



Buddhist education between tradition, modernity and networks: reconsidering the 'revival' of education for the Saṅgha in twentieth-century China

Stefania Travagnin

To cite this article: Stefania Travagnin (2017) Buddhist education between tradition, modernity and networks: reconsidering the 'revival' of education for the Saṅgha in twentieth-century China, *Studies in Chinese Religions*, 3:3, 220-241, DOI: [10.1080/23729988.2017.1392193](https://doi.org/10.1080/23729988.2017.1392193)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23729988.2017.1392193>



© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 29 Nov 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2539



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Buddhist education between tradition, modernity and networks: reconsidering the ‘revival’ of education for the Saṅgha in twentieth-century China

Stefania Travagnin

University of Groningen

ABSTRACT

In line with the overall focus on the special issue, this article offers a critical evaluation of Welch’s writing on Buddhist education. It analyzes the vocabulary and conceptual binaries used by Welch, and assesses the impact of his arguments on the field. The first part of this study will also critically contextualize Welch’s publications within a wider range of works that have been published in the Welch and Post-Welch eras. The second part of the article rethinks the research paths that have been undertaken so far and propose new trajectories for an alternative study of Buddhist education. It also suggests adopting the conceptual category of networks in order to unveil connections and dynamics of the actual religion on the ground that remain unexplored. Finally, given the debates that the idea of ‘revival’ has provoked, this article will conclude with some reflection on if and how we could frame the situation of the Saṅgha education in twentieth-century China in relation to the revival paradigm.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 10 November 2016

Accepted 11 March 2017

KEYWORDS

Holmes Welch; Modern Chinese Buddhism; Buddhist education; Saṅgha education; Chinese Buddhist revival; Chinese Buddhist women; Buddhist networks

Introduction

The study of modern Chinese Buddhism is still a relatively young field. Although we can already count the presence of a few generations of scholars and methodological patterns, this scholarship is still questioning its core paradigms and key research parameters.

Holmes Welch’s (1924–1981) publications, his questions and concluding arguments, have become particularly popular among Western students and scholars in the last few decades. In fact, almost all studies in Western languages on this subject refer to them in one way or another. This is probably the case, in part, because of the breadth, rather than depth, of the topics explored by Welch, as well as his attention to the revival paradigm as an analytical concept. However, Welch’s works are only part of a larger body of scholarship produced in the last half century in the West as well as in China concerning the social, historical and political development of Buddhism in China from the late Qing until the Mao period.

An overview of the field, from the early steps through the first achievements to the current *status quo* reveals continuities but also shifts in approaches, sources, questions and themes under investigation. In *The Buddhist Revival in China*, Holmes Welch reflected on challenges that research on Buddhism in contemporary China posed in the 1960s; he observed:

Even the simplest facts about Chinese Buddhism are sometimes difficult to establish; and they are always difficult to assess because they are incomplete. Until much more investigation has been carried out, every interpretation must be very, very tentative.¹

After almost 50 years, in light of the new ethnographic and archival studies and the new research tools available in this 'Post-Welch era', we have now moved beyond 'very, very tentative' interpretations of the development in Chinese Buddhism from late Qing until the Cultural Revolution. At the same time that we have overcome older challenges, however, new ones generated by different social and political frames of the Buddhist communities have emerged.

If we consider publications from the past two decades, we notice that Welch's attention to the relation between state and religion and the role of nationalism has continued and been developed further in the 'Post-Welch era'.² Recently, new perspectives coming from the fields of cultural studies, especially material culture and media studies, have reshaped research conducted in this field.³ Moreover, reflections on Buddhism in China after Mao, including the new openness to religion in post-1980 China that has reshaped Buddhism and Buddhists, constitute a significant part of recent scholarly studies.⁴ Scholars have formulated new questions, in terms of both content and methodologies, to address these new religious and social landscapes. Furthermore, an increasing dialogue among disciplinary approaches from the humanities and social sciences has brought new collaborations and produced genuinely interdisciplinary scholarship.⁵

Continuities as well as new perspectives and findings in the field can help position and evaluate Welch's contribution from a wider perspective; we can certainly appreciate his work as a model for scholarly enquiry while also proposing alternative research trajectories. This article will assess key approaches and questions that have recurred in the field by focusing on the specific theme of Saṅgha education. In line with the overall focus on the special issue, this study starts with a critical evaluation of Welch's writing on Buddhist education. It analyzes the vocabulary and conceptual binaries used by Welch and it assesses the impact of his arguments on current research. The first part of the article will also critically contextualize Welch's publications within a wider range of works that have been published in the Welch and Post-Welch eras. The second part of the article will rethink the research paths that have been undertaken so far and propose new trajectories for an alternative study of Buddhist education. Finally, given the debates that the idea of 'revival' has provoked, this article will conclude with some reflection on if and how we could frame the situation of the Saṅgha education in twentieth-century China in relation to the revival paradigm.

Positioning Holmes Welch in the field of modern Chinese Buddhism

Holmes Welch's works, published between in the late 1960s and early 1970s, provided an early Western understanding of how so-called 'traditional' or 'mainstream' Chinese

Buddhism had changed in the last century and offered his explanation as to why those transformations had occurred.

It is well known that Welch was not the first Westerner to explore and report on post-Qing Buddhist China.⁶ A quick survey of Western scholarship on Chinese Buddhism that predated Welch's books reveals that the major works on the topic had mostly addressed doctrinal and textual (philological) themes, as well as the history of Buddhist schools and communities in the pre-Republican period.⁷ Some included a final chapter on the new situation of Chinese Buddhism in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁸ A few others focused specifically on the end of the Qing and the beginning of the Republic of China (PRC).⁹

Much of this material was available to Welch and he engaged with it quite explicitly, especially when he questioned the use of the term 'revival' in these publications. Most of the sources to which Welch had access in the early 1960s were written either by Buddhists or by Christians,¹⁰ a fact that explains how similar phenomena were often defined and judged in very different ways. Welch also had access to several Chinese journals on Buddhism that had been established after the Imperial period (especially beginning in the 1920s); he was thus able to contrast Western sources with Chinese ones. From a chronological perspective, then, Welch should be considered part of a (second) later generation of Western scholars in the history of the field; in other words, we can detect a 'Pre-Welch Era' on which research in this area is actually founded.

Nevertheless, Welch's oeuvre has received considerable attention in the Western academic sphere, probably due to the wide range of topics that his publications covered, some in more depth than others. Welch's scholarship stimulated interest in modern Chinese Buddhism among later generations of students and therefore, perhaps only unintentionally, he played a pivotal role in the foundation of the new field – 'Buddhism in twentieth-century China' – in the West.

Time and location in which Welch conducted his research, as well as the non-academic context in which he worked while in Asia certainly affected the narrative he presented on Buddhist China. His affiliation with the State Department as a foreign service reserve officer – both before he trained in East Asian studies and after, during his stay in Hong Kong – shaped his agenda and probably informed his research methodology. Welch based his narrative on ethnographic encounters or, more precisely, on interviews with monks from mainland China who resided in Hong Kong. He often put the material gathered from his informants into conversation with archival documents. As I will explain in more details below, the results that had been published in his books and articles on Buddhism made him a narrator of Buddhist history and practices affiliated with particular localities. He addressed specific micro-contexts but failed to analyze those micro-realities within a larger macro-reality. At the same time, Welch was a practitioner of the Chan school, a factor that also shaped his writings and explains at least in part his call for the preservation of 'pure' practice that he saw disappearing in the China where he lived.

During the period in which Welch was reporting on the situation of Buddhism and Buddhists in post-Imperial China, Chinese historians were conducting research on the same topic. Their sources were often different from the ones that Welch employed and they approached the topic from a different training background and perspective. Little wonder that their arguments and conclusions sometimes diverged from his. The lay

historian Guo Peng 郭朋 (1920–1984) and the Buddhist monk Dongchu 東初 (1908–1977) were two of Welch's Chinese counterparts.¹¹

Welch contributed considerably both to the foundations of a new field in the West and to Chinese studies in this area. Today, *The Buddhist Revival in China* is well known to Chinese in mainland China and Taiwan. It was translated into Chinese and published in mainland China in 2006 with the title *Zhongguo fojiao de fuxing* 中國佛教的復興. This Chinese translation has to be contextualised within the overall Chinese academic discussion of the supposed later revival (*fuxing* 復興) of religion in China after the end of the Cultural Revolution. The many works authored by Chinese scholars on the understanding of the religious landscape in post-1980 China, and the growing body of literature on the 'religious question' (*zongjiao wenti* 宗教問題) produced since the beginning of the twenty-first century all form part of this debate.

