Research Articles

To Beg or to Cook? Food Ethics, Cross Cultural Borrowing, and the Meal Rituals of Nanlin Buddhist Nuns in Central Taiwan

Shi Zhiru, Pomona College*

Abstract: This paper studies how the female Buddhist community of South Forest Nunnery (Ch. Nanlin sengniyuan 南林僧尼苑) in central Taiwan integrates alms begging into their monastery architecture and food practices. Using vinaya literature, with a focus on the Pāli vinaya of Theravāda communities in Southeast Asia and the Chinese version of the Dharmaguptaka vinaya called *Vinaya in Four Parts* (Ch. *Sifen lü* 四分律), as well as ethnographic notes from field research in Jiayi 嘉義, Taiwan and Bagan, Myanmar, I show that the alms food begging initiative at South Forest was implemented as part of broader Taiwanese Buddhist monastic reforms designed to emulate the economic model of Buddhist right livelihood prescribed in early Indian Buddhism. Through integrating alms begging at daily meals, South Forest nuns ritually enact the everyday behavior that they believe the Buddha and his early community observed and prescribed in the monastic codes. Drawing from cross-cultural practices, meal rituals at South Forest materialize the ethics of right livelihood as a distinctive food culture that sets the nuns apart from their peers in Taiwan. South Forest ritually (re)structures the food culture in the Chinese monastery through reimagining eating rites, so that meals become the material signifier of paradigm shifts in the economics and ethics of daily monastic life. The paper first provides emic descriptions and then engages in etic analyses that incorporate historical and ritual perspectives to address the religious significance of South Forest's adoption of alms practice. This combination of perspectives circumvents the constraints of anthropological approaches that analyze

 https://dx.doi.org/10.66775/xbs65942

Buddhist monastic culture of alms through contemporary theories of the gift economy, and often prioritize social dynamics and politics of identity formation over religio-cultural impetus. Rather than focus on social or political impact, South Forest nuns' reimagining of food practices is an attempt to proximate the Buddha's actions and moral charisma through constant ritual repetition. Ultimately, their reform of the monastic food economy occurs primarily through ritual performance.

Keywords: Alms, food ethics, meal rites, monastery kitchen, Nanlin [South Forest] Nunnery, Taiwanese monastic reform, Burmese Buddhism, vinaya, vegetarianism

Each morning at 6am at South Forest Nunnery (Ch. Nanlin sengniyuan 南林僧尼苑) in the township of Yüchi 魚池 in the mountainous county of Nantou 南投 in central Taiwan, nuns assemble on the monastery grounds to walk in procession to an area some distance from the monastery, designated as the "Alms Station" (*tuobo zhan* 托鉢站).[1] The nuns dress themselves in Indian-style robes of maroon color with an outer robe of patched squares, the number of which is emblematic of their ordination rank.[2] Carrying alms bowls in maroon pouches slung crossbody, the

* I am grateful to Kate Crosby, Pyi Kyaw, and Laura Anderson for organizing the "Buddhism and Food Ethics" Conference at the University of Oxford, U.K. (April 2024) where I first presented this paper. Kate Crosby further gave editorial suggestions on a shorter manuscript version of this essay. I also thank Kenneth Dean and Jack Chia Meng Tat for inviting me to speak at the Foo-Hai Buddhism seminar at Asia Research Institute, Singapore (August 2024) where I reframed the paper as a study on ritual theory. Jeffery Aung and Leo Chen, two wonderful students at Pomona College, read the final manuscript for remnant inconsistencies and oversights; I much appreciate their curious questions and deep engagement with the project. Above all, I also thank the South Forest nuns for their hospitality during my field research. I alone am responsible for all errors that still remain in the published version.

1 South Forest Nunnery was founded in 1982. Today, its community has about seventy permanent residential nuns. The monastery's name is derived from the historic Nanlin Monastery (Nanlin Si 南林寺) in the city of Nanjing in the province of Jiangsu in eastern China, which was the site of the first dual precept transmission for ordaining Chinese Buddhist nuns in 434.

2 Indian-style robes are called *tricīvara* because they comprise a set of three: an inner garment (*antarāvāsaka*), an upper garment (*uttarāsaṅga*), and outer garment (*saṅghāṭī*). For the description in the *Vinaya in Four Parts*, see *Sifen lü*, T 1428.22.601c–5c.

nuns mindfully proceed downhill until they arrive at the refectory building in the Alms Station (plates 1–3). In the serving room in the refectory, lay donors wait, standing palms together over metal trays and steel pots brimming with piping hot or refreshingly chilled food. As each nun walks past, donors take turns to heap food which they have prepared into the nun's bowls (plates 4–7). This ritual of giving and receiving alms food is enacted twice each day, at breakfast and lunch. For the midday meal, the nuns assemble at 10:45am to begin processing to the Alms Station, so that they can complete the communal meal by noon, after which they observe the monastic rule to abstain from consuming solid food.[3]



Plate 1. South Forest nuns assembling to walk to the Alms Station. Jiayi, Taiwan.[4]

[3] See *bhikkhu pācittiya* rule 37 and *bhikkhuni pācittiya* rule 120 in the Pāli vinaya; also see Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition*, 68–69. For Chinese Buddhist practice, see Tso, "The Practice of 'No-Eating After Noontime' as Recorded in Chinese Sangha History and the Problems It Faces" and Chiu, "The Practice of Fasting After Midday in Contemporary Buddhist Nunneries." In the *Vinaya in Four Parts* (*Sifen lü*, T 1428.22.662c), medicine is allowed after midday if a monastic is ill; moreover, the five medicinal foods—namely, ghee, fresh butter, sesame oil, honey, and molasses—are allowed at prescribed times (T 1428.22.869c).

[4] Unless otherwise indicated, all photos were taken by the author during her field trips in 2017.



Plate 2. South Forest nuns en route to the Alms Station. Jiayi, Taiwan.



Plate 3. Close up, Alms bowl and pouch. Courtesy of South Forest Nunnery.

The Indian robes, daily alms collection, and meal routine all call to mind Southeast Asian Theravāda communities, rather than Chinese Buddhist monasticism. [5]

[5] South Forest nuns understand the color huaise 壞色 in the Vinaya in Four Parts to be deep red dye (Sifen lü, T 1428.22.615c, 616c, 617a, 617b, 735c). Different colors are mentioned across different textual renditions of the monastic rules. However, the original robe used in India was made of patched cloths of different shades, so that ochre was likely an "uneven" color (Wijayaratna,

Indeed, South Forest is quite often mistaken to be part of the global Theravāda movement, even though their practices do not fit neatly into "Theravāda" Buddhism.[6] While practices like the Alms Station are certainly derived from Southeast Asian monasticism, South Forest nuns hardly characterize themselves as Theravāda, and this female community continues to uphold the Vinaya in Four Parts (Ch. Sifen lü 四分律, Skt. Dharmaguptakavinaya), the normative vinaya text in Chinese monasticism.[7] Why, then, do South Forest nuns adopt seemingly Theravāda monastic observances such as alms begging?



Plate 4. Lay donors waiting in the serving room to offer alms meal to the nuns. Jiayi, Taiwan.

Buddhist Monastic Life, 32, 37). The color maroon is used in Myanmar, but other Theravāda cultures wear saffron or ochre robes.

6 When South Forest Nunnery is mentioned in modern scholarship, it is typically in the context of monastic discipline in Taiwan or so-called "global Theravāda" developments. See Chen, "Nanchuan fojiao zai Taiwan de fazhan yu yingxiang: quanqiuhua de fenxi guandian."

7 *Sifen lü*, T 1428.22, 567a–1014b, translated in 410–412 CE by Buddhayaśas (ca. 384–417) and Zhu Fonian (n.d.). For the text of the *prātimokṣa*, or monastic rules for *bhikṣu*s, see *Sifen seng jieben* 四分僧戒本 [Dharmaguptaka Monastic Rules for Saṅgha], T 1430.22.1023a–30c; for *bhikṣunī*s, see *Sifen biqiuni jieben*, T 1431.22.1030c–41a.



Plate 5. Close-up, trays of food in the serving room. Jiayi, Taiwan.



Plate 6. Nuns are receiving food from lay donors. Jiayi, Taiwan.



Plate 7. Alms bowl filled with food. Jiayi, Taiwan.

Using vinaya literature, especially the Pāli vinaya and the Chinese *Vinaya in Four Parts*, as well as ethnographic notes from my field research in July 2017, I show that the alms food begging initiative at South Forest was implemented as part of broader Taiwanese Buddhist monastic reforms designed to emulate the economic model of Buddhist right livelihood prescribed in early Indian Buddhism. Through integrating alms begging at mealtimes, South Forest nuns ritually connect themselves to the Buddha and his early community, to affirm daily their resolution to enact right livelihood as part of broader monastic reforms. Drawing from cross-cultural practices, meal rituals at South Forest materialize the ethics of right livelihood as a distinctive food culture that sets the nuns apart from their peers in Taiwan.

Building an Alms Station in Taiwan

South Forest's founder, bhikṣunī or nun elder Weijun 惟俊 (1947–2020), was a native of Guangdong 廣東 in South China who migrated with her family to Hong

Kong in 1951.[8] Subsequently, she went to England and the United States for her education, after which she settled down in Canada as an accountant until 1979 when she met the educator nun Xiaoyun 曉雲 (1913–2004). Shortly after, she left her job and family for Taiwan to teach English at the Lotus Buddhist Academy (Lianhua xuefoyuan 蓮華學佛院), a female Buddhist center which Xiaoyun founded on Yangming mountain 陽明山 in northern Taipei.[9] There, Weijun met the vinaya monk Guanghua 廣化 (1924–1996). Born in the province of Jiangxi 江西 in mainland China, Guanghua entered Taiwan during wartime as a military officer traveling on the marine fleet of the Republican Chinese army. He subsequently quit military service, became a monk, and resided at South Putuo Monastery (Nanputuo si 南普陀寺) in the city of Taizhong 台中 in central Taiwan.[10] Styling himself as a vinaya teacher, Guanghua was harshly critical of Taiwanese monastic discipline and wielded a lasting influence on Weijun who herself received ordination in 1982 under the nun Shi Hong'en 釋宏恩.[11]

Emulating Guanghua, Weijun sought to institutionalize an alms begging initiative in her community at South Forest.[12] In March 2005, she assigned her nun disciple Shi Jianning 釋見寧 to set up an alms station on the monastery's grounds. At first, the nuns installed a temporary station comprising a big tent that could hardly withstand seasonal typhoons. A steel building was soon erected in its place where, regardless of climate, the nuns gathered daily to collect alms food. Shortly after, the community purchased a plot of land within walkable distance from the

8 For a short biography, see Nanlin sengni yuan, "Weijun heshangni luezhuan."

9 On Xiaoyun, also called Huiwan, see Li, "The Legend of Bhikṣuṇī Huiwan," 11–38.

10 South Putuo Monastery is named after Mount Potala (Putuo shan 普陀山), the abode of the bodhisattva Guanyin in Chinese mythology. In 1996, Guanghua held a threefold platform transmission of *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣunī* precepts at South Putuo Monastery which lasted for six months and was hailed as the longest ordination ritual in modern Chinese Buddhist history. See Bianji weiyuanhui, *Guanghua lüshi yonghuai ji*, 347–64.

