

神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

Selection at the Gate: Access to the Monkhooood and Social Mobility in Traditional Tibet

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2014-03-01 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Jansen, Berthe メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/1946

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 International License.



Selection at the Gate: Access to the Monkhood and Social Mobility in Traditional Tibet

Berthe Jansen

Leiden University

Introduction¹

Tibetan society before 1959 is often seen as highly stratified and hierarchical, offering limited opportunities to climb the socio-economic or socio-political ladder. In the 1920s, Charles Bell estimated that of the 175 *rtse drung* – the monastic government officials at the *Dga' ldan pho brang* – forty were from families that supplied the lay-officials (*drung 'khor*), but that the rest of the people were the sons of ordinary Tibetans who were chosen from among the many monks of the Three Seats (*'Bras spungs*, *Se ra*, and *Dga' ldan*) (Bell 1931: 175). This, along with other similar examples, is often seen as evidence that social mobility in Tibet was possible, but that becoming a monk was a first, necessary requirement to move up in life for those from a 'working class' background. Bell furthermore noted that: 'Among the laity it is wellnigh impossible in this feudal land for a man of low birth to rise to a high position; but a monk, however humble his parentage, may attain to almost any eminence' (ibid.: 169). If the above statement is correct – and there is no reason to suppose that it is not – it raises the question of whether the monkhood itself was open to all. If it was not, the question of potential access to the betterment of one's social status becomes a question of the criteria for entering a monastery. This article attempts to answer these questions, and thus demonstrate the limits of this vow-induced social mobility and shed light on the opportunities and limitations of ordinary Tibetans in pre-modern times.²

¹ I am grateful to Jonathan Samuels and Jonathan Silk for their invaluable comments and corrections. The usual disclaimers apply.

² By 'pre-modern' here I mean the time before 1959 and by 'Tibet' I mean 'ethnographic Tibet', an area encompassing much more space than the Tibet on any map, however contested its borders may be. For the current purpose, the unifying factor is the presence and dominance of monastic Buddhism. While this article will mainly address Tibetan Buddhist societies, Bon monasticism is also referred to, and because its organizational features are largely identical with Buddhist monasticism (Kvaerne 1970: 188), the two Tibetan traditions will be often conflated. While the phrase is used throughout this article, I am aware that a singular 'Tibetan society' does not, and never did, exist. Furthermore, it hardly needs to be specified that all concepts of society should be seen in the context of a specific time and space.

Generally speaking, there are relatively few sources that inform us about the lives as well as the rights and prospects of people born among the lower strata of traditional Tibetan society. In other words, there is a scarcity of primary sources that deal with social history. By social history I here indicate history that informs us on the way people lived and the way society functioned: the history of the ordinary. In addition to the limitations of sources, there is a tradition in Tibetan Studies of academics who focus on texts written by religious practitioners, specialists and Buddhist intellectuals. That is to say, for a long time in Tibetan Studies there has been a focus on the extraordinary, rather than on the ordinary. This does not mean that works written hundreds of years ago by high incarnations or lineage masters such as biographies, hagiographies and the like do not provide any details on the lives of common people: we can certainly obtain a certain amount of information on Tibetan society when we read between the lines. Needless to say however, some genres of texts are more informative than others. The type of texts under discussion here is very useful when one wants to gain a more balanced idea of what non-elite society in pre-modern Tibet was like. While many of the records that contain details on the way ordinary life was regulated and organized were lost, burnt, destroyed or are presently under lock and key, this particular genre of texts has been preserved, mostly in the various collected works (*gsung 'bum*) of important religious masters. The texts in question are monastic guidelines (*bca' yig*).

Monastic guidelines (*bca' yig*) as sources for social history

Contrary to how Ter Ellingson (1989) and Gene Smith (2001) described the *bca' yig*, works that bear this name can be guidelines not just for monasteries, but also for situations in which a certain organization of a gathering of people is desirable. This gathering can have a religious purpose, but need not have.³ There is a lot more to say on the genre of *bca' yig*, its purported relation to legal documents, parallels with monastic rules in other Buddhist traditions and the way the monastic guidelines intersect with Vinayic materials, but I elaborate on these issues elsewhere.⁴ Because my current research focuses on the organization and social position of monasteries in pre-modern Tibet, I here mostly use *bca' yig* that were written for monastic

³ Grothmann notes that in the Himalayan community of Pachakshiri, a *bca' yig* is used for a whole lay-community (2012: 137-9).

⁴ For a brief overview of the diverging Buddhist traditions that used different texts containing monastic organizational rules, see Jansen (forthcoming a).

purposes. It is solely for this reason that here the word is translated with the phrase ‘monastic guidelines’.

These monastic guidelines are works that can comprise just one folio, but they may also be very large, consisting of well over a hundred folios. As said above, many of these monastic guidelines can be found in the collected works of certain authors. However the copies that were and are still kept and used in monasteries throughout the Tibetan Buddhist world take the shape of scrolls. In some monasteries these texts are read out in front of the assembly of monks at certain occasions by a monk-official (often a disciplinarian, *dge skos*), in others they are displayed above the door of the assembly hall (*'du khang/ tshogs khang*). Sometimes, they are kept away from both the (lay) public as well as the ordinary monks. The reasons my informants gave for this air of secrecy ranged from ‘it needs to be protected because it is so precious (*rtsa chen po*)’ to ‘it contains information that is none of other people’s business.’ The attitude of keeping the *bca'yig* away from the public appears to be one that is more prevalent among – although not exclusive to – the *dge lugs* monasteries.

Due to the destruction of so many monasteries that took place during but also before the Cultural Revolution, many of these original texts are now assumed lost. The *bca'yig* that are available to us appear in the collected works of (mostly) well-known religious masters, abbots, or incarnations. It is difficult to give an estimate of how many and what kind of monastic guidelines have perished, but it is important to note that it appears to have been customary for people in high religious standing to author this genre of texts. This tradition is, to a lesser extent, ongoing both in Tibetan monasteries in exile as well as in Tibetan areas in China. Nowadays, new monastic guidelines are being composed by committees consisting of knowledgeable and senior monks who are often appointed by someone of high religious standing. When the work has been compiled, sometimes the person with the highest religious authority gives his final stamp of approval by signing his name.

Although monastic guidelines can have a ritual dimension, the contents of most *bca'yig* is highly pragmatic. A set of monastic guidelines often explicitly claims that it was written in accordance with a specific time and place, which means it served to fill a certain organizational need. Exactly because of this claim of addressing issues that were seen as important at that time and place, *bca'yig* are good sources for information on monastic organization and changes in- and outside the monasteries, without the level of hyperbolic praise that a monastery often receives in other

Tibetan sources such as monastic/ abbatial histories (e.g. *gdan rabs*) or biographies (*rnam thar*). These texts document situations that were seen by the authors as problematic. In many monastic guidelines, new rules are introduced by first noting how certain issues were dealt with wrongly in the past, and how ‘from now on’ people need to behave or manage the monastery differently.

