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Abstract
When Japan, during the Kamakura (1180–1333) and Muromachi (1336–1573) periods, imported Zen Buddhism from Song (960–1279) and Yuan (1279–1368) China, it not only continually dispatched Zen monks on pilgrimages to China to seek materials for transmitting sectarian doctrine, but also introduced Zen temple architecture and monastic discipline to Japan, established the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery 五山十剎 system of government temples, and developed Five Mountain 五山 literature. This system of government temples is believed to have imitated the Song system of government temples of the same name. Moreover, it is the best example of Sino-Japanese cultural interaction in the field of Buddhism.

In contrast with the ample materials we have on the operation of the Japanese system of the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery government temples, we lack sufficient materials to determine the time and impetus of the Song system of Five Mountain, Ten Monastery government temples and are at a loss to give a detailed accurate account of the Song system. Among the many views in circulation, the view most accepted by modern scholars is that Shi Miyuan 史彌遠 proposed to the court to establish this system of government temples during the reign of Emperor Ningzong (r. 1194–1224) of the Southern Song dynasty. But this theory comes down to us from Song Lian 宋濂 (1310–1381) of the early Ming dynasty, and no Song or Yuan sources mention this matter. Moreover, no Japanese Five Mountain Zen monks touch on this matter in any of their writings. Hence, whether Shi Miyuan actually proposed this system of government temples is a topic worth revisiting.

This paper discusses whether Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system from the vantage point of materials related to Shi Miyuan and observations of Japanese Zen monks, and it reaches the conclusion that it is not credible that Shi Miyuan proposed the system to the court.
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1 Introduction

When the shogun Ashikaga Yoshimitsu (1358–1408) visited Tōji Temple in Kyoto in 1382, he met with the monk Gidō Shūshin (1325–1385) and asked about the establishment of the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries of Kyoto. Shūshin said that they were established by the previous shogun. He added that the Five Mountains were, in order of precedence, first, Kenchō Temple in Kamakura and Nanzen Temple in Kyoto; second, Engaku Temple in Kamakura and Tenryū Temple in Kyoto; third, Jufuku Temple in Kamakura; fourth, Kennin Temple in Kyoto; fifth, Tōfuku Temple in Kyoto; and that later Jōchi Temple in Kamakura and Jōmyō Temple in Kamakura and Manju Temple in Kyoto were added to the ranking to give Kamakura and Kyoto each five temples designated as Five Mountain temples. Yoshimitsu then asked whether China also had Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries. Shūshin replied that Japan’s Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system was copied from China, and that China’s Five Mountains were, in order, Jingshan Temple, Lingyin Temple, Tiantong Temple, Jingci Temple, and Ayuwang Temple.1 Later in 1386, when Yoshimitsu met Shūshin in Shōkoku Temple in Kyoto, he asked about making Shōkoku Temple, his family temple, into the sixth mountain on par with the Five Mountains. Shūshin replied that ever since the days of the Song dynasty, there have been only Five Mountains, and that the term “Six Mountains” would be unheard of. But during the Yuan dynasty, he said, Dalongxiang Jiqing Temple in Nanjing was placed over the Five Mountains. Hence, he suggested elevating the status of Nanzen Temple above the Five Mountains and making Shōkoku Temple one of the Five Mountains. This would certainly be acceptable.2 From that point on, the five temples serving as the Five Mountains in Kamakura and the five temples serving as the Five Mountains in Kyoto remained fixed, with each Five Mountain

---


2 Gidō Shūshin, *Kūge nichiyō kufū ryakushū*, vol. 4, p. 16. Yoshimitsu built the Shōkoku Temple as the final resting place of Hino Nobuko 日野宣子, the wife of his wife’s uncle. Thus did Yoshimitsu come to know about the Zen sect. For the details of this story, see Imaeda 2001, pp. 471–482.
temple serving as the head of a nexus of local temples, the whole forming a huge Buddhist network.

The military governments of the Kamakura and Muromachi bakufu 朝廷 assiduously introduced Chan (= Japanese Zen, 禪) Buddhism from China: Japanese Zen monks continuously went on pilgrimages to China to study Chan Buddhism, some at the foot of a high-ranking priest, others by engaging in the affairs of a temple. They copied the architecture style of Chinese Five Mountain temples. And they took notes on the preaching and rituals of the temple, which they brought back to Japan for reference. The Japanese thus gradually built the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system of government temples. The process by which Japan imported this system quintessentially characterizes Sino-Japanese cultural interaction during the Song and Yuan periods.

The Japanese Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system began imitating the Chinese system in the Song period, and the Song Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system was said to originate when Shi Miyuan (1164–1233) proposed such a system to the Southern Song court. Song Lian (1310–1381), in volume 2, “Inscription for the Stupa in Which Gufengde, Abbot and Chan Master of the Jingci Temple, Was Interred” 住持淨慈禪師孤峰德公塔銘, in his Record of Protecting the Law, wrote,

In the past, each abbot would take his seat and preach the law, so that there might be compassion in benefits conferred. There was never any ranking associated with the seating. In the Song period, Shi, Prince of Wei, petitioned the throne to establish a system of Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries, like what commoners call government agencies. Those who serve in these government temples must follow the discipline of a small monastery and wait until their good reputations are apparent. Then they will be promoted step by step, up as far as the famous Five Mountains, much like a government official might become a general or minister. Thus, human compassion might flourish, so that nothing can be added thereto. Ecclesiastics and laity often admire such compassion, but unless one enters the priesthood and removes oneself far from the web of ordinary relations, such compassion is not easy to attain.3

This passage mentions several key points: The first is that Shi Miyuan proposed to the court the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system of govern-

---

ment temples. The second is that the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries were to be like government agencies and serving in the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries was like being a bureaucrat—one had to undergo rigorous examination. The third is that to be an abbot, one had first to serve in a small monastery, be examined and promoted to a large monastery, and eventually be promoted to the abbotship of one of the Five Mountains. The process was much like a Confucian student’s serving as a government official and eventually becoming a general or minister. Just as being a general or minister was the highest attainment for a government official, so being the abbot of one of the Five Mountains was the highest attainment for a monk. Unless one excelled above the ordinary run of monks, one could hardly attain the level of an abbot at one of the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries.