11 Guanghua evidently advised Weijun to seek ordination under a female teacher (Weijun, interview by author, July 2017).

12 South Forest nuns Shi Jianguo and Shi Jianyin, interview by author, July 2017.

main monastery. Permanent concrete architecture was constructed on this space, and the site was henceforth named “Alms Station.”



Plate 8. Refectory called Hall of Five Contemplations. Jiayi, Taiwan.

The Alms Station comprises three buildings, with the main architecture being the refectory called the Hall of Five Contemplations (*wuguan tang* 五觀堂), a name adopted from traditional Chinese monasteries (plate 8). Besides a dining space, the Hall of Five Contemplations also has an indoor kitchen similar to traditional Chinese monasteries and a serving room which functions as the designated space for laity to offer alms food (plates 9, 10). Next to the refectory is a three-story lodging house for laywomen donors to sleep over, while directly opposite stands a one-story bungalow that doubles as lodging for male donors. A nearby warehouse stores dishware, kitchen utensils, and other cooking props that the donor volunteers use to cook or serve the meal. Over the years, the number of aspiring alms donors escalated, so the community set up a year-round roster for potential donors to register their participation in the alms meal program. Donors often have to wait for almost a year before a time slot opens for them to offer a meal to the nuns. Individuals, families, groups, and even entire organizations will sign up as donors for a meal on specific dates and times. Ideally, lay donors would come themselves

to cook and offer the meal(s) to the nuns, and most donors generously register to do both. However, South Forest also allows donors who are unable to come personally to contribute monetarily to the cost of a meal, whereas less financially able donors may opt to contribute only manual labor and time to cook the meal *in situ*. For every meal, some donors will be physically present to prepare, cook, and serve food to the community as part of daily alms practice. Donors preparing breakfast stay in the temporary lodgings the night before to ensure they will have breakfast ready by 6am. The donors themselves see to all details of the meal, such as menu planning, grocery shopping, produce transportation, food preparation, meal serving, and after-meal cleanup, freeing the nuns from all tasks related to daily sustenance. Moreover, in compliance with the monastic rule against food storage, donors typically clear away and bring home leftover food after the alms meal.[13] While South Forest nuns eventually plan to train lay leaders to run the Alms Station, at the time of my field research, the nuns still oversaw the operation of mealtimes even if they did not themselves prepare or cook the meals.

[13] This is the *pācittiya* rule 38 for monks and *pācittiya* rule 121 for nuns in the Pāli vinaya, which is cited by Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 65. Cf. *bhikṣunī pācittika* rules 24 and 25 (*Sifen lü,* T 1428. 22.735a-b), translated into English by Heirman, *Rules for Nuns According to the Dharmagutakavinaya*, vol. 2, 534–35; Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkhunī Patimokkha of the Six Schools*, 183. Also see chapter four on nuns in Kong, "Food and Craving in Early Buddhist Monasticism Focusing on Pali Literature," 188–226.



Plate 9. Kitchen in Alms Station. Jiayi, Taiwan.



Plate 10. Stove and wok in kitchen. Jiayi, Taiwan.

Cross-Cultural Histories of Alms Food and Monastic Kitchens

The Sanskrit term *bhikṣu*, meaning "one who desires a share [of food]," refers to a fully ordained Buddhist monk.[14] Therefore, by their appellation, monastics are depicted as depending on alms for their living— a lifestyle evidenced in the numerous references to the Buddha and his monks on alms rounds scattered across Indian Buddhist literature. Moreover, the Pāli vinaya declares alms food to be the *only* proper sustenance for monastics:

> Monks must not eat food which they have not received from someone else's hands. If a monk does eat food which he has not received from someone else's hands, he commits an offense in the Pācittiya category.[15]

Similar rules are also prescribed in the *Vinaya in Four Parts* on which South Forest nuns rely as their monastic disciplinary text.[16] Furthermore, the Pāli vinaya also forbids monastics from cooking their own food:

> Food cooked in the monastery must not be consumed. Monks who cook in the monastery, or who eat what has been cooked there, are guilty of breaking the law.[17]

However, this rule was reversed elsewhere in the Pāli vinaya to accommodate famine conditions. In an anecdote in the *Mahāvagga* chapter, during a famine the Buddha was said to have permitted monks first to store dry food and then cook food

---

[14] Etymologically, *bhikṣu* is the nominal form of *bhikṣate*, "to beg, to obtain," deriving from the root verb *bhikṣ*, "to wish, to share, to partake." In early India, *bhikṣu* is a beggar or mendicant, especially a brahman in the fourth period of his life where he subsists on alms. Early Indian Buddhists adopted the term for Buddhist mendicants, specifically fully ordained monks. Fully ordained nuns were called *bhikṣunī*.

[15] *Bhikkhu pācittiya* rule 40 and *bhikkhunī pācittiya* rule 122 in the Pāli vinaya; see Oldenborg, *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ*, vol. 4, 90, translated by Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 58.

[16] *Pācittika* rule 26 in the *Sifen lü* T 1428.22.735a, translated by Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, vol. 2, 534–35; Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkhunī Patimokkha*, 183.

[17] Oldenborg, *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ*, vol. 1, 211; translated by Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 65.

inside the monastery.[18] Prior to the famine, lay helpers were cooking food at the monastery for the monks but when the famine broke out, these lay helpers began hoarding the food intended for monks. The Buddha then revised the rule and permitted cooking and preserving food on monastery grounds:

> I allow you to do your cooking yourself; I also allowed you to eat what has been dried and cooked in the monastery, and what you have cooked yourself.[19]

As I will show later, a similar anecdote appears in the Chinese translation of the *Sarvāstivādavinaya* but with remarkable disparities that could explain Chinese development of monastic kitchens. Moreover, the *Khandhaka* book of the Pāli vinaya[20] refers to monastic appointments overseeing food, gives permission to store and cook food, and also stipulates special dispensations for those going on a journey––all of which suggest modifications to the extant food rules.[21] In short, the Pāli vinaya rules record an array of attitudes toward food and cooking that index inevitable changes accompanying the broader transition from eremitic to cenobitic monasticism in early India.

With the construction and gifting of permanent buildings and land by wealthy donors, cenobitic monasticism increasingly took centerstage in the Buddhist landscape of early India.[22] Originally conceived as residences for rain retreats, permanent buildings soon became year-long residences where monastic communities eventually settled down, giving up the itinerant life. Jetavana Monastery (Qiyuan jingshe 祇園精舍) in the city of Śrāvastī was one such early

---

18 Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 66.

19 Oldenborg, *Vinaya Piṭikaṃ*, vol. 1, 212; translated by Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 66.

20 The *Khandhaka* book consists of the chapters on *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga*.

21 The *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga* chapters enumerate monastic officer appointments for handling food such as the dispenser of meals who decides which monks to send to which house; the superintendent who distributes rice gruel, solid food, and fruit, as well as a more general storekeeper (Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 64). These roles suggest changes to the monastic rule against storing food.

22 Dutt, *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India*, 58–65.

site.[23] In the Chinese version of the *Sarvāstivādavinaya* called *Vinaya in Ten Recitations* (Ch. *Shisong lü* 十誦律, Skt. *Dasabāṇavāravinaya*),[24] when the donor Anāthapiṇḍada ("he who gives alms to the helpless") aspired to build lodgings for the Buddha and his disciples during their travels through the city of Śrāvastī, his list of the facilities in the monastery included a kitchen (*shichu* 食廚).[25] Archaeological reports have identified cooking areas among the ruins of Jetavana, although such ruins all date to a later period as the original buildings were destroyed before the seventh century when Chinese pilgrim monk Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664) visited the site.[26] Excavated ruins of Nalanda Monastery at Bihar reveal structures that are suspected to be the remains of a large furnace used for cooking.[27] Burnt rice discovered *in situ* further confirmed that the space was once used as a monastery kitchen. Similarly, the ruins of Nagarjuna Hill (Skt. *Nāgārjunakoṇḍā*) also contain at least one monastery site that had a kitchen and a refectory.[28] Evidently, by the early medieval period in India, kitchens were fairly common in Buddhist monasteries. Moreover, Gregory Schopen and Shayne Clarke convincingly show that a range of complex relationships existed between the monastery and the laity, and monasteries and monks owned possessions including land and servants.[29] Therefore, the realities of medieval Indian monasticism

---

23 The story of building Jetavana Monastery is recounted in several Buddhist literary sources; see Shi, "Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana: Imagining a Utopian Monastery in Early Tang," 84–125.

24 *Shisong lü*, T 1435.23.1a–470b.

25 *Shisong lü*, T 1435.23.244b. The term *shichu* appears elsewhere in the same text (4c, 183b, 190a, 244c, 275c).

26 *Datang Xiyu ji*, T 2087.51.899b. Cf. to the report by the fourth- to fifth-century pilgrim monk, Faxian 法顯, who saw two layers of the original building during his travels in India; see *Gaoseng Faxian zhuan*, T 2085.51860b.

27 For a picture of the remains of a big furnace, see Debazoti1985, "File:Remnant of the ancient kitchen of Nalanda Mahavihara.jpg."

28 Kim, "Constructing the Buddha's Life in Early Monastic Arrangements at Nagarjunakonda"; site 4 in Kim's labeling has a kitchen and a refectory. A few other monasteries in the vicinity also had refectories and possibly cooking areas.

29 Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident of Medieval Indian Monasteries," and also essays in Clarke, *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*.

contradicted the vinaya prescription of alms food as the only proper livelihood for monastics.

Nonetheless, Theravāda Buddhists of Southeast Asia who follow the Pāli vinaya continue to perpetuate the rhetorical idealization of monastic economy centered on almsgiving by the laity, even if monasteries do not or cannot adhere strictly to it in praxis.[30] Today, in Buddhist Southeast Asian countries like Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and Thailand, the sight of monks on alms rounds "begging" for food is still fairly common, even if increasing industrialization and urbanization have constrained the practice geographically. Some Theravāda forest saṅghas who opt to strictly observe the vinaya will only eat food collected on alms rounds or given by invitation.[31] Some monks might also adhere to the vinaya prohibition against handling and possessing cash money, relying on lay attendants for such tasks.[32] Nevertheless, kitchens and food preparation spaces are certainly present in Southeast Asian monasteries, which is not surprising since the Pāli vinaya itself included revisions to the rules against cooking and storing food in the monastery. Richard Gombrich reported that few monasteries in contemporary Sri Lanka were so poor that they had to depend solely on alms for food.[33] In fact, at the monastery where he conducted research, the monks "ate food provided from their own resources and cooked in the monastery kitchen" for eight months of the year, except when they were invited out to meals at the homes of lay donors or for special

---

30 See Crosby, *Theravāda Buddhism: Continuity, Diversity, and Identity,* 193–217.

31 Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 58; Gombrich, *Precept and Practice: Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon*, 278–79. Also see descriptions of forest monks in Tiyavanich, *Forest Recollections: Wandering Monks in Twentieth-Century Thailand*.

32 P. *kappiyakāraka* ("those who make things suitable for monks"); see Gombrich, *Theravāda Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*, 94, 104, 162. Schopen translated the Indian usage as "proper bondman" in "The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two Vinayas," 162. Chinese sutra translations typically render the term as "pure person" (*jingren* 淨人), namely, an attendant who facilitates activities that could defile the purity of the monastic; see, for example, *Mohe sengqi lü*, T 1425.22.306a.

