddhist Perspective on Modernization and Globalization* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004). Richard Madsen seems to be arguing that these organizations devalue external rituals and emphasize internal morality (p.6). Yet in his book, which is based on his fieldwork of religious organizations in modern Taiwan, there is no lack of instances in which rituals play a central role in the activities of these organizations. See Richard Madsen, *Democracy's Dharma: Religious Renaissance and Political Development in Taiwan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

anti-superstition discourses internal to Buddhism emerged is as important, if not more, as the actual content in the articulation of these discourses.

Welch describes the association of modern Chinese elites with Buddhism as an "expression of cultural loyalism." By choosing Buddhism as their religious identity, he says, they were choosing to be Chinese. He also concludes that monks "did not have the same problem of religious identity as laymen."[508] He seems to be suggesting that a "Buddhist identity" for monks was, or at least ought to be, static despite the tumultuous socio-political environment. I have shown that this was very much not the case. One of the most significant developments in twentieth century Chinese Buddhism was the reformulation of Buddhist identity as a result of changes in the socio-political sphere. Without overemphasizing the impact-response and tradition-modernity approaches,[509] I argue that the Chinese Buddhists felt a genuine threat from the secularist state's adoption of the Western paradigm of religion and superstition and the presence of Christian missionaries beginning at the turn of the twentieth century. On top of that, a deep sense of moral dilemma and rising nationalism became the impetus for the reformulation of Buddhist identity. In addition, the modern educated student-monks, who have not gained much scholarly attention, were the most vocal and earnest participants in this process.

In order to reposition Buddhism in the modern society, they were faced with two dilemmas: how to imagine a Buddhist identity under the new system of governance, and how to fit into the nation-building project. They tried to solve both problems by proposing a linkage between Buddhism and the state – that is to say, by binding the fate of Buddhism to that of the

---

[508] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 261.

[509] For Cohen's criticism of these approaches and his proposal for a China-centered approach, see Paul Cohen, *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984) and *China Unbound: Evolving Perspectives on the Chinese Past* (New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003).

nation or by patriotism/nationalism to their Buddhist piety. These young monks passionately voiced their opinions about how love for the country was love for their religion. This would allow them to create a citizenship discourse that justified their participation in politics and national defence, as I will explain below.

In communist China, this discourse on nationalism and patriotism was also deployed to support a collaborationist approach vis-à-vis the government. In other words, the current Buddhist slogan of love for the party, nation, and Buddhism (*aidang aiguo aijiao* 愛黨、愛國、愛教), in that particular order, which is the underlying principle for Buddhism in mainland China is not new but a continuation of the conceptualization of the Buddhism-state relationship dating to the Republican period.[510]

Lastly, I argue that this tendency should not be seen merely as a secularization of Buddhism. To the contrary, I see the Chinese Buddhists' production of nationalist and citizenship discourse as a manifestation of their resistance to secularization, when the government consistently attempted to relegate religion to the private sphere. This created a structural tension when, in negotiating with the state, the Buddhists reacted by constantly trying to write themselves back into the public sphere. Yet this tension did not always manifest in conflict and opposition. Paradoxically, by associating the fate of Buddhism with that of the nation, the Buddhists were willing to relinquish part of their autonomy to the state, maintaining that it was the state that bore the responsibility of interfering and supervising necessary reform within Buddhism to safeguard the modernization process. Fafang and Daxing, for example,

[510] For the life and thought of monk Juzan 巨贊 (1908-1984) and layman Zhao Puchu 趙朴初 (1907-2000), who were instrumental in the transformation of the Buddhist Association in mainland China after 1949, see Yu Xue, "Buddhist Contribution to the Socialist Transformation of Buddhism in China: Activities of Ven. Juzan during 1949–1953," *Journal of Global Buddhism* 10 (2009): 217–254; Shi Xinrong, *Juzan fashi yanjiu* 巨贊法師研究 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 2006); Zhe Ji, "A Testament Betrayed: Zhao Puchu and His Renjian Buddhism," ed. Jessica Main and Rongdao Lai, *The Eastern Buddhist Special Issue on Engaged Buddhism* (Forthcoming).

claimed that the difficulty in systematically organizing Buddhism was due to the lack of government effort to directly manage and supervise Buddhist affairs.[511] Citing the secularist framework of the separation of religion and state, the Republican government turned down proposals to set up a national council of religious affairs, but it continued to assert control over the definition and regulation of region.[512] The Nationalist government only decided to step in and interfere, in 1936, when the fight for control of the Chinese Buddhist Association between Taixu and Yuanying's factions intensified and Taixu quit all his positions and withdrew from the association. The Ministry of Mass Training (Zhongyang minzhong xunlian bu 中央民衆訓練部) prepared a draft charter to reorganize the Chinese Buddhist Association, which was considered to be siding with the reformist faction. Dai Jitao later urged the KMT Central Party Committee to not meddle with Buddhist affairs. Without the cooperation of Yuanying's group, the reorganization ended in failure.[513]

In short, I would suggest that it was within these paradoxes that we see the production of Buddhist nationalism based on the conviction there was a place for Buddhism in Chinese modernity. And the Chinese Buddhists succeeded by appropriating the language and symbols imposed on them by the secular nationalists. During the early years of the republic, Buddhist engagement with the political realm was limited to stressing the compatibility between Buddhism and the ideology of the state. Entering the late 1920s and 1930s, they began to seriously contemplate the issues of their rights and duties as citizens, which we will now turn to.

---

[511] Fafang, "Juantou yu 卷頭語," HCY, vol. 17, no. 4 (1936), MFQ 193:143; Daxing, "Minguo shibanian de Zhongguo fojiao 民國十八年的中國佛教," XDSQ 43-44 (1930), MFQB 39:204.

[512] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 46.

[513] Chen and Deng, *Ershi shiji Zhongguo* fojiao, 47-50; Chen, *Nanjing guomin zhengfu shiqi zhengjiao de guanxi*, 134-147. Chen is of the opinion that the Nationalist government decided to interfere in order to unify the Chinese Buddhists in the anti-Japanese war, which seemed inevitable by this time. In addition, it was also trying to prevent the penetration of Chinese Buddhist circles by Japanese Buddhist missionaries.

Are Monks Citizens?

Although there was a consensus shared by Chinese intellectuals, politicians, and reformers throughout the twentieth century that "to remake the people as the foundation of national sovereignty was the most urgent task of the day,"[514] it was not always clear which social groups they had in mind when the spoke about the "people." It seems that membership in the new political community was not automatic. For example, were women citizens or mothers of citizens?[515] Furthermore, as different parts of the country were ruled by different powers, the boundaries of citizenship fluctuated greatly in the first half of the twentieth century. There were different conceptions of citizenship in the late Qing, during the warlord era, and under Nationalist rule. Therefore, in its short history in modern China, citizenship was always susceptible to redefinition and negotiation – who would qualify as members of the political community changed over time. Perry and Goldman have pointed out that the different terms used to describe the idea usually translated as "citizenship" further complicate our attempt to understand its meaning during this period. In short, what we would translate as "citizen" in English could be associated with nationalism (as in *guomin* 國民), public spirit (as in *gongmin* 公民), urban rights and responsibility (as in *shimin* 市民), and/or a combination of them.[516] The lack of an official definition of citizenship meant that the government, intellectuals, and ordinary people were all involved in negotiating its boundaries.

---

[514] Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation*, 92.

[515] Joan Judge, "Citizens or Mothers of Citizens? Gender and the Meaning of Modern Chinese Citizenship," in *Changing Meanings of Citizenship in Modern China*, ed. Elizabeth Perry and Merle Goldman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 23–43.

[516] Perry and Goldman, *Changing Meanings of Citizenship in Modern China*, 5.

In the early Republican period, membership in the citizenry (*guomin*) was restricted to the occupational groups representing different "sections" (*jie* 界) based on the ancient idea of society divided into gentlemen, farmers, artisans, and merchants (*shi nong gong shang* 士農工商).[517] However, after the Northern Expedition, the KMT regime promoted an inclusive citizenship aimed at transforming the entirety of the population into citizens.[518] Ironically, however, this expanding membership also meant a narrowing focus of citizenship over the Republican period.[519] In its political mobilization, the Nationalists attempted to spread the symbols of citizenship to the masses, but it was to be done through the party – to support the nation meant to support the party. In other words, political citizenship in modern China was often considered something that was granted by the government rather than a natural, universal right. And the reason that this political citizenship was granted was for the people to contribute to the collective good of the nation – individuals were always subordinate to the nation, and, in this case, the party.

Harrison argues that the Nationalist regime's successful manipulation of national symbols meant that legitimacy was eventually transferred from the people to the citizens who made up the party.[520] In other words, subsuming national ideology under the party also meant that certain people were excluded from citizenship – a "citizen" was a member of the KMT. As participation in the political institution was impossible for the majority of the population, in the name of nation-building, the Nanjing government introduced the "national" (Gregorian) calendar (*guoli*

[517] Harrison, *Making of the Republican Citizens*, 117.

[518] Ibid., 196.

[519] John Fitzgerald, *Awakening China: Politics, Culture, and Class in the Nationalist Revolution* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), 6.

[520] Harrison, M*aking of the Republican Citizens*, 117.

國曆) and new national holidays in the attempt to draw a boundary between these new symbols of citizenship and traditional rituals and customs. Therefore, the party-state also demanded that new citizens of the Republic reject other identities traditionally associated with local community and religion. However, as Nedostup demonstrates in her study of the KMT's failure to replace traditional lunar festivals and rituals, such as the lunar new year and temple festivals, with new national holidays,[521] the state's effort to implement a homogenous identity did not always succeed.

During this tumultuous period when citizenship dominated public discourse and its definition was fluctuating, the Chinese Buddhists felt the urgency to assert that they, too, were citizens of the new republic. In their writings, these monks showed solid faith and high hopes in the Nationalist ideals (perhaps as a testament to the success of the KMT's propaganda machine). Their passion to engage in the political arena was also fuelled by the state's offer of rights and democracy, although according to the Nationalist ideology this freedom would only arrive after the period of political tutelage (*xunzheng* 訓政) when citizens were ready for a constitutional government. As many scholars have demonstrated, the Republican period was also the time when the "secular" state decided to create a separate realm to manage and control religion following the Western framework of church and state.[522] It was a complex process in which much negotiation and tension arose when both religion and the state attempted to define their respective realms. Under this framework, the state would work with recognized religions along a corporatist model,[523] while "superstition" would be banned and persecuted. With the creation of

[521] Rebecca Nedostup, "Ritual Competition and the Modernizing Nation-State," in *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2008), 87–112.

[522] Goossaert, "Republican Church Engineering"; Ashiwa and Wank, *Making Religion, Making the State*.

[523] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 47.

national religious associations, religion could become one of the "sectors" along other occupational social groups under the hierarchical management of the government in state-building. However, this proved to be more complicated than the Republican leaders originally anticipated.

The Buddhists were the first to set up a national association immediately after the founding of the republic in 1912. But rather than a unified national church-like organization, the history of Buddhist associations up to 1949 was marked by competition and clashes between the monastics and the laity, and also different factions within the monastic establishment. In fact, numerous "national associations" were formed during this period, each claiming to represent all Buddhists and vying for state support and recognition. They were also competing for control over the large landholdings and resources of Buddhism, which were traditionally managed independently by each monastery.[524]

This lack of a coherent central authority left room for negotiation and debate within the Buddhist community over the desirable mode of interaction with the state. One of the main characteristics of the formation of Buddhist citizenship was its linkage with the reform movement. Most of the monks who were actively engaged in these debates identified with the reformist faction represented by Taixu. In negotiating for a new national and religious identity, these monks' formulation of a citizenship discourse can be seen as an attempt to develop a paradigm for interacting with the state and society. By defining Buddhism as a unifying moral force which was also an integral component of Chinese culture and stressing the capacity of Buddhism to contribute to the Nationalist project, these monks were forging a new identity as

---

[524] For a history of these Buddhist associations, see Chen and Deng, 29-74; Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 23-50.

well as a new mode of interaction with the state. Influenced by Liang Qichao's idea of new citizens, these reform-minded monks saw the solution in the creation of "new monks."

New monks were educated in both Buddhist doctrine and secular knowledge at modern Buddhist academies, inspired to undertake the selfless bodhisattva path for the benefit of all sentient beings, and perhaps more important, committed to revitalizing Buddhism so that it could live up to the challenges and demands of modern times. Just as monk Tanbo put it, being a new monk meant "to eliminate bad habits and reform undesirable institutions in order to revive Buddhism from its degenerated state and give it a bright new outlook."[525] Others, in demarcating new monks from the conservative "old" monks, were more eager to emphasize the new monks' commitment to socio-political participation. Daxing, in analyzing the tendencies of the old and new groups, listed half a dozen characteristics that included their different attitude toward education, proselytization, and organizational hierarchy. What stands out is his description of the new monks as those who "shared equal rights and obligations in the nation and society," whereas the old monks were "dependent on society, enjoying their privileges yet failing to fulfill their obligations."[526] As I have argued in previous chapters, this dispute between the "old" and "new" factions in the monastic establishment was more complicated than just an ideological debate. Beside the competition for authority and orthodoxy, the "old" monks formed the immensely powerful lineage and temple networks that controlled a substantial proportion of monastic landholdings. Nonetheless, criticism of the traditional monks, often painted in broad strokes, was important to both the formation of the new monk identity and the production of Buddhist citizenship in the twentieth century.