The theory that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system became received opinion after the beginning of the Ming period (1368–1644), and over the last hundred years, scholars who discuss the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries all assume this theory as the basis of their views. But in another work, “Inscription for the Stupa in Which Jueyuan, the Fourth Chan Master of the Tianjie Temple, Was Interred” 天界善世禪寺第四代覺原禪師遺衣塔銘序, in volume 1 of his Record of Protecting the Law, Song Lian wrote,

The according of stupas to the good was not settled practice in the Sui and Tang dynasties. Monks simply followed the discipline of the monastery. Even in the Song dynasty, when grand temples flourished, monasteries were still not ranked hierarchically. Just the large monastery in the capital was made the head of all the other monasteries. Only after the Song capital was moved south was the system of the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries instituted south of the Chang River, and were monks elevated on the basis of qualifications. And yet the monasteries at Huangmei and Caoxi were not included among them. Hence, Chan monasteries increasingly departed from the past.4

There is a gap of over seventy years from when the Southern Song instituted the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to when Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system. Song Lian, in his memorial inscriptions for two Chan masters, has this much of a time discrepancy in what he writes. Was he unaware of the discrepancy?

One does not encounter mention of Shi Miyuan’s proposal of the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system in any official records of the Song or Yuan dynasties, nor in any biographies or collected works of Chan monks, not even

in the collected works of Japanese Five Mountain Zen monks. Mujaku Dōchū 無著道忠 (1653–1745), in “Distinctions, the Five Mountains” 區界・五山 (in Notes on the Manifestations of Zen), quoted from “Inscription for the Stupa in Which Jueyuan, the Fourth Chan Master of the Tianjie Temple, Was Interred,” but clearly omits any mention of the “Inscription for the Stupa in Which Gufengde, Abbot and Chan Master of the Jingci Temple, Was Interred.” Mujaku Dōchū, it appears, did not regard the view that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system as credible.

Most modern scholars who discuss the Chinese and Japanese Five Mountain, Ten Monastery systems accept the theory that Shi Miyuan proposed the system. Indeed, this theory serves as the beginning of discussion of this topic. Yet from the Song to the Qing dynasty, Chinese and Japanese scholars and Chan and Zen monks held the opposite view. In this essay I wish to discuss whether the view that Shi Miyuan proposed the system is credible.

2 Shi Miyuan’s Connection with Buddhism

Shi Miyuan’s career in politics spanned the reigns of the Southern Song emperors Ningzong 寧宗 (r. 1194–1224) and Lizong 理宗 (r. 1224–1264), and he came to power in 1208. At first he served as Vice Director in the Ministry of Rites. The grand councilor at the time, Han Tuozhou 韓侂冑 (1152–1207), instigated a war with the Jin state in 1206, a war that ended in defeat. A year later, at Emperor Ningzong’s suggestion, Shi Miyuan plotted to kill Han Tuozhou, and in 1208 he himself became grand councilor. This was Shi Miyuan’s first step on the road to power. In 1224 Emperor Ningzong fell critically ill, whereupon Shi Miyuan placed Lizong on the throne and killed the Prince of Ji 濟王, the heir designated by Emperor Ningzong. He retained political control up until his death in 1233. If Shi Miyuan had indeed proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system, he must have done so between 1208 and 1224.

Song Lian did not indicate whether Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to the court of Emperor Ningzong or that of Emperor Lizong, but Tian Rucheng 田汝成 (1503–1557), in volume 3 of his West Lake Excursions 西湖遊覽志, wrote that the Five Mountain system was established in 1220 during the reign of Emperor Ningzong. Hence, scholars maintain that this system was instituted during the reign of Emperor Ningzong, mainly because Emperor Lizong revered Neo-Confucianism, and because soon after Emperor Lizong’s death, Southern Song was conquered by the Mongols. The timeframe was too short, and the political situation at court too chaotic, for the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to be established during the reign of Emperor Lizong. Because the timeframe is inappropriate
and the bits of evidence one can adduce too few, scholars do not think that the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system was instituted during the reign of Emperor Lizong. That leaves the reign of Emperor Ningzong and the period from 1208 to 1224 as the most reasonable timeframe. From Shi Miyuan’s rise to power (1208) to the fall of the Southern Song dynasty (1279) is a period of more than seventy years. It ought to be possible to find materials on the operation of the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system during this timeframe. Hence, even though materials are scarce on the establishment of the Five Mountain system of government temples, most scholars think that it was during the Jiading era (1208–1224) of Emperor Ningzong’s reign that Shi Miyuan proposed and established this system.5

In addition, scholars are also led to affirm the theory that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system by the connection that Shi Miyuan’s family had with Buddhism. Zongjian 宗鑑, in “Zhilian” 智連, volume 7 of his The Orthodox Lineage of the Buddhist Tradition 釋門正統 (ca. 1237), wrote that when Zhilian was the abbot of Yanqing Temple 延慶寺, a high-ranking official once came to discuss the Chan discipline.6 This official, according to Zhipan 志磐 in A Chronicle of the Patriarchs of Buddhism 佛祖統紀 (1269), volume 16, was Shi Miyuan’s father, who, while living in the countryside, practiced Chan Buddhism and also discussed Chan discipline and debated the import of the Garland Sutra 華嚴經 and the Sutra on the Perfection of Wisdom 般若經. Moreover, Zhilian, after he passed away, was said to be reincarnated as Shi Miyuan,7 and for a while, monks at the time regarded the belief that Shi Miyuan was the reincarnation of Zhilian as a beautiful story. After Shi Miyuan passed away, Chan Master Shitian Faxun 石田法薰 (1171–1245) made an offering to his soul.8