Trajectories in the study of Saṅgha education: Western and Chinese scholarship in dialogue

In *The Buddhist Revival in China* Holmes Welch devoted an entire chapter on 'Buddhist Education' in which he described Vinaya education (which he called 'traditional education') and a few selected seminaries (which he called 'new schools'). Welch outlines Taixu's 太虛 (1890–1947) Wuchang Buddhist Institute (*wuchang foxueyuan* 武昌佛學院) and Minnan Buddhist Institute (*minnan foxueyuan* 閩南佛學院), Dixian's 諦閑 (1858–1932) Academy for Spreading the Dharma (*hongfa xueyuan* 弘法學院), Deyi's 得一 Tianning Seminary (*tianning foxueyuan* 天寧佛學院), and Ouyang Jingwu's 歐陽竟無 (1871–1943) Chinese Metaphysical Institute (*zhina neixue yuan* 支那內學院) for the laity.¹² Welch also included an appendix with a long but not exhaustive list of names and locations of the 'new' Buddhist seminaries established in China in the first half of the twentieth century. Overall Welch interpreted the development in the educational sector as part of the 'revival' of Buddhism in modern China.¹³

The subject also appears as a minor topic in Welch's other Buddhism-related books. In *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism: 1900–1950*, Welch described the setting and process of occasional lectures on Buddhist scriptures given by itinerant senior monks.¹⁴ Finally, in *Buddhism Under Mao*, Welch reported on the different – and politically based – education that monastics were receiving. He discussed the opening of secular schools by monks in order to promote their involvement in social welfare, the foundation of the Chinese Buddhist Academy (*Zhongguo foxueyuan* 中國佛學院) in Beijing in accordance with the new directions given by the newly established Buddhist Association of China (BAC), and the reopening of the Jinling Scriptural Press in the early 1950s.¹⁵

Rich in content and interview notes, Welch's account of Buddhist education does, however, lack important details. The list of sources, objectives and also the limits of his overall research that Welch included in the preface of *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism 1900–1950* (1967) indicates that he was aware of some of these. First, Welch left many topics unaddressed. Quoting Welch, his trilogy did not address 'doctrine', rather it included an assessment of historical development of systems and institutions of Buddhism and was not a substantial Buddhist 'intellectual history'. Welch did not analyze any of the following elements: 'ritual, liturgy, iconography, and architecture',

‘the historical development of any of the practices’ he explored, ‘nuns and nunneries’, and ‘Lamaism’. Finally, he engaged ‘only incidentally’ with ‘Buddhism in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and among overseas Chinese’.¹⁶ Second, Welch tried to match the material he had gathered from his informants with written documents but often reported oral material even if it was unverified.¹⁷ Third, in *Buddhism under Mao* we see another problem in Welch’s approach: he does not contextualize Buddhism within the overall religious landscape in China;¹⁸ he makes Buddhism into a representative model of religion in China without considering the rest of the spectrum, in terms of both differences and connections. Finally, Welch seemed to be driven by a search for an ideal Chinese Buddhism that he could not find on the ground, and this expectation coloured his narrative leading him to make strong judgements about the material he studied.¹⁹

There are similarities and differences between Holmes Welch’s works on Buddhist education and other scholarship on Buddhist education produced in twentieth-century China during roughly the same period. These contemporary works belong to what we might call the ‘Welch era’ and the ‘Post-Welch era.’ Comparing these works can help us revise Welch’s frameworks, paradigms, and classification systems and to propose an alternative epistemology of Buddhist education in twentieth-century China. There are, in particular, parallels between Welch’s scholarship and the following works authored by the Chinese monk Dongchu: *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi* 中國佛教近代史 (published in 1974) and *Zhongri fojiao jiaotong shi* 中日佛教交通史 (published in 1970).

Dongchu was a monk native to mainland China but active in Taiwan from the 1950s onward; he was a student of the reformist monk Taixu who studied in Taixu’s new-style Minnan *foxueyuan*. Dongchu was an advocate for Buddhist learning and made the dissemination of Buddhist education his lifelong mission. Welch was a Western scholar and Buddhist practitioner, whereas Dongchu was an ordained Chinese Buddhist monk. Welch and Dongchu both wrote on the development of Chinese Buddhism in the twentieth century, but whereas Welch produced a series of well-documented ethnographic reports, Dongchu offered a larger historical analysis to frame the same phenomena. A parallel between Welch’s and Dongchu’s scholarship shows that they addressed similar themes in the study of Buddhism but did not always draw similar reflections. For example, in line with their own imagined ideals of Chinese Buddhism, Welch expressed pessimism in Taixu’s ability to develop further his overall reforms, including the then-recent modernization of Buddhist education. Only a few years later, Dongchu expressed serious doubts about the value of the scientific education that his own teacher Taixu had defended and proposed at the beginning of the twentieth century. Finally, Dongchu was one of the many monks that Welch described in his own works, and Dongchu’s works also provide answers to questions that Welch had posed to other monastics.

Another Chinese academic work that belongs to the Post-Welch era and which could serve as reference here is *Ershi shiji zhi zhongguo fojiao* 二十世紀之中國佛教, written by the lay scholars Chen Bing 陳兵 and Deng Zimei 鄧子美, published in the mainland in 1999 and reprinted in Taiwan in 2003. Similarly to Welch, Chen and Deng discussed the ways in which the twentieth-century development of Buddhism should be understood in terms of *fixing* (‘revival’). Chen and Deng also discussed Buddhist education

in relation to that term, depicting the effects of new learning on the Saṅgha and in terms of a larger Buddhist ‘revival’. Deng Zimei’s previous book, *Chuantong fojiao yu Zhongguo jindaihua* 传统佛教与中国近代化 (1994), also addressed Saṅgha education. It did so within the framework of a tradition/modernity binary.

More research on Saṅgha education has appeared in the last few years. Ding Gang’s book *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu* 中國佛教教育 (2010) is a historical survey of different education structures and curricula from the first transmission of Buddhism to China until early twentieth century. As for the first decades of 1900s, Rongdao Lai’s PhD dissertation (2014) reflected on the case of the early Wuchang Buddhist Institute, Taixu’s programs and the formation of *new* student-monks as *the* citizens of the *new* China.²⁰ Ji Zhe’s recent research²¹ and Douglas Gildow’s PhD dissertation (2016)²² addressed Saṅgha education in the post-Mao (and post-1980) China. My own work has looked at late Qing and early twentieth-century China. It explores the shifts and continuities in the discourse and practices of Saṅgha education²³ and offers a diachronic study of the Minnan Buddhist Institute by looking at the ways politics shaped the Saṅgha’s curriculum and learning goals.²⁴ Ding Gang and Thomas Borchert have looked at Buddhist education among (non-Han Buddhist) minorities.²⁵ Several journal articles, authored mostly by Chinese and Taiwanese scholars, have also examined current trends in Buddhist education on the mainland.²⁶ The same can be said about Taiwan, in addition to the book *Taiwan fojiao de sengjia jiaoyu* 臺灣佛教的僧伽教育 (2013) authored by Zhou Yuru 周玉茹, several articles on selected Buddhist institutes have been produced.²⁷ In short, the theme of Buddhist education in twentieth-century China has been explored in more depth in recent years; while most of this new scholarship is indebted to Welch’s works, the narrative and perspectives that are now proposed show bridges as well as shifts from Welch’s positions.

In the following sections I will question Welch’s approach on three levels: (1) I argue for the need to define the larger historical and discursive narrative that goes beyond – and is inclusive of – the distinct patterns that Welch outlined in his books; (2) I suggest problematizing and reassessing the terminology and systems of classifications that Welch applied to the analysis of religion, Buddhism, Buddhists, and China in his volumes. Finally, (3) I invite a rethinking of our understanding of ‘revival’ as an analytic concept in the precise context of Saṅgha education.

A discursive narrative approach: from micro- to macro-history and networks

History belongs to those who write it, and the person who wrote more history than anyone else was T’ai-hsü.²⁸

This section suggests research trajectories that could integrate the results of Welch’s research. While in recent years some have already been adopted by scholars of Buddhist education in modern China, others constitute new paths that could make constructive progress in the study of the theme.

Welch presented some important case studies of the new Buddhist seminaries based in southern China. He also drew parallels between the classical system of teaching and the recent curricula, which incorporated secular subjects in addition to the study of

Buddhist doctrine. Welch's insights into specific cases and the micro-histories he completed would, however, become even more significant if they were contextualised within a diachronic macro-history as well as a synchronic macro-frame. In other words, Welch's micro-histories would have greater implications if considered in relation to the larger context of the historical development of East Asia, and in connection with the other religions' educational systems and non-religious social structures. A more substantial analysis of what I define as the 'background discourse of Buddhist education' would help us to understand the relevance of those cases in China, as well as the larger picture that contributed to those achievements in the Buddhist sphere. It is important to ask what the alternative education for the Saṅgha entailed, besides those few *foxueyuan* that started appearing in 1920s. Additionally, within that macro-frame how were those alternatives dialectically linked to the handful of new *foxueyuan*? While Welch provided initial materials in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Dongchu provided the needed macro-frame; he included more case studies, discussed the achievements and failures of the new *foxueyuan* in greater detail, and thus offered a detailed report on the competing voices in the education sector of early twentieth-century Chinese Buddhism. Another crucial macro-frame coincides with the overall landscape of religious education, and the dynamics that developed among religious groups in defining their own schooling system. For instance, we know that in the pre-modern (Imperial) era the first structures of Buddhist education built within the monastery served as the reference model for the Confucian private education in the Song period. The Confucian *shuyuan* 書院 had in fact been planned following the model of the Buddhist education provided within the *siyuan* 寺院. Similarly, Daoist colleges have been inspired by Buddhist examples. The religious education context in the first half of twentieth-century China thus demonstrates networks and cooperation among different religious groups. These examples of cross-tradition cooperation and conflict shed important light on the development in the education sector for each of those groups and also define the overall context in better detail.²⁹

Welch conceived of the genealogy of the early twentieth-century 'modern' Buddhist education as a threefold historical process. For him, everything started with the pioneer lay Buddhist Yang Wenhui 楊文會 (1837–1911). The second period corresponds to Taixu's early career, from the 1920s to the early 1930s (and thus encompasses Taixu's Wuchang and Minnan *foxueyuan*). The third moment coincides with Taixu's late career, from the mid-1930s onwards (and thus Taixu's Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Institute). Welch mentions a few other monks, but none appears as 'modern' as Taixu; it is clear then that Taixu stood out in Welch's work as the key figure of the 'new' and 'modern' Buddhist education in the Republic of China. There is no doubt about Taixu's key contribution to reforming the organization and education of the Saṅgha, yet in terms of the discursive narrative and macro-frame mentioned above, I propose to go beyond what I call the 'Taixu paradigm'. Welch seemed to translate the history of the modern Buddhist education in terms of a Taixu-centered history, as the quotation at the start of this section suggests. Dongchu did not depart much from this position either.