33 Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 277.

events.[34] During the other four months, the villagers performed alms giving on a scheduled rotation, but this was hardly for economic reasons and more to give the villagers opportunities for merit-making.[35] In 2017, when I visited the temple of the monk Khammai Dhammasāmi (1964–) in Shan State, Myanmar, the temple had a spacious kitchen where laypeople cooked a grand feast for both monastic and lay guests who had gathered to celebrate Dhammasāmi's birthday.[36] Therefore, kitchens and cooking were and continue to be everyday realities in Buddhist monasteries in South and Southeast Asia, but they never quite assumed the integral role that became characteristic of East Asian monasticism. Despite these contradictory realities, monastic undertaking of alms rounds and lay offerings of food retain their rhetorical force as paradigmatic moral ideals in Theravāda Buddhist discourse.[37]

Turning to Chinese monasticism, there are some historical disparities. According to Sze-bong Tso, the first monastic rule (Skt. *prātimokṣa*, Ch. *jieben* 戒本) translated into Chinese was derived from the *Mahāsāṅghikavinaya*. As this vinaya did not have the prohibition against handling gold or silver, Tso believes that the first generation of Chinese Buddhist monastics were most likely unaware of the vinaya prohibition against personal possession of cash and money.[38] This omission could have facilitated the shifts that emerged early in the food economy of Chinese monasticism. Prior to the translation of a complete vinaya, the monk Dao'an 道安 (312–385) composed a set of regulations for use as the blueprint for life

---

34 Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 278.

35 Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 277–78.

36 Originally from Shan State, Myanmar, Dhammasāmi joined monkhood at the age of six. Subsequently, he studied at the University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka, before joining the University of Oxford in the U.K. to complete his PhD in 2004. Popularly known as "The Oxford Sayadow," Dhammasāmi founded the Oxford Buddha Vihara at Oxford in 2003 and, upon his return to Myanmar, he set up the Shan State Buddhist University in 2014 for the higher education of monks.

37 Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 278.

38 Tso, "The Transformation of Buddhist Vinaya in China," 13.

in the Chinese monastery.[39] Dao'an's text most likely inspired the rise of the subgenre of monastic literature called "rules of purity" (*qinggui* 清規) which eventually replaced the Indian vinaya as *the* paradigm for daily life in Chinese Buddhist monasteries.[40] Other Indian vinayas were quickly translated into Chinese but the *Vinaya in Four Parts* emerged as the standardized vinaya for Chinese monasticism and was transmitted as such to the rest of East Asia.

As the fifth-century compilation of essays titled *Collection to Propagate and Clarify Buddhist Teachings* (Ch. *Hongming ji* 弘明集) records, the teachings of Buddhism and its institution of monasticism attracted strong criticism from Chinese court elites, especially ethnocentric Confucian scholar-bureaucrats, with their unwavering commitment to Chinese civilizational supremacy.[41] Specifically, monasticism, with its ready association with alms begging, invited cultural disdain and social ridicule, and some Confucian literati swiftly branded monastics as beggars and social parasites who drained state resources.[42] In 845, Emperor Wuzong 武宗 (r. 841–846) issued an edict to suppress Buddhism that indignantly voiced this court sentiment:

---

[39] Dao'an composed the *Sengni guifan* 僧尼軌範 [A Model Rule for Monks and Nuns], which is no longer extant today. See Hirakawa, *Ritsuzō no kenkyū*, 203; Ōchō, *Chūgoku Bukkyō no kenkyū*, 26; Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*, 10.

[40] "Rules of purity" refer to the regulations on life in the monastery that were produced in China. The history of producing monastic codes of living can be traced back to the fourth-century monk Dao'an. The most famous rules of purity collection is the so-called *Baizhang qinggui* 百丈清規 [Rules of Purity by Baizhang] attributed to the Chan monk Baizhang Huaihai 百丈懷海 (720–814). However, modern scholarship is divided on whether this legendary monastic code ever existed; if it did, it is no longer extant. Instead, the oldest surviving monastic rules is the twelfth-century composition called *Chanyuan Qinggui* 禪苑清規 [Rules of Purity for the Chan Monastery], attributed to Changlu Zongze 長蘆宗賾 (ca. 1107), X 1245.63.522a–566a. See Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, 28–37; for contemporary Taiwan, see Chiu, "The Application of Traditional Rules of Purity (*Qinggui*) in Contemporary Taiwanese Monasteries," 249–277.

[41] See *Hongming ji*, T 2102.52.1a–96b, especially the essay titled "Mouzi lihuo lun" 牟子理惑論 [Treatise on Mouzi Disputing Errors], 1a–7a.

[42] The Confucian literati Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824) is representative of such criticism of Buddhism in medieval China; see his court petition against Buddhists in *Changli xiansheng wenji*, 39, and in *Sibu congkan*, 2b–4b. Above translation follows Watson, trans., "Memorial on the Bone of Buddha."

> now if even one man fails to work the fields, someone must go hungry; if one woman does not tend her silkworms, someone will be cold. At present there are an inestimable number of monks and nuns in the empire, each of them waiting for the farmers to feed him and the silkworms to clothe him, while the public temples and private chapels have reached boundless numbers, all with soaring towers and elegant ornamentation sufficient to outshine the imperial palace itself.[43]

Such criticism no doubt further instigated Chinese Buddhist monastics to develop models of bodily sustenance beyond the monastic rule that advocates consuming only the food given during alms round or at a meal invitation by householder(s).

The changes made to the prohibition of cooking inside the monastery are recorded in the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations*, which broached the matter quite differently from the Pāli vinaya. In the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations*, a wealthy donor was preparing an abundant meal offering for the Buddha and his disciples on open grounds outside of the monastery.[44] Suddenly winds blew, rains fell, and the donor's efforts were frustrated. This led the Buddha to declare a new rule approving monks to mark out an area inside the monastery for food preparation. Very soon, the monks themselves "were cooking rice, soup, pancakes, and meat" in the space assigned for food preparation.[45] Seeing this, some heretics chided the monks for not living up to the moral standards of being monks, since by installing kitchens and food storehouses, they made their monasteries no different from the residences of householders with their kitchens and other food facilities. Hearing about it, the Buddha proclaimed the rule to cook only outside the boundaries of the monastery. Then the monks began cooking on the open grounds outside the monastery. The smoke of the cooking fire attracted villagers to gather around, and the monks ended up sharing their food with the villagers until very little food was left for the

---

43 *Jiutang shu* 舊唐書 [Old History of the Tang Period], 18A:14b–15a, in *Bonaben ershisi shi* 百衲本二十四史 [Bona Edition of the Twenty-four Dynastic Histories], collected in *Sibu congkan*; translated by Watson, "Emperor Wuzong's Edict on the Suppression of Buddhism: Edict of the Eighth Month (845)," 586.

44 *Shisong lü*, T 1435.23.190a–b.

45 *Shisong lü*, T 1435.23.190a.

monastic community. Learning about it, the Buddha reversed the regulation, stating:

> From this day on, do not heed the rule to mark out a space [for cooking inside the monastery]. If one does so, one commits a misdeed (Skt. *duṣkṛta*). Those who previously did it should stop doing so.[46]

In this passage, the Buddha ultimately reverses the rules allowing monks to cook either inside or outside the monastery. This meant that monastics were to return to observing the rule to eat only food collected on alms rounds or by invitation –– a very different conclusion from the ruling in the Pāli vinaya which permitted storing and cooking food inside the monastery in response to famine conditions. From the anecdote in the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations*, it appears that at some juncture in the early history of Buddhist monasticism, Indian communities were already installing cooking areas inside their monasteries, a practice that aroused controversy over its legitimacy. Unlike the Pāli vinaya, *Vinaya in Ten Recitations* ultimately ruled against cooking inside or outside the boundaries of the monastery. Reading the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations*, medieval Chinese Buddhists quite likely concluded that the regulation for or against cooking inside the monastery was fairly circumstantial and not intended to be a morally binding decision. This would provide some precedence for installing kitchens in the monasteries.

Not only were medieval Indian monasteries equipped with kitchens, refectories, and warehouses for food storage, the monks and monasteries quite often owned possessions,[47] and it was therefore not always necessary to get food through alms rounds. In fact, some Buddhist monasteries grew so large that it was no longer pragmatic to conduct daily alms rounds.[48] For example, Xuanzang recorded that at the monasteries in the city of Anurādhapura in Sri Lanka, the vast numbers of monks and nuns were fed at a central kitchen with supplies from the king and his

---

46 *Shisong lü*, T 1435.23.190b, translated by author.

47 See Schopen, "Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk's Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India" and other essays in his *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*.

48 Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 277.

court.[49] Medieval Chinese Buddhists most likely learned from pilgrim records about the range of practices in India, where major monasteries no longer lived by alms begging but had other economic resources such as revenue from the ruler or the state.[50] Chinese monasteries quickly gave up daily alms collection –– if it was ever practiced on any significant scale –– and instead installed kitchens and cooked their own meals to address the dilemma of bodily sustenance for their communities.[51] Despite the objection in the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations*, cooking in monasteries was certainly the norm by the time of the great vinaya monk Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), who helped standardize the *Vinaya in Four Parts* as the normative text for the transmission of ordination precepts in China.[52] When Daoxuan imagined Jetavana Monastery in writing and illustration, he not only endowed this first Indian monastery with Chinese palatial architecture but also allocated spaces for grain storage and meal preparation, as well as areas for cooking, serving, and dining.[53] In fact, the text enumerated different kitchens for varying functions, such as the sanitized kitchen courtyard for [sick] saṅgha (*seng jingchu yuan* 僧淨廚院),[54]

---

49 *Datang Xiyu ji*, T 2087.51.934b. Xuanzang, the author of *Datang Xiyu ji*, did not himself visit Sri Lanka, but he derived descriptions of Anurādhapura from Faxian's accounts; see Kim, "Images and Monasteries in Faxian's Account on Anurādhapura," 133–52.

50 Notably, such travel records included the accounts of the Chinese pilgrim monks Faxian and Xuanzang.

51 Based on his study of Dunhuang documents, epigraphy, apocryphal scriptures, and secular texts, Jacques Gernet outlined a detailed picture of monastic commerce in medieval China from the fifth to the tenth centuries, where begging and field labor were more exceptions than daily activities. See Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, 152–191.

52 Daoxuan is esteemed for his codification of the *Vinaya in Four Parts* to produce the school of Buddhism called South Mountain Vinaya (Nanshan lü 南山律).

53 Daoxuan, *Zhong tianzhu sheweiguo qiyuansi tujing*, T 1899.45.882b-96b. See English translation of this text in Shi, "Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana," 235–354. Also see discussion in McRae, "Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana and the Ordination Platform Movement in Medieval Chinese Buddhism."