Moreover, Shi Miyuan’s family were members of the educated elite of Ningbo and maintained good relations with Chan and Tiantai-learning monks. Yanqing Temple, in present-day Ningbo, was ranked in the Ming dynasty as the second best of the teaching-monastery Five Mountains 教院五山,9 and was also the temple where Siming Zhili 四明知禮 (960–1028) developed Tiantai learning. Both The Orthodox Lineage of the Buddhist Tradition and A Chronicle of the Patriarchs of Buddhism were collections of biographies of monks written and edited by Tiantai-learning monks, and they eval-

5 Ishii 1987, p. 396.
6 The Buddhist Canon, Continued 續藏經, vol. 75, p. 343.
7 Taishō Revised Tripitaka, vol. 49, p. 231.
8 The Buddhist Canon, Continued, vol. 70, p. 354a. On the connection of Shi Miyuan’s family with Buddhism, also see Ishii 1987, pp. 395–399.
9 For changes in the ranking of Yanqing Temple, see Noguchi 2005, p. 277.
uate Shi Miyuan quite positively. And yet in every passage concerning Shi
Miyuan’s dealings with the monks, there is no mention of the Five Mountain,
Ten Monastery system.

In addition, the late Song lyricist Zhou Mi 周密 (1232–1298), in his
*Miscellaneous Observations from Guixin Street* 癸辛雜識, includes several
lyric poems about Shi Miyuan’s family. For example, volume 1 of the
supplementary collection includes “An Appreciation of Shi Hao” 史浩傳贊,
and volume 2 includes “The Prince of Wei [Shi Miyuan] Appreciates the
Famous Vessel” 衛王惜名器, “The Career of Shi Songzhi” 史嵩之始末, “The
Revenge of Songzhi” 嵩之起復, and “Shi Zhaizhi” 史宅之. Shi Hao (1106–
1194) was Shi Miyuan’s father, Shi Zhaizhi (1205–1249) was his son, and Shi
Songzhi (1189–1257) was his nephew. These lyric poems give a straightforward
appraisal of members of Shi Miyuan’s family, but Zhou Mi said not a
word about any proposal to establish a Five Mountain, Ten Monastery
system, an event too considerable to overlook.

The greatest difficulty in discussing when the Five Mountain system of
government temples was established is that materials are scarce, that the Song
literature seldom mentions the Five Mountain government temples. According
to what we know at present, the earliest use of the term “Five Mountains”
was by the Southern Song scholar Lin Xiyi 林希逸 (1193–1271), who, in
“Inscription for the Stupa in Which the Former Abbot of Tianzhu Temple and
Monastery Monk Was Interred” 前天竺住持同菴法師塔銘 (volume 21 of
Zhuxi Yanzhai ji shiyi gao xujì), wrote, “Qiantang 錢塘 went to Tianzhu Temple 天
竺寺, the head of all teaching temples. Monks of this temple were held in
esteem comparable to that of monks of Shuangjing 雙徑 of the Five
Mountains.”

By function, temples in the Song period were divided into
meditation temples 禪寺, teaching temples 教寺, and discipline temples 律寺.
This passage is saying that Qiantang entered Tianzhu Temple 徑山寺, the head
of the Five Mountain meditation temples. Jingshan Temple was also called
Jingwu 徑塢. Hence it also had the name Shuangjing 雙徑. Lin Xiyi was a
presented scholar during the reign of Lizong of the Southern Song. Thus, his
statement indicates that during the reign of Lizong, temples and monasteries
in the Southern Song period were already grouped as meditation-temple Five
Mountains 禪寺五山 and teaching-temple Five Mountains 教寺五山, but he did
not indicate which were the other four temples of the meditation-temple Five

---

10 Wenyuan 文淵閣 copy of the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 (Complete Library of
the Four Branches of Literature) (photographic reproduction, Taipei: Taiwan
765.
Mountains or specify why there were Five Mountains for both meditation temples and teaching temples.

Records from the Song period on the Five Mountain government temples are exceedingly rare. Only in the Yuan period do records start listing the temples in the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system. For example, Cheng Tinggui 成廷珪 (fl. 1338), in “To Siming Mengtang 寄四明夢堂懷禪師兼簡用堂上人” (volume 3 of The Poems of Cheng Tinggui 居竹軒詩集), wrote,

The Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries are luxuriant, high, and precipitous.
And I really love my brook-side hut, hidden in the foliage.
The old disciples of Huaihai now have an opportunity.
For an itinerant revered monk is a rare sight nowadays.
No one talks about Maonü escaping civil strife or officials sounding out the complaints of the people.
One only sees Japanese monks inquiring about the Buddhist law.
I talk with Mr. Geng, and we fondly recollect together.
With white clouds in a blue sky throughout the day, what is there to worry about?  

This poem indicates that Japanese monks who went to China to meditate and study had to have the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries on their itinerary.

In addition, Xie Yingfang 謝應芳 (1295–1392) of the Yuan dynasty, in “Mourning Rigong, Head of Dalin Monastery” 悼大林菴主日公 (volume 17 of Turtle Nest Compositions 龜巢稿), wrote,

The peak of Mt. Xiong’er has a returning guest.
We meet again, wearing the old meditation robes.
The Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries all spread the word.
No one hastens the lingering clouds to fly away from the lofty pinnacle.