---

[525]Tanbo 曇缽, "*Xin jiu sengqie de chongtu* 新舊僧伽的衝突," HCY, vol. 14, no.1 (1933), MFQ 183:86.

[526] Daxing, "Zhongguo fojiao xinjiu liangpai zhi qushi 中國佛教新舊兩派之趨勢," XDSQ, vol. 2, MFQ 66:362-363.

The emergence of the nation-state mandated a reconstitution of Buddhist identity and institutions. Monks were aware that it was vital to organize themselves according to the framework of the modern nation-state. However, the challenge they faced was in reconciling the tension between the otherworldly orientation of the monastic vocation and this-worldly demands of political and social citizenship. In actively seeking equal citizenship, they were confronted with the stereotypical notion of the *sangha* being "outside of this world" (*fangwai* 方外). One of the intriguing characteristics for young monks writing to express their opinions during this period is how they were skilled in both the language of modernity and the doctrine of Buddhism. This allowed them to formulate a Buddhist citizenship utilizing the language and symbols popularized by the state yet firmly grounded in Mahāyāna doctrine. Therefore, Buddhist citizenship discourse should be seen as not only the reformulation of Buddhist identity, but also as a rhetorical justification for Buddhist social engagement in modern times.

Immediately after the founding of the Nanjing Provisional Government in 1912, the Chinese Buddhists started to draw from the ideals of the republic by proclaiming that in the democratic polity of the Republic of China, monks and nuns, just like ordinary people, were citizens.[527] Many monks set out to challenge the traditional view that, when one left home to become a member of the *sangha*, one was not only renouncing worldly possessions but also severing all ties with society. Daxing countered that although monks and nuns have left home, they did not leave the boundaries of the nation. As they were subject to national laws and regulations while sharing equal obligations such as taxation, they were legally the same as ordinary people. The guarantee of freedom of religion in the constitution also prevented the government from treating monks and nuns differently. Therefore, he argued, Buddhists ought to

[527] Zongyang, *Zongyang shangren ji* 宗仰上人集, ed. Tang Wenquan (Wuchang: Huazhong shifan daxue chubanshe, 1999), 79.

defend the rights granted to all citizens by the constitution. He further commented that this was in harmony with Buddhist teaching because:

> 我們學佛是非要一個‘人身’不可的， 我們做中國的僧尼也非得要一個中國的‘公民資格’不可。
>
> [Just as] we need a human rebirth to study the Buddha Dharma, we as Chinese monks and nuns need a Chinese citizenship.[528]

In another article protesting the government's confiscation of monastic property, he criticized the government for discriminating against Buddhist monks and nuns:

> 我們是中華民國的人民，我們要與中華民國的人民享有同等的一切權力。
>
> We are the citizens of the Republic of China. We [therefore] demand equal rights with all citizens of the Republic.[529]

Government policies on monastic property were confusing and constantly changing, for both practical and legal reasons, which will be discussed below. What these monks' writing tells us so far is that the student-monks were convinced that they were protected by the constitution and were not hesitant to voice harsh criticism when the government did not live up to that ideal. Doing so also further enforced their identity as an autonomous social group in the nation.

On the other hand, Taixu, in line with his grandiose style, reinterpreted the term "*sangha*" by extending its meaning to include all of humanity. In the most inclusive sense, he said, "*sangha*" or "*samgraha*" means any group of people co-existing in harmony (*hehe* 和合).

---

[528] Daxing, "Suiyuan riji: fojiao sengni yao buyaogongmin quan 隨緣日記:佛教僧尼要不要公民權," HCY, vol. 17, no. 8 (1936), MFQ 194:327-328.

[529] Daxing, "E'sheng tiyong sichan 鄂省提用寺產," HCY, vol 17, no. 5 (1936), MFQ 193:339.

He directly equated the "people" of a given nation to what he called the "citizen *sangha*" (*guomin seng* 國民僧). He divided all humans into ten different categories of co-existing groups ranging from "family *sangha*" (*jiating seng* 家庭僧) to "citizen *sangha*" and "human-realm *sangha*" (*renjian seng* 人間僧). Likening the political hierarchy and various sectors in society to the different organs in a human being, he argued that a progressive nation would necessarily need seamless coordination between its various components. And the foundational element of a nation was its citizenry.[530]

Therefore, a country where citizens live harmoniously while being sensitive to each other's needs and well-being is the greatest manifestation and realization of the Buddhist doctrine of interdependence. All citizens should be taught to realize this interdependence so that they would selflessly dedicate themselves to the welfare of all citizens in the same country and, eventually, all of humanity.[531] In unmistakably Buddhist language, Taixu associated the realization of Buddhahood with the discourse of political rights promoting the interests of the state over those of the individuals. By doing so, he wished to show that Buddhist monks were also capable of playing the role of active participants in nation-building projects. However, I will argue that by voluntarily subsuming individual rights into the generalized responsibility for public service, the Buddhists planted themselves into a paradoxical position, one that would eventually make their claim for rights confusing and hard to justify. This challenge is most evident in their struggle against temple confiscation activities in the name of developing education and building infrastructures for the modern nation-state.

[530] Taixu "Xinseng 新僧," TXQ 22:1022, 1031.

[531] Taixu "Guojiaguan zai yuzhouguan shang de genju 國家觀在宇宙觀上的根據," TXQ 22:1252.

Lastly, drawing on the principles of Mahāyāna Buddhism, these young monks also stressed the importance of the bodhisattva spirit of not abandoning sentient beings in this world, and the skilful means to sacrifice one's own interest to accomplish what was beneficial to the welfare of sentient beings. In so doing, they were able to provide a classic Mahāyāna justification for acting and engaging in this-world activities, so long as it benefited others. A close examination of the socio-political circumstances reveals the urgency for Chinese monks to contemplate on how to react to the demands of the current time. The numerous confiscation campaigns compelled monks to search for a way to launch their counter-attack based on legal terms rather than on the good will or moral obligations of the state. The need to defend Buddhism and protect its property eventually culminated in the debate on how much political participation would be appropriate for Chinese monks, which boiled down to two concerns: (1) How to defend Buddhism and protect Buddhist property? This was also when the different factions within Buddhism were most unified; (2) How to gain respect and prestige as a unique social group which was historically considered otherworldly? Should monks run for political office? What would be the doctrinal basis for a Buddhist political party? As we will see below, the Buddhists were very divided on the second issue.

Performing Citizenship

The core argument for this chapter is that a distinctively Buddhist citizenship emerged in the student-monks' continuous negotiations with the state. When tension was escalating as China's conflicts with Japan in the 1930s eventually led to the Sino-Japanese War, the government issued instructions demanding monks and nuns receive mandatory military training. This sparked heated debates within the monastic community on the doctrinal justifications for monastic

participation in military action, when the Chinese Buddhists were faced with the harsh reality that with the claim of rights came the demand of obligations. The remainder of this chapter focuses on the formulation of Buddhist citizenship in performing the collective student-monk identity. Through their debates and petitions on the right to protection of property, their participation in political institutions, and their duty to defend the nation in the war, young monks strove to develop their own notion of rights and obligations as engaged citizens of the Republic.

Property Rights

Scholars of modern China generally agree that citizenship in the first half of twentieth century China was grounded less in the protection of individual rights and freedom than in the pursuit of collective welfare that called for political activism and participation.[532] However, the case study of the Buddhist defense of temple property sheds light on the nascent sense of rights in the formulation of citizenship in Republican China. Although Chinese Buddhists in the Republican period viewed themselves as individual citizens obliged to contribute to the common good of the nation, property rights and religious freedom formed the core of their conception of citizenship. This could be seen as a practical response that emerged due to government policies that were considered threatening to the very survival of Buddhism. As Dongchu, who experienced the numerous hostile *miaochan xingxue* campaigns during this period, vividly pointed out, issues surrounding monastic property were the greatest obstacles that haunted Chinese Buddhism in the twentieth century.[533]

---

[532] Culp, *Articulating Citizenship*, 278; Judge, "Citizen or Mother of Citizens?" 31; Zarrow, *Imagining the People*, 14.

[533] Dongchu, *Zhongguo jindai fojiaoshi*, 99. Aside from temple confiscation by the government, he is also referring to the corruption and internal conflicts that involved wealth and property in the Buddhist community.

In fact, although the *miaochan xingxue* movements were dramatic events in the collective memory of modern Chinese Buddhists, the tension between Buddhism and the state concerning monastic wealth and landholding was not unique to the twentieth century. In imperial China, the accumulated wealth and tax exempt status of Buddhism frequently led to criticism, suppression, and outright persecution.

According to the *vinaya*, the ideal of monks and nuns is characterized by their simple lifestyle, with minimal material possessions, supported by the laity. As the field of merit (*futian* 福田), the *sangha* tended to attract donations by the laity. Since *bhiksu* and *bhiksuni* are prohibited from accumulating wealth and property, lay donations are usually transferred into the collective ownership of the *sangha* for the purposes of sustaining the *sangha* and propagating Buddhism. Yet studies of the monastic economy, both in India and China, show that the structural tension between ideal and reality was more complicated than that dictated in the *vinaya*. Inscription and archaeological evidence suggest that from very early on in India, Buddhist monks owned and used property and were actively engaged in commerce.[534]

Likewise, Buddhist monasteries played an active role in shaping medieval Chinese economic institutions and patterns, such as the use of contracts, the development of a cash economy, and loans.[535] Through donations from the imperial family, the aristocracy and wealthy merchants, Buddhism evolved into one of the major land-holders by the mid-Tang period. They possessed and traded in agricultural land, employed workers, owned slaves, collected rent from

[534] See Gregory Schopen's various essays in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), and *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004).

[535] Eric Trombert, *Le crédit à Dunhuang: vie matérielle et société en Chine médiévale* (Paris: Collège de France, Institut des hautes études chinoises: De Boccard, édition-diffusion, 1995).

tenants, and gave out loans at high interest rates.[536] They also operated water-powered rolling mills, oil presses, hostels, and pawnshops. As religious institutions, Buddhist monasteries and temples also drew in enormous revenue in the form of monetary and material donations on the occasions of festival, ceremonies, and funerary rites.[537] In short, the Buddhists of medieval China were involved in a complex economic network which consisted not only of a "transaction exchange mechanism" based on merit-making activities,[538] but was also deeply embedded in agriculture and trade in the country. To use Gernet's words, it was a system in which "gifts were transformed into commercial goods and worldly gain into offerings."[539] Therefore, it is not hard to imagine the historical criticism of the Buddhist institution as a burden to the economy, and the economic motivations behind anti-Buddhist campaigns in which the state attempted to control the size of the *sangha*, seize monastic lands, and confiscate Buddhist images for their copper.

There is no evidence for the same kind of vibrant Buddhist economy in late imperial China,[540] but study shows that major monasteries still owned thousands of acres of land in the Republican period.[541] Contrary to the Chan ideal of "a day without work is a day without food," monks at big monasteries such as Jinshan did not cultivate their land. Indeed, monastery-owned

---

[536] For a classic study of Buddhist economy in medieval China, see Jacques Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, trans. Franciscus Verellen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995). On the construction of monasteries and merit-making in Chinese Buddhism, see John Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 185–198.

[537] Chen, *Buddhism in China*, 258-285.

[538] Michael J. Walsh, *Sacred Economies: Buddhist Monasticism & Territoriality in Medieval China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

[539] Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society*, 196.

[540] Buddhism in the late imperial period is an understudied field. For an important study on the relationship between Buddhism and its elite patrons in the late Ming, see Timothy Brook, *Praying for Power: Buddhism and the Formation of Gentry Society in Late-Ming China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993).

[541] Welch, *Practice of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 216-243. For monk Zhenhua's account on collecting rents for the Lingyan Mountain Monastery 靈巖山寺 in Suzhou, see Chen-Hua, *In Search of the Dharma*, 123-136.

lands were leased to the peasants, who would pay their annual rent in the form of harvested grain. Welch has observed that the big monasteries were very rich and they continued to purchase land using surplus income well into the 1930s.[542] Such was the background when reformers, government officials, and educators in the twentieth century, who faced difficulty in securing financial sources for educational reform and military expenses, proposed to appropriate monastic property.