I therefore suggest that we should work toward unveiling other patterns of agencies and agendas that influenced the implementation of the new teaching methods and curricula in Buddhist education. Buddhist history has been usually told as a male

history, and also as a history of eminent masters. Gazetteers and historical documents can, in contrast, bring less-known Buddhists back to life, alter our understanding of the historical picture we currently have, reveal the relevance of Buddhist ordained and lay women. This approach may eventually characterize Taixu as not only a major contributor to modernity, but also as part of a larger background and wider group. Recent scholarship on modern Buddhism (within and beyond China) is already moving in this direction,³⁰ and hopefully more works about the specific Chinese region along these lines will follow.³¹

When did this so-called modern Buddhist education start? Welch had his ‘modern’ history starting with Yang Wenhui. Post-Welch scholarship has also made the late-Qing the beginning of a new page in the history of Chinese Buddhism, and has referred to contacts with the West and the emergence of Christian colleges in China as factors that pushed forward these changes. Buddhism during the Ming and early Qing periods, however, already shows traces of that new beginning, and so provides evidence that factors of transformation do not only come from outside Buddhism or China, but also developed within Buddhism. As a result, the roots of the post-Imperial Buddhist landscape can be found in Imperial China. In his role as historian, Dongchu provided a short overview of the Yuan, Ming, and early Qing periods preceding Yang Wenhui’s initiatives, however he focused on the overall institutional structures and social function of Buddhism, not on the education sector. A new genealogy of the educational systems would highlight forms of continuity and better understand elements and reason for developments.

The social environment in which Welch’s monks and lay Buddhists operated has defined the form and modalities of their agencies and initiatives, and has also provided those Buddhists with an alternative field of action: the opening of structures of secular education for the larger public. In the late 1960s Welch had already noted the existence of these schools. Chapter Two of Brooks Jessup’s PhD dissertation also covers schools opened by lay Buddhist associations in Shanghai between the late 1920s and the late 1930s,³² as does Brian J. Nichol’s research on the orphanage opened within (and by) Kaiyuan Monastery 開元寺 in Quanzhou 泉州.³³ A thorough analysis of the interaction between political power, social pressure, and Buddhist communities provides, as mentioned above, a macro-dimension to the reality of Buddhist education. Recent work on Saṅgha engagement in the public education sector has revealed the political background and meaning of this entrepreneurship, in the first half of the twentieth century as well as during the People’s Republic.³⁴ For instance, research at the Shanghai municipal archive reveals an important account of elementary schools opened by the Saṅgha before Mao, while documents explain the function and structure of so-called *zhuxue* 助學 activities (supplementary education) undertaken by the Buddhist community recently.³⁵

Welch limited his work to research on the male Saṅgha only and not the whole Saṅgha. Post-Welch scholarship on twentieth-century Chinese Buddhism did not proceed very differently. Buddhist history has normally been told as a male history, in both pre-modern and modern times; the position and role of Buddhist women in Buddhist communities, however, add important data to the history of Buddhism in China, and also contributes to the overall field of women studies in China. For instance, going back in history and considering specifically the subject of education, we find that the

religious complex and its religious education was the earliest institution to provide educational opportunities for women in China. What forms of education could the female Saṅgha attend in the last two centuries? How did Buddhist women contribute to the early twentieth-century development of Buddhist education in China? Canonical sources and historical documents can be a valid reference for the study of the conditions of Buddhist women and their education in Imperial China.³⁶ There are only a few scholarly studies on educational programs by and for Buddhist women in post-Imperial China.³⁷ The last decade has, however, witnessed an increasing amount of research on Buddhist education for women in Taiwan, mostly in relation to the *renjian fojiao* 人間佛教 practice that has spread on the island.³⁸ Even so, most of those studies address education as one aspect of more general research on women and religion, and do not focus on education projects as their main subject. Taking Buddhist education for women as an epistemological lens through which to investigate the historical development of Buddhist education in China could offer results important for both the fields of history and of women's studies.

Finally, as he himself admitted, Welch's research on Buddhism and Buddhists in mainland China was conducted by interviewing monastics who then resided in Hong Kong. It would be valuable to integrate this perspective on the 'mainland China situation' with the 'Taiwan situation' of the time. Second, it would be important to trace the links between the three areas of Taiwan, Japan, and mainland China further, looking at 'Saṅgha exchanges' and other channels of network exchange and cooperation in the education sector. With regard to pre-modern China, we know of networks of student-monks operating within the East Asian region,³⁹ but how did those networks later evolve in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries? The same can be argued for the teacher-monks: how did Japanese monks contribute to transformations in curricula and teaching methods? What were the constructive but also conflictive relations between Saṅgha education in China, Japan, and Taiwan?⁴⁰ In other words, what is the modern 'education network' in this region? Recent works on Buddhist education in Japan,⁴¹ and on the Dharma and Saṅgha exchanges between Japan, China, and Taiwan prior to and immediately after 1945 have provided the field with some preliminary data.⁴² Welch himself outlined some of the Buddhist exchanges that happened between China and Japan in the 1950s,⁴³ but his historical analysis does not focus on the education sector in particular.

On the other hand, Dongchu published an entire volume on the history of Sino-Japanese Buddhist relations in 1970 (*Zhongri fojiao jiaotong shi*) and included some arguments on the subject even later in his *Zhongguo fojiao jindai shi*. Dongchu contributed an historical overview that covers from the early Imperial to the Republican period. He presented detailed lists of travelling monks and the spheres that were affected by Buddhist exchanges (including the impact of Japanese Buddhist universities on Chinese Buddhist education systems), and the history of different Sino-Japanese Buddhist associations (including the associations of exchange student-monks). The education context is, however, analyzed as peripheral to other concerns, and was not the core theme in Dongchu's argumentation. Finally, Dongchu's critical judgment on the 'poor' Dharma discipline of Japanese monastics did not facilitate a deeper and critical study of the channel of education in the Sino-Japanese Buddhist relations. More attention on the subject will also serve to expand on Welch's work, which has discussed

how the education-related motivations that monks had in going to Japan could have functioned as a 'cover' for more secular objectives, such as political and military agendas. Correspondence among Chinese monks is a promising source for this research. For instance, on 28 August 1949, the monk Dao'an 道安 records three reasons for going to Japan: (1) to study the state of recent developments in Japanese Buddhism; (2) to investigate the involvement of Japanese Buddhists in the Japanese army and thus in the conflict with China; (3) to make progress in his own cultivation.⁴⁴ Dao'an also reported that the funds necessary for going to study in Japan were all donated by Buddhist disciples, and this opens a further avenue of study on the financial sponsorship of these scholarly exchanges. Later, in a correspondence with the senior monk Daxing 達醒 dated to the end of September 1949, Dao'an pointed out again his interest in studying the situation of the Buddhist universities in Japan.⁴⁵ Since 1945 there have been delegations of monks from the mainland travelling to Taiwan to deliver lectures to student-monks and nuns, and mainland monks inviting Taiwanese student-monks to the mainland to participate in seminars.⁴⁶ Conversely, since the late 1980s increasing numbers of delegations of Taiwanese monks have been travelling to the mainland to participate in joint conferences to discuss the future of Saṅgha education.⁴⁷

Updating taxonomy and terminology: beyond the *old-and-new* binary

This meant that the traditional system of monastic education had to be reformed and expanded and that new kinds of monastic schools had to be created.⁴⁸

As far as terminology and taxonomy are concerned, Welch framed his assessment of Buddhist education in early twentieth-century China in terms of *old* and *new*. Reading through Welch's work, his use of the phrase '*new* education' is used to imply the teaching of non-Buddhist (secular) subjects, the hiring of lay teachers, and the adoption of 'modern teaching methods', which include the use of an entrance examination, a standardized marking system, blackboards, and the issuing of diplomas. On the other hand, *old* education is used as a synonym for a conservative and traditional system of learning (such as the Vinaya Hall and the Dharma Hall), and an 'old-fashioned atmosphere'. The *new* education involves the etic study of Buddhism as a philosophy, whereas the *old* system of learning is identified with the emic study of Buddhism as Dharma.