54 Daoxuan explained that the Buddha himself instituted this kitchen for the use of sick monks a year before he passed into parinirvāṇa; *Qiyuansi tujing*, T 1899.45.894a.

kitchen courtyard (*shichu yuan* 食廚院),[55] kitchen for meal preparation (*zaoshi chu* 造食廚),[56] the rector's personal kitchen (*weina chushe* 維那廚舍), and the cook's personal kitchen (*dianzuo jüchu* 典座居廚).[57] Evidently, the famous Chinese exponent of monastic discipline Daoxuan did not consider culinary matters to be a breach of monastic regulations. Indeed, biographies of eminent monks compiled in the seventh and tenth centuries yield a count of twenty-seven monasteries with kitchens, the earliest dating to 513 CE and the latest to 716 CE.[58] While more can be said on the subject, suffice it to conclude that kitchen installation and meal preparation in monasteries were always more the norm than the exception in Chinese Buddhist history. The integral role of the kitchen and of cooking in East Asian monastic life is most eloquently lauded in a Japanese work titled *Instructions for the Cook* (*Tenzō kyōkun* 典座教訓), composed by the renowned Zen monk Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253).[59] In his essay, Dōgen reminisced about his encounter with the cook of a monastery in China during his travels and the teachings that the cook imparted to him. The prestige of the cook and the soteriological significance of cooking and the kitchen are characteristics of East Asian Buddhist monasticism.

Historical Analysis: Monastic Food Reform in Taiwan

Given the established roles of kitchen and cooking in the history of East Asian monasticism, why did Guanghua—the inspiration for Weijun—stigmatize age-old

---

55 *Qiyuansi tujing*, T 1899.45.895a.

56 *Qiyuansi tujing*, T 1899.45.895a. This is most likely a kitchen for making food preserves such as noodles, fermented foods, and so forth, which could be used for daily cooking.

57 *Qiyuansi tujing*, T 1899.45.894c, 895a.

58 The numbers are based on Tso's calculations of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 2060.50.425a–707a and the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T 2061.50.709a–900a; see Tso, "The Transformation of Buddhist Vinaya," 10.

59 *Tenzō kyōkun* was compiled in 1237 as the first part of *Eihei shingi* 永平清規 [Rules of Purity for Eihei Monastery]. Leighton and Okumura have translated *Eihei shingi* in Eihei Dōgen (1200–1253), *Dōgen's Pure Standards for the Zen Community: A translation of the Eihei shingi*. For another English translation of *Tenzō kyōkun*, see Uchiyama, *Refining Your Life: From the Zen Kitchen to Enlightenment*, 3–19.

dilemmas in Chinese monastic history as malpractices endemic to Buddhist monasticism in twentieth-century Taiwan? An important factor was the changing roles of the Buddhist Association of the Republic of China (BAROC) during the rapid democratization of Taiwan in the aftermath of the abolition of martial law in 1987. The government-in-exile Nationalist Party enforced martial law to ensure a state of preparedness for war against China. Under martial law, BAROC was legalized as the umbrella Buddhist organization under which all other Buddhist monasteries and centers were subordinated.[60] As a liaison between all Buddhists and the government, BAROC enjoyed a monopoly over Buddhist ordination and was the sole organization that was legally endorsed to administer nationwide ordination ceremonies. This institutional monopoly lasted throughout the forty years of authoritarian rule by the Nationalist Party. After the abolition of martial law, the revised Law on Civic Organizations was passed in 1989 to legalize non-governmental organizations in politics and other spheres of society. For Buddhism, this paved the way for independent groups to gain official standing as civic groups, leading to the rise of movements like Dharma Drum Mountain (Fagu shan 法鼓山), Buddha's Light Mountain (Foguang shan 佛光山), and the Compassion Relief Foundation (Ciji jijinhui 慈濟基金會). These organizations quickly rivaled and even eclipsed BAROC in economic and socio-cultural standing.[61] As another by-product of its decentralization, BAROC lost its long monopoly over ordination rites and autonomous Buddhist groups with resources and inclination could now privately fund and organize ordination rites at their monasteries.

Vinaya teachers like Guanghua now emerged in this religious landscape, and could publicly lead ordination assemblies and set their own expectations for monastic standards. During BAROC's institutional monopoly, modifications were introduced to ordination procedures, such as accepting cash and money in the alms bowl, and exempting women candidates from two years of probation as female

---

60 On BAROC, see Jones, *Buddhism in Taiwan: Religion and the State 1660–1990*, 137–177.

61 Jones calls this the "period of pluralization" in his *Buddhism in Taiwan*, 178–218. For new movements, see Laliberté, *The Politics of Buddhist Organizations in Taiwan 1989–2003: Safeguard the Faith, Build a Pure Land, Help the Poor*; Madsen, *Democracy's Dharma: Religious Renaissance and Political Development in Taiwan*.

trainees (Skt. *śīkṣamāṇā*, Ch. *shichamona* 式叉摩那).[62] Guanghua accentuated these departures to portray a monastic institution steeped in decline, with problematic ordination procedures and lax precept observation. To reform monastic discipline, he proposed several changes including the "return" to alms begging as part of the proper livelihood for monastics. The ordination assemblies which BAROC organized often concluded with a public ritual procession where ordainees paraded on the streets, collecting money as alms from the public. Such monetary donations were typically redistributed towards social welfare and disaster relief programs. Guanghua called out this collection of cash for going against the vinaya admonition to monks and nuns to accept only food, not money, in their alms bowls.[63] In May 1985, when South Putuo Monastery organized a precept transmission assembly, Guanghua integrated two alms rounds into the schedule to educate the ordinands on proper alms begging. His precept transmission assembly was oriented around the slogan, "The Buddha instituted alms begging for food as remedy for the body, so we should beg only for food, not money (佛制乞食, 為療色身, 但乞食物, 不乞金錢)."[64]

Heeding Guanghua's call, Weijun supported institutionalizing alms begging in monasteries. She explained the disappearance of alms begging in Chinese monasticism:

> After Buddhism was transmitted into China, due to the impact of Chinese customs, Buddhist monastics were unable to follow the Buddha's example of begging alms for their meals. They could only set up stoves in monasteries to cook for themselves, and they themselves had to take care of requisites for their livelihood. For the monastery's survival, they had to resort to expedient means to provide for the four requisite offerings. Also, the lives of

---

62 For *śīkṣamāṇā*, see Heirman, "Becoming a Nun in the Dharmaguptaka Tradition," 174–93.

63 For the rule against handling money, see *Sifen lü*, T 1428.22.728a. Also see Chiu, "Rethinking the Precept of Not Taking Money in Contemporary Taiwan and Mainland Chinese Buddhist Monasteries," 10–56.

64 South Forest archival records, cited in notes compiled by Shi Jianguo for author, July 19, 2017, translated by author.

> monastic communities became secularized, seeking and hoarding material goods, which solicited contempt from society.[65]

South Forest nuns explain the reason for introducing their alms begging initiative:

> To eliminate malpractice and rectify the foundation, our elder nun has advanced an alms begging initiative at South Forest to return to the Buddha's original intent in instituting precepts. To help monastics lessen desires, have contentment, dwell at ease on the path, free themselves from the three poisonous minds, and attain the path to transform the worldly into the holy, we will seek out the perfected teaching of merit and wisdom from when the Buddha was in this world. How can we, ordained disciples of the latter generations, abolish and not practice the etiquette of virtuosity (*deyi* 德儀) which is resonant with the Dharma and which the patriarchs have practiced since antiquity? Since alms begging is a basic duty of monastics, with various benefits like protecting the true Dharma and mutual enhancement between monastics and laity, we therefore should observe [alms begging] for as long as we are monastics.[66]

The rationale that the Buddha and patriarchs had always practiced alms begging, however, is not historically sound since, as we have seen, giving up alms rounds was hardly a recent phenomenon and the installation of stoves and cooking spaces inside Buddhist monasteries had already taken place in India.

However, Weijun's appeal to the "etiquette of virtuosity" (*deyi* 德儀) deserves further analysis and offers a clue on how to approach the return to alms begging advocated by her and her female community at South Forest. The phrase melds ethical potency (*de* 德) with ritual etiquette (*yi* 儀). Specifically, *yi* hearkens to the concept of ritual (*li* 禮) in early Confucian writings which held up cultured and refined behavioral manifestations as embodied expressions of inner ethical states of humaneness (*ren* 仁). Xunzi 荀子, the early fourth-century Confucian thinker, further defined "ritual" as the code of behavioral norms which sages of the past

---

65 Notes compiled by Shi Jianguo, July 19, 2017, translated by author.

66 Notes compiled by Shi Jianguo, July 19, 2017, translated by author.

instituted to guide the masses away from their naturally base inclinations which could potentially lead them astray;

> In antiquity the sage kings … initiated rituals and righteousness and formulated standards and various measures to straighten and enhance human nature and emotions; they did this to rectify them, to train and transform them, and to guide them. … rites and righteousness were produced by the sages, and hence are things that human beings can learn; they can be devised and brought to completion.[67]

Although Weijun did not allude to Xunzi, she deployed a logic similar to Xunzi's theory of rites in her argument to reinstate alms begging as behavioral rites manifesting inner states which Buddhist ancestors like the Buddha himself introduced and observed. This is no surprise since, historically, Chinese exegetes often deployed Confucian concepts and terminology to explain Buddhist thought and practices.[68] Given the Chinese penchant for behavioral ritualizing of inner virtues, it is more pertinent to approach South Forest's implementation of the rule on alms begging in ritual terms, to which I will now turn my attention.

Ritual Analysis: Enacting the Food Practices of the Buddha

The Alms Station, as an architectural concept, was borrowed from Theravāda communities in Myanmar which a group of South Forest nuns visited. During their visit, they encountered monks living in remote areas who, after daily alms rounds in the village, were unable to return to their home monasteries in time to finish their meals by noon according to monastic rule.[69] These monks resolved the problem by building a rest house en route to the monastery where the monks could

---

67 "Hsün Tzü [Xunzi]," translated in Sommer, ed., *Chinese Religion: An Anthology of Sources*, 69–70.

68 The classic example is "Mouzi lihuo lun," T 2102.52.1a–7a. Other essays in the *Hongming ji* also use Chinese concepts and cultural practices to explain Buddhism.

69 Shi Jianguo and Shi Jianyin, interview by author, Nantou, July 2017.

stop to take their meals. In addition, during my field research in Bagan in November 2017, I visited a few village alms houses that served as centralized locations for pious laypeople in the vicinity to gather, prepare, or even cook food offerings for the monks on their daily alms rounds (plates 11–13). Moreover, Burmese monasteries in remote areas might install a permanent building on their premises, where lay volunteers can come to prepare, cook, and serve alms meal for the monks during meditation retreats. Such buildings have cooking facilities and can also include a communal eating area, but if not, the monks will collect food in their bowls and return to their own quarters to eat.[70] Based on my field observations in rural Bagan, the behavior at alms rounds appears to vary geographically. Some ritual deportment might be evident during the walking procession from house to house, but on the whole, the atmosphere was fairly casual and younger monks and novices could be quite boisterous getting on and off transportation vehicles to the village (plates 14–16).[71] Moreover, alms collection and the meal are hardly liturgically oriented, although merit transference is sometimes recited briefly at the beginning of the communal meal.[72] Though South Forest has borrowed from Burmese examples, their alms practice and alms station exhibit a different kind of ritual performativity from their Theravāda counterparts.