Beginning with the proposals of Zhang Zhidong and Kang Youwei in 1898, "build schools with temple property" campaigns continued throughout the Republican period, when temples were confiscated, occupied, or auctioned off by the military, government officials and local elite. Based on the newly conceived notions of religion and superstition, Buddhist property was not the only target of the series of *miaochan xingxue* movements. In fact, this new arena for contestation for temple property between the state and religious actors proved more devastating to local and communal religion. Nonetheless, the question of how to protect their temple property dominated the Buddhist formulation of their relationship with the state during the first half of the twentieth century. In addition to petitioning the government in protest, Buddhists struggled to find a structural solution to protect their religion based on national law and party ideology.

For example, the Buddhists sought representation through the national Buddhist association. However, as I suggested earlier, the Buddhist association, with its various provincial and municipal "branches," was far from being a unified and coherent national organization. The government's preference to deal with religions through its secularist framework, in which religions were represented by the church-like national associations, led to the creation of another new arena of contestation, in which the different factions in Buddhism fought for control over

[542] Welch, *Practice of Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 240 and 222.

the national Buddhist association. This less-than-coherent power relation posed two challenges for the state. First, its interaction with the national Buddhist association was a trial for the state's proclaimed ideal of the separation between the public, represented by the state, and the supposedly private religious spheres. When opposing factions each petitioned the government to intervene and supervise the internal organization of the Buddhist association, the government seemed unable to decide when/whether to step in and where to draw the line demarcating religion and the state. Second, the promulgation of rules for managing religions ironically became the unifying factor for the opposing factions. When the Buddhists univocally protested against the government's policies, it was forced to negotiate with the very organization that it originally created to manage and control religion. These negotiations also often led to the state revising or abolishing some regulations.[543]

Besides the prominent Buddhist leaders who petitioned the party and various government offices, and sought assistance from their "friends in high places,"[544] the student-monks were the most articulate group in the debate on defending property rights. Shortly after the founding of the periodical *Xiandai sengqie* by the student-monks at the Minnan Buddhist Academy in 1928, there were rumors that Xue Dubi, then Minister of the Interior, planned to submit a proposal at the upcoming National Conference on Education (Quanguo jiaoyu huiyi 全國教育會議) to

[543] Nedostup and Liang have noted Republican-era Buddhists' adoption and manipulation of nationalist and party ideology in petitioning the government, in a fashion similar to the imperial custom of petitioning the enlightened, sagely ruler. See Rebecca Nedostup and Hong-Ming Liang, "'Begging the Sages of the Party-State': Citizenship and Government in Transition in Nationalist China, 1927– 1937," *International Review of Social History* 46, no. Supplement S9 (2001): 185–207. For the Buddhist negotiations with the communist state to represent their interests through the Chinese Buddhist Association in post-Mao China, see Ji Zhe, "Secularization as Religious Structuring."

[544] Welch has noted the importance of prominent politicians and KMT party elders in serving as mediators when negotiations with local officials and the Ministry of the Interior failed. In fact, the grey zone in interpreting the laws on managing religion and the officials' unwillingness to intervene caused many Buddhists to "bypass official channels and make direct use of personal connections" whenever possible. See Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 153. Young monks, however, were critical of some abbots whose only solution for temple confiscation was to seek the help of prominent laymen in petitioning the government. See, for example, Fachuang, "Gao quanguo youzhi zhengli fojiao de sengqie tongbaomen 告全國有志整理佛教的僧伽同胞們," XDSQ 4 (1928), MFQ 139:437.

convert all Buddhist temples into schools.[545] In response to this, *Xiandai sengqie* published a special issue on reorganizing Buddhism, which also reprinted Xue's letter to the Buddhist Association as well as a news report for a press conference he held, denying the rumors.

During this time and well into the 1930s, a large number of articles on *miaochan xingxue* written by young monks appeared in periodicals including *Xiandai sengqie* and *Haichaoyin*. For example, in 1931, *Xiandai sengqie* published a collection of 75 letters, many of them from young student-monks, opposing the confiscation of temples for building schools.[546] The student-monks generally responded to news about *miaochan xingxue* by ferociously protesting the government's violation of the Buddhists' property rights and freedom of religion, and criticizing the conservative Buddhist establishment for their refusal to contribute to *sangha* reorganization and educational reform.

In defending their rights to the protection of property, student-monks realized the urgency of defining clear boundaries between collectively-owned Buddhist property from public property based on national laws. Buddhist property, they argued, belonged to *all* Buddhists within the national boundaries:

> 宗教寺院，不問其經濟來源之為國家所與，或私人捐助，抑或教徒募化而來，一入宗教財產範圍，即為教團所有，與私人之所有權體同一律，任何人不得藉端侵略，以損害其所有權。
>
> A temple associated with a religion, regardless of its sources of funding – whether it is granted by the government, a private donation, or [fund] raised by its followers – is under

[545] The rumor was first published in newspapers. Buddhist periodicals quickly picked that up and started to reprint the "news." For example, *Xiandai senqie* reprinted the piece from the *Xiamen Commercial News* (Xiamen shangbao 廈門商報) in large character in its April 1928 issue. See "Fojiao yaowen 佛教要聞," XDSQ 3 (1928), MFQ 139:402.

[546] "Fandui 'miaochan xingxue' de tongxin 反對'廟產興學'的通信," XDSQ, vol. 4, no. 1 (1931), MFQ 66:507-539.

> the collective ownership of the [religious] order once it is made a religious property. It is in essence the same as any privately-owned property. No one shall, under any pretext, attempt to invade [such property] and violate its ownership.[547]

This was a direct response to the "Standard for Maintaining and Abolishing Temples" ("Shenci cunfei biaozhun" 神祠存廢標準). It therefore aimed at differentiating the temples for the Buddhist *religion* from local shrines on one hand, and stressed the right of the Buddhists to their temples and monasteries on the other. Unlike the "Regulation for Temple Management" ("Simiao guanli tiaoli" 寺廟管理條例), the new "Regulations for Temple Oversight" ("Jiandu simiao tiaoli" 監督寺廟條例), promulgated in 1929 to replace the former, granted religious associations the right to oversee the sales and transfer of religious property. However, the regulations still asserted the government's authority in approving these transactions and overseeing the finance of Buddhist and Daoist temples while requiring them to engage in charitable activities. The government also retained the authority to dismiss any "temple managers" – members of the clergy – who did not follow these regulations.[548]

Furthermore, the Buddhists felt the pressing need to define, in legal terms, Buddhist property due to the confusing and competing definitions of religious property as either private (*si* 私), public (*gong*公) or government (*guan* 官) property.[549] The vaguely defined terms "publicly owned" and "government-owned" often led to temples being confiscated by local officials. The

---

[547] Shi Huijue 釋會覺, "Lun zongjiao siyuan yu fei zongjiao cimiao yingyou zhi qubie 論宗教寺廟與非宗教祠廟應有之區別," *Zhongguo fojiaohui yuekan* 中國佛教會月刊 5-6 (1930), MFQ 20:90.

[548] Zhongguo di'er lishi dang'anguan 中國第二歷史檔案館, *Zhonghua minguo shi dang'an ziliao huibian* 中華民國史檔案資料匯編, vol. 5.1 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1994), 1017, 1027. The "Regulations for Temple Oversight" would remain the only law governing Buddhist and Daoist temples in the Republic of China in Taiwan until the present day.

[549] Nedostup, *Superstitious Regimes*, 97.

fact that most temples were built by public donation made it possible to define them as public – and therefore government – property that could be appropriated for government initiatives. As early as 1913, Taixu proposed a detailed survey of all temple property and landholdings in order to differentiate them from public or community-owned property. Under his plan, all Buddhist property would be brought under the collective ownership of the *sangha* represented by the national Buddhist Association and its respective local branches.[550] In a critique of Tai Shuangqiu's *miaochan xingxue* proposal in 1928, he further advocated the idea of managing Buddhist temples as neither public nor private property but as assets belonging to a kind of "legal entity" (*caituan faren* 財團法人) that would be protected by the nation's civic laws.[551]

In the 1930s, under pressure from the Buddhists, the Nationalist government issued several orders clarifying the status of Buddhist temples as public but not government property and prohibiting local officials from illegally occupying or confiscating temple property. Yet the competition for control over religious space across the country was far from over. Forceful expropriation of temple property by government and military officials was prevalent. This led young monks such as Daxing to criticize the government for failing to maintain the rule of law and protect the property of its citizens. Citing Sun Yat-sen, he argued that if citizens were not differentiated on the basis of their religious belief, then the Buddhists had the same rights as all other citizens, which included the right to the protection of property.[552] In another essay

[550] Taixu, "Shang fojiao zonghui quanguo zhihuibu lianhehui yijianshu 上佛教總會全國支會部聯合會意見書," TXQ 17:331.

[551] Taixu, "Dui Tai Shuangqiu miaochan xingxue yundong de xiuzheng 對於邰爽秋廟產興學運動的修正," TXQ 17:644.

[552] Daxing, "Qing Sifayuan jieshi sanyi yi 請司法院解釋三義疑 [sic]," HCY, vol. 17, no. 5 (1936), MFQ 193: 338.

discussing temple confiscation in Hubei, he urged Chinese monks and nuns to resist illegal temple confiscation and demand equal rights as citizens of the republic.[553]

Furthermore, in turning to freedom of religion in defense of Buddhist property rights, student-monks contested the government's discrimination against the Buddhists and Daoists in the various rules on managing temples. Buddhist and Daoist temples and monasteries were required to register with the government and engage in charitable activities while Christians, Muslims and Tibetan Buddhists were exempted from these rules.[554] These discriminatory policies, the young monks argued, were in serious violation of the freedom of religion granted to citizens and should be corrected.[555] They demanded that adherents to each religion, just as all citizens in the nation, be treated equally by the nation's laws.[556]

In addition to petitioning the government, young monks also wrote self-critically in Buddhist periodicals, urging Buddhists to reflect on the reason why their temples were targeted. Often, they pointed to a predicament internal to Buddhism. In a style consistent with their criticism of the "old" monks, they identified the root cause as the incompetence and corruption among those in charge of massive temple resources who refused to properly utilize them to fund Buddhist education. The negative public perception, they argued, was the reason why government officials disregarded the well-being of Buddhism, labeling it as superstition and hence an impediment for China's march toward modernization.

---

[553] Daxing, "*Esheng tiyong sichan*," 339.

[554] Chen, *Nanjing Guomin zhengfu shiqi zhengjiao guanxi*, 43.

[555] Jichen, "Neizhengbu banbu simiao chanye xingban gongyi cishan shiye 内政部頒佈寺廟產業興辦公益慈善事業," XDSQ, vol. 5, no. 8 (1933), MFQ 68:443.

[556] Shi Huijue, "Lun zongjiao siyuan yu fei zongjiao cimiao yingyou zhi qubie," 89.

Haishan 海珊 acknowledged that poor public perception could lead to an unsympathetic attitude. He did not shy away from pointing out the paradox in the managing of property within the Buddhist establishment:

> 現在這班當住持的，他們對於廟產方面，不僅管理而已。而且有實在的享受，無限的利賴。慈善事業，一點不作；佛教教育，半籌莫展...什麼'弘法利生'、'挽回國運'的重大事業，他們當住持的人們，都視為兒戲，一些也不注意！像這樣坐擁巨資，百般享樂的方丈大老爺，把有用的廟產，用之於無用之地，又何怪他人有此'廟產興學'的提議呢?
>
> Those who are abbots nowadays are not just managing temple property. There are actual enjoyment and limitless profit [involved]. [They are] not engaged in any charitable work and not able to do anything for Buddhist education…Important undertakings such as spreading the *dharma* to benefit sentient beings and saving the nation are trifling matters these abbots pay no attention to! How could these abbot-landlords – who indulge in all sorts of pleasure while sitting on large sum of assets and abuse temple resources – blame those who propose *miaochan xingxue*?[557]

Here Haishan has identified a major obstacle in efforts to reorganize the *sangha* – an issue that reformist monks were well aware of. Although ideally Buddhist monasteries were considered to be collectively owned by the *sangha*, in reality a small number of the monastic elite on top of the institutional hierarchy often had absolute control over monastic lands and resources. The aim of the student-monks, therefore, was to bring change to the tradition so that it could re-align itself with the Buddhist ideal of collective ownership.

[557] Haishan 海珊, "Fandui miaochan xingxue de tongxin (41) 反對廟產興學的通信(四一)," XDSQ, vol. 4, no. 1 (1931), MFQ 66:528.