Although one would assume that monastic guidelines are written just for monks, close reading reveals that it is more likely that they pertained not just to a specific community but also to a specific physical space. This space could be the monastic compound itself but in some cases it also extended to the monastic estates (*chos gzhis/ mchod gzhis*). Hence lay-people were in some contexts also subject to the rules of the *bca’ yig*, which in turn suggests that monastic guidelines help us understand the power-relations between the monastic and lay-communities. An illustration of the extent of judicial power the monastic guidelines attempted to exert is given in an article by Toni Huber, in which he demonstrates the territorial control monasteries had over trespassers, most notably hunters. A 15th century *bca’ yig* for Rgyal rtse chos sde states, for example, that non-monastics, such as hunters and traders, were to be fined when they were found to have killed animals on monastic territory: the punishment was to offer a communal tea service (*mang ja*) to the monks. These same monastic guidelines also state that the residents of the monastery and its retreat-houses were responsible for overseeing the protection of life in the area (Huber 2004: 134). This shows that certain monasteries had judicial autonomy over their territory, which translates into the monasteries having not just rights but also obligations, both towards the area, the animals found therein, and the lay-people living nearby.

Concerning the relationships between lay-people and monks, many monastic guidelines demonstrate great concern for the reputation that the monks enjoyed among lay-people. The reasoning often given for creating certain rules is that if the monks do not behave properly the lay-people would lose faith in the community of monks and thereby in the Sangha, one of the three Jewels. Similar arguments are common in Vinayic literature. Due to the position of political, judicial and economic power of the larger monasteries in pre-modern Tibet, the relationship between the donor and the recipient, between the layperson and the monk was very complex and varied from time to time and place to place. By reading the *bca’ yig* one can get a glimpse of the balancing act that took place between monks and lay-people, who all had harmony as a shared goal.

As mentioned above, monastic guidelines are often concerned with the organization of the monastery. Many of these texts actually contain ‘job-descriptions’: they state, for example, what it means to be a disciplinarian and what the duties of a ‘chant-master’ (*dbu mdzad*) are supposed to be. Occasionally, these works do not just state the functions of the monk-officials but also how much remuneration they were to receive for their efforts. This is usually enumerated in *skal*, i.e. the shares of the income or donations at the monastery that would be divided among (some of) the monks. Not surprisingly, monks holding positions of a higher rank would receive more *skal*. Thus by reading the *bca’ yig* one can get an idea of the internal hierarchy of the monastery. It appears that it was indeed possible and even common practice for ordinary monks with certain qualities and a certain level of education to get high-paying and powerful positions at the monastery. Clearly then, certain *bca’ yig* contain information on the level of social-economic mobility of the monks within a monastery. However, the monastic guidelines also provide information on the extent of social mobility more generally.

As mentioned earlier, social mobility in the Tibetan society was relatively low and one of the few ways of climbing up the social and political ladder was to join a powerful monastery. In the modern-day Tibetan monasteries in exile, ‘anyone who shows the slightest inclination’ can become ordained and even the restrictions with regard to who can or cannot enter the monkhood that are contained within the Vinaya are ‘routinely disregarded’ (Gyatso 2003: 222). The widespread assumption, perhaps based on this contemporary practice, is that this open-door policy is a historical continuation: that any male at any given time and place in Tibet could become a monk and make something of himself.⁵ This idea is perhaps strengthened by the popular image of Buddhism as a religion that originally agitated against the caste system and that strove towards a more egalitarian society. The question is whether these images, both of Tibetan monasticism and that of Buddhism in general, correspond with historical realities. Some of the information on this issue is conflicting to say the least.

Admission to the monastery

Sarat Chandra Das, who visited Tashi Lhunpo (*Bkra shis lhun po*) monastery towards the end of the 19th century, states that ‘the order of the Lamas is open to all,

⁵ Goldstein’s coining of the phrase ‘the ideology of mass monasticism’ (1998; 2009) has contributed to the notion that the monkhood in Tibet was open to all. For a critique of this position see Jansen (2013: 111-39).

from the highest noble to the Ragyabas, the lowest in the social constitution of Tibet' (Das 1965 [1893]: 4), while elsewhere he notes that to be admitted to Tashi Lhunpo one could not be one of the 'lower castes' (ibid.: 7). The latter statement, along with the numerous restrictions that are contained in some of the *bca' yig*, suggests that entry to the monkhood and admission to the monastery were at times and at certain monasteries restricted. The custom of restricting different types of people from joining the Sangha or a monastery was not a Tibetan invention. To understand what drove the Tibetans to exclude certain groups of people from entering the monastery, we need to first look at the Indic materials. Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*, which is one of the main Vinaya-texts used throughout all Tibetan Buddhist traditions, states a number of restrictions in the chapter on ordination, the *Pravrajyāvastu* (*Rab tu byung ba'i gzhi*).

Although the classification is not made in the text itself, one can distinguish (at least) three different types of reasons for excluding someone from becoming a monk. One could be excluded on the basis of one's physical disposition, that is to say, people who were handicapped, ill, deformed, had one of the five sexual 'disabilities,' who were too young, or even too old, were not eligible. Then there were those who were excluded on the basis of their behaviour, which is to say those who had committed any of the five seriously negative acts (*mtshams med lnga*); monks who had broken any of the root vows; known criminals, and people who generally were deemed to be too troublesome. Lastly, people could be excluded on the basis of their background or their social circumstances. Some of these were slaves (S. *dāsa, bran*), the king's soldiers, and people without permission from their parents (Bapat and Gokhale 1982: 20, S.116-148). So far, excluding the people mentioned above appears quite commonsensical – from a socio-economic point of view, if nothing else – for allowing them to seek refuge in a monastic community may have meant getting on the wrong side of the authorities and society, depriving it of work-force and sons. However, the *Vinayasūtra* also mentions other groups of people: 'cobblers (*lham mkhan*), and those of low caste (S. *cāṇḍāla, gdol pa*) and 'outcastes' (S. *pukkala, g.yung po*) may not be ordained.'⁶ The Sanskrit version contains, but the Tibetan translation omits, the chariot-makers (S. *rathakāra, shing rta byed pa*) from this list. Guṇaprabha's auto-commentary, the *Vinayasūtravṛtti* does contain this

⁶ 'Dul ba'i mdo, D4117: 4b: *lham mkhan dang gdol ba dang g.yung po dang de lta bu rab tu dbyung bar mi bya'o*/ The relevant section in the Sanskrit text can be found in Bapat and Gokhale (1982): S.149-64.

group of excluded people.⁷ The *Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, attributed to Dharmamitra, gives an explanation for each of the above terms given in the *Vinayasūtra*:

A cobbler is someone who works with hides, a *gdol pa* is someone of an inferior caste, and a *g.yung po* is a barbarian (*kla klo*). These types of people may not be given food and [thus] there also is a prohibition on ordaining them. This should be understood to mean that there is a very strict prohibition against [them becoming] *śramaṇeras* (*dge tshul*) and the like.⁸

It is unclear to which categories of people *gdol pa* and *g.yung po* refer here exactly. In this context, the word *gdol pa* seems to denote someone who is of low birth, but who exists within the caste-system, whereas the word *g.yung po* appears to carry the connotation of an outsider, a foreigner, or simply an outcaste. The explanation seems to suggest that there was no commensality between the givers of the food and the prospective receivers of the food and that that was perhaps the main problem. Although these are important and interesting issues, for the current purpose, it is not of crucial importance to understand what Buddhists in early India ultimately meant by the above terms, but rather how Tibetans understood, interpreted, and applied them.