From these two examples, one can see “Five Mountains” and “Ten Monasteries” being combined into a set phrase, but examples of the use of “Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries” are still quite rare.

From these limited materials, we can draw the following inferences: References to the Five Mountains began during the reign of Emperor Lizong (r. 1224–1264) of the Southern Song dynasty, or possibly as early as the reign

---

11 Wenyuange copy of the Siku quanshu, vol. 1216, no. 155 in the belles lettres section, p. 333.
of the Emperor Ningzong (r. 1194–1224). From Lin Xiyi’s inscription, we can infer that meditation temples and teaching temples in the Five Mountain system of government temples appeared at the same time, but only in the Yuan dynasty did people start referring to the Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries together. Even if Song Lian’s statement were true that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system, he could not have proposed the Five Mountains and the Ten Monasteries together.

3 Government Temples Were Not Government Agencies, and Monks Were Not Bureaucrats

The view that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain system of government temples includes the notion that government temples became government agencies and that the monks became bureaucrats. In one of his writings, Song Lian mentions that monks must first serve in small monasteries and gradually be promoted to larger monasteries, with the Five Mountain government temples being the culmination of their careers, just like bureaucrats working in government agencies.

In the Song dynasty, temples varied in the manner in which they selected their abbots. Some openly elected their abbots. Some relied on recommendations to appoint their abbots. Some brought in their abbots from the outside. Some selected their abbots by secret ballots. For some temples, the government appointed abbots. The Five Mountain government temples all had their abbots appointed by the government. Scholars believe that government temples were equivalent to government agencies, that the monks in government temples were just like bureaucrats, and that the government appointed outstanding monks in the government temples to be abbots. This is the reason that scholars cite Song Lian’s inscription. However, the appointment system was used for all Song government temples. It was one way in which the government controlled temples and monasteries. It was not an outcome of the government’s viewing them as government agencies. If the appointment system were an indication that temples and monasteries had become government agencies, the system should have already appeared during the Northern Song period (960–1127). The reign of Southern Song Emperor Ningzong (r. 1194–1224) is rather late in the game to consider making the Five Mountain government temples into government agencies.

For a monk, after leaving the secular world, first to cultivate himself in a local temple, then to move around until reaching a metropolitan temple, and finally to move to a major temple near the central government seems like the natural order of things. But except for a few well-known ecclesiastics who could exercise their talents as the abbot of a large or first-rate temple, most monks ended up in local temples. In fact, absent the recommendation of a
powerful backer, it was difficult to enter a large temple and become its abbot. Though one can find examples of monks who gradually moved from small temples to the Ten Monasteries and later became the abbot of a Five Mountain government temple, such examples were rare, too rare to form the basis of expectations for the progression of a monastic career.

In addition to general activities, the most important obligations of monks at government temples during the Song dynasty were praying for the well-being of the imperial family, carrying out intercessions by an assembly of monks in response to natural disasters, burning incense and praying, and praying for the imperial family prior to engaging in group meditation. In fact, the regulations for monks during the Song and Yuan dynasties even specified the formulas and wording for prayers for the imperial family. These activities were monks’ regular functions, and they were not limited to the Five Mountain government temples. To take these activities as indicating that monks were bureaucratized is an exaggeration of the facts.

*Classified Regulations and Laws to the Qingyuan Era*慶元條法事類, completed in 1202, was a record of the laws and regulations from the beginning of the Southern Song (1127) to the Qingyuan era (1195–1200). Two volumes of this work are devoted to policies regulating monastic life. Covered in great detail are the proper way to test the sutras, how to obtain a permit to enter monastic life, passports for travel, and the duties of the abbot. Yet throughout these two volumes, there is no mention of standards for evaluating abbots; much less is there any basis for asserting that government temples became government agencies and that monks became bureaucrats.

From the Six Dynasties period (222–589) on, there were organizations of monk officials managing the affairs of monastic discipline. Though monk officials are equivalent to government officials, they have never been included in the lists of officials in the history books. Among organizations of monk officials, the closest thing to government agencies was the Commission for Buddhist and Tibetan Affairs 宣政院 during the Yuan dynasty. The Yuan court instituted the commission to manage affairs relating to monks and nuns.

---

13 *Classified Regulations and Laws to the Qingyuan Period*慶元條法事類 originally consisted of 80 volumes, of which only 36 remain. Volumes 51 and 52 are titled *Daoism and Buddhism*道釋門. Volume 50 covers the maintenance and transmission of doctrine, confines for testing the sutras, monastic names and tonsures, monk ordination, and abbots, and gives illuminating references. Volume 51 covers traveling, presenting registers of monks to the government, oaths, death, and miscellaneous transgressions, and gives illuminating references.

and although the monks on the commission were equivalent to officials, there were both ordained and lay commissioners working together on the commission, and none of them had high positions. Nonetheless, government temples in general were not equivalent to government agencies, nor were the monks serving at such temples ever regarded as public servants, nor did the lists of officials in the history books reserve any space for notable ecclesiastics.