---

70 Shi Zhihui and Shi Dexue, interview by author, Three Studies Grove (Sanxue yuan 三學苑), Jiayi, Taiwan, July 2017. Although not affiliated with South Forest, these two nuns are very familiar with contemporary Burmese monasteries, having regularly participated for extended periods at meditation retreats in Maymyo in the state of Mandalay in central Myanmar.

71 Based on my field observations of alms begging in rural Bagan, Myanmar from late November to early December 2017.

72 Gombrich, cautioned that while Sri Lankan monks might recite the *anumodanā* before partaking food offerings from the laity, such recitation is different from the Christian saying of grace before a meal, for instance, because in Buddhist Myanmar, the recitation only happens when the meal is given as alms to monks. Nothing is recited when monks eat food cooked in their own monasteries. See Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 277.



Plate 11. Village alms house. Bagan, Myanmar.



Plate 12. Female donors packaging food in alms house. Bagan, Myanmar.



Plate 13. Female donor holding a tray of food as alms offerings. Bagan, Myanmar.

During my visit in July 2017, what particularly impressed me about South Forest's alms practice was the constant ritualization that underscored its daily implementation. Indeed, the Alms Station came across as much as a ritual site as a utilitarian building. Unlike in Burmese monasteries where such buildings are primarily functional and ritual is minimally iterated, at South Forest, ritual performativity runs through almost every step of the alms meal. From the silent procession to the Alms Station, to receiving food from the laity, to then eating the alms meal—all the activities are steps toward a ritual enactment of the alms rounds of the Buddha and his disciples while they were in this world. The nuns of South Forest are quite a spectacle as they walk silently in single file from the monastery grounds to the Alms Station. Their maroon Indian robes, alms bowls in maroon pouches, and sockless casual sandals all set them apart from typical Chinese monastic etiquette. But it is hardly the Burmese or even Theravāda association that the South Forest community intends to invoke. Rather, their ritualization of alms begging is meant to cut across the past to bring the ethical actions that the Buddha and his disciples themselves lived out into this time, this world. South Forest's practice of alms collection thus exemplifies anthropologist Roy Rappaport's theory of ritual that foregrounds ritual enactment of meaning in the deliberate and

constant repetition of a moment from the sacred past which is identified as its origins.[73] For South Forest nuns, meals are more than the consumption of food and bodily sustenance. Meals are the temporal junctures in the monastery's daily calendar when the community assembles to imitate the set of behavioral gestures that perfectly mirror the ethical minds of the Buddha himself. Meals, in this sense, are daily communal ritual affirmations of the monastic reform to which South Forest is committed. They are inserted junctures of ritually orchestrated experiences where, together, the community bodily performs and materializes the actions of right livelihood that supposedly trace back to the Buddha and his disciples, even down to the make, measurements, and size of the alms bowl. Emulating the practice of Guanghua's monastery, South Forest has specially commissioned black iron bowls with capacities of less than half a gallon, which the nuns believe better conform to the prescriptions in the *Vinaya in Four Parts*.[74] Nonetheless, the nuns are allowed to possess chopsticks and spoons, eating utensils not mentioned in the vinaya.

[73] Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*, 107–138.

[74] The *Vinaya in Four Parts* states, "The six types of bowls are the iron bowl, the bowl of the Soma Kingdom, the bowl of the Uggara kingdom, the bowl of the Youjiashe kingdom, the black bowl, and the red bowl. They are generally [made of] two types [of material], iron and clay. For sizes of alms bowls, the big one should be three pecks, the small one should be one and a half pecks. This rule should be observed to perform pure giving" (*Sifen lü*, T 1428.22.622a).



Plate 14. Burmese monks getting off the truck at alms site. Bagan, Myanmar.



Plate 15. Scene of Burmese monks at village alms. Bagan, Myanmar.



Plate 16. Close-up, Burmese monks receiving alms. Bagan, Myanmar.

Ritual performativity underscores the entire meal process. Arriving at the building, the nuns proceed single file into the small serving room where laypeople, palms joined in salutation and dressed in aprons, stand over trays and pots of food that they have prepared. Every meal thus brings together *in situ,* on the one hand, the alms recipients comprising the residential community of nuns and, on the other hand, the alms givers: lay donors from outside the community who are visiting to donate time and provisions toward the livelihood of the saṅgha. Both givers and recipients come together to perform their prescribed roles in the rites of gift exchange in which lay donors offer food while the nuns transfer spiritual merit to the donors. The giving and receiving of material food starts another cycle of gift exchange in the non-material realm, in which the nuns liturgically bestow their spiritual attainments as merits to lay donors. After receiving the food in their bowls, the nuns file into the refectory, take their seats, and the ritual meal begins. The celebrant leads the communal recitation using the meal-offering liturgy from the daily ritual manual of traditional Chinese monasteries (plates 17, 18). Outside of mealtimes, the act of giving is also ritually memorialized at the close of the monastery's morning and evening liturgies during which donors' names are recited

aloud to the community.[75] This liturgical naming of donors ritually seals the transfer of merit from the nuns to the donors, thereby completing the twofold cycle of gift exchange that begins with alms food. Practiced twice daily all year round, the alms meals ritually materialize a model of economic and spiritual interdependence between monastics and laity that the community regards as a norm of ethical living taught by the Buddha and observed by his early community. This gift exchange is hardly novel and emulates the rhetorical paradigm of monastic-laity relations found in many parts of Theravāda Southeast Asia.[76]



Plate 17. South Forest Nuns seated and reciting the meal liturgy at the Alms Station. Jiayi, Taiwan.

[75] The names of each day's donors are also written on a white board located outside the serving room in the refectory, which the nuns will walk by as they enter the serving room to collect alms. For daily liturgies, see Shi, "Zhongguo fojiao zaowanke xingcheng."

[76] For studies on monastic-lay relations, see especially Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, and Spiro, *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes*. More recent works include Cook, "Alms, Money, and Reciprocity: Buddhist Nuns as Mediators of Generalized Exchange in Thailand"; Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia: Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain Reflections on Dāna*; Sihlé, "Towards a Comparative Anthropology of the Buddhist Gift (and Other Transfers)."



Plate 18. South Forest Nuns eating in the refectory. Jiayi, Taiwan.

While the nuns borrow significantly from Theravāda Buddhist culture in Southeast Asia to reconfigure monastic meals, there is no doubt that they remain Chinese Mahāyāna. Throughout the meal ritual, continuities with Chinese practices prevail. Besides the liturgies, the community also observes the rite of feeding hungry ghosts, a staple rite in East Asian Buddhist monasteries.[77] Before eating the meal, each nun puts aside a mouthful of food on a small plate as a ritual token to feed hungry ghosts. This rite transforms the monastic recipients of food alms into compassionate givers who are able to multiply and share their food with living beings of the unseen realms.[78] The alms food from lay donors is thus ritually multiplied to extend the gift beyond the human sphere to the realm of invisible spirits which the laity cannot access on their own. After the nuns have finished the meal, these mouthfuls of food

[77] The ritual was introduced in the Tang 唐 period (618–907) but the extant corpus of ritual texts on feeding hungry ghosts dates to the Yuan 元 period (1280–1368). For English translations of the rite, see Orzech, "Saving the Burning-Mouth Hungry Ghost," and Stevenson, "Feeding Hungry Ghosts." Also see Lye, "Feeding Ghosts—A Study of the *Yuqie yankou* Rite," "Song Tiantai Ghost-Feeding Rituals," and "*Yuqie yankou* in the Ming–Qing."

[78] Exegetical or liturgical writings on ghost feeding rites often call the practice "compassionate feeding" (*cibei bushi* 慈悲佈施); for example, see Chuan, "Fomen shishi zhong de cibei jingshen."

are collected and left outdoors for birds and other creatures to feast on. Even the communal dining space is envisaged in traditional Chinese style with long tables and chairs, rather than the Southeast Asian habit of sitting on the ground to eat. Moreover, in the dining hall at South Forest, there is a side table shrine for the arhat monk Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja (Binduluo baluoduodu 賓度羅跋羅墮闍) who hearkens back to the devotional myths and practices of traditional Chinese monasteries.[79] At every meal, donors set up a tray containing alms food for Piṇḍola, thus honoring the pledge made by their ancestral monk Dao'an, who promised that monasteries would continuously provide food offerings to this arhat as he endlessly roamed in this world to serve as an everlasting field of merit for living beings to create good karma.[80]

South Forest accentuates the participation of lay donors, so that together monastics and laity ritually set forth the twofold cycle of gift exchange, affirming their symbiotic dependence on each other for the continuous prosperity of an ethical economy for a Buddhist society. It is at meals that individual nuns participate and ritually bond with the community to reiterate their chosen shared lifestyle and live out the behavioral norms of the monastic code. While South Forest has vibrant educational programs for both nuns and laity,[81] it is participation in

---

79 The *Aśokāvadāna* records that because Piṇḍola inappropriately showed off his magical powers, the Buddha told him to remain forever on earth to receive food alms so that living beings could generate merit; see translation by Strong, "The Legend of the Lion-Roarer: A Study of the Buddhist Arhat Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja," 71–72. The Indian myth of Piṇḍola was circulated across different Buddhist geographies, where varying cultural motifs were sometimes added. For Chinese sources on Piṇḍola, see Lévi and Chavannes, "Les seize arhats protecteurs de la loi." For Piṇḍola as the wandering saint in East Asia, see DeVisser, "The Arhats in China and Japan"; Minakata, "The Wandering Jew"; Mecsi, "Pindola in Korea and Japan: Is the Wandering Jew Coming from East Asia?"

80 The East Asian tradition of venerating Piṇḍola as the patron saint of the refectories in Buddhist monasteries can be traced back to the Chinese monk Dao'an, who promised this arhat that monasteries will always reserve a seat at mealtimes for him; see Link, "The Biography of Shih Tao-an," 35. The method of inviting Piṇḍola to offerings is recorded in *Qing Bintoulu fa* 請賓頭盧法, T 1689.32.784b-c, attributed to the monk Huijian 慧簡 (ca. 457 CE). On the shrine of Piṇḍola in the Chinese monastery's refectory, see Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, 14.

81 For example, there are ten courses on the role of laity in supporting the monastic community (Shi Jianning, interview by author, Nantou, July 2017).

alms begging that enables lay donors to engage Buddhist right livelihood through the material processes of food preparation, cooking, alms giving, and eating. Typical of reform movements, the urgency of returning to the "pristine origins" runs through South Forest discourse.[82] This return to the "pristine origins" is achieved daily by ritually enacting the perfected behaviors of the Buddha and his early community at mealtimes, as reflected in monastic prescriptions on food procedures. Ultimately, such ritual performativity and repetition bridge the temporal and spatial gap between the South Forest nuns and the Buddha and his early community, conforming not only to Rappaport's theory of ritual as performative meaning, but also to Xunzi's theory of ritual behavior in early China. As Xunzi explained, past sages set up rites as a guide to ethical behavior so that the performance of rituals would always behaviorally imitate the charismatic virtuosity of sages, thus eventually leading to sagehood. For the South Forest community, the ritual performativity of mealtimes transforms the mundane daily actions of the making and eating of food into critical steps in their vision of monastic reform.