There can be no doubt that the Tibetan society into which Buddhism was introduced was a stratified one, but the Indic notions of caste cannot have been easily adapted, or ‘culturally translated’ by the Tibetans. It is therefore of some interest to look at what these concepts were taken to mean by Tibetan Buddhists in different times and places, by which we can better understand the way the various strata in Tibetan societies were conceived of. While in some contexts *g.yung* seems to mean ‘civil’ or ‘civilians’ (as opposed to the military (*rgod*)), during the time of the Tibetan empire (Iwao 2012: 66), in some Dunhuang texts (PT 1089 and PT 1077) the word *g.yung* appears to denote ‘people of the lowest order, virtually outside the pale of Tibetan society’ (Richardson 1983: 137). According to the BGTC

⁷ ‘Dul ba’i mdo’i ’grel pa mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa (*Vinayasūtra-vṛtyabhidhānasvayākhyāna*), D4119: zhu24B: *shing rta byed pa dang / lham mkhan dang / gdol pa dang / g.yung po dang / de lta bu rab tu dbyung bar mi bya’o zhes bya ba la/*

⁸ ‘Dul ba’i mdo’i rgya cher ’grel pa, D4120: ’u36B: *lham mkhan dang gdol pa dang g.yung po dang de lta bu rab tu dbyung bar mi bya’o zhes bya ba la/ lham mkhan zhes bya ba ni ko lpags mkhan no/ gdol pa zhes bya ba ni rigs ngan no/ g.yung po zhes bya ba ni kla klo’o/ de lta bu zhes bya ba ni zan bza’ bar mi bya ba ste/ de dag ni rab tu dbyung ba’i phyir yang bkag pa nyid yin pas dge tshul nyid la sogs pa dag gi phyir ches shin tu bkag pa yin par rig par bya’o/* To my knowledge, a Sanskrit version of this text is not extant.

the word *g.yung po* refers to *cāṇḍāla* or *bukkasah*,⁹ a low caste in early India, which is said to be the same as *gdol rigs*. However, the second meaning given is that of a pejorative word for a group of people who eat crab, frogs, and tadpoles.¹⁰ In the same dictionary, *gdol pa* is also taken to mean *cāṇḍāla*, but the word is further explained to mean butcher (*gshan pa*) as well as ‘a low caste in the society of early India.’¹¹ The phrase *gdol rigs* is said to denote ‘people who are even lower than the *sūdra* (*dmangs rigs*), the lowest caste of the four *varṇas* in early India, [and they consist of] blacksmiths, butchers, hunters, fishermen, weavers (*thags mkhan*) and bandits (*chom po*), etc.’¹² All these dictionary entries show that the words can denote both Indic and native notions of people at the bottom of society.

The *bca’ yig* texts under examination here deal with these concepts in a similar way, usually displaying an awareness of them being Vinayic stipulations while translating them to the societal sensibilities of Tibetan Buddhists, in different times and different contexts. As alluded to above, these notions crop up in the monastic guidelines when the topics of admission to the monastery and entry to the monkhood are raised. It is worth noting however that the restrictions that the monastic guidelines impose do not simply reflect those found in the Vinaya.¹³ The texts state limitations based not just on one’s societal background, one’s physical condition or one’s past conduct, but also on one’s economic position, as well as one’s place of origin. To a certain extent, however, these limitations are interlinked. In the monastic guidelines, the most common bases on which people are excluded from becoming a monk are 1) one’s origins 2) one’s economic position, and 3) one’s societal background.

⁹ This appears to be a misreading for *pukkala*, which is understandable because graphically *bu/pu* and *salla* may appear very similar.

¹⁰ BGTC: 2624: 2) *sdig srin dang sbal pa lcong mo sogs za mkhan gyi mi rigs la dma’ ’bebs byas pa’i ming/*

¹¹ Ibid.: 1354: <caNDala> *bshan pa/ sngar rgya gar gyi spyi tshogs nang gi dman pa’i rigs shig*

¹² Ibid.: *sngar rgya gar gyi rigs bzhi’i tha ma dmangs rigs las kyang dman pa’i mgar ba dang/ bshan pa/ rngon pa/ nya pa/ thags mkhan/ chom po sogs spyi’i ming/*

¹³ For this, and many other reasons, I am of the opinion that contrary to the opinion of some scholars, *bca’ yig* cannot be seen as commentaries, appendices or simplified versions of Vinaya materials; see Jansen (forthcoming a).

1) Exclusion on the basis of one's origins

This discussion is concerned with a large geographical and cultural space, as well as more than 800 years of Tibetan monasticism.¹⁴ It is therefore important to understand that monasteries in the Tibetan Buddhist world had different functions. Some were small local monasteries that mainly served their direct community with ritual, prayers and ceremonies, others were large and had a focus on education, some concerned themselves with retreat and practice, and yet others had a strong administrative function. These different monasteries required and attracted different types of monks. Small village monasteries were usually populated with monks from the direct surroundings, while certain large, prestigious and well-positioned monasteries had a more interregional and sometimes even international character.

Because Das accurately noted in 1893 the restrictions with regard to certain people entering the monastery of Tashi Lhunpo, which was both a large educational and administrative institution, he may have seen or known of its *bca' yig* written in 1876 (*me byi lo*).¹⁵ This work gives a long list of people who were not allowed to enter the monastery as monks.¹⁶ It stipulates that people from the direct surroundings of the monastery may not join Tashi Lhunpo.¹⁷ Sandberg notes that this rule extended to all Gelug (*dge lugs*) monasteries in the Tsang area: one was not to enter a monastery less than forty miles away from home (Sandberg 1906: 122). A similar restriction was in place at the Bon monastery of Manri (Sman ri); local men were discouraged from joining. Most monks living at Manri monastery before 1959 were said to be from the east of Tibet (Cech 1988: 70). The reason for this rule Cech was given by her informants was the danger of nepotism. We can perhaps then carefully deduce from this that nepotism was something certain monastic institutions – particularly those that conducted ‘business’ with the lay-people in the immediate surroundings – tried to avoid.¹⁸

It was thus largely for pragmatic reasons that some larger and more prestigious monasteries did not enroll monks from the neighbourhood. These types of

¹⁴ This time-frame of roughly 800 years is because the earliest *bca' yig* date from the late 12th century and while monastic guidelines are still written in contemporary monasteries, the cut-off point for ‘traditional Tibet’ is around 1950.