We see that in Welch the binary of *old* and *new* overlaps with a second binary of *traditional/conservative* and *modern*. Finally, Welch also interpreted the addition of secular subjects to the curricula of Buddhist academies as part of the *new*, whereas the mere textual study in Buddhism is identified as core of the *old*. Here we can detect the overlapping with a third binary of *sacred* and *secular*.

Looking at the Western scholarship on which Welch relied, we also find a widespread emphasis on Taixu in association with the concepts of 'modern', 'reform', and a 'modernised Buddhist message',⁴⁹ while the Buddhism beyond Taixu seems just to reflect an entity that was 'formerly Buddhism',⁵⁰ that had no place in early twentieth-century China. In other words, consciously or not, Welch is adopting the vocabulary that was used in Western accounts at the time.

A few decades later, Chen Bing and Deng Zimei, for instance, also wrote in terms of ‘recent new-style education’ (*jindai xinshi jiaoyu* 近代新式教育) and ‘new monks’ (*xinseng* 新僧.) This is one example of how the discourse of Buddhist education was successfully framed in the twentieth-century by the Chinese Saṅgha as well as the Buddhist laity and academics, who were active in contrasting new monks *xinseng* 新僧 against old monks *jiuseng* 舊僧.

In this paper I would like to go a step further and question these three binaries, and further propose alternative sets of concepts that would better frame the situation of Buddhist education in Republican China. What do *old* and *new* really stand for? Are we allowed to always associate tradition with *old* rather than aligning it with the modern instead? What do modern and conservative mean in the context of Buddhist education?

First of all, when it comes to those binaries, we should question who is giving those labels and why, and how those who received those labels react. For instance, students and teachers are two distinct communities who perceive the shared education structure in different ways. Furthermore, the early development of *foxueshe* and *foxueyuan* coincided with the establishment of larger organizational structures for Buddhist China, i.e. the founding of China-wide Buddhist associations. The different arrangement of the Buddhist network under one overall umbrella (i.e. the Chinese Buddhist Association) is thus part of the *new*, while the *old* is defined in terms of sectarian individualities.

In her PhD dissertation, Rongdao Lai pointed out another important aspect of this *new* and *old*. In the case of the binary of *xinseng* or *seng qingnian* and *jiuseng*, the binary labeling was used by representatives of *foxueyuan* education in a conscious attempt to distinguish themselves from those affiliated with hereditary monasteries who had opposed the reforms.⁵¹ Changes in the student–master relationship then also become related to the terms *old* and *new* education.⁵²

New and *old* also mean a different way for the Buddhist schools to relate to – and rely on – the government. Different levels and forms of intervention on the part of the central government in deciding the curriculum can also be identified with *new* and *old*, and different levels and modalities of intervention in society for the monastics link to a different form of citizenship. In other words, the *xinseng* also became *xinmin* 新民. The *new* education is related to a Buddhism that is defined in terms of ethical philosophy and science, whereas the *old* education is related to a Buddhism that is conceived as a religion of superstitious beliefs and rituals. *New* and *old* also identify a different material world in the system of learning, in terms of the materials used for teaching and methods of disseminating the learning outcomes. The *new* education also witnessed the development of lay Buddhism and the involvement of Buddhist laity in teaching and education activities.

The *new* education was aimed not only at training religious preachers, but also (and especially) at cultivating loyalty to the government and respect for the political ideologies of the Republic. Taixu himself defined the monastics who had graduated from his seminaries as *xin jumin* 新居民, but also specified that Saṅgha members were not merely common citizens (*putong jumin* 普通居民), they were religious teachers (*zong-jiaoshi* 宗教師) too.⁵³ Lai argues that the early Republican period witnessed ‘the emergence of a new discourse on Buddhist participation in nation-building projects.’⁵⁴ There is, in fact, a new political ideology in the Republican period that dictates a

different civil role for the Saṅgha. Nevertheless, at the same time we see a different form of the expected interaction between religious groups and ruling power that had been already a part of the *old* China.

Old and *new* systems of Buddhist education in the history of China are mirrors of two historical moments, but also overlapping features of the same period, and thus they are reflections of two different ways of dealing with changes in political ideology and the social function of religion. The contrast between *old* and *new* in Buddhist education, I would argue, reflects the co-existence of two forms of orthodoxy in Buddhism. The same founders of the *new* system of education still preferred the *old* system in certain respects, and similarly some of the defenders of the *old* systems were not completely rejecting the *new* models. For instance, as founder of *foxueyuan*, advocate of the addition of secular subjects to the curricula, the adoption of blackboard, exams, diplomas and so on, Taixu was a modernist and a promoter of the *new* education. At the same time, Taixu also maintained an *old* stance in relation to the scholarly approach to Buddhist scriptures, and was very critical of the *new* historical and critical approach to Buddhist studies that had been initiated in Japanese Buddhist academia. Student-monks per se were enthusiastic regarding the *newly* organised schools, but were puzzled about why they had to study biology and Japanese, which were among the *new* subjects.⁵⁵ The monk Yanpei 演培 (1917–1996) reported on these student-monks who were annoyed that they had to study Mozi 墨子 and the Japanese language.⁵⁶ Furthermore, Dongchu, who was trained in Taixu's *foxueyuan*, not only shared Taixu's concern for the Japanese Buddhist *new* methodologies in Buddhist studies, but was also critical of the structure and the secularization processes that those *foxueyuan* had been subject to.⁵⁷

Was there a *revival* in Buddhist education?

This section questions to what extent the system of learning for Buddhists partook of the overall idea of Buddhist revival that Welch explored but also contested. Quoting Welch:

'The purpose of all these schools,' in Chih-kuang's words, 'was to revive Buddhism (*hsing-chiao*), because for many years the clergy had emphasized religious cultivation, not lecturing and exegesis; and so monks did not have a deep enough understanding of the scriptures'.⁵⁸

Thus it is treble misleading to speak of 'the Buddhist revival in China'. First, 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. Second, it never affected the Chinese population as a whole. The 'occasional Buddhists' who made up the great majority of the laity and the 'call monks' who made up the great majority of the Saṅgha did not take part in it. Third, I believe, it concealed certain trends which, if they had continued, would have meant not a growing vitality for Buddhism but its eventual demise as a living religion.⁵⁹

Two points within the above statement are important for the context of Buddhist education: the ideas of 'series of innovations' vs. 'restoration of the past', and 'secular' vs. 'religious'. In the history of Saṅgha education in China, however, we have often seen

the learning of the Dharma being matched with the study of classics (especially Confucian literature) or elementary science. This was done in order to improve the level of general education within the Saṅgha. Again, a binary system of analysis does not seem to work.

Welch was not the first Western scholar who discussed and also contested the real presence of a Buddhist revival in China, however he was the only one who questioned the Christian bias that lies at the root of any argument regarding a revival in modern Chinese Buddhism.⁶⁰ Western and Japanese scholars alike have considered Welch's adoption of the term 'revival' in the title of the book, and addressed the issue of whether or not it is helpful to speak of a revival in Chinese Buddhism.⁶¹

Regarding Buddhist education specifically, Welch was critical of Taixu's great plans, and also clearly stated that in terms of numbers of students, the *old* education system was still far larger than the *new* one. Welch placed a great deal of emphasis on the transition from an uneducated Saṅgha to a time that saw the theorizing of different measures to tackle the lack of education within the Saṅgha. In Welch's assessment, the late Qing and early Republican eras witnessed the potential for a new beginning (or revival) rather than a concrete new beginning (or revival). Dongchu argued that there had been signs of a change already after 1898, but, like Welch, was aware of the limited results of that change in quantitative – if not qualitative – terms. It is particularly interesting that Dongchu does not use the term *fixing* very often in his work.

Starting from the late Qing and early Republican periods, we see a stronger presence of Buddhism in the secular sphere, and consequently of the public domain in the *new* Saṅgha education, but does this imply a revival? Buddhism and Buddhists had never disappeared, and thus ritual practices and ceremonies, lectures and Dharma teaching for resident monks, had never ceased. The political influence of the Buddhist community, however, had declined considerably since earlier Imperial times; in that sense, yes, there was a revival of the public presence of Buddhism, and consequently of the public presence in the new settings of Buddhist education. Has this revival really brought an amelioration of Buddhism or just an improvement of the status of Buddhism in social and political opinion? Did this revival mean a restoration or just the application of a wave of changes in accordance with the historical era? After 1945, Taiwan undertook a mission to cleanse the religious landscape of Japanese Buddhism, and became a new venue for the practice of Chinese Buddhism. Many Chinese Buddhists who had escaped the Republic of China and fled to Taiwan facilitated that shift, and the establishment of Buddhist seminaries and Dharma teaching in Taiwan. That was clearly instrumental for the successful restatement (rather than revival) of Chinese Buddhism on the island.