At the same time, in an attempt to win the sympathy of the laity, student-monks also reminded them of their indispensable role in protecting Buddhism. In an open letter to the laity, Juemi 覺迷 urged them follow and support virtuous monks who were dedicated to the task of revitalizing Buddhism to save the nation.[558] In short, the ideals of property rights and freedom of religion constituted important components in the student-monks' formulation of citizenship. They were skilled in turning these symbols of the new republic into weapons to protest the government's policies on religion. Also, as ardent supporters of the reformist project, they sought to transform the hardships confronting Buddhism into moral capital in addressing issues within the tradition. They firmly believed that the numerous cases of temple confiscation should serve as a wake-up call for all Buddhists in the country to unite and strengthen Buddhism through *sangha* reorganization and education reform. Some even went as far as to suggest that they should embrace and welcome the *miaochan xingxue* proposal of government officials and educators because "their intention might seem to be opposing Buddhism but was actually to protect it."[559] Therefore, their religious citizenship was endowed with the dual meaning of protecting their equal rights as citizens and safeguarding Buddhism as a vibrant religio-cultural tradition in the republic.

In general, I agree with Welch's position that "Republican laws provided more for the Buddhists' protection than for their control,"[560] despite the fact that the devastation of *miaochan xingxue* and anxiety about the survival of Buddhism featured prominently in Buddhist literature in this period. What I would like to highlight here is the power of negotiation associated with the

[558] Juemi 覺密, "Jinggao hufa de jushi 敬告護法的居士," XDSQ 5 (1928), MFQ 139:440-441.

[559] Huiyun 慧云, "Seng jiaoyu zhi guoqu xianzai ji weilai 僧教育之過去現在及未來," HCY, vol. 12, no. 8 (1931), MFQ 178:27.

[560] Welch, *Buddhist Revival in China*, 142.

production of this literature. In other words, the writing monks, a large proportion of them being student-monks, were well aware of their capacity to draw attention to issues concerning Buddhism and society and, as a result, negotiate with the various political and social institutions in defending their position. Their success in doing so lay in their sensitivity to current socio-political discourses and their ability to adopt and transform these discourses in justifying a place for Buddhism in the new republic.

Political Participation

The dominance of the renunciatory trend in Buddhism means that the tradition tends to be regarded as other-worldly by both its adherents and observers. The other-worldly orientation of Buddhism is often interpreted as the fundamental reason why Buddhism should remain politically aloof. Yet early Buddhist texts also extol the ideals of a righteous, compassionate wheel-turning king (*cakravartin*), for which the Indian King Aśoka is the most famous example. An exhaustive survey of scholarship on the relationship between Buddhism and politics falls outside the scope of this study. Yet a few examples are imperative to shed light on the symbiotic relationship between Buddhism and political power in the history of Buddhism in Asia. In China, scholars have shown that the rise of Buddhist schools and teachers in medieval times was directly related to their association with political powers. Buddhist monks were not only on the receiving end of imperial patronage, but also played a pivotal role in court politics.[561] In traditional Southeast Asia, Buddhist kingdoms formed a network of galactic polities in which

[561] See, for example, Jinhua Chen, *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship: Tanqian in Sui Buddhism and Politics* (Kyoto: Scuola italiana di studi sull'Asia orientale, 2002) and *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (643-712)* (Boston: Brill, 2007); Albert Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

social, religious, and cosmological orders were integrally linked. Grounded in a Buddhist worldview, secular and religious power emanated from the centre to the periphery.[562]

Under colonialism in the nineteenth century, however, there was an eventual erosion of the power of the galactic polity as the expansion of colonial powers posed severe challenges to the traditional worldview and the paradigm of governance.[563] Colonialism also led to the introduction of secular avenues to power in these regions. Yet we are also warned by some scholars from making sweeping generalizations concerning the forces of colonialism and modernity as there was relative stability in the practice of Buddhism at the local level.[564] During the post-colonial period, *sangha*-state relations and the role of the *sangha* went through yet another redefinition with the emergence of nation-states. The symbolic functions of the Buddhist institution were expanded to incorporate various ethnic groups and the newly defined national boundaries.[565] The power of the secular state, education, nationalism and anti-imperialism continued to draw Buddhist communities into the political sphere.

The semi-colonial setting of China in the early twentieth century makes it an interesting comparative case study for the relations between Buddhism and modernizing nation-states. China shared with colonial Asia the concerns and challenges of nationalism, imperialism, and

---

[562] Stanley Tambiah, *World Conqueror and World Renouncer* and "The Persistence and Transformation of Tradition in Southeast Asia, with Special Reference to Thailand," *Daedalus* 102, no. 1 (1973): 55–84.

[563] Gombrich and Obeyesekere, *Buddhism Transformed*.

[564] Anne Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010).

[565] Tambiah, *Buddhism Betrayed?: Religion, Politics, and Violence in Sri Lanka* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Juliane Schober, *Modern Buddhist Conjunctures in Myanmar: Cultural Narratives, Colonial Legacies, and Civil Society* (Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press, 2011); Charles Keyes, *Thailand, Buddhist Kingdom as Modern Nation-state* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1987); Mahinda Deegalle, *Buddhism, Conflict and Violence in Modern Sri Lanka* (New York: Routledge, 2006). See also the collection of essays in Ian Harris, *Buddhism and Politics in Twentieth-century Asia* (York: Pinter, 1999) and *Buddhism, Power and Political Order* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

educational modernity. Yet the modernization project in China started with a proclaimed nationalist secularism – Buddhism, once rid of superstitious elements, would be relegated to the private sphere. Therefore, the Chinese Buddhists, while struggling to respond to the demands of the expanding nation-state, were also finding creative ways to resist this secularizing force and secure a place for Buddhism in the new nation-state.

The second dimension of the Chinese Buddhists' performance of citizenship during the Republican period concerned the political rights of citizens, which included voting and running for office. Their efforts in negotiating with the government during the temple confiscation campaigns led Chinese Buddhists to contemplate the issue of political representation. Beginning in the early 1930s, they were engaged in debates on how to better represent and protect the interests of Buddhism in national politics. As citizens of the republic, should they register as voters? How viable was the idea of monks running for office? Should they form a Buddhist political party? The Buddhists in the Republican period were divided on the issue of political participation. In general, the monastic community was in favor of seeking political representation whereas the laity was largely against it.

When the "Regulations for the Elections of the National Assembly" ("Guomin dahui daibiao xuanju fa" 國民大會代表選舉法) was announced in May 1936, the political status of monks and nuns became hotly contested within the Buddhist community.[566] Taixu immediately wrote to urge monks and nuns to earnestly participate in the elections.[567] The regulations stated that all citizens above the age of twenty who had taken the oath of citizenship were legitimate

[566] The KMT's Third Party Congress declared in 1929 that there would be a six-year period of political tutelage ending in 1935, after which a constitution would be promulgated by the National Assembly followed by the election of a new government. See Edmund S. K. Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 31.

[567] Taixu, "Sengni ying canjia Guomin dahui daibiao xuanju 僧尼應參加國民大會代表選舉," TXQ 18:178-179.

voters and candidacy was open to anyone above the age of twenty-five. Therefore, he reminded the monks and nuns that there was nothing that prevented them from voting or seeking candidacy in the National Assembly.

In addressing the tension between mundane political activism and other-worldly religious pursuit, Daxing insisted that there was no difference in terms of political citizenship for Buddhist monks and nuns since the constitution guaranteed the freedom of religion for all citizens.[568] Since monks and nuns owed the same duties and obligations to the nation as all other citizens, he argued, they should not give up any right – including political rights.[569] In addition, as good citizens who would sacrifice their own interests for the benefit of the people, monks and nuns were in a good position to represent the people under the supervision of the government. Fafang further established the connection between a modern monastic career and political citizenship arguing that monks and nuns shared the same rights and obligations as ordinary people and "citizenship" was the foundation of a monk's moral character (*sengge* 僧格).[570]

Later on, when the Nanjing government announced the allocation for membership in the national assembly, divided into different geographic regions and various occupation-based sectors – agricultural societies, workers' union, chamber of commerce and the like, the clergy was not included. Upon learning this, the Chinese Buddhist Association petitioned the KMT Central Executive Committee, which eventually agreed that monks and nuns would not be

[568] Daxing, "Fojiao sengni yao buyao gongmin quan 佛教僧尼要不要公民權," HCY, vol. 17, no.8 (1936), MFQ 194:328.

[569] The term *gongmin quan* 公民權, although often translated generally as citizenship, literally means "citizen's rights." It refers to the political rights of citizens.

[570] Fafang, "1936 nian de Zhongguo fojiao 1936 年的中國佛教." In Zhang Mantao, *Minguo fojiao pian*, 164.

excluded.[571] Such enthusiasm shown by the monastics provoked fierce opposition from some lay Buddhists. The prominent layman Ouyang Jingwu, in citing the irreconcilable tension between renunciation and politics, posited that allowing monks and nuns the rights to vote and run for office would lead to the destruction of Buddhism.[572] A monk's leaving home, he claimed, meant renouncing all his mundane attachments, connections, and possessions. Therefore, voting and running in elections clearly violated *vinaya* rules. He urged the government to reconsider its decision and proposed that monks and nuns who planned to do so be ordered to first disrobe.

Furthermore, Ouyang saw nothing but greed and ignorance in the monks who advocated for a politically engaged Buddhism based on the Mahāyāna notion of *upāya* (*fangbian* 方便). He criticized the majority of China's monks and nuns, whom he estimated to be close to a million in number, for being "parasites wandering around aimlessly, who brought endless harm and not even the least bit of benefit for the nation."[573] He lamented that it was unfortunate that the "revolution"[574] did not eliminate these heinous monks. He suggested that these monks be sent back to society to contribute to building the nation as ordinary citizens while those who were truly dedicated to the Buddha's path would remain and uphold Buddhism.

Needless to say, such harsh criticism provoked counter-attacks, especially from the student-monks writing for various Buddhist periodicals. They accused Ouyang for being out-of-touch with his time, and misinformed in both Buddhist teaching and this-worldly common

[571] Chen, *Nanjing Guomin zhengfu shiqi zhengjiao guanxi*, 243.

[572] Ouyang Jingwu, "Zhi Chen Lifu xiansheng shu 致陳立夫先生書," *Fojiao banyuekan* 佛教半月刊 137 (1936), MFQ 53:43.

[573] Ouyang, "Yin sengni canjia guoxuan bian fangbian yu sengzhi 因僧尼參加國選辨方便與僧制," *Fojiao banyuekan* 139 (1936), MFQ 53:162-164.

[574] It is not clear which revolution he was referring to. I am assuming that he was using the term in a generic manner – referring to the political and social upheavals in the past decades.

sense.[575] Yinshun later comments that Ouyang, having studied Yogacāra philosophy for thirty years, had missed the comprehensiveness of Buddhism due to his over-specialization.[576] The first round of exchange between monks who were in favor of a political Buddhist citizenship and those who were against it highlighted the inherent tension between the modern notion of citizenship and the traditional monastic ideal of abstinence from political involvements.

The National Assembly was originally scheduled to convene in November 1937, but was postponed by the outbreak of full-fledged war with Japan. It did not take place until 1946. At that time, the Buddhists were once again caught up in the debate on the appropriateness of political participation. Taixu contemplated the possibility of forming a political party but was "slow to decide."[577] After evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of Buddhist engagement in politics, taking into account the real-life situation in Burma, Sri Lanka and Tibet, he came to the conclusion that the ideal solution would be to "participate in politics but not in governance" (*wenzheng bu ganzhi* 問政不干治).[578] In other words, monks were encouraged to get involved in politics to protect the interests of the people, which could include serving as people's representatives in the provincial and national assemblies, but not seek appointments in the executive branch of the government, in which they would exercise power over others. For Taixu, politics was directly related to the collective interest of the people, and a bodhisattva would not shun the opportunity to improve the conditions of all sentient beings.

---

[575] Jiying, "Da wei fojiaotu canjia guoxuan zhi ma heshang zhe 答為佛教徒參加國選之罵和尚者," *Fojiao yu foxue* vol. 1, no. 11 (1936), MFQ 78:314.

[576] Yinshun, TXN 406.

[577] Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism*, 188. In fact, he founded the weekly *Juequn zhoubao* 覺群週報 in Shanghai in 1946. Its original aim was to serve as the newspaper for the Buddhist political party. See TXN 527.

[578] Li, *Fojiao xinyang yu shehui bianqian*, 329.

The debate continued even after Taixu clarified his position. Supporters of his idea, which consisted mainly of student-monks, further wrote to justify political participation from the perspectives of Buddhist doctrine as well as historical precedents.[579] Prior to the convocation of the National Assembly in 1946, the Archbishop of Nanjing, Paul Yu 于斌 (1901-1978), nominated Taixu as a member for the assembly. Chiang Kai-shek initially approved the proposal but later withdrew his decision due to the opposition from his close aide Chen Lifu 陳立夫 (1900-2001).