¹⁵ 8th (5th) Panchen bla ma, Bstan pa'i dbang phyug (1854/5- 1882), *Bkra shis lhun po bca' yig*: 35-158.

¹⁶ It needs to be noted here that people requesting admission to the monastery could either be laymen in search of ordination or monks from other monasteries.

¹⁷ The villages that are named are Zhol, Rnams sras and Bde legs. (*Bkra shis lhun po bca' yig*: 68).

¹⁸ Restricting people from entering the monastery on the basis of their regional origins did not just happen in Tibetan Buddhist areas; in Korea, during the Koryŏ dynasty (918-1392) not just slaves but also the inhabitants of entire regions were prevented from ordination (Vermeersch 2008: 155).

monasteries were well known for their multi-ethnic make-up. Drepung ('Bras spungs) monastery in the late 17th century had monks from almost all Tibet's neighbours. Its *bca'yig* written by the Fifth Dalai Lama (Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho, 1617-1682) in 1682 notes the presence of Indian, Newari, Mongolian, *Hor* and Chinese monks ('*Bras spungs bca'yig*: 302). Even though in Drepung the multi-ethnic monastic society was a *fait accompli*, the Fifth Dalai Lama viewed the presence of so many foreigners as a possible security threat, mentioning that this might result in the Barkor (Bar skor) getting set on fire.¹⁹ This mistrust of foreign monks may also be implicit in the admission-policy of the Namgyal monastery (Rnam rgyal grva tshang). Although the only extant set of monastic guidelines does not state any restrictions whatsoever,²⁰ Thub bstan yar 'phel, the current general secretary (*drung spyi*) of the monastery in Dharamshala, India, informed me that its admission-policy has historically been very strict. He mentioned that traditionally only 'pure' Tibetans (*bod pa gtsang ma*) could become monks there. This was because Namgyal monastery was the Dalai Lama's monastery, which made it part of the establishment. It could prove harmful to the Dalai Lama's government if a foreign monk would step out of line. Thub bstan yar 'phel noted that now that the Dalai Lama has resigned from politics in 2011, this policy, that effectively excludes 'Himalayan peoples' (*hi ma la ya'i rigs brgyud*), has become less relevant. However, this rule of only admitting Tibetans is upheld to this day (Personal communication, 2012).²¹

In Sikkim, people were also prevented from entering the monastery on the basis of their origins. According to the 'History of Sikkim' ('*Bras ljongs rgyal rabs*) only Tibetan stock was admitted in the Sikkimese 'Pemionchi' (Pad ma yang rtse) monastery (Carrasco 1959: 188), thereby effectively excluding the Lepchas, many of whom did practice Tibetan Buddhism. In the *Gazetteer of Sikkim* it is mentioned that the 'novitiate' gets questioned by the disciplinarian and chant-master on his descent and if he has 'a good strain of Tibetan blood he is let off cheaply and vice versa' (Risley 1894: 292). As the above citation suggests, the entrance fee was not equal for all. Carrasco notes that in Sikkim in the second half of the twentieth century, all

¹⁹ '*Bras spungs bca'yig*, 302: *bar skor lta bur mi sna tshogs bsdad na me mi brgyag pa'i nges pa'ang mi 'dug*. Also see Jansen (2013: 123).

²⁰ This is the *bca'yig* written for Rnam rgyal grva tshang written by the seventh Dalai Lama, Bskal bzang rgya mtsho in 1727.

²¹ One notable exception to this rule is of course Georges Dreyfus, who was admitted to this monastery at the behest of the Dalai Lama himself, but whose admittance met with some resentment from the other monks (Dreyfus 2004: 32).

new monks had to pay an admission fee, with the notable exception of those belonging to the nobility (Carrasco 1959: 188). This admission fee was formalized at certain monasteries, but at most monasteries it was not a set fee but rather an offering by the parents.²² Monasteries were (and are) fundamentally pragmatic: those which were short of monks would invite boys in, for little or no remuneration at all.²³ The likelihood remains however that certain, possibly more prestigious, monasteries did demand relatively high fees from monks-to-be and that this fee would be higher for certain groups of people. Thus in some cases the poorest families could not afford to send their sons to the monastery, suggesting that another factor that limited access to the monastery was one's economic situation.

2) *Exclusion on the basis of one's economic situation*

It appears that in pre-modern Central Tibet, an ordinary family had to ask their 'landlord' for permission to send a son to the monastery. Surkhang notes that this permission had to come from the district officer (*rdzong dpon*) and that if permission was granted one would be presented with an official document called '*khrol tham*, a 'seal of release' (Surkhang 1986: 22). Eva Dargyay, who bases her research on oral accounts, mentions that consent was always given due to social and religious pressure (Dargyay 1982: 21). Even in the unlikely cases that this consent was everywhere and in all instances given, it still does not mean that ordination was always financially possible. A modern Tibetan-language book on Mtshur phu monastery gives a rather detailed list of what one was expected to donate upon entrance. At least one communal tea to all the monks (*grva dmangs*) had to be offered, for which seven round bricks of tea (*ja ril*) and ten *nyag lcags khal* of butter were required. This was called the 'enrolment tea' (*sgrig ja*). The book furthermore gives a long list of what quality *khatag* (*kha btags*) had to be given to whom by the new monk. This process of providing tea and *khatags* could then be repeated for the group of monks who shared a home monastery, but only in the case the monk came from another institution (Rin chen dpal bzang 1995: 257, 8).

²² See Dreyfus (2004: 59) for a description of a monk's admission into the monastery. What has to be noted here is that actually entering and living at a monastery and getting officially admitted to the monastery are separate occasions and it is likely that certain 'monks' living at a monastery at a certain time never actually were officially enrolled at the monastic institution. On semi-monks and unofficial monks in Drepung see Jansen (2013).

²³ In some cases a chronic lack of new monks at an economically powerful monastery resulted in the levying of the 'monk-tax' (*grva khral*). I discuss this 'tax' in more detail in Jansen (forthcoming b).

In Phyi dbang bkra shis rdzong monastery in Ladakh the requirements for the enrolment tea were adjusted to the affluence of the family. I was told that all families could always afford to pay for it (Dkon mchog chos nyid, personal communication 2012). The originally oral version of the monastic guidelines for Sera Je (Se ra byes), which now has been written down, also mentions that the entry fee depended on what the individual could afford. For a layman to enter the monastery: ‘one should offer the master at least a needle and some thread and [if one is well off] a horse or even an elephant’ (Cabezón 1997: 350). According to Snellgrove and Richardson however, ‘would-be’ monks at Drepung, after having made an application with the chief teacher of the house (*khams/ kham tshan*) of choice, had to provide a large amount of gifts and offerings just before the start of the Tibetan New Year (Snellgrove and Richardson 1986 [1968]: 238). The admission fee thus varied greatly over time and among monasteries.