Chen and Deng used the term *fixing*, revival, to define what has characterized Buddhism from the late nineteenth century onward. According to Chen and Deng, the revival movement (*fixing yundong* 復興運動) was a response to the new times, and involved the Buddhist education context as well. Chen and Deng also speak in terms of 'huge changes' (*juda biange* 巨大變革) in the Buddhist community and in Buddhist education projects, and underline the challenge for the new relations between religion and politics as an important element within these changes. The reason behind Chen and Deng's adoption of the term *fixing* in relation to Buddhism in general and Saṅgha education in particular, however, appears similar to the rationale behind Welch's use of

that term in his own work. If Welch was responding to the contemporary Christian-biased view of Chinese Buddhism, Chen and Deng are representative of an intellectual China that is politically framed and is asked to present a certain portrayal of the new nation and of the role of Buddhism in it.

From another perspective, if we read Buddhism as one part of the dynamics that characterize China overall, then Buddhist education can be seen as partaking of the recent development of education in China. In that sense, can we talk of a revival? Or shall we just use the term in the sense of transformation and adaptation?⁶²

Conclusion: alternative networks and new research paths

Welch discussed Buddhist education through an analysis of specific cases and micro-histories. The field will definitely improve if those micro-histories can be contextualised within a diachronic macro-history as well as a synchronic macro-frame. In that respect, Dongchu has already provided us with some important arguments regarding the contextual background, but more work is necessary. Micro-histories need to be contextualised within a larger historical development, and analyzed in relation to other religions' education systems and non-religious social structures. Larger or different types of contexts help to unveil new connections and unexplored networks that have the potential to highlight dynamics and paradigms of actual religious practice on the ground. The network of Buddhist women, female institutes of education, the *san-jiao* network, and the interrelations between Buddhist education systems and structures of learning in Daoism and Confucianism, cross-strait networks and structures of exchange between greater China and the rest of East Asia: these are just a few examples of religio-social networks that ought to be considered as we move forward. The conceptual category of networks can be used in synchronic as well as diachronic research. As for the latter, the historical development of Buddhist education should be studied via a 'network-history' rather than following the classical 'dynastic history' that conceals important trajectories and dynamics.

The tension between *old* and *new* in the Buddhist education context in the first half of the twentieth-century China cannot be reduced to a binary either, because it uncovers the co-existence of overlapping theories and two forms of orthodoxy in Buddhism. An alternative would be to look at recent developments in Buddhist education from a Dharmic perspective, precisely through the often-used concept of *qili qiji* 契理契機. Therefore, instead of relying on the 'revival paradigm' only, we may look at recent forms of Buddhist education as adaptation to new times, an adaptation which, however, is not completely disconnected from the pre-modern and mainstream systems of learning. In fact, Buddhism and Buddhist education have changed in accordance with the new times, but, as in any situation of change, they could not embrace a complete transformation in that initial stage, as Welch's pessimistic view and Dongchu's negative view of Taixu's reforms make clear.

Notes

1. Holmes Welch, *The Buddhist Revival in China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 259.

2. Two examples are Xue Yu's book *Buddhism, War and Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 2004), and the special issue of *Global Buddhism* 10 (2009) edited by Hung-yok Ip on 'Buddhist Activism and Chinese Modernity'.
3. See for instance Francesca Tarocco, *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism: Attuning the Dharma* (London: Routledge, 2007); Philip Clart and Gregory Adam Scott eds., *Religious Publishing and Print Culture in Modern China: 1800–2012* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015); Stefania Travagnin ed., *Religion and Media in China: Insights and Case Studies from the Mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan* (London: Routledge, 2016).
4. The changes in the Buddhist landscape include the new functions that Buddhism has been asked to serve in the private and public spheres under the leadership of the Buddhist Association of China (BAC), see Ji Zhe, 'Secularization as Religious Restructuring: Statist Institutionalization of Chinese Buddhism', in *Chinese Religiosities: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, ed. Mayfair Mei-hui Yang (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008) 233–260; Ji Zhe, 'Chinese Buddhism as a Social Force: Reality and Potential of Thirty Years of Revival,' *Chinese Sociological Review* 45:2 (2013): 8–26; or alternative forms of assembly and practice developed by the laity vis-à-vis the Saṅgha, see Gareth Fisher, *From Comrades to Bodhisattvas: Moral Dimensions of Lay Buddhist Practice in Contemporary China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014). Furthermore, recent new patterns of globalization and the improvement of cross-strait relations have made mainland Buddhism and Buddhists engaging more closely with Taiwanese Buddhist groups, see for instance André Laliberté, 'The Growth of a Taiwanese Buddhist Association in China: Soft Power and Institutional Learning', *China Information* 27:1 (2012): 81–105.
5. An example of this could be the volume *Buddhism After Mao*, edited by Gareth Fisher, Ji Zhe and André Laliberté (forthcoming with University of Hawai'i Press), which is based on a multidisciplinary and multi-year project on the same topic.
6. For instance, publications by Johannes Prip-Møller (1899–1943) and the missionary Karl L. Reichelt (1877–1952) predated Welch's works. Alexandra David-Neel, L.A. Waddell and Giuseppe Tucci belong to a 'Pre-Welch Era' as well, however their works focused on Buddhism in Tibet.
7. See for instance the old but still used historical works Kenneth K.S. Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Arthur F. Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.)
8. These titles include Lewis Hodous, *Buddhism and Buddhists in China* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1923); James Bissett Pratt, *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism and a Buddhist Pilgrimage* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1928); Karl L. Reichelt, *Truth and Tradition in Chinese Buddhism: A Study of Chinese Mahayana Buddhism* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1927), 298 onwards is a short analysis on 'Present-Day Buddhism in China' (present day meaning the late Qing and early Republican periods.)
9. I am referring to, for example, Johannes Prip-Møller, *Chinese Buddhist Monasteries: Their Plan and Its Function as a setting for Buddhist monastic life* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937); Karl L. Reichelt, 'Buddhism in China at the Present Time', *International Review of Mission* (1937); Karl L. Reichelt, *The Transformed Abbot* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1954); J.E.C. Blofeld, *The Jewel in the Lotus: An Outline of Present Day Buddhism in China* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1948); Frank Millican, 'The Present Situation Among the Buddhists', *Chinese Recorder* 59 (28): 600.
10. See, for instance, reports published on the *Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal*, from 1868 to 1941.
11. For Dongchu and Guo Peng as historians of Han Buddhism see Rongdao Lai, 'Historiography as Legitimacy: Revisiting Historical Writing in Modern Chinese Buddhism', paper presented at the conference *Framing the Study of Religion in Modern China and Taiwan: Concepts, Methods and New Research Paths*, Groningen, 2015.
12. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival in China*, 103–120.
13. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival in China*, 10–15.

14. Holmes Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism 1900–1950* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 310–316.
15. Holmes Welch, *Buddhism under Mao* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 157–162.
16. Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism*, v.
17. Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism*, vi–vii.
18. Welch, *Buddhism Under Mao*, vii–viii.
19. On this subject see also the article on ‘Building and Reconstruction’ in this volume.
20. Rongdao Lai, ‘Praying for the Republic: Buddhist Education, Student-Monks, and Citizenship in Modern China (1911–1949)’, PhD diss., McGill University, 2014.
21. See for instance Ji Zhe, ‘Schooling Dharma Teachers: The Buddhist Academy System and Elite Monk Formation’, in *Buddhism After Mao*, ed. Fisher, Ji and Laliberté, forthcoming.
22. Douglas Gildow, ‘Educating Chinese Buddhist Monastics in the People’s Republic of China: Seminaries, Academia, and the State’, PhD diss., Princeton University, 2016.
23. Stefania Travagnin, ‘Concepts and Institutions for a New Buddhist Education: Reforming the Sangha Between and Within State Agencies’, *East Asian History* 39 (2014): 89–101; ‘From xue 學 to jiaoyu 教育: Conceptual understanding of “study” and “education” in modern Chinese Buddhism’, in *Concepts and Methods for the Study of Chinese Religions II: Intellectual History of Key Concepts*, ed. Scott and Travagnin (Berlin: De Gruyter, forthcoming).
24. Stefania Travagnin, ‘Political Adjusting(s) in the Minnan Buddhist Institute: Sanmin zhuyi 三民主义 and aiguo zhuyi 爱国主义 in the Sangha education context’, *Review of Religion and Chinese Society* 2:1 (2015): 21–50.
25. Thomas Borchert, *Educating Monks: Minority Buddhism on China’s Southwest Border* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2017); Ding, *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu*, 183–201.
26. The special issue ‘Fojiao jiaoyu zhuanlun’ 佛教教育專論 of *Putuo xuekan* 普陀學刊 2 (2015) is an example. See especially the following articles: Li Xiangping 李向平, ‘Fojiao jiaoyu de dangdai kunjing jiqi gaige lujing’ 佛教教育的當代困境及其改革路徑, 27–47; Deng Weiren 鄧偉仁, ‘Juannei ren yu juanwai ren, xueshu yu shijian: Xifang foxue yanjiu yu xiandai fojiaojiaoyu de wenti’ 圈內人與圈外人, 學術與實踐: 西方佛學研究與現代佛教教育的問題, 48–59; Tang Zhongmao 唐忠毛, ‘Zhongguo jindai fojiao jiaoyu xingban de Beijing jiqi leixing fenxi’ 中國近代佛教教育興辦的背景及其類型分析, 60–82; Long Yahui 龐亞輝, ‘Xuexiu xiangchang, heyi keneng? – Nanchuan fojiao guojia xiandai fojiao jiaoyu de wenti he qishi’ 學修相長, 何以可能? — 南傳佛教國家現代佛教教育的問題和啟示, 83–95; Wang Rongguo 王榮國, ‘Fuzhou gushan tongquansi yu jindai seng jiaoyu’ 福州鼓山涌泉寺與近代僧教育, 96–116.
27. See also Zhonghua Institute of Buddhist Studies, ed. *Taiwan foxueyuan suo jiaoyu nianlan* 台灣佛學院所教育年鑑 (Taipei: Fagushan, 2002).
28. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival in China*, 256.
29. Recent Chinese scholarship has offered some results of this cross-tradition analysis, see for instance Ding Gang, *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu* (2010), and Zhe Ji, *Religion, éducation et politique en Chine moderne / Religion, Education, and Politics in Modern China* (2011). Another example is the panel ‘Educating Religious Experts for the Nation: Institutions and Curricula for Christian, Han Buddhist and Daoist Specialists in Modern China’ presented at the AAR Annual Meeting, San Diego, November 2014.
30. See for instance *Figures of Buddhist Modernity in Asia*, edited by Justin McDaniel, Mark Rowe, and Jeffrey Samuels (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2016). This book is a collection of not-so-eminent and less well-known monks, who yet were crucial in the modernization of Buddhism.
31. The volume *Making Saints in Modern China*, ed. Ownby, Goossaert and Ji (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) is a collection of religious leaders in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some of them are Buddhists, yet quite well-known. Less eminent monks are among those discussed by Kan Zhengzong 闕正宗 in his *Taiwan gaoseng* 臺灣高僧 (Taipei: Puti changshu, 1996).