The imminent civil war between the Nationalists and Communists, as well as Taixu's death the following year prevented real action in bringing about a Buddhist presence in representative politics. Yet the debates in which the Chinese Buddhists strove to reshape themselves into a national citizenry by assimilating political ideas into their religious identity had important ramifications for future Buddhism-state relations. In the worlds of contemporary Chinese Buddhism, the landscape for political participation is too diverse to generalize. In short, a number of high-profile monks, who are among the top leadership in the Buddhist Association of China in the mainland, are also members of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (*Zhongguo renmin zhengzhi xieshang huiyi quanguo weiyuan hui* 中國人民政治協商會議全國委員會; shortened: *Quanguo zhengxie* 全國政協) and the National People's Congress (*Quanguo renmin dabiao dahui* 全國人民代表大會; shortened: *Renda* 人大).[580] In Taiwan, the political inclination of Buddhist monks and nuns ranges from being closely related to the political world, such as Xingyun 星雲 (1927-) of Foguangshan 佛光山who is himself a

[579] He, *Fofa guannian de jindai tiaoshi,* 285.

[580] Ji, "Secularization as Religious Restructuring," 249.

member of the KMT Central Committee, to the utterly apolitical such as Zhengyan 證嚴 (1937-) of Tzu Chi (Ciji 慈濟), who requires even her lay followers to avoid any form of political participation.[581]

David Strand has shown that beginning in the 1920s, common people – rickshaw pullers, police, merchants, workers, and women – were active participants in popular politics.[582] Although direct participation in national political institutions was largely impossible for the great majority of the people, politics became "a way of life" in which citizens "confronted leaders and each other face-to face."[583] For the Chinese Buddhists in a society undergoing state-sponsored secularization, the performing of citizenship involved not only negotiations with the state for a place in the public sphere, but also contestation in (re)defining Buddhist identity in the new republic. In the process, new sets of identity, such as that of the student-monk, emerged. In addition, the modern notions of rights, laws, and freedom became the cornerstones in the formulation of this new religious citizenship. However, rather than viewing this modern religious citizenship as a new invention in Buddhism-state relations, I argue that it should be seen as a Buddhist reformulation and defense of the symbiosis between Buddhism and secular powers. This reformulation can be summarized by the words of Jichen, an outspoken and prolific student-monk:

> 佛教的隆替是與政治有密切的關係的。政治上了軌道，佛教自然好，政治不上軌道，佛教自然是糟糕。

[581] André Laliberté, *The Politics of Buddhist Organizations in Taiwan, 1989-2003: Safeguarding the Faith, Building a Pure Land, Helping the Poor* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

[582] David Strand, *An Unfinished Republic: Leading by Word and Deed in Modern China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011); *Rickshaw Beijing: City People and Politics in the 1920s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

[583] Strand, *Unfinished Republic*, 1.

> The rise and fall of Buddhism is intimately linked to politics. If politics is on the right track, then Buddhism will naturally prosper; if not, then naturally it is terrible for Buddhism.[584]

Defending the Nation

Lastly, Chinese Buddhist monks and nuns performed citizenship through fulfilling civic duties as prescribed by the constitution – in this case, to defend the nation by serving in the military. This is perhaps the most controversial aspect in the Buddhist engagement with the modern nation-state.

Buddhism is usually portrayed as a pacifist religion whose basic tenet is founded on the principle of non-violence (*ahiṃsā*). Given the recent inter-religious tension and violence between the Buddhists and religious minorities in Burma, Sri Lanka, and Thailand, the issue of violence in Buddhism has started to gain increasing scholarly attention. Yet the majority of scholars studying the subject start by asserting that there is no doctrinal basis for condoning violence in Buddhism. Therefore, any justification for violent actions can be seen as a misinterpretation of Buddhist teaching, a deviation from the norms of non-violence.[585] A rare exception is Jerryson and Juergensmeyer, who challenge the stereotype of Buddhism as a pacifist religion, and present textual and ethnographic accounts of Buddhist involvement in the structural violence of warfare, covering different Buddhist traditions in different time periods.[586]

---

[584] Jichen, "Xiandai fojiao jiaoyu de wenti," XDSQ, vol. 4, no. 3(1931), MFQ 67:133.

[585] See, for example, Peter Harvey, *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values, and Issues* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 255; Daizen Bryan Victoria, *Zen at War* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006); Xue Yu 學愚, *Buddhism, War, and Nationalism: Chinese Monks in the Struggle against Japanese Aggressions, 1931-1945* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Xueyu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi*.

[586] Michael Jerryson and Mark Juergensmeyer, eds., *Buddhist Warfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

This study does not pretend to have an answer for the debate on the canonical justification for violence in Buddhism, but recognizes the important role of historical, political, and social circumstances in which violence is utilized as a response to defending Buddhism and the nation from internal and external threats. Staying close to the focus of this chapter, I will start with the issue of religious nationalism which is often invoked as the rationale that justifies warfare.

In Sri Lanka, the mytho-historical narrative of King Duttagamani in the fifth century *Mahavamsa* is often invoked to justify violence against the separatist Tamil minority in order to protect the integrity of the island of Lanka, a Buddhist promised land, and the purity of Sinhalese Buddhism.[587] Although scholars usually claim that this is a distorted, heretical teaching of Buddhism that cannot be viewed as the basis for a Buddhist just-war theory,[588] Bartholomeusz reminds us of the power of myth and narrative vis-à-vis doctrinal pacifism. She rightly points out that attention to narrative often reveals ethical positions that might run counter to canonical interpretations.[589]

The issue of violence becomes even more complicated in Mahāyāna Buddhism when, according to the bodhisattva ideal, compassionate killing can be seen as a skillful means to protect the lives of many. In his study of the Zen Buddhists' active support for Japanese imperialist expansion in Asia, Brian Victoria attributes the cause for the Zen collaboration with Japanese imperialism and militarism to the connection between Zen and the samurai warrior

[587] Mahinda Deegalle, "Is Violence Justified in Theravāda Buddhism?" *Ecumenical Review* 55, no. 2 (2003): 125.

[588] Gananath Obeyesekere, "Buddhism, Nationhood, and Cultural Identity," in *Fundamentalisms Comprehended*, ed. Martin Marty and Scott Appleby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 231–256.

[589] Tessa Bartholomeusz, *In Defense of Dharma: Just-war Ideology in Buddhist Sri Lanka* (New York: Routledge Curzon, 2002), 167.

ethos (*bushidō*).[590] He considers wartime Japanese Zen leaders to be "thoroughly and completely morally bankrupt"[591] who fully subjugated Buddhism to the state. In addition, they formulated a just-war ideology in which Japan, as the only Buddhist country, had to go to war for the benefit of China.[592] Building on Victoria's observation of the importance of institutional history in the Japanese Buddhists' support for military expansionism, Christopher Ives takes a more sympathetic stance towards the leaders of Imperial-way Zen. He argues that, due to the historical symbiotic relationship between Buddhist institutions and Japanese rulers, Japanese Buddhist leaders were "pushed onto a bandwagon that had been set in motion by other actors."[593] In both the cases of Sri Lanka and Japan, it is clear that nationalism, national protection, the protection of Buddhism, and even the spread of the *Dharma* constitute the main components in the production of a modern Buddhist just-war theory.

Returning to our story in China: As conflicts with Japan were escalating in the early 1930s, Chinese Buddhists repeatedly wrote to their counterparts in Japan urging them to stand united under the Buddhist teaching of compassion and condemn their government's invasion of China, which was causing enormous suffering for innocent people.[594] Yet most of the responses they received were either defending Japan's position or accusing the Chinese of mistreating Japanese Buddhist missionaries.[595] When full-scale war finally broke out following the Marco Polo Bridge Incident on July 7, 1937, the Chinese Buddhists felt deeply saddened and

[590] Victoria, *Zen at War*, 95.

[591] Daizen Victoria, *Zen War Stories* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 144.

[592] Victoria, *Zen at War*, 95.

[593] Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen*, 127.

[594] See, for example, Taixu, "Zhi Riben fojiaotu dian 致日本佛教徒電," TXQ 24:327.

[595] Xue Yu, *Buddhism, War, and Nationalism*, 77. Xue Yu's is the only study on Buddhism and war in modern China in English. See also the expanded and revised edition of the same book Xue Yu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi*.

disappointed by their inability to convince Japanese Buddhists to protest against their government's aggression in China.

In the several years leading up to the war, student-monks were writing to discuss and debate ways in which they could contribute to protecting the nation. The national government's announcement, in July 1936, that all adults, including monks and nuns were required to take part in military training, incited a wide range of emotion and reaction within the Buddhist community. The student-monks responded positively to the government's call, although they were fully aware of the tension between their commitment to the Buddhist teaching and precepts on the one hand, and their patriotic sentiment in serving the nation as citizens on the other. Fafang's statement about the fundamental Buddhist precept of not killing below fully captures this paradox that the patriotic monks found themselves in:

> 不服兵役，則有背國家法令及放棄國民應盡之義務；既然不盡應盡之義務，也就不能享應享之權利；這個國民資格也就取銷了。服了兵役，則有違乎我佛慈悲之旨，有犯殺戒，犯了殺戒，這個僧尼的資格也就取銷了。
>
> By not fulfilling military service, [we] go against the nation's law and betray [our] obligation as citizens. If [we] do not fulfill [our] obligation, then [we] will not be able to enjoy the rights that [we] ought to have. This would take away [our] qualification as the nation's citizens. Fulfilling military service goes against the Buddhist principle of compassion. Breaking the precept of not killing revokes our status as monks and nuns.[596]

He hence invited his fellow monks and nuns to express their views on this paradoxical situation.

[596]Fafang. "Sengni yingfou fu guomin bingyi 僧尼應否服國民兵役?" HCY, vol. 17, no.8 (1936), MFQ 194:278.

Most of the young monks who supported the government's call tried to produce a doctrinal justification for violence against evil. Some suggested that monks abandon their precepts to serve the nation.[597]

Even before the Marco Polo Bridge Incident, the Buddhists probably felt that a war of resistance against Japanese aggression was inevitable. In December 1936, the editorial for the periodical *Fohaideng* 佛海燈 sent out calls for submissions to various Buddhist academies about its planned special issue *Sangha for National Protection* (*Sengqie huguo zhuanhao* 僧伽護國專號). It received more than fifty essays, mostly from student-monks at the academies. Due to the enthusiasm and large number of submissions, *Sangha for National Protection* ran for three consecutive issues.[598] In short, China's student-monks seemed to have come to the consensus that it was necessary to lend the government their support without reserve. Furthermore, they argued that national protection was fully compatible with the bodhisattva ideal of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Those who had reservations about actively participating in combat proposed that they could raise money to provide military supplies, or serve in medical or rescue teams.[599] Others, preferring a more aggressive approach, claimed that passively praying for the well-being of the nation and its people[600] was simply inadequate, especially while the Japanese Buddhists were directly supporting their armies. For example, the student-monk Juexian argued that in addition

[597] Chen, *Nanjing guomin zhengfu shiqi zhengjiao de guanxi*, 257.

[598] Xue Yu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi*, 90.

[599] Yuguang 漁光, "Hujiao hujia yu huguo 護教護家與護國," *Fohaideng*, vol. 2, no. 4 (1937), MFQ 51:424.

[600] The Buddhists, under the sponsorship of prominent politicians and military officials, were organizing numerous *dharma* assemblies for the protection of the nation during the war. See Scott "Buddhist Nationalism of Dai Jitao."

to lending moral and material support, they should make a real effort in the war against Japanese aggression – meaning to take up arms and join the army in the battle field.[601]

In their writing we can see an enthusiastic outpouring of nationalistic sentiment – these young monks were prepared to risk their lives, as bodhisattvas, to save the nation from invasion. In terms of the doctrinal justification for such action, they often invoked the *Jātaka* tale of the ship captain bodhisattva, who was sailing with five hundred merchants on a ship. Knowing that one of the passengers, a pirate, had the intention to kill everyone aboard, the captain killed the pirate out of compassion. In the story, although the bodhisattva has committed wrongdoing by killing a person, he immediately earned immeasurable merit for the selfless act of saving many.[602]

In other words, the appropriate action of a selfless, compassionate bodhisattva would be to kill to prevent another less spiritually attained being from committing murder, and as a result saving the lives of many. The young monks justified their participation in war as a skilful means to "kill one to allow many to live" (*yisha duosheng* 一殺多生). They further argued that they would not be committing any wrongdoing if killing was done out of compassion but not hatred. By killing Japanese soldiers who would most definitely get reborn in hell as a result of murdering innocent people during the war, wrote Yicheng 一乘, Chinese monks were also saving them spiritually. Therefore, compassionately killing future wrongdoers – Japanese soldiers – could be seen as the most significant task of "eradicating suffering and saving the world."[603] Here we can see that the rationale for war participation for the Chinese monks was not

[601] Juexian, "Sengxun wuzhuang huguo lun 僧訓武裝護國論," *Fohaideng*, vol. 2, no. 4 (1937), MFQ 51:425-428.

[602] Xue Yu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi*, 93. This is a well known story that appears in several Buddhist texts, notably the *Yogācārbhūmi* by Asanga.