Conclusion: Food Ethics, Meal Rites, and Vegetarianism

In conclusion, I turn to food ethics, the theme of this issue. Why study food and the meals of South Forest? As the nourishment that sustains life, food is the heart of daily life in the monastery and therefore a critical aspect of monastic life to address in any vinaya reform.[83] As I have shown, at South Forest, mealtimes become critical spaces for ritualized change, opening the way for the early Buddhist paradigm of economic interdependence between monastics and laity whereby monastics receive the worldly gift of food from laypeople who, in turn, receive merit from monastics.

---

[82] On the quest for origins, see Masuzawa, *In Search of Dreamtime: The Quest for the Origin of Religion*.

[83] Robes, alms food, lodgings, and medicine are the four requisites of monastic life.

The alms relationship between monastics and laity is often studied through the theory of gift exchange that can be traced to French sociologist Marcel Mauss.[84] For Mauss, archaic and indigenous societies were organized around extensive networks of relationships that foregrounded obligations to give, receive, and, most importantly, reciprocate among different groups, so that giving constitutes a fundamental action that infiltrates into various dimensions of society and bonds different social groups. Such actions were not limited to or motivated by the building of economic wealth and alliances but, rather, helped establish social solidarity. Maussian theory has two caveats: first, it presupposes that universal reciprocity always exists in all forms of giving and, second, it prioritizes socio-economic stakes to an extent that other factors are obliterated. At first glance, Buddhist alms offerings in Asia appear to validate Maussian theory. However, Buddhists hardly regard merit transference from monastics to laity as simply exchanging spiritual benefits for material requisites. Rather, in the Buddhist world, merit unequivocally surpasses all material gifts, so that any exchange can never be equitable. Moreover, pious laity would regard offering alms as an opportunity to perform good karma. In the Mahāyāna explication of giving, a lack of reciprocity is precisely the defining attribute of the bodhisattva's perfection of giving.[85] Indeed, the Mahāyāna concept of the gift as "no-gift" philosophically defies the classification of Buddhist alms as a socio-economic transaction.[86] Refining Mauss' theory, anthropologist Chris Gregory distinguishes between gifts and commodities, arguing that in Papua New Guinea, the indigenous gift economy shaped and was

---

84 See Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. For an overview of studies on the gift in Buddhist societies, see Sihlé, "Towards a Comparative Anthropology of the Buddhist Gift," and Michaels, "Gift and Return Gift, Greeting and Return Greeting in India: On a Consequential Footnote by Marcel Mauss." In his study of Buddhist transformations of taste in East Asia, Moerman repeatedly invokes gift exchange as a metaphor for the communal relations in Buddhist society, for example: "In the essential collaborative act of Buddhist communities, the exchange of food for the promise of liberation, celestial ambrosia is a necessarily social construction" (Moerman, "Sweetness and Power: The Buddhist Transformation of Taste," 180).

85 See Ohnuma, "Gift."

86 In Mahāyāna doctrine, the perfection of giving (Skt. *dānapāramitā*) has three aspects; namely, the bodhisattva's giving has no giver, no gift, and no recipient. This understanding of giving is invoked especially in Prajñāpāramitā literature.

reshaped by the development of a commodity economy, and vice versa, all deeply rooted in the forces of political formation.[87] If Mauss highlights social solidarity, then Gregory foregrounds politics, holding the role of political economy as paramount in both gift and commodity economies. These classic anthropological studies highlight that local food economies, enacted through gift exchange or commodity transfer, are ultimately rooted in either social hierarchy or political power. Most recently, anthropologist Nicholas Sihlé has argued for the need for cross-cultural comparison to illuminate the dynamics of transactional services that would not fall under the concept of gift.[88] As an example, he discusses Tibetan chanting monks who regularly receive monetary compensation from laypeople who hire the monks to perform funerary rites for deceased family members. While these anthropological studies have provided valuable insight into the economic, political, and social implications of giving and receiving alms in Buddhist societies, their approaches seldom offer in-depth analysis of the religious significance of the food economy in the monasteries of Buddhist South and Southeast Asia. Religious factors are automatically regarded as suspect and subsidiary to the secular forces of economics, politics, and society. The standard trope is to highlight the disparity between theory and practice, where religious narrative does not quite match the ethnographic data of living practice. Such an approach, whether it be anthropological like Gombrich's study of Sri Lankan monasticism or historical like Schopen's reconstructions of Indian monasticism, obviously contribute immensely to our understanding of the phenomena under study. But it cannot unravel why a particular paradigm or trope is so deeply implanted in the religio-cultural *imaginaire* that it retains its rhetorical sway even after it has been established as historically inaccurate. Moreover, if economic or sociopolitical forces are catalytic in shaping the Buddhist alms-merit paradigm, then why does the paradigm persist long after monasteries have outgrown those original economic or sociopolitical motivations?

---

87 Gregory, *Gifts and Commodities*.

88 Sihlé, "Towards a Comparative Anthropology of the Buddhist Gift."

To answer these questions, my study began with emic descriptions of South Forest's practices to explain how the tradition understands its own actions through ethnographic and textual analyses. I then contextualized this data through historical and ritual perspectives as a form of etic analysis, interweaving early Chinese theory of rites with contemporary anthropological theory of ritual. Through this combination of ethnographic, historical, ritual, and textual approaches, I have shown how South Forest nuns see themselves as implementing early Indian prescriptions of alms begging as part of broader monastic reforms in contemporary Taiwan. Historically speaking, however, their return to alms practice is best understood as a ritual enactment that simulates the ethical actions of the Buddha and his early disciples in a manner that conforms to the understanding of ritual ethics in early Confucian thought. Through daily ritual performance of the early Buddhist model of gift exchange, South Forest nuns see themselves as executing an economic reform in monastic life that enables them to proximate the lifestyle of the Buddha and his early community. As mentioned previously, the historical realities of Indian Buddhist monasticism were far more complex than a uniform observance of alms collection and meal invitation, and kitchens were in fact quite common in the cross-cultural history of Buddhist monasticism, even in the Theravāda cultures of Southeast Asia. Granted, practice and theory often are not quite the same, but in the mental sphere of the religious *imaginaire*, alms begging and the reliance on laity for daily sustenance continue to be perpetuated as rhetorically powerful monastic ideals, especially among Theravāda Buddhists in Southeast Asia. Invested with the authority of the historical Buddha and his early saṅgha, such ideals are quite often called upon to authorize reform and innovation, as with the South Forest nuns in central Taiwan.[89]

In terms of food history, I have shown that Chinese Buddhist monasteries developed somewhat differently from their Indian and Southeast Asian counterparts with regard to the institutionalization of cooking and kitchens in monasteries. Additionally, Chinese Buddhist monasteries endorsed a totally

[89] Evidently, in Sri Lanka, many monasteries have given up alms rounds, and these days only modern fundamentalists such as the Vajirārāma in Colombo would still beg for alms regularly (Gombrich, *Precept and Practice*, 278).

vegetarian diet early in their history, much like their Daoist counterparts.[90] As Eric Greene has argued, early Chinese records reveal that by no later than the third century CE, or even from the start of the transmission of Buddhism into China, the assumption that Buddhist monastics were vegetarians was prevalent among both Chinese Buddhists and non-Buddhists.[91] The adoption of total vegetarianism allowed monastics to avoid the killing of animals as well as the three kinds of forbidden meat in the vinaya during the preparation and cooking of meals in the monastery kitchens.[92] Alongside vegetarianism, Chinese monasteries also cultivated land for agricultural produce to use for cooking meals in their kitchens, a move that also thwarted medieval Chinese court criticism of monastics as social parasites who could not yield productive labor toward their own food consumption.[93] While the vinaya, or prescriptive ethics of Indian Buddhism, explicitly forbids monastics from tilling land and growing food,[94] in practice, Indian monasteries were known to own land, including orchard groves and agricultural fields, and monastics participated in worldly activities like family inheritance, property disputes, and even slave ownership.[95] The lands of medieval Chinese monasteries were most likely tilled by lay servants or even slaves of the monastery,

---

90 For Buddhist and Daoist practices of vegetarianism, see Kieschnick, "Buddhist Vegetarianism in China"; Tu, *Zhongguo zhonggu de shushi guan*; Wong, "Vegetarianism in the Pre-Tang Context: Clarifying Misconceptions about Chinese Vegetarianism."

91 Greene, "A Reassessment of the Early History of Chinese Buddhist Vegetarianism," especially 35–37. Early biographies of Buddhist nuns in China already described Buddhist women as observing vegetarianism; see *Biquini zhuan* 比丘尼傳 [Biographies of Nuns], compiled by Baochang 寶唱 (ca. 465), T 2063.50.935b, 937c, 938b.

92 The *Vinaya in Four Parts* prohibits eating the three kinds of impure meat: (1) meat of animals you see slaughtered; (2) meat of animals that you hear slaughtered; (3) meat of animals that you suspect were killed for your sake (*Sifen lü*, T 1428.22.872b, 998b). A similar list is found in the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations* (*Shisong lü*, T 1435.23.190b).

93 On state criticism of the economic non-productivity of Buddhist monastics and monasteries, see Watson, "Emperor Wuzong's Edict on the Suppression of Buddhism: Edict of the Eighth Month (845)," 586.

94 The *pācittiya* rule 2 of the Pāli vinaya prohibits harming plants, while *pācittiya* rule 10 prohibits the digging of land; cf. *Sifen lü*, T 1438.22.572a.

95 See note 28 for works by Schopen and Clarke on these topics.

or else rented out to local peasants.[96] As mentioned earlier, Daoxuan's imagination of the Indian Jetavana monastery in the seventh century CE allocated a cluster of buildings, quarters, and parks—mostly located on the extreme eastern boundary of the monastery grounds—to the functions of cooking, eating, growing, and storing food.[97] Since his writings and illustrations better reflected the architectural realities of China than the historical monasteries of India that he purported to describe, Daoxuan's descriptions offer confirmation that by the seventh century, daily sustenance in major Chinese monasteries had evolved into a highly elaborate venture that involved a sizeable team of dedicated monastic and lay workers assigned to various quarters for different phases of food production and consumption.[98] Daoxuan even demarcated a space as the special quarters of the head cook, thereby accentuating the prestige of the head cook in the monastery who oversaw the extensive production of food for the community of resident monks and lay helpers.[99] Although kitchens and cooking were hardly unique to Chinese monasteries, it was only in China that the mundane realities of land ownership and kitchens, as well as cooking and eating, were explicitly integrated into daily monastic life through architectural and soteriological imaginings, such that the daily activities of cooking and eating seamlessly evolved into spheres of spiritual cultivation. The dichotomy of the sacred and the profane disappeared and the two spheres merged to encompass each other.

From the perspective of ethics, the pragmatic changes in Chinese Buddhist monasticism involved a paradigmatic shift from an ethics of renunciation to an ethics of compassion in the handling of meals. Both ethical systems had dietary implications. On the one hand, the ethics of renunciation emphasized the monastic

---

96 For a detailed discussion of monastery assets and land from India to China, including the labor roles of serfs, monastic menials, and slaves in the Chinese monastic economy, see Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society*, 63–191. Also see Pu, "Slaves (*nubi* 奴婢) in Daoxuan's Vinaya Writings."