32. See Brooks Jessup, 'The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920–1956', PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 2011.
33. Nichols, Brian J., 'China's Quanzhou Kaiyuan Buddhist Monastery, Survival and Revival', PhD Diss., Rice University, 2011. See also Nichols's unpublished paper 'The Rise and Demise of Quanzhou Kaiyuan's School for Orphans (1925 to 2003)', presented at the Association of Asian Studies Annual Meeting, Toronto 2012.
34. See the studies by Ji, Gildow and Travagnin on post-1980 China mentioned in the previous section.
35. As for the more recent decades, see the unpublished paper by André Laliberté, 'Buddhism and Education in Contemporary China: State Commitments, Local Governments' Fiscal Constraints and Temple *zhuxue* 助学', presented at the Association of Asian Studies Annual Meeting, Toronto 2012.
36. Biographies of 'scholars-nuns' can be found already in the *Biqiuni zhuan* 比丘尼傳 (T 2063, 50), attributed to Baochang 寶唱 and compiled in early sixth century. On leadership in teaching of Chan nuns in the seventeenth century, see also Beata Grant, *Eminent Nuns: Women Chan Masters of Seventeenth-Century China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 58–76. The book *Tangdai de biqiuni* by Yuzhen Li (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1989) offers excellent material on nuns in the Tang dynasty, but not much on the education sector.
37. See for instance Ester Bianchi, *The Iron Statue Monastery 'Tiexiangsi': A Buddhist Nunnery of Tibetan Tradition in Contemporary China* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2001), which also partly covered the Buddhist institute for nuns opened within the nunnery Tiexiangsi 鐵像寺 in Sichuan (103–120); Darui Long, 'Buddhist Education in Sichuan', *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43:2 (2002): 59–78 (also on the nun Shi Longlian 釋隆蓮 and the institute for nuns' education hosted at Tiexiang Temple); Yuan Yuan, 'Chinese Buddhist Nuns in the Twentieth Century: A Case Study in Wuhan', *Global Buddhism* 10 (2009): 375–412. See also some of the biographies included in *Xu biqiuni zhuan* 續比丘尼傳, edited by Shi Zhenhua 釋震華 in 1940s under Taixu's request.
38. See for instance part of Shi Hengqing, *Putidaoshang de Shannuren* (Taipei: Dongda, 1995); Shi Zhaohui, 'Taiwan biqiuni de shehui guanhuai', *Xiangguang zhuangyan* June (1997): 102–111; Lingpo Yu, *Zhongguo jindai fomen renwu zhi: disiji* (Taipei: Huiju, 1998); Stefania Travagnin, 'Le Eredi di Guanyin: Ritratti di Maestre e Praticanti del Nuovo Buddhismo Taiwanese', MA diss., Ca'Foscari University, 2000; 'Ven. Miaoqing and Yuantong Chan Nunnery: A New Beginning for Monastic Women in Taiwan', in *Bridging Worlds: Buddhist Women's Voices Across Generations*, ed. by Karma Lekshe Tsomo (Taipei: Yuanquan press, 2004): 83–96; 'Master Yinshun and Buddhist Women in Taiwan: Fayuan and Yitong Nunneries, Disciples of Guanyin in Northwest Taiwan,' in *Out of the Shadows: Socially Engaged Buddhist Women*, ed. by Karma Lekshe Tsomo (Delhi: Indian Books Centre, 2005): 198–210; Chün-fang Yü. 'Bringing the Dharma to the People: The Audit Education Classes', in *Korean Nuns within the Context of East Asian Buddhist Traditions*, ed. by Hyewon (Seoul: Hanmaum Seoun, 2004): 352–373, and *Passing the Light: The Incense Light Community and Buddhist Nuns in Contemporary Taiwan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013).
39. See for instance Marcus Bingenheimer, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Japanese Student-Monks of the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries. Their Travels to China and their Role in the Transmission of Buddhism* (Munich: Iudicium, 2001).
40. See the article on 'Narratives of Buddhist Decline' in this volume.
41. See for instance Nakura Eisaburo, *Nihon Kyoikushi* (Tokyo: Yachiyo, 1984); Yutaka Tanigawa, *Meiji zenki no kyoiku kyoka bukkyo* (Kyoto: Shibankaku Shuppan, 2008); Hayashi Makoto, 'Shukyo kei Daigaku to Shukyogaku', *Kikan Nihon Shishoshi* 72 (2009): 71–88, and 'General Education and the Modernization of Japanese Buddhism', *Eastern Buddhist* 43 (2012): 133–152.

42. See for instance Shi Ruwu, 'Guangfu qianhou Taiwan fojiao zhi bijiao' (1990); Yuming Xu, 'Mingguo yilai liuri xueseng de lishi jiuyi yu Shengyan fashi dongdu liuxue', *Donghua wenren xuebao* 6 (2004): 195–222.
43. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival*, 160–173.
44. Shi Dao'an, *Daoan fashi yiji* (Taipei: Daoan fashi jinianhui, 1981), v.5, 233–234.
45. Shi Dao'an, *Daoan fashi yiji* (Taipei: Daoan fashi jinianhui, 1981), v.5, 238–240.
46. Du Zhongquan, 'Huixin dangchu ji shi, quanshui zai shan nai qing – Min tai ma xin hongfa gaoseng Huiquan fashi zhuan', *Shijie zongjiao xuekan* 18 (2011): 129–181.
47. See for instance Shi Shengyan, 'Liangpan foxue jiaoyu jiaoliu', *Rensheng* 180 (1998): 18–39.
48. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival*, 107.
49. James Bissett Pratt, *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism and a Buddhist Pilgrimage* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1928), 379–392.
50. Lewis Hodous, *Buddhism and Buddhists in China*, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1923).
51. Lai, 'Praying for the Republic: Buddhist Education, Student-Monks, and Citizenship in Modern China (1911–1949)', PhD diss., McGill University, 2014, 8.
52. Lai, 'Praying for the Republic', 10.
53. See Shi Taixu, 'Seng jiaoyu zhi mudi yu chengxu' (1931), 'Fojiao yingban zhi jiaoyu yu seng jiaoyu' (1931), 'Lun jiaoyubu wei ban sengxue shifu neizhengbu ziwen' (1933), 'Zhongguo de seng jiaoyu ying zenyang' (1938), 'Xiandai xuyao de seng jiaoyu' (1938).
54. Lai, 'Praying for the Republic', 84.
55. Shi Yinshun 釋印順, 'Youxin fahai liushi nian' 遊心法海六十年, in *Huayu ji* 華雨集, (Taipei: Zhengwen, 1993), v.3, 1–3. Besides mentioning that he had to attend courses of Japanese and English language, Yinshun classified subjects in the curriculum like science, philosophy and sociology as 'Western new disciplines' (*xifang de xinxue* 西方的新學) and 'secular studies' (*shixue* 世學).
56. Shi Yanpei 釋演培, *Yige fanyu seng de zibai* 一個凡愚僧的自白 (Taipei: Zhengwen, 1989), 50–63.
57. Shi Dongchu 釋東初, *Zhongguo fojiao jindai shi* 中國佛教近代史 (Taipei: Zhonghua fojiao wenhua guan, 1974), 217.
58. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival*, 14.
59. Welch, *The Buddhist Revival*, 264.
60. For instance, Lewis Hodous wrote: 'There are signs of a revival of Buddhism in China. Whether this is a tide, or a wave, only the future can reveal ... When the republic was established Buddhism felt a wave of reform. The monasteries established schools for monks and children', see Lewis Hodous, *Buddhism and Buddhists in China* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1923.) James Pratt argued this point more extensively: 'Even in distant America one hears a good deal about the Buddhist revival in China. The phase is becoming familiar and the subject attracts one's interest from afar ... There is thus both a ceremonial, a mystical, and an intellectual side to the Buddhist revival. There is also an active side ... But most of the energy of the Buddhist revival goes into efforts at reform within Buddhism and attempts to propagate it ... But the aim of the leaders of the Buddhist revival is not to reproduce the ancient Buddhism but to purify the religion from the superstitions that have gathered round it, to harmonize it within modern science, and to spread abroad a knowledge of the essentials of Mahayana thought ... The Buddhist revival is as yet quite unorganized and has but slight funds ... A slight effort toward Buddhist revival is also made by preaching or lecturing services ... I am not over sanguine as to the success of the Buddhist revival in China'; see James Bissett Pratt, *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism and a Buddhist Pilgrimage* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1928).
61. Such as those by Timothy H. Barrett (1972), Kenneth Ch'en (1969), Michael Gasster (1969), Leon Hurvitz (1969–1970), Hisao Inagaki (1971), Lewis R. Lancaster (1971), Van Phong Joseph Nguyen (1970), David Yu (1970).
62. Other takes on the revival paradigm have been recently published in Ji Zhe 汲喆, Tian shuijing 田水晶, and Wang Qiyuan 王启元 eds., *Ershi shiji zhongguo fojiao de liangci fuxing* 二十世紀中國佛教的兩次復興 (Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2016).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