[603] Yicheng 一乘, "Sengqie huguo de zhengtu 僧伽護國的正途," *Fohaideng*, vol. 2, no. 4 (1937), MFQ 51:433.

dissimilar to, for example, the Japanese Buddhists who subordinated Buddhism to the nation in the name of compassion. As is evident in the Chinese Buddhists' participation in Marxist campaigns during the Korean War, this glorification of the selfless bodhisattva ideal in justifying violence would further subject Buddhism to the control and manipulation by the nation-state.[604]

Compared to the passionate young monks, Taixu as well as the leadership of the Buddhist Association were more prudent in formulating their reaction. They petitioned the government, and while expressing their approval of the order for monks and nuns to receive military training, pleaded with the government to take into consideration the Buddhist precept of not killing. They proposed that *sangha* members be organized as separate, non-combatant units.[605] In replying to the Buddhists' petitions, the government agreed that monks and nuns would be organized in non-combatant units such as rescue and logistical teams. Shortly after, military rescue training classes were set up in Suzhou, Zhejiang, Anhui, Shanghai, and Nanjing whereas "*sangha* rescue teams" (*sengqie jiuhu dui* 僧伽救護隊) were formed in Shanghai, Hankou, Ningbo and Chongqing.[606] Many temples also opened their doors as temporary hospitals for the wounded or as shelters for war refugees. When the Japanese armies intensified their attacks toward the end of the 1930s, the Chongqing government called on Chinese youth and students to sign up for military duty. Some monks decided to directly participate in fighting while some formed guerrilla units.[607]

---

[604] Xue Yu, "Buddhists in China during the Korean War (1951-1953)," in *Buddhist Warfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 131–156.

[605] "Fojiaohui xiang zhongyang qingyuanbingyi sengni xunlian jiuhu 佛教會向中央請願兵役僧尼訓練救護," *Fojiao yu foxue*, vol. 1, no. 10 (1936), MFQ 78:260.

[606] Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 273-274. The Nationalist government was moved to the inland city of Chongqing after Japanese forces captured Nanjing in 1937.

[607] Xue Yu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi*, 261-273.

In short, the Sino-Japanese War was a period in which citizenship discourse was dominated by nationalism and patriotism. The student-monks sought to fulfill their responsibility as engaged citizens in various ways during the war of resistance. Several points are noteworthy in analyzing wartime participation of the Chinese Buddhists. First of all, while Buddhist periodicals were filled with discussions and proposals on how the Buddhists should unite and act collectively to protect the nation from Japanese invasion, voices that opposed the breaking of precepts to serve the nation were few and far between. It is not clear if it was due to self-censorship or that the Buddhists were unanimously in favor of wartime participation.

Secondly, although the student-monks were aware of the apparent conflict between monastic precepts and the inevitable acts of killing and causing harm to others, there seems to have been a strong sense of nationalistic pride in discussing and describing their "contribution" during the war. Dongchu, for example, dedicates an entire chapter on the Buddhist contribution to the anti-Japanese war in his monumental work on the history of modern Chinese Buddhism. He praises and pays tribute to monks who participated or lost their lives during the war.[608] This leads to my last observation: it seems that the Chinese Buddhist recollection of and reflection on the war never moves past the glorification phase. Although one can argue that reasons for the Japanese and Chinese Buddhists' participation in war were different – one was the militant imperialist while the other the victim of imperial expansionism – the just-war theories that they formulated were virtually the same.[609] In recent years, Japanese Buddhists have gradually come to realize, some even apologize, for their past support of violence during World War II. But to

[608] Dongchu, *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi*, 933-954.

[609] Chinese scholars also tend to highlight the contrast between Chinese and Japanese Buddhists' participation in the war. According to these scholars, the Chinese Buddhists' wartime efforts were "in accordance to the *vinaya*" – referring to the *sangha* rescue teams – and the Japanese Buddhists' were not. See, for example, Deng, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua*, 273.

the best of my knowledge, there has yet to be a former Chinese soldier-monk who openly reflects on his understanding and interpretation of Buddhist teaching to justify wartime participation.

Conclusion

Xue Yu has argued that the beginning of the Sino-Japanese War marked the shift in the relationship between Buddhism and the state from opposition – when Buddhists intensely protested temple confiscation and other religious policies – to subjugation – when they fully supported the government's anti-Japanese war. He also identifies nationalism as the driving force for this shift, which has thoroughly transformed the Chinese Buddhist institution.[610] Being equally critical of wartime Chinese and Japanese Buddhists, he shares Victoria's view that in subordinating the protection of Buddhism to serving the nation, monks intentionally misinterpreted the original meanings of Buddhist teaching. His position remains largely the same between the English and the revised Chinese editions of his book.[611]

While Xue Yu's study of the Buddhist participation in the war – the first in English scholarship – sheds light on an aspect of modern Chinese Buddhism that is understudied, my approach is different from his in two ways. First, he identifies the young monks, who received a modern Buddhist education, as the major driving force in the anti-Japanese military campaigns. But he leaves unexplained how and why these young monks came to identify with each other. In this dissertation, I examine the process in which the student-monk identity was produced in the years leading up to the war. Second, I maintain that, contrary to Xue Yu's assertion, the Buddhist attitude toward the government pre- and post-1937 was not as clear cut as he has described.

[610] Xue Yu, *Buddhism, Way, and Nationalism*, 197.

[611] Xue Yu, *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi*, 394.

Rather, nascent nationalism was developing among the student-monks in the decades prior to the war. The manifestation of nationalistic sentiment was undoubtedly more discernible during the war. Yet we certainly miss the point if we see the war as the sole cause for Chinese Buddhist nationalism.

The Chinese Buddhists had high hopes for the republic, both in 1912 and in 1927, when Chiang Kai-shek's forces successfully placed the nation under a relatively stable central government in Nanjing. They were also eager to participate in the nation-building process by emphasizing how Buddhism could contribute to the modernization of China. Certainly, the relationship between Buddhism and the state was not without tension and competition, as Nedostup has convincingly demonstrated, but the Buddhists were unmistakably arguing for a legitimate place in the nation's public sphere. I argue that we cannot properly understand Buddhist nationalism during this period without carefully analyzing the process of subject formation and citizenship discourse *before* the war. Also, there existed an integral connection between Buddhist nationalism and the rise of the collective student-monk identity.

Returning to the rise of citizenship consciousness among China's student-monks, I propose that the Buddhist academies as well as the numerous Buddhist periodicals were instrumental in the formation of a textual community that enabled various citizenship discourses to be formulated, debated and negotiated among the student-monks. The generation of citizenship discourse then structurally connected Buddhism to the state. This articulation of Buddhist identity is also crucial to any attempt to understand later development in the ways in which the Chinese *sangha* interacts with the state in mainland China and Taiwan. In addition, the academies can also be seen as embodying an action-oriented pedagogy[612] in which, on top of doctrinal learning, student-monks learned by listening to, reading about, and imitating the speech

[612] Samuels, "Toward an Action Oriented Pedagogy."

and actions of leading reformist monks such as Taixu, Daxing, Fafang, and Jichen. Therefore, it was not a coincidence that the reformers' call for action, both in defending and reviving Chinese Buddhism, and in participating in the war, echoed so strongly within the community of young student-monks.

Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have argued that the Buddhist academies, the student-monks, and the various Buddhist periodicals formed an imagined community that was instrumental in the production of Chinese Buddhist citizenship in the twentieth century. By elucidating the identity formation process of student-monks as both religious actors and engaged citizens, I have shown that the creation of student-monks as both an actual and imagined community is crucial to our understanding of the trajectory of modern Chinese Buddhism.

In this study, I propose an inclusive definition of "student-monk" to include those who identified with the textual community formed around modern Buddhist academies, and, more importantly, with the Buddhist periodicals that were widely circulated during the Republican period. I define student-monks to be those who were educated in both religious and secular knowledge, were sensitive to the socio-political issues of the day, and shared a vision for modern China in which Buddhism would play a socially and politically active role. I argue that the "student-monk" served as an ideal image of the modern monastic career for China's young and progressive monks. This would have long-lasting impact in the self-understanding and practice of modern Chinese Buddhism.

By focusing on the *foxueyuan* – a well-recognized but understudied topic – in the first half of this dissertation, I tried to systematically document the growth of modern Buddhist education in China. I maintain that the search for a new monastic education system culminated in the founding of the Wuchang Buddhist Academy, which became the model for new-style Buddhist schools in China. Wuchang represented a new way to imagine not only the study of Buddhism but, more importantly, what it meant to be a monk. This explains the reason why,

despite its short life, it has remained an icon for modern monastic education in the collective imagination of the Chinese Buddhists.

To better understand its legacy, I suggest viewing the Wuchang Academy as the origin for not just a network of schools and graduates, but a modern lineage whose identity was constantly shaped and reshaped by its participants in responding to situations both within and outside of Buddhism. I have shown that the academy marked three paradigm shifts in the institution and practice of modern Chinese Buddhism: the vertical teacher-student dynamic which led to a new understanding of the traditional master-disciple relationship in Buddhism; the construction of a horizontal relationship among the students, which eventually manifested in the emergence of a collective student-monk identity; and a reformulation of orthodoxy that reinforced the role of the Buddhist academies and their students in the institutional transformation of Chinese Buddhism in the twentieth century.

Lastly, in Chapter 4, I have demonstrated that the Chinese Buddhists crafted a distinctive form of citizenship by combining various dimensions of the existing discourse on legal rights, political participation, and civic obligation, with re-interpretations of Buddhist soteriology to formulate the expression of a national identity firmly grounded in the language of Buddhism. I argue that, in performing the collective student-monk identity, educated monks sought to develop their own notion of rights and obligations as members of the political community through their engagement and constant negotiation with the state and its religious policies.

Through this study of modern monastic education, the emergence and performance of the student-monk identity, I hope to contribute to the growing body of scholarship on Buddhism in twentieth-century China and shed light on the multiple visions of Buddhist modernity. This study of student-monks shows the complexity of contestation between different actors in the state-

imposed secularization process in China. Although the student-monks acknowledged the power of the expanding state, they nonetheless saw themselves as active participants in the modernization project that was necessary for both Buddhism and the nation. In other words, the student-monks were both the products of a transformed Buddhism-state relation and agents for that very transformation.

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

Huang Xianian 黃夏年 ed. *Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng bubian* 民國佛教期刊文献集成補編. Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 2008.

———. *Minguo fojiao qikan wenxian jicheng* 民國佛教期刊文獻集成. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 2006.

Liang Qichao 梁啟超. *Yinbingshi heji* 飲冰室合集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1932.

Jing'an 敬安. *Bazhi toutuo shiwen ji* 八指頭陀詩文集. Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1984.

Kang Youwei 康有爲. *Kang Nanhai ziding nianpu* 康南海自訂年譜. Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1972.

Taixu 太虛. *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書. Taipei: Shandaosi fojing liutongchu, 1980.

Tang, Zhijun 湯志鈞, ed. *Zhongguo jindai jiaoyushi ziliao huibian: Wuxu shiqi jiaoyu* 中國近代教育史資料彙編: 戊戌時期教育. Shanghai: Shanghai jiaoyu chubanshe, 2007.

Yang Buwei 楊步偉. *Yige nüren de zizhuan* 一個女人的自傳. Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1987.

Yang Wenhui 楊文會. *Yang Renshan quanji* 楊仁山全集. Hefei: Huangshan shushe, 2000.

Yinshun 印順. *Taixu dashi nianpu* 太虛大師年譜. Taipei: Zhenwen chubanshe, 1992.

Yu Lingbo 于凌波. *Minguo gaoseng zhuan sanbian* 民國高僧傳三編. Taipei: Huiming wenhua, 2001.

———. *Xiandai fojiao renwu cidian* 現代佛教人物辭典. 2 vols. Gaoxiong: Foguang chubanshe, 2004.

Zhenhua 真華. *Canxue suotan* 參學瑣談. Taipei: Tianhua chubanshe, 1984.

Zhongguo di'er lishi dang'anguan 中國第二歷史檔案館. *Zhonghua minguo shi dang'an ziliao huibian* 中華民國史檔案資料匯編. Vol. 5.1. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1994.

Zongyang 宗仰. *Zongyang shangren ji* 宗仰上人集. Edited by Wenquan Tang. Wuchang: Huazhong shifan daxue chubanshe, 1999.

Secondary Sources:

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. New York: Verso, 2006.

Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

———. "Religion, Nation-State, Secularism." In *Nation and Religion: Perspectives on Europe and Asia*, edited by Peter van der Veer and Hartmut Lehmann, 178–196. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

———. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Ashiwa, Yoshiko. "The Globalization of Chinese Buddhism: Clergy and Devotee Networks in the Twentieth Century." *International Journal of Asian Studies* 2, no. 2 (2005): 217–237.