During the reign of the Hongwu emperor (r. 1368–1398) of the Ming dynasty, Jiqing Temple in Dalongxiang was renamed Tianjie Chan Temple 天界禪寺, and it was given a lintel tablet recognizing it as “the best Chan gathering in the empire.” To manage monastic life in a systematic way, the government established a Buddhist Bureau 善世院 within the Tianjie Chan Temple and set up a Central Buddhist Registry 僧錄司, and in the registry it established departments and divided duties in order to systematically manage the monks and nuns of the entire nation.15 Talented monks took up positions within the bureau, and such monks were indeed the equivalent of bureaucrats. Indeed, the Hongwu emperor even treated these monks as bureaucrats, for they engaged in diplomatic missions with countries where Buddhism was highly regarded. The Hongwu emperor thus gave such monks important duties when it served his purposes.16 For example, in 1372 Zhongyou Zuchan 仲猷祖闡 and Wuyi Keqin 無逸克勤 (1321–1397) were sent on a diplomatic mission to Japan.17 While they were there, Ashikaga Yoshimitsu wanted these two Chan masters to transmit Buddhist doctrines to Japan, and he invited them to serve as abbots at Tenryū Temple. They refused, saying that they dared not remain in Japan to propagate Buddhist doctrines in Japan without the Ming emperor’s permission. Chan monks of the Ming dynasty, compared with those of the Song and Yuan dynasties, were notably more bureaucratised, and their sense of mission for promoting culture abroad was considerably diminished.18

15 Song Lian, in “Sending Off Chan Master Juechu on His Way to the Lower Chang River” 送覺初禪師還江心序 (vol. 8 of his Record of Protecting the Law), wrote that the Buddhist Bureau established the positions of director 統領, associate director 副統領, educational assistant 贊教, and conversion preceptor 纪化 in order to systematically administer the well-known mountains, etc., within the empire. See the Jiaxing Edition of the Tripiṭaka, vol. 21, p. 670.

16 See Ueda 2011, pp. 68–99.

17 For the course of the mission, see Song Lian, “Epitaph for the Burial Mound of Monk Yuanpu of Jiqing Teaching Temple in Kangzhou” 杭州集慶教寺原璞法師璋公圓塚碑銘 (vol. 2 of his Record of Protecting the Law) and “Sending Off Wuyi Keqin on His Visit to His Parents before Undertaking His Mission” 送無逸勤公出使還鄉省親序 (vol. 8 of his Record of Protecting the Law).

18 See Ueda 2011, pp. 188–190.
If we compare the statements and actions of Song and Ming monks, we can see that Tianjie Chan Temple had indeed become more like a government agency by the Ming period, and that the monks of this temple had indeed become more bureaucratic. Yet the Central Buddhist Registry instituted at Tianjie Chan Temple was a government agency managing Buddhist monks throughout the nation. There are also other means to see how government temples became more like government agencies. Pursuing these hints will broaden our understanding of the bureaucratization of government temples during the Ming dynasty.

In “The Testing of Monks” 僧家考課 (volume 27 of Wanli ye huo bian), the Ming scholar Shen Defu 沈德符 (1578–1642), when discussing abbot vacancies in temples and monasteries of the two Ming capitals, mentions that monks were tested in assemblies by a director from the Ministry of Rites, that they were examined on their ability to write eight-legged essays 八股文, that those who performed well were selected to be abbots, that abbots were selected on their ability to write eight-legged essays without regard to seniority, education, or comportment, that abbots were ranked like officials, and that changes in positions in temples and monasteries were described as promotions, as in documents pertaining to personnel changes among officials. Shen Defu lived toward the end of the Ming dynasty, and he thus observed the temples and monasteries of the two Ming capitals to resemble government agencies. Very likely the development of this change began at the beginning of the Ming dynasty. Song Lian quite possibly was contrasting monks of Ming times, who had engrained in them bureaucratic tendencies typified by the Central Buddhist Registry, with the monks of government temples during Song and Yuan times.

4 The Flow of Information between China and Japan during the Song and Yuan Dynasties

There are temporal inconsistencies between Song Lian’s two memorial inscriptions and the time when the Five Mountains were established. Though later scholars did not accept the view that the Five Mountains were established after the Song dynasty fled south, their views are consistent with this view. Ninkū Jitsudō 仁空実導 (1309–1388), a Japanese monk of Jōdō Sect 淨土宗, West Mountain School 西山派, in his New Precepts for Study and Comportment 新學行要鈔, mentions that the Southern Song emperor Gaozong 高宗 (r. 1127–1162) set up meditation, teaching, and discipline temples, and that for each type of temple he instituted the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system. Since this is the first mention that the three types of temples each

19 Taishō Revised Tripitaka, vol. 74, p. 785. For portions of the Taishō Revised
instituted the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system, we can surmise that the system began during the reign of Emperor Gaozong.

Though prior to Song Lian there was no mention of which temples the Five Mountains included or the order of their ranking, Zhou Mi, in “Yan Temple” 阎寺 (in his Miscellaneous Observations from Guixin Street, volume 2 of the supplemental collection 別集), recounts how the Emperor Lizong built the Gongde Monastery 功德院 for his Honored Consort Yan. In this account, he mentions all the benefits that the emperor conferred on Yan Temple: “For the Five Mountains before him, nothing was out of the question.”20 The “Five Mountains before him” refers to Jingci Temple 淨慈寺, Lingyin Temple 靈隱寺, and the three Tianzhu Temples 天竺寺, all five of which were in Hangzhou. The Ming writer Shen Defu, in his “Testing of Monks,” confirms this reference.21 Zhou Mi (1232–1298) lived during the late Song and early Yuan dynasties. When a writer of the time writes about a matter of his own time, it stands to reason that what he writes is accurate. Well, in that case, the term “Five Mountains,” during the late Song period, referred, it would appear, to the five great monasteries in Hangzhou.