97 Tsai, *Lives of the Nuns: Biographies of Chinese Buddhist Nuns from the Fourth to Sixth Centuries*, 10.

98 This is also true of contemporary Korean Buddhist monasticism; see descriptions of daily monastic life in Buswell, *The Zen Monastic Experience*.

99 *Qiyuansi tujing*, T 1899.45.895a.

cultivation of ascetic detachment, in which the primary impetus was to withdraw from worldly activities to focus on spiritual growth. Thus, the ethics of renunciation prescribed alms begging as the proper livelihood that freed monastics from worldly preoccupations, like food matters, to focus singularly on spiritual cultivation. However, alms begging could involve extended commutes that would potentially undermine any temporal benefit from not cooking. As part of their practice of humility and non-attachment, the alms beggar accepted all food offerings, even meat, with the exception of the previously mentioned three kinds of "impure meat" prohibited by monastic rules.[100] On the other hand, the ethics of compassion was rooted in the perception of equality between self and others, a state that would nurture a culture of altruistic care for monastics undertaking worldly activities to fulfill the needs of living beings.[101] The ethics of compassion naturally aligned with a diet of vegetarianism that avoids killing animals as bodily sustenance for humans and instead cherishes animal lives in the same way that human lives are cherished.[102]

Through instituting alms begging, South Forest reinstates the early Buddhist ethics of renunciation into daily meals in the monastery. However, the community still faithfully observes a traditional Chinese vegetarian diet as well as the Mahāyāna ethics of compassion implicit in vegetarianism. Given their vegetarian diet and geography, it is difficult for the nuns to go out to the village to collect food from house to house like in some Theravāda monastic cultures in Southeast Asia.[103] Instead, the nuns opt for a permanent Alms Station that is furnished with kitchen, stove, and sinks, as well as serving and dining spaces, to bridge Indian ideals and

---

[100] See note 91.

[101] On altruism in Mahāyāna Buddhism, see Williams, *Altruism and Reality: Studies in the Bodhicaryāvatāra*.

[102] Schmithausen, "The Case of Vegetarianism—A Buddhist Perspective"; Gómez, "Nonviolence and the Self in Early Buddhism."

[103] Chinese Buddhist vegetarianism also observes the prohibition against eating the five pungent plants, namely, chives, garlic, leek, onions, and shallots. In its enumeration of food prohibitions, the *Śivapurāna* states, "A devotee of Śiva shall refrain from eating meat, garlic, onions, red garlic, potherb, *Śleṣmātaka*, pig of rubbish and liquors" (Shastri, trans., *The Śiva Purāṇa*, vol. 1, 167).

Taiwanese realities. In doing so, South Forest effectively combines both the ethics of renunciation and the ethics of compassion in their daily meals. Their diet remains Chinese Buddhist vegetarian, but they incorporate alms begging through daily ritual behavior to highlight their rhetorical return to the monastic economic model rooted in the gift economy supposedly observed by the Buddha and his early community. South Forest owns extensive land properties that include plots of agricultural land that surround the monastery buildings up the hill. The nun Jianguo explained that, by legal definition, South Forest is unable to use these inherited agricultural lands for religious purposes. They therefore had to grow agricultural produce on these lands to conform to their designated legal usages.[104] South Forest assigns lay volunteers to till these lands and the yield of vegetables and fruits are used to supplement the groceries which donors bring to the Alms Station––an arrangement that is reminiscent of medieval Chinese monastery estates with their agricultural landholdings. This means that in actual practice, South Forest does not rely solely on alms for their meals and, in fact, the monastery possesses independent resources that yield supplies toward their daily meals at the Alms Station. The tight schedules of donors wishing to offer meals indicate that even if reforms had been motivated by a lack of food, the alms program has outlasted such basic economic needs. In other words, the reform in food economy appears not to be driven by a lack of wealth or resources and should instead be understood as a ritual change in meal culture centered on the ritual import of enacting the ideal of right livelihood traditionally traced back to the Buddha and his early community.

Following the vinaya, South Forest nuns explain that rules about daily alms begging and the prohibition on cooking in the monastery are intended to free monks and nuns from spending too much time and labor on the mundane business of procuring bodily sustenance.[105] In other words, the community aims to recover the early Buddhist ethics of renunciation that advocates withdrawal from social entanglements. However, far from being a marginal activity, mealtime is

[104] Shi Jianguo, written communication, May 2024.

[105] Shi Jianguo, interview by author, Nantou, July 2017.

remarkably pivotal to the structure and operation of religious and communal life at South Forest. Given their ritual routinization, the daily alms rites are comparable to the traditional morning and evening liturgies of Chinese Buddhist monasteries, which South Forest nuns continue to observe. Indeed, daily liturgies and meals are the only common activities in which the entire residential community is expected to participate. By integrating alms begging into their monastery architecture and meal rites, South Forest ritually (re)structures food culture in the Chinese monastery, such that mealtime becomes a material signifier of paradigm shifts in the economics and ethics of monastic life. The emergent template of the monastery economy highlights co-dependency between monastic and lay communities in their dual roles as givers and recipients of the gift exchange. The alms meal ultimately confirms the ethical authority and purity of the nuns by ritually aligning their daily meals with the perfected moral actions of the Buddha and his early community in ancient India.

Confucian emphasis on ritual etiquette has also left an indelible mark on the Chinese monastic codes, and traditional Chinese monastery meals that are based on the aforementioned rules of purity are highly ritualized activities, such as the tea ceremony which Kehan Ding discusses in this issue.[106] Buddhist meal etiquette in East Asian monasteries has evolved into art forms like the *ōryōki* 応量器 in Japanese Zen monasteries which has been transmitted across Asia and also to North America. [107] Similarly, in contemporary Taiwan, South Forest derives inspiration from both vinaya ideals of food economy and monastic practice in Southeast Asia, but ultimately ritualizes alms meals into a Buddho-Confucian food ethic that amalgamates Indian vinaya prescriptions with cross-cultural elements. At every meal, the community "returns" to the idealized monastic economy of the

[106] On rules of purity, see note 39.

[107] *Ōryōki* (literally, "vessel for just the right amount") is the name given to the formal ritual of serving and eating meals in Japanese Zen monasteries. The ritual involves the use of a set of nested lacquered wooden bowls, a cloth for wrapping and cleaning, and also specific utensils used in a choreographed sequence of setting up, receiving food, eating, and then cleaning up. This ritualized style of eating foregrounds mindfulness and appreciation of food based on the principle of receiving "just enough." See Nagahisa, *Shokuji sahō to ōryōki no mochīkata shou ku*; Marra, "*Fucha Ryōri*: The Monastic Cuisine of the Obaku-Zen School."

Buddha's time through ritual performativity and repetition. The result is an innovative cross-cultural interpretation of ethical food economy that deftly intertwines threads from South Asian, Southeast Asian, and East Asian cultures.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

T Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新脩大蔵経 (Takakusu and Watanabe, eds.)

X Wan xu zangjing 卍續藏經

Chinese Canonical Sources

Biqiuni zhuan 比丘尼傳 [Biographies of Nuns]. Compiled by Baochang 寶唱 (ca. 465). T 2063.50.934a–948a.

Chanyuan qinggui 禪院清規 [Rules of Purity for the Chan Monastery]. By Changlu Zongze 長盧宗賾 (ca. 1107). X 1245.63.522a–566a.

Datang Xiyu ji 大唐西域記 [The Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions]. By Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664). T 2087.51.867b–947c.

Gaoseng Faxian zhuan 高僧法顯傳 [Travel Record of the Eminent Monk Faxian]. By Faxian 法顯 (ca. 337–422). T 2085.51.857a–866c.

Hongming ji 弘明集 [Collection for the Propagation and Clarification of Buddhism]. Compiled by Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518). T 2102.52.1a–96b.

Mohe sengqi lü 摩訶僧祇律 [Mahāsāṅghika vinaya]. Translated by Buddhabhadra 佛陀跋陀羅 (359–429). T 1425.22.227–549a.

Sibu congkan 四部叢刊 [Collectanea of the Four Categories]. Compiled in 1911–1949 by Zhang Yuanji 張元濟 (1867–1959). Shanghai: Shanghai shangwu, 1920–1922. Reprints 1929, 1935).

Sifen biqiuni jieben 四分比丘尼戒本 [Dharmaguptaka Monastic Rules for Bhikṣuṇī]. By Buddhayaśas 佛陀耶舍 (ca. 384–417). T 1431.22.1031a–1041a.

Sifen lü 四分律 [Vinaya in Four Parts] [Dharmaguptaka Vinaya]. Translated in 410–412 by Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (n.d.). T 1428.22.567a–1014b.

Sifen sengjie ben 四分僧戒本 [Dharmaguptaka Monastic Rules for Saṅgha]. By Buddhayaśas. T 1430.22.1023a–1030c.

Shisong lü 十誦律 [Vinaya in Ten Recitations] (Skt., *Daśabhāṇavāravinaya*). Translated by Puṇyatara 佛若多羅 (n.d.), Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (343–413), Dharmaruci 曇摩流支 (n.d.), and Vimalākṣa 毘摩羅叉 (n.d.). T 1435.23.1a–470b.

Song gaoseng zhuan 宋高僧傳 [Song Biographies of Eminent Monks]. By Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001). T 2061.50.709a–900a.

Qing Bintoulu fa 請賓頭盧法 [The Ritual Method of Inviting Piṇḍola]. Attributed to Huijian 慧簡 (ca. 457). T 1689.32.784b–c.

Xu gaoseng zhuan 續高僧傳 [Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks]. By Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). T 2060.50.425a–707a.

Zhong tianzhu sheweiguo qiyuansi tujing 中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經 [Illustrated Sutra on Jetavana Monastery in the Kingdom of Śrāvastī in Central India]. By Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). T 1899.45.882b–96b.

Secondary Sources

Bianji weiyuanhui 編輯委員會, ed. *Guanghua lüshi yonghuai ji* 廣化律師永懷紀 [In Lasting Memory of Vinaya Teacher Guanghua]. Taizhong: Nanputuo Temple, 1996.

Buswell, Robert. *The Zen Monastic Experience*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Chen, Jialun 陳家倫. “Nanchuan fojiao zai Taiwan de fazhan yu yingxiang: quanqiuhua de fenxi guandian” 南傳佛教在台灣的發展與影響: 全球化的分析

觀點 [Growth and Impact of Theravāda Buddhism in Taiwan: Analyzing the Globalization of Theravada]. *Taiwan shehui xue* 台灣社會學 [Studies on Taiwanese Society] 24 (2012): 155–206.

Chiu, Tzu-lung. "Rethinking the Precept of Not Taking Money in Contemporary Taiwan and Mainland Chinese Buddhist Monasteries." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 21 (2014): 10–56.

———. "The Application of Traditional Rules of Purity (Qinggui) in Contemporary Taiwanese Monasteries." *Buddhist Studies Review* 36, no. 2 (2019): 249–277.

———. "The Practice of Fasting After Midday in Contemporary Buddhist Nunneries." *Journal of the Oxford Center of Buddhist Studies* 11 (2015): 57–89.