- Barrett, Timothy H. "Book review of *The Buddhist Revival in China*" *Modern Asian Studies* 6:4 (1972):494–495.
- Bianchi, Ester. *The Iron Statue Monastery "Tiexiangsi": A Buddhist nunnery of Tibetan tradition in contemporary China*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2001.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. *A Biographical Dictionary of the Japanese Student-Monks of the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries. Their Travels to China and their Role in the Transmission of Buddhism*. München: Iudicium, 2001.
- Borchert, Thomas. *Educating Monks: Minority Buddhism on China's Southwest Border*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2017.
- Ch'en, Kenneth K.S. *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Ch'en, Kenneth K.S. "The Buddhist Revival in China by Holmes Welch." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 28:3 (1969):618–619.
- Chen Bing 陳兵, and Dong Zimei 鄧子美. *Ershi shiji zhi zhongguo fojiao* 二十世紀之中國佛教. Taipei: Xiandai chan chubanshe, 2003.
- Chen-hua (ed. and intr. by Chun-fang Yu, tr. by Denis C. Mair). *In Search of the Dharma. Memoirs of a Modern Chinese Buddhist Pilgrim*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publ, 1992.
- Clart, Philip and Scott, Gregory Adam eds., *Religious Publishing and Print Culture in Modern China: 1800-2012*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Deng Weiren 鄧偉仁, "Juannei ren yu juanwai ren, xueshu yu shijian: Xifang foxue yanjiu yu xiandai fojiaojiaoyu de wenti" 圈內人與圈外人, 學術與實踐: 西方佛學研究與現代佛教教育的問題. *Putuo xuekan* 普陀學刊 2 (2015):48–59.
- Ding Gang 丁剛. *Zhongguo fojiao jiaoyu* 中國佛教教育. Chengdu: Sichuan jiaoyu chubanshe, 2010.
- Du Zhongquan 杜忠全. "Huixin dangchu ji shi, quanshui zai shan nai qing – Min tai ma xin hongfa gaoseng Huiquan fashi zhuan 會心當處即是, 泉水在山乃清 – 閩台馬新弘法高僧會泉法師傳." *Shijie zongjiao xuekan* 世界宗教學刊 18 (2011):129–181.
- Eisaburo Nakura 英三郎名倉 ed. *Nihon Kyōikushi* 日本教育史. Tokyo: Yachiyo, 1984.
- Fisher, Gareth. *From Comrades to Bodhisattvas: Moral Dimensions of Lay Buddhist Practice in Contemporary China*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2014.
- Fung, Edward S.K. *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Gasster, Michael. "The Buddhist Reivival in China by Holmes Welch." In *The American Historical Review*, 75:1 (1969): 185–186.
- Gildow, Douglas. "Educating Chinese Buddhist Monastics in the People's Republic of China: Seminaries, Academia, and the State." PhD diss., Princeton: Princeton University, 2016.
- Grant, Beata. *Eminent Nuns: Women Chan Masters of Seventeenth-Century China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.
- Goossaert, Vincent, Ownby David, and Ji Zhe, eds. *Making Saints in Modern China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- He Jinlin 賀金林. "Qing mo seng jiaoyu hui yu siyuan xingxue de xingqi 清末僧教育會與寺院興學的興起." *Anhui shi xue* 安徽史學 6 (2005): 28–34.
- Hodous, Lewis. *Buddhism and Buddhists in China*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Huang, Fu-ch'ing. *Chinese Students in Japan in the Late Ch'ing Period*. Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1982.
- Hurvitz, Leon. "The Buddhist Revival in China by Holmes Welch." *Pacific Affairs* 42:4 (1969-1970):516–517.

- Inagaki, Hisao. "The Buddhist Revival in China by Holmes Welch." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 34:1 (1971):178–179.
- Jessup, James Brooks. "The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920–1956." PhD Diss., University of California Berkeley, 2010.
- Ji Zhe. "Secularization as Religious Restructuring: Statist Institutionalization of Chinese Buddhism." In *Chinese Religiosities: Afflictions of Modernity and State Formation*, edited by Mayfair Mei-hui Yang, 233–260. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- Ji Zhe, ed. *Religion, éducation et politique en Chine moderne/Religion, Education, and Politics in Modern China*. Extrême-Orient, Extrême-Occident n° 33, 2011.
- Ji Zhe. "Chinese Buddhism as a Social Force: Reality and Potential of Thirty Years of Revival." *Chinese Sociological Review* 45:2 (2013): 8–26.
- Ji Zhe 汲喆, Tian shuijing 田水晶, and Wang Qiyuan 王启元 eds. *Ershi shiji zhongguo fojiao de liangci fuxing* 二十世紀中國佛教的兩次復興. Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2016.
- Ji Zhe. "Schooling Dharma Teachers: The Buddhist Academy System and Elite Monk Formation." In *Buddhism After Mao*, edited by Gareth Fisher, Ji Zhe and André Laliberté (forthcoming).
- Kan Zhengzong 闕正宗. *Taiwan gaoseng* 臺灣高僧. Taipei: Puti changshu, 1996.
- Lai, Lei Kuan Rongdao. "Praying for the Republic: Buddhist Education, Student-Monks, and Citizenship in Modern China (1911–1949)." PhD Diss., McGill University, 2014.
- Lai, Rongdao. "Historiography as Legitimacy: Revisiting Historical Writing in Modern Chinese Buddhism." Paper presented at the conference *Framing the Study of Religion in Modern China and Taiwan: Concepts, Methods and New Research Paths*, Groningen, 2015.
- Laliberté, André. "Buddhism and education in contemporary China: State commitments, local governments' fiscal constraints and temple zhuxue 助學." Paper presented at the *Association of Asian Studies Annual Meeting*, Toronto 2012.
- Laliberté, André. "The Growth of a Taiwanese Buddhist Association in China: Soft Power and Institutional Learning." *China Information* 27:1 (2012): 81–105.
- Lancaster, Lewis R. "The Buddhist Revival in China by Holmes Welch." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 31 (1971):336–338.
- Li Silong. "The Practice of Buddhist Education in Modern China." *Chinese Studies in History* 46:3 (2013):59–78.
- Li Xiangping 李向平. "Fojiao jiaoyu de dangdai kunjing jiqi gaige lujing" 佛教教育的當代困境及其改革路徑. *Putuo xuekan* 普陀學刊 2 (2015): 27–47.
- Li Yuzhen 李玉珍. *Tangdai de Biqiuni* 唐代的比丘尼. Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1989.
- Long, Darui. "Buddhist Education in Sichuan." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 34:2 (2002):184–206.
- Long Yahui 龐亞輝. "Xuexiu xiangchang, heyi keneng? – Nanchuan fojiao guojia xiandai fojiao jiaoyu de wenti he qishi" 學修相長, 何以可能? — 南傳佛教國家現代佛教教育的問題和啓示. *Putuo xuekan* 普陀學刊 2 (2015): 83–95.
- Makoto Hayashi 淳林. "Shūkyō kei Daigaku to Shūkyōgaku 宗教系大学と宗教学." *Kikan Nihon Shishōshi* 季刊日本思想史 72 (2009):71–88.
- Makoto Hayashi. "General Education and the Modernization of Japanese Buddhism." *The Eastern Buddhist* 43:1/2 (2012):133–152.
- Nichols, Brian J. "China's Quanzhou Kaiyuan Buddhist Monastery, Survival and Revival." PhD Diss., Rice University, 2011.
- Nichols, Brian J. "The Rise and Demise of Quanzhou Kaiyuan's School for Orphans (1925 to 2003)." Paper presented at the *Association of Asian Studies Annual Meeting*, Toronto 2012.
- Nguyen, Van Phong Joseph. "Welch (Holmes) *The Buddhist Revival in China*" *Archives de sociologie des religions* 30 (1970):251.
- Pratt, James Bissett. *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism and a Buddhist Pilgrimage*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1928.
- Prip-Møller, Johannes. *Chinese Buddhist Monasteries: Their Plan and Its Function as a setting for Buddhist monastic life*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Reichelt, Karl L. *The Transformed Abbot*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1954.