Moreover, the Japanese monk Kūkoku Myōō 空谷明應 (1327–1407), in volume 1 of Quotations of Jōkō, Preceptor of the Realm [i.e., Kūkoku Myōō] 常光國師語錄, recorded that Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹 recommended Chan Master Chenggu 承古 as the resident head of Jianfu Temple 薦福寺, in Raozhou, Jiangxi Province. He noted that Suzhou had Five Mountains, and that Jianfu Temple was originally ranked third among them, but after Chan Master Chenggu became the resident head of the temple, it became ranked as number one.22 Kūkoku Myōō, after becoming a monk, studied under Musō Soseki 夢窗疎石 (1275–1351) and, in terms of renown, is often mentioned with Zekkai Chūshin 絶海中津 (1336–1405). When he obtained his information, Suzhou, during the Northern Song period, already had five temples known as the Five Mountains, and Jianfu Temple in Raozhou had risen in rank from number three to number one. One can see that, though he was a little off as far as places were concerned, reports reaching Japan at the time were different from Song Lian’s information. It thus seems that prior to the end of the Yuan dynasty, Suzhou and Hangzhou both had five temples known as the Five Mountains.

The earliest reference to the Five Mountains nearly as it is presently

---

20 Zhou Mi 1988, p. 295
21 Shen Defu 1959, p. 688.
22 Taishō Revised Tripitaka, vol. 81, p. 21.
conceived occurs in the conversation between Gidō Shūshin and Ashikaga Yoshimitsu. The three Tianzhu Temples were excluded from the Five Mountains, and in their place appeared Jingshan Temple in Hangzhou, Tiantong Temple in Mingzhou, and Ayuwang Temple in Mingzhou. There is no question that Jingshan Temple should be included in the designation, but why were two temples of Mingzhou included? Mingzhou is the present-day city of Ningbo. Japanese monks coming to Song or Yuan China left Hakata in Kyushu by ship and first entered China at Ningbo. Hence, Ningbo is no less important than Hangzhou. In its intercourse with Song China, Japan first recognized Ayuwang Temple late in the Heian period (794–1192). For instance, the general Taira no Shigemori (1138–1179) sent the monk Myōden to Mingzhou to donate gold to Ayuwang Temple. During the Kamakura period, Minamoto no Sanetomo (1192–1219) sent a large ship to visit this temple. As for Tiantong Temple, it was the first temple at which Japanese monks stayed. For example, Eisai (1141–1215) entered Song China to study under Chan Master Xu’an Huaichang at Tiantong Temple, and Dōgen (1200–1253) also studied at Tiantong Temple, under Tiantong Rujing 天童如淨 (1163–1228). Numerous Japanese monks spent time at Mingzhou. Hence, we can infer that the two temples at Mingzhou were more important than the three Tianzhu temples.\footnote{See Kimiya 1977, pt. 4, “Southern Song and Yuan Dynasties,” chap. 2, “Monks Entering Song China, Monks Settling in Song China, and the Transmission of Culture” 入宋僧・歸化宋僧と文化の移植, pp.334–362.}

In addition, the painting \textit{Famous Monasteries of the Great Song Empire} 大宋名藍圖, painted by a Japanese monk during the Jiading era (1208–1224) of Emperor Ningzong’s reign, includes Jingshan Temple, Lingyin Temple, and Jingci Temple in Hangzhou; Tiantong Temple and Ayuwang Temple in Mingzhou; Jinshan Temple in Zhenjiang; and Daochang Temple in Heshan, Huzhou.\footnote{This painting is also called \textit{Illustrated Explanation of the Five Mountains of the Great Song Empire} 大宋五山圖說, but in addition to the Five Mountains, the painting also depicts Jinshan Temple in Zhenjiang, Bishan Temple 碧山寺 in Mingzhou, and Wannian Temple 萬年寺 on Mt. Tiantai. Hence, using the name \textit{Famous Monasteries of the Great Song Empire} is more appropriate. The text in the painting has been thought to be composed by Dōgen, Enni 圆爾, or Gikai 義介, but since the text contains a reference to the painting \textit{Years of Ordination} 夏臘圖, which is recorded as having been composed sometime during the Jiading period (1208–1224), we can eliminate Dōgen and Enni. Scholars have yet to agree on whether Gikai painted this work. On the date of the text, see Shimizu Kunihiko 清水邦彦, “A Study of Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries, Held by Daijō Temple” 大乗寺蔵 五山剎圖 考, 	extit{Hikaku minzoku kenkyū} 23 (2009), no. 3: 152–160. For the text itself, see Lan Jifu 1990, pp.589–592.}
changes in the composition of the Five Mountains provides evidence that there were repeated vicissitudes in the prestige of temples during the Song and Yuan dynasties, although these changes were also viewed differently from the different perspectives of Chinese and Japanese observers.

From the news it received in interactions with China, the Japan side developed two different views. Kokan Shiren 虎關師鍊 (1278–1346) said that the monks of Lingyin Temple met in the Zhizhi Hall and decided on the ranking of the Five Mountains. Now, Lingyin Temple was always ranked below Jingshan Temple. Why would the monks of Lingyin Temple decide the ranking of the Five Mountains? Mujaku Dōchū thought that since Lingyin Temple was within the city of Hangzhou, Jingshan Temple was outside of the city, and Lingyin Temple was close to the imperial residence, it was natural for Lingyin Temple to be given the right to determine the ranking. Mujaku Dōchū also gave an example. Though Shōkoku Temple, located in hills north of Kyoto, was ranked second among the Five Mountains, because it was the family temple of the shoguns of the Muromachi bakufu, who set up a prebend in the Rokuon building to manage the affairs of the Five Mountains, Shōkoku Temple was given the privilege of managing these affairs.25 Lingyin Temple had similar circumstances.