Chuan Yao 傳耀. "Fomen shishi zhong de cibei jingshen" 佛門施食中的慈悲精神 [The Spirit of Compassion in the Ghost Feeding Rites of Buddhism]. *Putuo qikan* 普陀期刊 [Putuo Magazine], China Buddhist Academy of Mount Putuo, December 2021, https://www.zgpts.com/pts/xsgw/6747.shtml

Clarke, Shayne. *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Cook, Joanna. "Alms, Money, and Reciprocity: Buddhist Nuns as Mediators of Generalized Exchange in Thailand." *Anthropology in Action* 15, no. 3 (2008): 8–21.

Crosby, Kate. *Theravāda Buddhism: Continuity, Diversity, and Identity.* New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

De Bary, Theodore and Irene Bloom, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition 1: From Earliest Times to 1600s*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Debazoti1985, "File:Remnant of the ancient kitchen of Nalanda Mahavihara.jpg." *Wikimedia Commons*, January 20, 2015, page last edited April 30, 2025, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Remnant_of_the_ancient_kitchen_of_Nalanda_Mahavihara.jpg#:~:text=File%20history.%20Click%20on%20a%20date/time%20to,file%20as%20it%20appeared%20at%20that%20time

DeVisser, Marinus Willem. “The Arhats in China and Japan.” *Ost-asiatische Zeitschrift* 10 (1922/23): 71–80.

Dutt, Sukumar. *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India.* London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

Eihei Dōgen (1200–1253). *Dōgen’s Pure Standards for the Zen Community: A translation of the Eihei shingi*. Translated by Taigen Daniel Leighton and Shohaku Okumura. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

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.

Gómez, Luis O. “Nonviolence and the Self in Early Buddhism.” In *Inner Peace, World Peace: Essays on Buddhism and Nonviolence,* edited by Kenneth Kraft, 31–48. New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Gombrich, Richard. *Precept and Practice: Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

———. *Theravāda Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo.* London: Routledge, 1988.

Greene, Eric M. “A Reassessment of the Early History of Chinese Buddhist Vegetarianism.” *Asia Major* 29, no. 1 (2016): 1–43.

Gregory, Chris. *Gifts and Commodities.* London: Academic Press, 1982; 2nd ed., Chicago: Hau Books, 2015.

Heim, Maria. *Theories of the Gift in South Asia: Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain Reflections on Dāna.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Heirman, Ann. *Rules for Nuns According to the Dharmaguptakavinaya.* 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2015.

———. “Becoming a Nun in the Dharmaguptaka Tradition.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 25, no. 2 (2008): 174–93.

Hirakawa, Akira 平川彰. *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* 律蔵の研究 [A Study of the Vinayapiṭaka]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1970.

Jones, Charles Brewer. *Buddhism in Taiwan: Religion and the State 1660–1990.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.

Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn. *The Bhikkhunī Patimokkha of the Six Schools.* Bangkok: Thammasat University Press, 1991.

Kim, Haewon, "Images and Monasteries in Faxian's Account on Anurādhapura." *Hualin International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 2, no. 1 (2019): 133–52. https://glorisunglobalnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/hualin2.1_kim_ha.pdf

Kim, Young-Jae. "Constructing the Buddha's Life in Early Monastic Arrangements at Nagarjunakonda." *Religions* 15 (2024): 559–75. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15050559

Kong, Man Shik. "Food and Craving in Early Buddhist Monasticism Focusing on Pali Literature." PhD dissertation, King's College, University of London, 2016.

Laliberté, André. *The Politics of Buddhist Organizations in Taiwan 1989–2003: Safeguard the Faith, Build a Pure Land, Help the Poor.* London: Routledge, 2013.

Lévi, Sylvain, and Édouard Chavannes. "Les seize arhats protecteurs de la loi." *Journal asiatique* 8 (1916): 205–75.

Li, Yu-chen. "The Legend of Bhikṣuṇī Huiwan." In *The Anniversary Memorial of Venerable Xiaoyun and the Sixth International Symposium of Tiantai School,* edited by Karma Lekshe Tsomo, 11–38. Taipei: Huafan University, 2007.

Link, Arthur. "The Biography of Shih Tao-an." *T'oung-pao* 46 (1958): 35.

Lye, Hun Y. "Feeding Ghosts—A Study of the Yuqie yankou Rite." PhD dissertation, University of Virginia, 2003.

———. "Song Tiantai Ghost-Feeding Rituals" and "*Yuqie yankou* in the Ming–Qing." In Orzech, Charles D., Henrik H. Sørenson, and Richard K. Payne, eds. *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, 520–24, 561–567. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Madsen, Richard. *Democracy's Dharma: Religious Renaissance and Political Development in Taiwan.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Marra, Claudia. "Fucha Ryōri: The Monastic Cuisine of the Obaku-Zen School." Online paper, n.d., https://www.academia.edu/10346764/Fucha_Ryori_the_Monastic_Cuisine_of_the_Obaku_Zen_School

Masuzawa, Tomoko. *In Search of Dreamtime: The Quest for the Origin of Religion.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies.* Translated by W. D. Halls. London: Routledge, 2002. First published in 1990.

McRae, John R. "Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana and the Ordination Platform Movement in Medieval Chinese Buddhism." In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya: Essays Presented in Honor of Stanley Weinstein*, edited by William Bodiford, 68–100. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.

Mecsi, Beatrix. "Piṇḍola in Korea and Japan: Is the Wandering Jew Coming from East Asia?" *Asian Studies* 2, no. 2 (2014): 75–88.

Michaels, Axel. "Gift and Return Gift, Greeting and Return Greeting in India: On a Consequential Footnote by Marcel Mauss." Translated by Philip Pierce. *Numen* 44, no. 3 (1997): 242–269.

Minakata, Kumagusu. "The Wandering Jew." *Notes and Queries* 9, no. 4 (1899): 121–24.

Moerman, Max. "Sweetness and Power: The Buddhist Transformation of Taste." In *Buddhism and the Senses: A Guide to the Good and Bad*, edited by Robert DeCaroli and Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 167–182. New York: Wisdom Publications, 2024.

Nagahisa, Gakushi 永久岳水. *Shokuji sahō to ōryōki no mochikata shou ku* 食事作法と応量器の用い方 [Meal Etiquette and the Use of Ōryōki]. Tokyo: Komeisya 鴻盟社 [Komeisha Publishing], 1987.

Nanlin sengni yuan. “Weijun heshangni luezhuan” 惟俊和尚尼略傳 [A Short Biography of the Nun Elder Weijun], https://www.dbecs.org/?page_id=2385

Ōchō, Enichi 横超慧日. *Chūgoku Bukkyō no kenkyū* 中國佛教の研究 [Studies on Chinese Buddhism]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1958.

Ohnuma, Reiko. “Gift.” In *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 103–123. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ.* 5 vols. London: Pali Text Society, Luzac and Co., 1879–83. Reprint 1964–82.

Orzech, Charles D., trans. “Saving the Burning-Mouth Hungry Ghost.” In *Religions of China in Practice,* edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 278–83. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Pu, Chengzong. “Slaves (*nubi* 奴婢) in Daoxuan’s Vinaya Writings.” *Studies in Chinese Religions* 2, no. 1 (2016): 18–44.

Rappaport, Roy A. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Schmithausen, Lambert. “The Case of Vegetarianism—A Buddhist Perspective.” *The Korean Journal of Indian Philosophy* 12, no. 1 (2003): 309–29.

Schopen, Gregory. “The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident of Medieval Indian Monasteries.” In *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India,* 258–89. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1997.

———. *Buddhist Monks, Nuns, and Other Worldly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India.* Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2014.

———. “Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk’s Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India,* 170–192. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2004.

———. “The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two Vinayas.” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17, no. 2 (1994): 145–173.

Shastri, J.L., trans. *The Śiva Purāṇa*. 4 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1950. Reprint, 1970.

Shi Datian 釋大田. “Zhongguo fojiao zaowanke xingcheng” 中國佛教早晚課的形成 [The Formation of Morning and Evening Liturgies in Chinese Buddhism]. *Faguang zazhi* 法光雜誌 [Dharma Light Monthly] 296 (May 2014): 3–4.

Shi Zhihui 釋智慧. “Daoxuan’s Vision of Jetavana: Imagining a Utopian Monastery in Early Tang.” PhD dissertation, University of Arizona, 2002.

Sihlé, Nicolas. “Towards a Comparative Anthropology of the Buddhist Gift (and Other Transfers).” *Religion Compass* 9, no. 11 (2015): 352–385.

Spiro, Melford. *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes.* New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Strong, John S. “The Legend of the Lion-Roarer: A Study of the Buddhist Arhat Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja.” *Numen* 26, no. 1 (1979): 71–72.

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [Revised Buddhist Canon Compiled under the Taishō Era (1912–1926)]. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1932. Digitized in CBETA (v. 5.2 or updated) (https://www.cbeta.org) and SAT Daizōkyō Text Database (http://21dzk.l.u-Tōkyō.ac.jp/SAT/satdb2015.php).

Tiyavanich, Kamala. *Forest Recollections: Wandering Monks in Twentieth-Century Thailand.* Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1997.

Tsai, Kathryn Ann. *Lives of the Nuns: Biographies of Chinese Buddhist Nuns from the Fourth to Sixth Centuries.* Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1994.

Tso, Sze-Bong. “The Practice of ‘No-Eating After Noontime’ as Recorded in Chinese Sangha History and the Problems It Faces.” *Hua-Kang Buddhist Journal* 6 (1983): 327–344.

———. “The Transformation of Buddhist Vinaya in China.” PhD dissertation, Australian National University, 1982.

Tu, Zongcheng 涂宗呈. *Zhongguo zhonggu de shushi guan* 中國中古的素食觀 [Vegetarianism in Medieval China]. MA thesis, National Taiwan University, Department of History, 2005.

Uchiyama, Kōshō. *Refining Your Life: From the Zen Kitchen to Enlightenment.* Translated by Thomas Wright. Boston: Weatherhill Publishing, 1983. Reprint, *How to Cook Your Life: From the Zen Kitchen to Enlightenment.* Boulder: Shambhala Publications, 2005.

Wan xu zangjing 卍續藏經 (Man Extended Buddhist Canon). 150 vols. Xin wenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, Taibei, 1968–1970. Reprint of Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧, et al., eds. *Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [Buddhist Canon of Great Japan, Continued], 120 cases. Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin 藏經書院, 1905–1912. Digitized in CBETA (v. 5.2 or updated, https://www.cbeta.org).

Watson, Burton, trans. “Memorial on the Bone of Buddha [by Han Yu 韓愈].” In *Sources of Chinese Tradition 1: From Earliest Times to 1600s*, edited by Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom, 583–85. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

———, trans. “Emperor Wuzong’s Edict on the Suppression of Buddhism: Edict of the Eight Month (845),” in *Sources of Chinese Tradition 1: From Earliest Times to 1600s*, edited by Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom, 585–86. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Wijayaratna, Mohan. *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition.* Translated by Claude Grangier and Steven Collins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Williams, Paul. *Altruism and Reality: Studies in the Bodhicaryāvatāra.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Wong, Hon Foong. “Vegetarianism in the Pre-Tang Context: Clarifying Misconceptions about Chinese Vegetarianism.” MSc thesis, London Centre for History of Science, Medicine, and Technology, 2010.

Sommer, Deborah, ed. *Chinese Religion: An Anthology of Sources*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

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.