Although it is by no means clear how affordable it was for average-income or poor families to provide such offerings, it does show that the monkhood was not as easily accessible as is sometimes imagined. In certain monasteries in Ladakh, a new monk had to have a monk-field (*grva zhing*). This was a field that was owned and worked by the monk’s relatives. The proceeds of the field would go towards the upkeep of the monk (Carrasco 1959: 32, 3).²⁴ A son of a family that did not hold any land could therefore not become a monk.²⁵ A so called monk-field was not always provided by the monk’s family: Dkon mchog chos nyid, an elderly monk at Phyi dbang bkra shis chos rdzong monastery in Ladakh, was assigned a field upon entering the monastery at eight years old in the 1930s. His relatives worked the field for him and he could live off the harvests (Personal communication 2012). This means that in certain monasteries in Ladakh the concept of ‘monk-field’ was flexible, and that sometimes even without land one could enter the monastery, although it is obvious that one had to have relatives able and willing to work the field one was assigned.

A thirteenth century *bca’ yig* for the monastery of ’Bri gung mthil states that an aspiring monk needed to have provisions that would last him at least a year: it is likely that poorer people would not have this kind of savings. This text, one of the

²⁴ A comparable system appeared to have been in place at Dunhuang in the ninth and tenth centuries. Monks and nuns possessed fields and they hired laborers to farm their land (Gernet 1995 [1956]: 132).

²⁵ To this day, Sri Lankan monasteries also only allow new recruits from the landholding caste (Gombrich 2006 [1988]: 166). It is not clear however whether the decisive factor is one’s birth in such a caste or the actual ownership of fields.

earliest works actually (but probably posthumously) called a *bca' yig*, written by Grags pa 'byung gnas (1175-1255), also requests monastic officials (*mkhan slob*) not to ordain people who had not gained permission from their superiors, or those that did not have any superiors (*'Bri gung mthil bca' yig*: 248a). This indicates that there were indeed people, perhaps runaway servants, who sought refuge in the monastery, and that this was perceived to be an unwelcome development. This is in many ways understandable: to allow landowners' servants to become monks would upset the social and economic balance, in particular in Central Tibet, where there tended to be a chronic lack of laborers (Goldstein 1986: 96). The materials available to me suggest however that concerns of lowly people and fugitives entering the monastery did not just stem from economical concerns.

3) *Exclusion on the basis of one's social position*

Persons whose social position was low, persons whose position could not be verified, or those who were simply destitute, were not always welcomed by the monasteries in Tibet. The author of the *'Bri gung mthil bca' yig*, mentioned earlier, clearly does not conceive of the monastery as a charitable institution: 'Ordaining all beggars and bad people without relatives will bring the Buddha's Teachings to ruin.'²⁶ It is clear from this text that the population at 'Bri gung mthil monastery was growing rapidly at the time of writing. There were too many people, possibly putting too much of a strain on the local population and its resources. Clearly the author Grags pa 'byung gnas wanted to put a stop to the unregulated population-growth at the monastery. He explains his wish for a more restrictive admission policy as follows:

These people do all kind of things that are not in accordance with the Dharma here in greater Klungs in Central Tibet (*dbu ru klungs chen*). Because they cause annoyance and bring [us] disgrace, I request that that type of people from now on will not get ordained. If the likes of them do get ordained then, whatever established rules (*bca' khrims*) are made here, it will be as in [the saying] 'if the old cow does not die, there will be no end to the stream of wet [cow-] dung (*snyi slan, sic: rlan*).'²⁷ [Then] whether or

²⁶ *'Bri gung mthil bca' yig* 248a: *sprang po dang mi log bza' med thams cad rab tu phyung bas bstan par snub pa 'dug*

²⁷ *'Bri gung mthil bca' yig* version b reads *snyi rlan*. Due to its vivid imagery the gist of the proverb, despite it not being a very well known one, is quite clear.

not established rules are made, there will not be [any]. This is what it comes down to.²⁸

It is possible that the author's main reason for not letting beggars and drifters become monks was that certain people had been abusing the system, becoming monks just so that they could feed or even enrich themselves. The problem with these types of people may have been that they lacked a support system, a family, which would ensure a level of social control. This does not mean that the author did not also entertain certain notions of class.

Kawaguchi mentions that people, such as blacksmiths, who would normally have difficulties in gaining access to the monastery, sometimes went to places far away and entered the monkhood having concealed their background (Kawaguchi 1909: 435, 6). Thus a prospective monk who arrived from further afield and who had no one to vouch for him was regularly suspected to be of lower social standing. Although in Tibet caste as understood in the Indian context was never an issue of much import, this did not mean that class, in the broadest sense of the word, did not matter.²⁹ A late 17th century *bca' yig* for the monastery of Mindrölling (Smin grol gling) states that people desiring to enter the monastery had to be *rigs gtsang*: this can be glossed as being of a pure 'type', 'class', 'background', 'lineage,' and even 'caste.' This phrase is thus very much open to interpretation. When I mentioned this term to a *mkhan po* from Mindrölling in India, he immediately suggested that it refers to people from blacksmith and butcher-families (Personal communication 2012).³⁰ According to Cassinelli and Ekvall, butchers were not allowed to become monks at Sakya (Sa skya) monastery. Men from blacksmith families were also not accepted into the monkhood, 'because they disturb the earth gods and make the implements of killing' (Cassinelli and Ekvall 1969: 269). Chapman, a mountaineer who visited Lhasa in the early 20th century, despite being rather ignorant of Tibetan culture, writes that those whose line of work had to do with taking life were

²⁸ 'Bri gung mthil bca' yig: 248a, b: *de 'dra ba rnams kyi dbu ru klungs chen 'dir chos dang mi mthun pa sna tshogs byed/ sun 'don/ zhabs 'dren rnams byed par* (248b) *'dug pas/ de 'i rigs rnams da phyin chad rab tu mi 'byin par zhu/ de 'dra ba rnams rab tu byung na 'dir bca' khrims ci byas kyang/ ba rgan ma shi na snyi slan rgyun mi chad kyi tshul du 'ong bar 'dug/ bca' khrims byas ma byas min 'dug/ rtsa ba 'dir thug nas 'dug*

²⁹ The concept of class as developed and defined by socialist thinkers did not exist in Tibet until modern times. In modern Tibetan *gral rim* is a neologism that denotes 'class.' See Kolas (2003) for an examination of notions of class in Tibetan society.

³⁰ This *mkhan po* explicitly requested to remain anonymous.

excluded from becoming a monk. He names tanners, butchers, gunsmiths, body-cutters and leather-workers (Chapman 1989 [1938]: 179).