Though Kokan Shiren’s view was not adopted later, the issue is why he used this information. Kokan Shiren had profound knowledge of literary Chinese and was the most Sinified Zen monk of his time. He studied Song Neo-Confucianism under Yishan Yining 一山一寧 (1247–1317), wrote a collection of poetry entirely in Chinese, and wrote the first Japanese collection of biographies of monks, An Account of Buddhism to the Genkō Era 元亨釋書 [1321–1324]. When he met a Chinese monk coming from Yuan China to Japan, he would discuss with him Song culture and new scholarly trends, and he had extensive conversations with Sesson Yūbai 雪村友梅 (1290–1347).26 Yet for all of his knowledge about China and his many opportunities to converse with Chinese monks, Kokan Shiren never heard any news that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to the court.

What Kokan Shiren said appears in volume 1 of Mujaku Dōchū’s Notes on the Manifestations of Zen. In this volume Mujaku Dōchū records Kokan

25 Mujaku Dōchū 1990, p. 39. Dōchū’s quotation of the Kokan Shiren passage leaves doubts. According to the manner in which Dōchū quotes Kokan Shiren, the whole passage should be what he said, but Shōkoku Temple was established after Kokan Shiren. Hence, I think that the first half of the passage quotes Kokan Shiren and the second half is Dōchū’s explication.

Shiren’s words and Song Lian’s “Inscription for the Stupa in Which Jueyuan, the Fourth Chan Master of the Tianjie Temple, Was Interred,” yet he omits Song Lian’s “Inscription for the Stupa in Which Gufengde, Abbot and Chan Master of the Jingci Temple, Was Interred.” By means of these editorial decisions, Mujaku Dōchū indicated that the latter work is not reliable, that is, that the view that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to the court is not credible.

Somewhat later than Kokan Shiren, Mugan Soō 夢巖祖應 (d. 1314) noted another view. In “On the Outstanding Mountains” 秀峰說 (in The Drought and Rain Collection 旱霖集), he stated that the Five Mountain system was established by Qian Chu 錢俶 (929–988), King of Wuyue 吳越, during the Five Dynasties period (907–960), and that later rulers continued it.27 Shun’oku Myōha 春屋妙葩 (1311–1388), a disciple of Musō Soseki, also held the view that King Qian Chu established the Five Mountain system.28 Mugan Soō once taught Kokan Shiren. In addition, he also studied the Confucian classics for over thirty years and later lectured on Mencius in Kyoto. As a student of Neo-Confucianism, he was held in high repute. In sum, the view of Mugan Soō and Shun’oku Myōha, that the Five Mountain system was already established in the Five Dynasties period, was relatively well accepted in Japan at that time. In the literature on Sino-Japanese interaction, there thus were two views as to the origin of the Five Mountain system, and neither of these views mentions Shi Miyuan.

Kokan Shiren’s view that the monks of Lingyin Temple met and determined the Five Mountains was not accepted at the time, and the views of Mugan Soō and Shun’oku Myōha, which reach all the way back to the Five Dynasties period or the Northern Song period, seem too far back to be credible, but there are relevant sources. The Southern Song literatus Mou Yan 牟巘 (1227–1311), in “Inscription for the Stupa in Which the Chan Master Longyuan Was Interred” 龍源禪師塔銘 (in volume 24 of his Collection of Mou Yan’s Works 牟氏陵陽集), wrote,

The Chan master’s family was from Siming and Shouguo, but they moved to Kaishou. When the governor and son of Grand Councilor Shi met the master, the two of them got along very well. The governor gave up his temporary residence and together with the master went into busi-

28 “The one who originally instituted the Five Mountains in the empire was the king of Wuyue. Emperor Taizu of the Song did not change the system, and the great Yuan emperor also kept it” (Shun’oku Myōha, Quotations of Chikaku Fumyō, Preceptor of the Realm 智覺普明國師語錄, vol. 3, in Taishō Revised Tripitaka, vol. 80, p. 666).
ness selling rabbit garments. He said, “How nice if I could quietly live out my days in the temple at Siming.” Before long, the seat at Daochang Temple fell vacant. The various mountains in Liangzhe nominated a horde of candidates, who came to the temple. For this mountain was a Tang monastery, and ever since the Xining era when the great poet Su Shi visited Daochang Temple and wrote a number of poems, its fame has been greater than the Five Mountains.\(^{29}\)

Grand Councilor Shi was Shi Miyuan. Daochang Temple was located in Heshan. Though it has always been listed as one of the Ten Monasteries, according to this passage, after Su Shi published the poem “A Visit to Daochang Temple in Heshan” 遠道場山何山 during the Northern Song Xining era (1068–1077), the temple increased in estimation, even surpassing the Five Mountains in notoriety. Well, can we understand this passage as indicating that the notion of the Five Mountains already existed during the reign of the Northern Song emperor Shenzong (r. 1067–1085), and that Daochang Temple was among the Five Mountains?

During the Song and Yuan dynasties, the private sector in Japan had frequent contact with China, and numerous monks from the Japanese Five Mountains visited China. Eisai entered Song China twice. He first entered China in 1168 from Ningbo and went on a pilgrimage to Mt. Tiantai. He later entered China in 1187 and, owing to instability, only went to Mt. Tiantai. He studied Chan Buddhism under Chan Master Xu’an Huaichang at Wannian Temple and went with him to Tiantong Temple, where he entered the priesthood. After he returned to Japan, he established the Rinzai School 臨濟宗 of Buddhism. Eisai’s disciple Dōgen in 1223 left Japan from Hakata and entered China at Ningbo. At Tiantong Temple he studied Chan Buddhism under Chan Master Tiantong Rujing, and he left us a vivid description of his conversations with his master, \textit{A Record from the Baoqing Era} (1225–1227) 寶慶記, composed in what was already the reign of Emperor Lizong. Rujing could become the abbot of Tiantong Temple only with help from Shi Miyuan, and in \textit{A Record from the Baoqing Era}, Dōgen records a conversation in which Rujing discussed the Five Mountains, but there is no mention that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain system to the court.