- Shi Dao'an 釋道安. *Daoan fashi yiji* 道安法師遺集, Taipei: Daoan fashi jinianhui, 1981.
- Shi Dongchu 釋東初. *Minzhu shiji de fojiao* 民主世紀的佛教. Taipei: Zhonghua fojiao wenhua guan, 1964.
- Shi Dongchu 釋東初. *Zhongri fojiao jiaotong shi* 中日佛教交通史. Taipei: Zhonghua fojiao wenhua guan, 1968.
- Shi Dongchu 釋東初. *Zhongguo fojiao jindaishi* 中國佛教近代史. Taipei: Zhonghua fojiao wenhua guan, 1974.
- Shi Hengqing 釋恆情. *Putidaoshang de Shannuren* 菩提道上的善女人. Taipei: Dongda, 1995.
- Shi Hongyin 釋宏印. "Tan seng jiaoyu 談僧教育." *Putishu* 菩提樹 315 (1979):32.
- Shi Ruwu 釋如悟 1990. 'Guangfu qianhou Taiwan fojiao zhi bijiao' 光復前後台灣佛教之比較. Paper presented at the *Second International Symposium on politico-religious relations in China*.
- Shi Shengyan 釋聖嚴. "Liangpan foxue jiaoyu jiaoliu 兩岸佛學教育交流." *Rensheng* 人生 180 (1998):18–39.
- Shi Shengyan 釋聖嚴. *Liuri jianwen* 留駙見聞. Taipei: Fagushan, 1999.
- Shi Taixu 釋太虛. "Seng jiaoyu zhi mudi yu chengxu 僧教育之目的與程序." In *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書, v.9, edited by Shi Yinshun 釋印順, 473–480. Hong Kong: Taixudashi quanshu chuban weiyuanhui [lecture originally delivered in 1931].
- Shi Taixu 釋太虛. "Fojiao yingban zhi jiaoyu yu seng jiaoyu 佛教應辦之教育與僧教育." In *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書, v.9, edited by Shi Yinshun 釋印順, 481–488. Hong Kong: Taixudashi quanshu chuban weiyuanhui [lecture originally delivered in 1931].
- Shi Taixu 釋太虛. "Lun jiaoyubu wei ban sengxue shifu neizhengbu ziben 論教育部為辦僧學事覆內政部咨文." In *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書, v.9, edited by Shi Yinshun 釋印順, 489–492. Hong Kong: Taixudashi quanshu chuban weiyuanhui [lecture originally delivered in 1933].
- Shi Taixu 釋太虛. "Zhongguo de seng jiaoyu ying zenyang 中國的僧教育應怎樣." In *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書, v.9, edited by Shi Yinshun 釋印順, 492–497. Hong Kong: Taixudashi quanshu chuban weiyuanhui [lecture originally delivered in 1938].
- Shi Taixu 釋太虛. "Xiandai xuyao de seng jiaoyu 現代需要的僧教育." In *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書, v.9, edited by Shi Yinshun 釋印順, 498–502. Hong Kong: Taixudashi quanshu chuban weiyuanhui [lecture originally delivered in 1938].
- Shi Xuming 釋續明. "Dui Xinzhu nuzhong foxueyuan biye tongxue xunci' 對新竹女眾佛學院畢業同學訓辭." In *Xuming fashi yizhu ji* 續明法師遺著集, 2 vols, 1307. Taipei: Zhengwen, 1986 [lecture originally delivered in 1960].
- Shi Yanpei 釋演培. *Yige fanyu seng de zibai* 一個凡愚僧的自白. Taipei: Zhengwen, 1989.
- Shi Yinshun 釋印順, "Youxin fahai liushi nian" 遊心法海六十年, in *Huayu ji* 華雨集, vol.3. Taipei: Zhengwen, 1993.
- Shi Zhaohui 釋昭慧. "Cong Taixu dashi dui seng jiaoyu zhi gaige, ping xiandai zhongguo seng jiaoyu zhi fazhan 從太虛大師對僧教育之改革, 評現代中國僧教育之發展." *Shizikong* 獅子孔 29:1 (1990): 23–29.
- Shi Zhaohui 釋昭慧. "Taiwan biqiuni de shehui guanhuai 台灣比丘尼的社會關懷." In *Xiangguang zhuangyan* 香光莊嚴 June (1997):102–111.
- Tang Zhongmao 唐忠毛. "Zhongguo jindai fojiao jiaoyu xingban de Beijing jiqi leixing fenxi" 中國近代佛教教育興辦的背景及其類型分析. *Putuo xuekan* 普陀學刊 2 (2015): 60–82.
- Tanigawa Yutaka 谷川 穰. *Meiji zenki no kyōiku kyōka bukkyō* 明治前期の教育教化仏教. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2008.
- Tarocco, Francesca. *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism: Attuning the Dharma*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "Le Eredi di Guanyin: Ritratti di Maestre e Praticanti del Nuovo Buddhismo Taiwanese." MA diss., Ca'Foscari University, 2000.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "Ven. Miaoqing and Yuantong Chan Nunnery: A New Beginning for Monastic Women in Taiwan." In *Bridging Worlds: Buddhist Women's Voices Across Generations*, edited by Karma Lekshe Tsomo, 83–96. Taipei: Yuanquan Press, 2004.

- Travagnin, Stefania. "Research in Practice? The role of the scholar-monk in contemporary Chinese Buddhism." Paper presented at Taiwan Studies Seminar, London, SOAS, 2 December 2004.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "Master Yinshun and Buddhist Women in Taiwan: Fayuan and Yitong Nunneries, Disciples of Guanyin in Northwest Taiwan." In *Out of the Shadows: Socially Engaged Buddhist Women*, edited by Karma Lekshe Tsomo, 198–210. Delhi: Indian Books Centre, 2005.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "Buddhist Nuns and Female Buddhism in Taiwan. Historical Patterns and Engendered Values." *World Fellow Buddhist Review*, 44:1 (2007):6–15.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "Concepts and Institutions for a New Buddhist Education: Reforming the Saṅgha Between and Within State Agencies." *East Asian History* 39 (2014):89–101.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "Political Adjusting(s) in the Minnan Buddhist Institute: *Sanmin zhuyi* 三民主義 and *aiguo zhuyi* 愛國主義 in the Sangha education context", *Review of Religion and Chinese Society*, 2:1 (2015): 21–50.
- Travagnin, Stefania ed., *Religion and Media in China: Insights and Case Studies from the Mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan*. London and New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Travagnin, Stefania. "From xue 學 to jiaoyu 教育: Conceptual understanding of 'study' and 'education' in modern Chinese Buddhism", in *Concepts and Methods for the Study of Chinese Religions II: Intellectual History of Key Concepts*, edited by Gregory Adam Scott and Stefania Travagnin. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, forthcoming.
- Tsai, Chin-ling. "Buddhist education and the rise of the Buddhist university in Taiwan." PhD diss., University of Bristol, 2012.
- Xu Yuming 許育銘. "Minguo yilai liuri xueseng de lishi jiuyi yu Shengyan fashi dongdu liuxue 民國以來留日學僧的歷史軌跡與聖嚴法師東渡留學." *Donghua wenren xuebao* 東華文人學報 6 (2004):195–222.
- Xue Yu. *Buddhism, War and Nationalism*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Yu, Chun-fang. "Bringing the Dharma to the People: The Audit Education Classes." In *Korean Nuns without the Context of East Asian Buddhist Traditions*, edited by Hyewon, 352–373. Seoul: Hanmaum Seoun, 2004.
- Yu, David C. "The Buddhist Revival in China by Holmes Welch." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 38:1 (1970):80–84.
- Yuan Yuan. "Chinese Buddhist Nuns in the Twentieth Century: A Case Study in Wuhan," *Global Buddhism* 10 (2009): 375–412.
- Wang Rongguo 王榮國. "Fuzhou gushan tongquansi yu jindai seng jiaoyu" 福州鼓山涌泉寺與近代僧教育. *Putuo xuekan* 普陀學刊 2 (2015): 96–116.
- Welch, Holmes. *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism 1900-1950*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Welch, Holmes. *The Buddhist Revival in China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Welch, Holmes. *Buddhism Under Mao*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Wright, Arthur F. *Buddhism in Chinese History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Zhang Mantao 張曼濤 ed. *Zhong-Ri fojiao guanxi yanjiu* 中日佛教關係研究. Taipei: Dacheng wenhua chubanshe, 1978.
- Zhonghua Institute of Buddhist Studies, ed. *Taiwan foxueyuan suo jiaoyu nianlan* 台灣佛學院所教育年鑑. Taipei: Fagushan, 2002.
- Zhou Yuru 周玉茹. *Taiwan fojiao de sengqie jiaoyu: Yi foxueyuan wei zhongxin* 台灣佛教的僧伽教育：以佛學院為中心. Taizhong: Taiping ciguangsi, 2013.