The 19th century *Bkra shis lhun po bca' yig*, in addition to excluding would-be monks on the basis of their place of origins, also gives further restrictions to do with one's social background:

[Not allowed are] outcastes (*gdol pa'i rigs*) who deal with killing, such as butchers, fishermen, hunters, and those who are here in Tibet considered a bad 'class', namely blacksmiths and tanners, as well as villagers who are after food and clothing, or those who have no land.³¹

The above demonstrates that the author of this *bca' yig* was well aware of the Vinaya rules, as he refers to outcastes, but he also gives the concept a local gloss by stating 'here in Tibet', which shows an awareness on the side of the author that certain restrictions had to do with local sensibilities. One set of monastic guidelines, written by the seventh Dalai Lama (1708–1757) for Sera Je, stipulates that 'black people'³² such as blacksmiths, cobblers, beggars and the like may not be allowed to become estate-dwellers (*gzhis sdod*).³³ Unfortunately, it is not clear whether this refers to monks who do not have 'resident' status or whether it pertains to all people living on grounds owned or managed by the monastery. However, earlier on, the text mentions that people from Kham and Mongolia who already belong to a subsidiary monastery (*gzhis dgon*) may not become residents (*gzhis pa*).³⁴ This suggests that the restriction in place against blacksmiths, cobblers, and beggars becoming estate-dwellers might not necessarily have meant that their admission was refused outright but that, if they were admitted at all, they would maintain an outsider status.

Smiths, and blacksmiths in particular, were traditionally considered to be very low on the societal ladder and to be of a 'polluted' or unclean type (*rigs btsog pa/ rigs mi gtsang ma*). The reason for this pollution is interpreted by some to be because blacksmiths provide the implements of killing, thereby implying that the justification for their low status is a Buddhist one (Fjeld 2008: 113). Other Tibetans

³¹ *Bkra shis lhun po bca' yig*: 68: *bshan pa/ nya pa/ ling pa sogs srog gcod gi byed pa gdol pa'i rigs dang/ mgar ba/ ko pags mkhan sogs bod 'dir rigs ngan du byed pa rnams dang/ grong gseb pa 'tsho chas kyi phyir dang sa cha ma zin pa [...]*

³² This phrase (*mi nag*) commonly refers to people who commit non-virtuous actions.

³³ *Se ra byes bca' yig*: 579: *mgar ba/ lham mkhan/ sprang po sogs mi nag gi gzhis sdod byed du mi 'jug*

³⁴ *Ibid.*: 571: *snga sor khams sog gis gzhis pa byed srol med 'dug kyang/ bar skabs su sna tshogs shig byung yod 'dug pas/ da nas bzung khams sog dang/ gzhis dgon yod pa'i rigs kyis gzhis pa byas mi chog*

answered the question why the smith is despised by saying that it simply had always been that way. However, when pressed to give reasons they commonly answered that it was because the work is dirty and dishonest, that they make weapons, the tools of killing, and because they work metal, the mining of which was prohibited because it was perceived to disturb the spirits, which in turn would bring bad luck (Rauber-Schweizer 1976: 80, 1).

The notion of pollution is not merely a historical fact; in certain Tibetan and Himalayan communities it is still very much a feature of everyday life, and similarly the exclusion of people from entering the monkhood on the basis of their birth is something that was, until very recently, a commonly accepted occurrence among some communities of Tibetan Buddhists. In Spiti, boys from the lower classes were not allowed to become monks at the local level. Traditionally only sons of the land-owning and thus tax-paying *khang chen* class were allowed to become monks, while the blacksmiths (*bzo ba*) and *Bedas* (musicians) could not enter the monastery as monks. In 2006, sixteen *bzo ba* boys from Spiti were admitted into Ganden Shartse (*Dga' ldan shar rtse*) monastery in South India. The rest of the community³⁵ summoned them to return to Spiti and punished the boys' families with a ban on access to water and fire (*me lam chu lam*), amounting to social ostracism.³⁶ This ban was only lifted in 2009 after letters of support by the head lama of the local monastery and the Dalai Lama were sent. The community still maintained that the boys of lower backgrounds should only ever become monks in monasteries outside of the Spiti area (Tsering and Ishimura 2012: 5-9). It is important to note here that the resistance against admitting people of 'blacksmith' background appears to have originated at the community level and not at the monastery one. This shows the level of influence a lay-community may have on monastic organization.

It can be surmised from the various examples given above that the exclusion of people on the basis of their societal status occurred throughout the ages, in monasteries of all different schools and in a variety of areas. While it is argued that in Tibet 'social inequality was based mainly on economic and political criteria' (Thargyal 2007: 67) and that the perception of pollution and the resulting 'outcaste'

³⁵ It is not clear whether this includes the inhabitants of the local monastery.

³⁶ The same practice occurs in Te, Mustang, where it is called *me bcaad chu gcaad*. In addition to not being allowed access to water and fire, villagers are not allowed to share any food and drink with those boycotted (Ramble 2008: 178, 9).

status is grounded in the present or original socio-economic status of these groups of people (Gombo 1983: 50), there may be more to it than that.

Reasons for excluding entry into the monastery

It is rare for monastic guidelines to give explanations or justifications why a certain rule is made, aside from citing certain authoritative Buddhist texts. This in itself is telling of both the authors as well as the audiences of this genre of texts: it implies the assumption on the part of the author that his moral authority will not be questioned and that the justifications are already known by the audience. Thus the mere absence of explicit reasoning as to why certain individuals could not become monks does not mean that this policy always sprang forth from mere socio-economic concerns. It is imaginable that certain restrictions were imposed in certain areas so as to not upset the precarious equilibrium of labour and to avoid the monasteries becoming tax havens and shelters for runaway peasants. We also can see quite clearly that monasteries tended to act in accord with the ruling societal norms, as they must have been careful not to upset society in general. However, by making rules and regulations that reiterated these societal norms, the monasteries further solidified existing inequalities. This is much in line with the way in which the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya positions the Sangha in society:

the Buddhist rule that *dāsas* [‘slaves’], *ārhtakas*, etc., could not become Buddhist monks or nuns does not seem simply to accept the larger cultural and legal fact that such individuals had no independence or freedom of action (*svatantra*) and were a type of property; it seems to actively reinforce it. There is in any case no hint of protest or reform (Schopen 2010: 231).