———. "Positioning Religion in Modernity: State and Buddhism in China." In *Making Religion, Making the State: The Politics of Religion in Modern China*, edited by David Wank and Yoshiko Ashiwa, 43-73. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Ashiwa, Yoshiko, and David Wank. "Making Religion, Making the State in Modern China: An Introductory Essay." In *Making Religion, Making the State: The Politics of Religion in Modern China*, edited by Yoshiko Ashiwa and David Wank, 1-21. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

———, eds. *Making Religion, Making the State: The Politics of Religion in Modern China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Aviv, Eyal. "Differentiating the Pearl from the Fish Eye: Ouyang Jingwu (1871-1943) and the Revival of Scholastic Buddhism." PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2008.

Ayers, William. *Chang Chih-tung and Educational Reform in China.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Bailey, Paul. *Reform the People: Changing Attitudes towards Popular Education in Early Twentieth-Century China*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990.

Barrett, Timothy. *The Woman Who Discovered Printing*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Bartholomeusz, Tessa. *In Defense of Dharma: Just-war Ideology in Buddhist Sri Lanka*. New York: Routledge Curzon, 2002.

Bastid, Marianne. *Educational Reform in Early Twentieth Century China.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1988.

Berger, Patricia. *Empire of Emptiness: Buddhist Art and Political Authority in Qing China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003.

Bergère, Marie-Claire. *Sun Yat-sen*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Bingenheimer, Marcus. *Der Mönchsgelehrte Yinshun (geb. 1906) und seine Bedeutung für den Chinesisch-Taiwanischen Buddhismus im 20. Jahrhundert*. Heidelberg: Edition Forum, 2004.

Birnbaum, Raoul. "Buddhist China at the Century's Turn." In *Religion in China Today*, edited by Daniel Overmyer, 123–144. *The China Quarterly Special Issues*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Blackburn, Anne. "Introduction." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 235–340.

———. *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010.

———. *Buddhist Learning and Textual Practice in Eighteenth-century Lankan Monastic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Borchert, Thomas. "Educating Monks: Buddhism, Politics and Freedom of Religion on China's Southwest Border." PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2006.

———. "Training Monks or Men: Theravada Monastic Education, Subnationalism, and the National Sangha of China." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 241–272.

Borthwick, Sally. *Education and Social Change in China: The Beginnings of the Modern Era*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1983.

Brokaw, Cynthia, and Christopher Reed, eds. *From Woodblocks to the Internet: Chinese Publishing and Print Culture in Transition, Circa 1800 to 2008*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Brokaw, Cynthia, and Jan Kiely. "Spreading the Dharma with the Mechanized Press: New Buddhist Print Cultures in the Modern Chinese Print Revolution, 1866-1949." In *From Woodblocks to the Internet: Chinese Publishing and Print Culture in Transition, Circa 1800 to 2008*, edited by Cynthia Brokaw and Christopher Reed, 184–210. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Brook, Timothy. *Praying for Power: Buddhism and the Formation of Gentry Society in late-Ming China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

———. "The Politics of Religion: Late Imperial Origins of the Regulatory State." In *Making Religion, Making the State: The Politics of Religion in Modern China*, edited by David Wank and Yoshiko Ashiwa, 22–42. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Carter, James. *Heart of Buddha, Heart of China: The Life of Tanxu, a Twentieth-century Monk*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Casanova, José. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Chan, Sin-wai. *Buddhism in Late Ch'ing Political Thought*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1985.

Chan, Wing-tsit. *Religious Trends in Modern China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

Chandler, Stuart. *Establishing a Pure Land on Earth: The Foguang Buddhist Perspective on Modernization and Globalization*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

Chen Bing 陳兵, and Deng Zimei 鄧子美. *Ershi shiji Zhongguo fojiao* 二十世紀中國佛教. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe, 2000.

Chen-Hua (Zhenhua). *In Search of the Dharma: Memoirs of a Modern Chinese Buddhist Pilgrim*. Edited by Chün-fang Yü. Translated by Denis Mair. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Chen, Hsi-yuan. "Confucianism Encounters Religion: The Formation of Religious Discourse and the Confucian Movement in Modern China." PhD Diss., Harvard University, 1999.

Chen, Jidong. "The Transmission of the Jōdō Shinshū Doctrine to China: The Discovery of the

‘Nanjingyu Shuojiao’ and Its Significance.” *Eastern Buddhist* 40, no. 1–2 (2009): 139–150.

——— (Chin Keito 陳継東). *Shinmatsu Bukkyō no kenkyū: Yō Bunkai o chūshin to shite* 清末仏教の研究: 楊文会を中心として. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin, 2003.

Chen, Jinhua. *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship: Tanqian in Sui Buddhism and Politics*. Kyoto: Scuola italiana di studi sull’Asia orientale, 2002.

———. *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (643-712)*. Boston: Brill, 2007.

Chen Jinlong 陳金龍. *Nanjing guomin zhengfu shiqi de zhengjiao guanxi: Yi fojiao wei zhongxin de kaocha* 南京國民政府時期的政教關係: 以佛教為中心的考察. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2011.

Chen, Yong. *Confucianism as Religion: Controversies and Consequences*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Chu, William. “A Buddha-shaped hole: Yinshun’s (1906-2005) Critical Buddhology and the Theological Crisis in Modern Chinese Buddhism,” PhD. Diss., UCLA, 2006.

Cohen, Paul. *China Unbound: Evolving Perspectives on the Chinese Past*. New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003.

———. *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Cong, Xiaoping. *Teachers’ Schools and the Making of the Modern Chinese Nation-state, 1897-1937*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 2007.

Culp, Robert. *Articulating Citizenship: Civic Education and Student Politics in Southeastern China, 1912-1940*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Curran, Thomas. *Educational Reform in Republican China: The Failure of Educators to Create a Modern Nation*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2005.

De Bary, W. Theodore, and John Chaffee, eds. *Neo-Confucian Education: The Formative Stage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Dean, Kenneth, and Zhenman Zheng. *Ritual Alliances of the Putian Plain, Volume 1: Historical Introduction to the Return of the Gods*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Deegalle, Mahinda. *Buddhism, Conflict and Violence in Modern Sri Lanka*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

———. “Is Violence Justified in Theravāda Buddhism?” *Ecumenical Review* 55, no. 2 (2003): 122–131.

Deng Zimei. *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindai hua: bainian wenhua chongchuang yu jiaoliu* 傳統佛教與中國近代化: 百年文化衝撞與交流. Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 1994.

Dikötter, Frank. *The Discourse of Race in Modern China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Ding Gang 丁鋼. *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu: Ru fo dao jiaoyu bijiao yanjiu* 中國佛教教育: 儒佛道

教育比較研究. Chengdu: Sichuan jiaoyu chubanshe, 1988.

Duara, Prasenjit. *Culture, Power, and the State: Rural North China, 1900-1942*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

———. “Religion and Citizenship in China and the Diaspora.” In *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, edited by Mayfair Yang, 43–64. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

———. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

———. *Sovereignty and Authenticity: Manchukuo and the East Asian Modern*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.

Dunch, Ryan. *Fuzhou Protestants and the Making of a Modern China, 1857-1927*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Ebrey, Patricia, and Peter Gregory, eds. *Religion and Society in T’ang and Sung China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993.

Eric Goodell. “Taixu’s Youth and Years of Romantic Idealism, 1890–1914.” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, no. 21 (2008): 77–121.

Fitzgerald, John. *Awakening China: Politics, Culture, and Class in the Nationalist Revolution*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Fogel, Joshua. *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao’s Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California Berkeley, Center for Chinese Studies, 2004.

Fogel, Joshua, and Peter Zarrow, eds. *Imagining the People: Chinese Intellectuals and the Concept of Citizenship, 1890-1920*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1997.

Foulks, Beverly. “Living Karma: The Religious Practices of Ouyi Zhixue (1599-1655).” PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2009.

Fung, Edmund. *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Gao Zhennong 高振農. *Fojiao wenhua yu jindai Zhongguo* 佛教文化與近代中國. Shanghai: Shanghai shehui kexueyuan chubanshe, 1992.

Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光. *Ge Zhaoguang zixuan ji* 葛兆光自選集. Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1997.

———. *Xichao you dongfeng: wan Qing Min chu sixiang, zongjiao yu xueshu shijiang* 西潮又東風: 晚清民初思想、宗教與學術十講. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Georges, Dreyfus. “Where Do Commentarial Schools Come from: Reflections on the History of Tibetan Scholasticism.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 273–297.

Gernet, Jacques. *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth*

Centuries. Translated by Franciscus Verellen. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Goldfuss, Gabriele. *Vers un bouddhisme du XXe siècle: Yang Wenhui (1837-1911), réformateur laïque et imprimeur*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 2001.

———. "Binding Sutras to Modernity: The Life and Times of Chinese Layman Yang Wenhui (1837–1911)." *Studies in Central and East Asian Religions*, no. 9 (1996): 54–74.

Goldman, Merle, and Elizabeth Perry, eds. *Changing Meanings of Citizenship in Modern China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Gombrich, Richard, and Gananath Obeyesekere. *Buddhism Transformed: Religious Change in Sri Lanka*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Goodell, Eric. "Taixu's (1890-1947) Creation of Humanistic Buddhism." PhD Diss., University of Virginia, 2012.

Goossaert, Vincent. "1898: The Beginning of the End for Chinese Religion?" *The Journal of Asian Studies* 65, no. 2 (2006): 307-335.

———. "Republican Church Engineering: The National Religious Associations in 1912 China." In *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, edited by Mayfair Yang, 209–232. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Goossaert, Vincent, and David Palmer. *The Religious Question in Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Guo Peng 郭朋. *Ming Qing fojiao* 明清佛教. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1982.

———. *Taixu sixiang yanjiu* 太虛思想研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1997.

Gyōnen. *The Essentials of the Eight Traditions*. Translated by Leo Pruden. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1994.

Hammerstrom, Erik. "Buddhists Discuss Science in Modern China (1895-1949)." PhD Diss., Indiana University, 2010.

Han, Huanzhong 韓煥忠. *Zijue jueta: Fojiao jiaoyu guan* 自覺覺他: 佛教教育觀. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2006.

Harris, Ian. *Buddhism and Politics in Twentieth-century Asia*. York: Pinter, 1999.

———. *Buddhism, Power and Political Order*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Harrison, Henrietta. *The Making of the Republican Citizen: Political Ceremonies and Symbols in China, 1911-1929*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Harvey, Peter. *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values, and Issues*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

He Jianming 何建明. "Cong Qihuan jingshe dao Wuchang foxueyuan 從祇洹精舍到武昌佛學院." *Jindaishi yanjiu* 近代史研究, no. 4 (1998): 112–126.

———. *Fofa guannian de jindai tiaoshi* 佛法觀念的近代調適. Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin

chubanshe, 1998.

He Jinlin 賀金林. “Qing mo seng jiaoyuhui yu siyuan xingxue de xingqi 清末僧教育會與寺院興學的興起.” *Anhui shixue* 安徽史學, no. 6 (2005): 28–34.

Heine, Steven, and Dale Wright, eds. *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Ho, Ping-ti. *Studies on the Population of China, 1368 - 1953*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hon, Tze-Ki. “National Essence, National Learning, and Culture: Historical Writings in *Guocui xuebao*, *Xueheng*, and *Guoxue jikan*.” *Historiography East and West* 1, no. 2 (2003): 242–286.

Hong Jinlian 洪金蓮. *Taixu dashi fojiao xiandai hua zhi yanjiu* 太虛大師佛教現代化之研究. Taipei: Dongchu chubanshe, 1995.

Huang, Julia. *Charisma and Compassion: Cheng Yen and the Buddhist Tzu Chi Movement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Huang Shijia 黃士嘉. *Wan Qing jiaoyu zhengce yanbian shi 1862-1911* 晚清教育政策演變史, 1862-1911. Taipei: Xinli chubanshe, 2006.

Ives, Christopher. *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen’s Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.

Jerryson, Michael, and Mark Juergensmeyer, eds. *Buddhist Warfare*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Jessup, Brooks. “The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920-1956.” PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2010.

Ji, Zhe. “A Testament Betrayed: Zhao Puchu and His *Renjian* Buddhism.” Edited by Jessica Main and Rongdao Lai. *The Eastern Buddhist Special Issue on Engaged Buddhism* (Forthcoming).

———. “Secularization as Religious Restructuring: Statist Institutionalization of Chinese Buddhism and Its Paradoxes.” In *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, edited by Mayfair Yang, 233–260. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Jiang Canteng 江燦騰. *Ming Qing Minguo fojiao sixiang shilun* 明清民國佛教思想史論. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1996.

———. *Taixu dashi qianzhuan (1890-1927)* 太虛大師前傳*(1890-1927)*. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1993.

Jinling kejing chu 金陵刻經處. *Wensi: Jinling kejing chu 130 zhounian jinian zhuanji* 聞思: 金陵刻經處130周年紀念專輯. Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 1997.

Jones, Charles. *Buddhism in Taiwan Religion and the State, 1660-1990*. Honolulu: University of

Hawai'i Press, 1999.