Moreover, when the Yuan court attacked Japan, the Kamakura bakufu organized prayer assemblies of monks to pray for the protection of Japan, and all over Japan, Song Chinese participated in such activities. Regardless of whether they came to Japan before or after the fall of the Song dynasty, these

\(^{29}\) Wenyuange copy of the \textit{Siku quanshu}, vol. 1188, p. 217.
Chinese united with the Japanese to resist the Yuan invasion. This shows that even under conditions of war, interactions between Japan and China continued.

There were also Chinese who went to Japan to proselytize. For example, after Lanxi Daolong (1213–1278) arrived in Japan, Hōjō Tokiyori (1227–1263) recognized his talents and appointed him as founder of Kenchō Temple in Kamakura. Lanxi Daolong brought to Japan relevant Song books, monk discipline, and temple architecture. He thus had a profound influence on the development of Buddhism in Japan. For another example, Yishan Yining originally went to Japan under orders from Kublai Khan to encourage the Japanese to submit to the Yuan court, but he took advantage of the opportunity to remain in Japan to proselytize. He also introduced Neo-Confucianism to Japan. Thereafter, Neo-Confucianism gradually took root among Japanese monks.

There were also Japanese monks who went to Yuan China of their own accord to study. The first monk to study in Yuan China was Sesson Yūbai, a disciple of Yishan Yining. He stayed in China for twenty-three years, traveling to twelve provinces and writing “An Account of Carrying Out the Way,” about what he saw and heard in China. In his literary accomplishments, he was the equal of Yuan literati.

Musō Soseki’s disciple Gidō Shūshin and Zekkai Chūshin had great respect for Ming literature. Taking advantage of the fact that Zekkai Chūshin was being sent as an envoy to China, Gidō Shūshin asked Song Lian to write the gravestone epitaph for Musō Soseki. Gidō Shūshin’s influence includes informing Ashikaga Yoshimitsu about the Chinese Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system, and suggesting that Yoshimitsu reorder the ranking of the Five Mountains and place Nanzen Temple in Kyoto over the Five Mountains.

As the above discussion clearly shows, though there was a brief war between China and Japan during the Yuan dynasty, generally speaking, throughout the Song, Yuan, and Ming dynasties, merchants and monks of the two countries were in continual contact. In view of Japan’s ample opportu-

33 See Kimiya 1977, “Monks Entering Yuan China and the Transmission of
nities for observing developments in China, if Shi Miyuan did indeed propose the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to the court, the Japanese would surely have mentioned that fact in their reports. To think otherwise defies common sense.

5 Conclusion

During the Song and Ming dynasties, Japan imported Chan Buddhism from China, copied its Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system, and sought to establish a base to transmit Chan Buddhism to the east. Japanese temples could foster a system in which they had power equal to that of the aristocracy and the military clans, they could create organizations of monk-soldiers, and they could develop centrally organized command structures. Chinese temples did not develop any of these structures. Thus, Japan consciously borrowed temple architecture, monastic discipline, Buddhist assembly rituals, etc., with the result that it seems that at this time China and Japan both had formally similar Five Mountain, Ten Monastery systems of government temples. However, these similar architectural styles, similar monastic disciplines, and meditative practices derived from the same tradition were structured differently and also functioned differently. It is correct to understand the Japanese Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system as a system of government-like agencies functioning in a bureaucratic manner. But Chinese government temples were different from government agencies, and Chinese monks were not the equivalent of bureaucrats.

From sources we can discern four views of the origins of the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system: Mugan Soō’s view that King Qian Chu established the system during the Five Dynasties period, Kokan Shiren’s view that the monks of Lingyin Temple met and decided on the system, and Song Lian’s views that the Southern Song emperor Gaozong established the system and that Shi Miyuan proposed the system to the Southern Song court. Yet because we have inadequate sources, we cannot arrive at a settled theory of the system’s origin. This is the most reasonable conclusion to be drawn in assessing the information flowing between China and Japan during the Song and Yuan dynasties.

Current received opinion affirms that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system to the Southern Song court, but this view appeared as late as the time of Song Lian. During the Song and Yuan dynasties, no sources said a word about Shi Miyuan’s alleged proposal. The information flowing between China and Japan during the Southern Song period indicates that Japanese Chan monks at Five Mountain temples did not accept...
the view that Shi Miyuan proposed the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system.

In medieval interaction between China and Japan, the Song and Yuan Five Mountain government temples had a profound influence on Japanese Five Mountain government temples. In modern interaction between China and Japan, Japanese Five Mountain temples have been linked with Song and Yuan Five Mountain temples. These Japanese Five Mountain buildings have been well preserved, but the Chinese Five Mountain buildings have been reduced to rubble—a vast difference. Because we lack adequate sources about the Song and Yuan Five Mountain system of government temples, scholars have used the Japanese system to reconstruct the Chinese system, and amid this work the view that Shi Miyuan proposed the system has reappeared. As mentioned above, there are four records of when the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system was established, but nowadays one sees scholars discussing only the view that Shi Miyuan proposed the system. They turn a blind eye to records of the other three views. This is selective use of the evidence, and their conclusions are nothing more than the results of such selective use of the evidence.

In examining the flow of information between China and Japan, we see the influence that these two nations had on each other, but the view that Shi Miyuan’s proposal to the Southern Song court was the beginning of the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system is not serious scholarship. Rather, it is only the embellishment of a story about Shi Miyuan. There is still room for discussion of the origins of the Five Mountain, Ten Monastery system.
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