From a purely pragmatic point of view, it made sense to exclude certain people: who in the traditional Tibetan society would have been willing to make donations, or to have prayers and rituals carried out by a monastery filled with beggars and outcasts?³⁷ It is tempting to look towards the doctrine of karma to explain why people of low birth, and who thus had accumulated less good karma, were not seen fit to become monks. This is, however, an argument that I have never come across

³⁷ While I previously used the word ‘outcaste’ as a translation of *pukkala* / *gyung po*, here the word ‘outcast’ is more apt, for in the Tibetan context the people who were turned away from the monastery were often those who had been banned or cast out of their village or tribe as a punishment for certain misdeeds.

reading pre-modern Tibetan texts.³⁸ I suspect that the aspect of pollution plays a larger role than previously acknowledged. This notion of impurity existed in- and outside of the monastery. The ideas of pollution continued into the monastic institutions not just because they had to accommodate the sensibilities of lay-people, who may have been unwilling to have monks from, for example, a blacksmith family perform the death-rites for their loved ones. In addition to these societal concerns, there are reasons to believe that these ‘polluted’ people were also excluded due to apprehension related to the presence of local deities, which were often transformed into protectors (*chos skyong/ srung ma*) there where a religious institution was built.

One of the earliest works actually called a *bca’ yig* gives an indication of the problem the presence of impure people could present for the gods living within the physical compound of the community. This short text by Rong zom chos kyi bzang po (1012–1088) was not written for a monastery but for a community of tantric practitioners, who were preferably celibate but who were not (necessarily) ordained as monks. It names five types of people who should not receive tantric vows (S. *samaya, dam tshig*): butchers, hunters, thieves, robbers, and prostitutes. These people are classed as sinful (*sdig can*), but it is furthermore mentioned that one should not sleep alongside persons who are unclean (*gang zag mi gtsang ma*). The text names nine problems that may occur if these people ‘and tantric vows are mixed’ (*dam tshig bsres na*). One of them is that giving these people vows will upset the protectors and the clean *vajra-dākinis*, and from that will arise [unfavourable] circumstances and obstacles.³⁹ The text then further explains how these unfavourable conditions would affect people’s religious progress and how this in turn would debase the Teachings (*bstan pa dman par ’gyur ba*), and that the end result would be strife and disharmony in the community.

There is more evidence that suggests that the behaviour and ‘cleanliness’ of the religious practitioners and the benevolence of the protectors were seen to be intimately related. The set of monastic guidelines for Mindrölling concludes by stating that those who go against the rules stipulated in the text will be punished by

³⁸ This is not to say that the model of karma is never used to justify the manner in which lower classes of people are treated in the Tibetan Buddhist world. An example of such reasoning, passed on orally and after 1959, can be found in Mumford (1989: 47-9).

³⁹ *Rong zom bca’ yig*: 399: *gsang sngags kyi srung ma rdo rje mkha’ ’gro ma gstang ma rnams ’khangs te sngags pa rnams la rkyen dang bar chad ’byung ba* [..]

the protectors and their retinue,⁴⁰ and the author Gter bdag gling pa calls for the monks to behave well for that reason (*Smin grol gling bca' yig*: 313). Another *bca' yig* in fact does not connect the mere keeping of the vows and behaving correctly to the munificence of the protectors, but suggests that if one does not perform certain rituals or even the style of incantation of prayers according to one's own religious tradition one might invoke the wrath of the protectors. The text in question is a set of monastic guidelines for one part of Samye (Bsam yas) monastery, called Lcog grva, where the mediums of the oracles (*sku rten*) and the monks who were charged with performing the necessary rituals were based. These guidelines, written by the Sakya (*Sa skya*) master Kun dga' blo gros (1729-1783), suggest that even though Samye was at that time part of the Sakya school, at some point monks started to carry out certain rituals, in particular those that had to do with the oracles entering the bodies of the mediums that were derived from other religious traditions. This change, according to the work, upset the oracles, which caused upheaval among the people living in the immediate surroundings. This text, in fact, is primarily an admonition asking the monks to keep to the Sakya tradition. The author mentions that he asked the Dalai Lama (*Rgyal dbang mchog gi sku mdun rin po che*)⁴¹ for advice on the situation at Samye and that the latter replied that:

It is not just at Lcog but in any monastic situation that if one's own original religious tradition – which ever that may be – remains unchanged then one will not become disengaged from the tantric vows of one's deities and teachers and the wrath of the Dharma-protectors will also not come about.⁴²

It thus appears that protector-deities were not well disposed to change. The monastery then also had to negotiate the local protectors, who were naturally conservative, on top of maintaining a balanced relationship with the local lay-people and the benefactors, both socially and economically.⁴³ The monastic guidelines are

⁴⁰ *Smin grol gling bca' yig*: 313: *mthu stobs kyi dbang phyug dpal mgon lcam dral 'khor dang bcas pas*

⁴¹ This must have been the 8th Dalai Lama 'Jam dpal rgya mtsho (1758–1804).

⁴² *Bsam yas lcog grva bca' yig*: 405: *phyir phebs su/ lcog tsam du ma zad dgon gnas gang du 'ang rang rang gi chos lugs gang yin de ma 'gyur ba zhig byung na lha bla ma'i dam tshig la sel mi 'jug pa dang chos skyong gi mkhu ldog mi yong ba'i gnad yin 'dug gsungs shing/*

⁴³ Schopen makes a similar argument in the context of the Vinaya literature: 'The Vinayas are actually preoccupied, if not obsessed with the avoiding any hint of social criticism and with maintaining the status quo at almost any cost. In terms of social norms, the monks who compiled the Vinayas were profoundly conservative men' (Schopen 1995: 478).

witness to this process of negotiating the changing times and socio-economic and political contexts, while the overall objective was to maintain the status quo. The adherence to the status quo by Tibetan monastics has often been commented upon by outside observers. I believe that this conservative attitude, in part, has to do with the main self-proclaimed objective of the Sangha as a whole (though not necessarily that of the individual monk), namely to maintain, preserve, and continue the Buddhist Teachings. Another major factor in the Tibetan monastics' rejection of most types of change, as alluded to above, is not just grounded in the mere fear of change but also in the trepidation of the local deities' reaction. Their wrath would not necessarily be limited to the monastic compound but might also affect surrounding lay-communities and their harvests.

While the monastic communities saw the preservation of the Teachings as their main *raison d'être*, the lay-population was probably – and understandably – more concerned with the effect that that preservation would have on the disposition of the local deities, which therefore may have been the perceived fundamental purpose of the presence of the monastery and its monks in the first place. This demonstrates the rather fluid relationship between lay-people and monastics, which was, in contrast to what is commonly thought, not merely a benefactor/recipient or patron/priest alliance, nor simply a hegemonic relationship, but rather a balance in which both parties had an obligation to care for each other's livelihood and continuance. While social change and progress may have been something on the minds of certain people at certain times, this adherence to the status quo was too firmly grounded in concerns regarding the continuity of Buddhism and the sensitivities of the deities for any significant societal change to take place.⁴⁴ When changes were implemented in traditional Tibetan society, they most commonly were initiated or authorized by people of high religious standing – exactly those people who were seen to have more control or power over the local deities.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ The question as to whether these deities were merely 'invented' to justify certain political or economic policies is here irrelevant. Hubert and Mauss noted the existence of a *sphère imaginaire de la religion*: arguing that because religious ideas are believed, they exist and they thereby become social facts (cited in Collins 1997: 73).