Judge, Joan. “Citizens or Mothers of Citizens? Gender and the Meaning of Modern Chinese Citizenship.” In *Changing Meanings of Citizenship in Modern China*, edited by Elizabeth Perry and Merle Goldman, 23–43. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Kang Suhua 康素華. “Shisuhua shidai de zongjiao jiaoyu gaige: Taixu dashi yu Niuman zhujia zhi bijiao yanjiu 世俗化時代的宗教教育改革: 太虛大師與紐曼主教之比較研究.” M.A Thesis, Nanhua University, 2003.

Karl, Rebecca, and Peter Zarrow. *Rethinking the 1898 Reform Period: Political and Cultural Change in Late Qing China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Ketelaar, James. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Keyes, Charles. *Thailand, Buddhist Kingdom as Modern Nation-state*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1987.

Keyes, Charles. “Merit Transference in the Kammic Theory of Popular Theravada Buddhism.” In *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry*, edited by E. Valentine Daniel and Charles Keyes, 261–286. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Kieschnick, John. *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

———. *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Kim, Hwansoo. *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877-1912*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2013.

Kwong, Luke. *A Mosaic of the Hundred Days: Personalities, Politics, and Ideas of 1898*. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1984.

Laliberté, André. *The Politics of Buddhist Organizations in Taiwan, 1989-2003: Safeguarding the Faith, Build a Pure Land, Help the Poor*. New York: Routledge Curzon, 2004.

Lan Richang 藍日昌. “Zongpai yu dengtong: Lun Sui Tang fojiao zongpai guannian de fazhan 宗派與燈統: 論隋唐佛教宗派觀念的發展.” *Chengda zongjiao yu wenhua xuebao* 成大宗教與文化學報, no. 4 (2004): 19–52.

Levenson, Joseph. *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate: a Trilogy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Li Xiangping 李向平. *Jiushi yu jiuxin: Zhongguo jindai fojiao fuxing sichao yanjiu* 救世與救心: 中國近代佛教復興思潮研究. Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe, 1993.

Li Zhongxing 李忠興, ed. *Quanxue pian: Zhongti xiyong de qiangguo ce* 勸學篇： 中体西用的強國策. Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1998.

Lin Zuojia 林作嘉. “Qing mo Min chu miaochan xingxue zhi yanjiu 清末民初廟產興學之研究.” M.A Thesis, Tunghai University, 2000.

Liu Chengyou 劉成有. *Jinxiandai jushi foxue yanjiu* 近現代居士佛學研究. Chengdu: Bashu

shushe, 2002.

Liu, Lydia. *The Clash of Empires: the Invention of China in Modern World Making*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

———. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity--China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Long, Darui. “Buddhist Education in Sichuan.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 34, no. 2 (2002): 185–206.

Lopez, Donald. *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Luo Cheng 羅琤. *Jinling kejing chu yanjiu* 金陵刻經處研究. Shanghai: Shanghai shehui kexueyuan chubanshe, 2010.

Luo Tongbing 羅同兵. *Taixu dui Zhongguo fojiao xiandai hua daolu de jueze* 太虛對中國佛教現代化道路的抉擇. Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2003.

Luo Zhitian 羅志田. *Quanshi zhuanyi: Jindai Zhongguo de sixiang, shehui yu xueshu* 權勢轉移: 近代中國的思想、社會與學術. Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 1999.

Madsen, Richard. *Democracy’s Dharma: Religious Renaissance and Political Development in Taiwan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

McMahan, David. *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Meynard, Thierry. *The Religious Philosophy of Liang Shuming: The Hidden Buddhist*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Nattier, Jan. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.

Nedostup, Rebecca. “Ritual Competition and the Modernizing Nation-State.” In *Chinese Religiosity: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, edited by Mayfair Yang, 87–112. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

———. *Superstitious Regimes: Religion and the Politics of Chinese Modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009.

Nedostup, Rebecca, and Hong-Ming Liang. “‘Begging the Sages of the Party-State’: Citizenship and Government in Transition in Nationalist China, 1927– 1937.” *International Review of Social History* 46, no. Supplement S9 (2001): 185–207.

Obeyesekere, Gananath. “Buddhism, Nationhood, and Cultural Identity.” In *Fundamentalisms Comprehended*, edited by Martin Marty and Scott Appleby, 231–256. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Pepper, Suzanne. *Radicalism and Education Reform in 20th-century China the Search for an Ideal Development Model*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Pittman, Don. *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism: Taixu’s Reforms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001.

Platt, Stephen. *Autumn in the Heavenly Kingdom: China, the West, and the Epic Story of the*

Taiping Civil War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

Poceski, Mario. “Chan Rituals of the Abbots’ Ascending the Dharma Hall to Preach.” In *Zen Ritual Studies of Zen Buddhist Theory in Practice*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale Wright, 83–112. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Poon, Shuk-wah. *Negotiating Religion in Modern China: State and Common People in Guangzhou, 1900-1937*. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2011.

Qu, Haiyuan 瞿海源. *Zongjiao, shushu yu shehui bianqian: Jidu zongjiao yanjiu, zhengjiao guanxi yanjiu* 宗教，術數與社會變遷 : 基督宗教研究, 政教關係研究. Vol. 2. Taipei: Guiguan, 2006.

Rawski, Evelyn. *Education and Popular Literacy in Ch’ing China*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1979.

Reed, Christopher. *A Gutenberg in Shanghai Chinese Print Capitalism, 1876-1937*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004.

Reinders, Eric. *Borrowed Gods and Foreign Bodies: Christian Missionaries Imagine Chinese Religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Ritzinger, Justin. “Anarchy in the Pure Land: Tradition, Modernity, and the Reinvention of the Cult of Maitreya in Republican China.” PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2010.

Rowe, William. *Hankow: Commerce and Society in a Chinese City, 1796-1889*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984.

———. *Hankow: Conflict and Community in a Chinese City, 1796-1895*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.

Sachsenmaier, Dominic, Jens Riedel, and S. N. Eisenstadt. *Reflections on Multiple Modernities: European, Chinese and Other Interpretations*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Samuels, Jeffrey. “Toward an Action-Oriented Pedagogy: Buddhist Texts and Monastic Education in Contemporary Sri Lanka.” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 72, no. 4 (2004): 955–971.

Sang, Bing. “Japan and Liang Qichao’s Research in the Field of National Learning.” In *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao’s Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China*, edited by Joshua Fogel, 177–202. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2004.

Sawada, Janine Anderson. *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

Schober, Juliane. “Colonial Knowledge and Buddhist Education in Burma.” In *Buddhism, Power and Political Order*, edited by Ian Harris, 52–70. New York: Routledge, 2007.

———. *Modern Buddhist Conjunctures in Myanmar: Cultural Narratives, Colonial Legacies, and Civil Society*. Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press, 2011.

Schopen, Gregory. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

———. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in*

India. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

Scott, Gregory. “Conversion by the Book: Buddhist Print Culture in Early Republican China.” PhD Diss., Columbia University, 2013.

Shao Yong 邵勇. “Qing mo miaochan xingxue yundong yu huixue minbian 清末廟產興學運動與毀學民變.” *Qinghai shehui kexue* 青海社會科學, no. 7 (2006): 129-132.

Shen, Kuiyi. “Wang Yiting in the Social Networks of 1910s-1930s Shanghai.” In *At the Crossroads of Empires: Middlemen, Social Networks, and State-Building in Republican Shanghai*, edited by Nara Dillon and Jean Oi, 45–64. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Shi Changhui 釋常慧. *Shengyan fashi fojiao jiaoyu lilun yu shijian* 聖嚴法師佛教教育理論與實踐. Taipei: Fagu wenhua, 2004.

Shi Miaoran 釋妙然. *Minguo fojiao dashi nianji* 民國佛教大事年紀. Taipei: Haichaoyin zazhishe, 1995.

Shi Xinrong 釋信融. *Juzan fashi yanjiu* 巨贊法師研究. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 2006.

Stark, Rodney, and Roger Finke. *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Strand, David. *An Unfinished Republic: Leading by Word and Deed in Modern China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

———. *Rickshaw Beijing: City People and Politics in the 1920s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Szonyi, Michael. “Secularization Theories and the Study of Chinese Religions.” *Social Compass* 56, no. 3 (2009): 312–327.

Tambiah, Stanley. *Buddhism Betrayed?: Religion, Politics, and Violence in Sri Lanka*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

———. “The Persistence and Transformation of Tradition in Southeast Asia, with Special Reference to Thailand.” *Daedalus* 102, no. 1 (1973): 55–84.

———. *World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand Against a Historical Background*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Tang, Yongtong 湯用彤. *Han Wei liang Jin Nanbeichao fojiaoshi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

———. *Sui Tang fojiao shigao* 隋唐佛教史稿. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982.

Tarocco, Francesca. *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism: Attuning the Dharma*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Tien, Po-yao. “A Modern Buddhist Monk-reformer in China: The Life and Thought of Yin-shun.” PhD Diss., California Institute of Integral Studies, 1995.

Trombert, Eric. *Le crédit à Dunhuang: vie matérielle et société en Chine médiévale*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut des hautes études chinoises: De Boccard, édition-diffusion, 1995.

Tuttle, Gray. *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Veer, Peter van der, and Hartmut Lehmann, eds. *Nation and Religion: Perspectives on Europe and Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Victoria, Daizen. *Zen War Stories*. New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003.

———. *Zen at War*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006.

Walsh, Michael. *Sacred Economies: Buddhist Monasticism and Territoriality in Medieval China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Wang Jianchuan 王見川. "Zhang Zongzai, Ning Dayun yu Minguo shiqi de 'Fohua xin qingnian hui' 張宗載、甯達蘊與民國時期的 '佛化新青年會'." *Yuanguang foxue xuebao* 圓光佛學學報, no. 3 (1999): 325–355.

Watson, James. "Standardizing the Gods: The Promotion of T'ien Hou ('Empress of Heaven') along the South China Coast, 960–1960." In *Popular Culture in Late Imperial China*, edited by David Johnson, Andrew Nathan, and Evelyn Rawski, 292-324. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Welch, Holmes. *Buddhism under Mao*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

———. *The Buddhist Revival in China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

———. *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism, 1900-1950*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Welter, Albert. *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Wright, Mary. *The Last Stand of Chinese Conservatism: The T'ung-chih Restoration, 1862-1874.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Xiao Ping 肖平. *Jindai Zhongguo fojiao de fuxing: Yu Riben fojiaojie de jiaowanglu* 近代中國佛教的復興: 與日本佛教界的交往錄. Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 2003.

Xu, Xiaoqun. *Chinese Professionals and the Republican State: The Rise of Professional Associations in Shanghai, 1912-1937*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Xu Yue 徐越. "Qing mo miaochan xingxue zhengce de yuanqi he yanbian 清末廟產興學政策的緣起和演變." *Shehui kexue yanjiu* 社會科學研究, no. 4 (2007): 151–158.

Xue Yu. *Buddhism, War, and Nationalism: Chinese Monks in the Struggle against Japanese Aggressions, 1931-1945*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

———. "Buddhist Contribution to the Socialist Transformation of Buddhism in China: Activities of Ven. Juzan during 1949–1953." *Journal of Global Buddhism* 10 (2009): 217–254.

———. "Buddhists in China During the Korean War (1951-1953)." In *Buddhist Warfare*, 131–156. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

——— (學愚). *Fojiao, baoli yu minzu zhuyi: Kang Ri zhanzheng shiqi de Zhongguo fojiao* 佛教,

暴力與民族主義: 抗日戰爭時期的中國佛教. Hong Kong: Zhongwen daxue chubanshe, 2011.

Yeh, Wen-Hsin. *Shanghai Splendor: Economic Sentiments and the Making of Modern China, 1843-1949*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Yifa, and Zongze. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.

Yu, Anthony. *State and Religion in China: Historical and Textual Perspectives*. Chicago: Open Court, 2005.

Yü, Chün-fang. *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Yuan, Yuan. "Chinese Buddhist Nuns in the Twentieth Century: A Case Study in Wuhan." *Journal of Global Buddhism*, no. 10 (2009): 375–412.

Zarrow, Peter. "Constitutionalism and the Imagination of the State: Official Views of Political Reform in the Late Qing." In *Creating Chinese Modernity: Knowledge and Everyday Life, 1900-1940*, edited by Peter Zarrow, 51–82. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.

Zhang Mantao 張曼濤. *Fojiao yu zhengzhi* 佛教與政治. Taipei: Dacheng wenhua chubanshe, 1979.

———, ed. *Minguo fojiao pian: Zhongguo fojiao shi zhuanji zhi qi* 民國佛教篇：中國佛教史專集之七. Taipei: Dasheng wenhua chuabanshe, 1978.

Zuo Songtao 左松濤. "Jindai Zhongguo fojiao xingxue zhi yuanqi 近代中國佛教興學之緣起." *Fayin* 法音, no. 2 (2008): 34-38。

Zürcher, Erik. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.