⁴⁵ One may argue that these people usually also had political power and that it was thus not necessarily their religious position that made change possible. I suspect, however, that in particular in the larger monasteries, the politically and economically significant posts were usually not given to the religiously influential monks, because holding such an office was seen as a potential threat to their religious standing.

Concluding remarks

I have argued above that while one of the few possibilities for social mobility in traditional Tibet was the entrance into the monkhood, some groups of people at certain points in time and in certain areas did not have that option. This gives us a rough idea of the layers of Tibetan society for which social mobility seems to have been severely restricted. Although the emphasis here has been on social mobility, it needs to be pointed out that in pre-modern Tibet education most commonly was only available in a monastic context, and it is probable that those who were excluded from becoming monks were also usually excluded from formal education.⁴⁶ Later non-monastic educational institutions, such as the *Rtse slob grva* at the Potala, largely followed the organizational patterns of the monasteries, while admission was restricted to the children of aristocrats and government officials.

It should be noted that most of the monasteries mentioned here that excluded certain types of people were in one way or another prestigious and important. This makes it likely that these monasteries, at the time their monastic guidelines were written, could in fact afford to turn away such types of people. It is furthermore noteworthy that, so far, I have not come across any *bca' yig* written for monasteries in Amdo and Kham that contain restrictions on the basis of one's social background. This may then confirm the suggestion that historically the east of Tibet had a more egalitarian society (Thargyal 2007: 205) but this, for now, is a mere argument from silence.

Three types of grounds on the basis of which it was impossible for people to enter the monastery can be distinguished: 1) one's birth place (for fear of nepotism) 2) one's economic situation (for fear of profiteering) 3) one's social background (for fear of pollution and social concerns). Some of these grounds can be traced to the Vinaya, although the categories found in Vinayic material often underwent a process of cultural translation in order to bring them in line with Tibetan social norms. These social norms were not just based on concerns of a purely pragmatic nature but also on notions of pollution and purity. I put forward the hypothesis that these notions of pollution in turn were closely related to the perceived presence of local deities and protectors, at monasteries and elsewhere. This perceived presence may have – in part – contributed to the aversion to change regularly commented upon by outside observers of pre-modern Tibetan society. A proverb from Sakya echoes this general

⁴⁶ A similar point is made by Tsering and Ishimura in the context of contemporary Spiti (2012: 6).

attitude: ‘no progress could be made unless the gods were offended’ (Cassinelli and Ekvall 1969: 83). Although the local deities were clearly no advocates for change, they presented lay and monastic Buddhists with a common cause, namely to appease these supernatural yet worldly beings.

When viewing pre-modern Tibetan society from a social history point of view one should never neglect the influence of religious practices and sentiments. These cannot and should not be reduced to being solely politically or economically motivated. In this way one gains a more nuanced understanding of the manner in which the lay and monastic communities interacted with each other. Therefore, by looking at both societal and religious norms and practices and where they intersect, one cannot but understand the pre-modern monastery to be part and parcel of Tibetan society, and not – as some people still choose to think – outside of it.

References

Tibetan language works

BGTC

Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo. 1993. Zhang Yisun, ed. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

Bkra shis lhun po bca' yig

Bstan pa'i dbang phyug. 1876. *Bkra shis lhun po dpal gyi bde chen phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba'i gling gi dge 'dun dbu dmangs dang/ bla brang nang ma sogs lto zan khongs gtogs dang bcas pa spyi khyab tu nges dgos pa'i yi ge khrims gnyis srog gi chad mthud rab brjid gser gyi rdo rje'i gnya' shing dge*. Gangs can rig brgya'i sgo 'byed lde mig ces bya ba bzhugs so: bca' yig phyogs sgrig. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1989: 35-158.

'Bras spungs bca' yig

Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho. 1682. *Chos sde chen po dpal ldan 'bras dkar spungs pa'i dgon gyi bca' yig tshul 'chal sa srung 'dul ba'i lcags kyo kun gsal me long*. In Tshe ring dpal 'byor et al. (eds) *Bod kyi snga rabs khrims srol yig cha bdams bsgrigs*. Lhasa: Bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1989: 275-323.

'Bri gung mthil bca' yig a

Grags pa 'byung gnas (1175-1255). Magha dha rdo rje gdan 'bri gung byang chub gling gi bca' khrims. In *Gsung 'bum*. Delhi: Drikung Kagyu Publications, 2002: 247-50.

'Bri gung mthil bca'yig b

— . Rdo rje gdan 'bri gung byang chub gling gi rtsa khirms. In *'Bri gung bka' brgyud chos mdzod chen mo*, vol. 34. Lhasa, 2004: 390-94.

Bsam yas lcog grva bca'yig

Kun dga' blo gros (1729-1783). Bsam yas lcog grva'i bca'yig. In *Gsung 'bum* vol. 3. Kathmandu: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang, 2008: 419 -28.

Rin chen dpal bzang.

1995 *Mtshur phu dgon gyi dkar chag kun gsal me long*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

Rong zom bca'yig

Rong zom chos bzang (1042–1136). Rong zom chos bzang gis rang slob dam tshig pa rnam la gsungs pa'i rva ba brgyad pa'i bca'yig. In *Gsung 'bum*, vol. 2. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1999: 399-414.

Rnam rgyal grva tshang bca'yig

Bskal bzang rgya mtsho. 1727. Rnam rgyal grva tshang la bstsal ba'i bca'yig gser gyi gnya' shing. In *Bod sa gnas kyi lo rgyus dpe tshogs bca'yig phyogs sgrigs*. Bod rang skyong yig tshags khang, ed. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2001: 64-73.

Se ra byes bca'yig

Bskal bzang rgya mtsho. 1737. Rgyal mchog bdun pa chen pos se ra theg chen gling la stsal ba'i khirms su bca' ba'i yi ge rab gsal nor bu'i me long zhes bya ba bzhugs so. In *Bod sa gnas kyi lo rgyus dpe tshogs bca'yig phyogs bsgrigs*. Bod rang skyong ljongs yig tshags khang, ed. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2001: 96-117.

Smin grol gling bca'yig

Gter bdag gling pa. 1698. O rgyan smin grol gling gi 'dus sde'i bca' khirms kyi yi ge blang dor gsal bar byed pa'i nyi ma. In *O rgyan smin grol gling gi dkar chag*. Bstan pa'i sgron me. Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1992: 272-316.

Vinayasūtra

Guṇaprabha, *'Dul ba'i mdo*, D4117.

Vinayasūtravṛttyabhīdhānasvayākhyāna

Guṇaprabha, *'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa*, D4119.

Vinayasūtraṅkā

Dharmamitra, 'Dul ba 'i mdo 'i rgya cher 'grel pa, D4120.

Other works

Bapat, P. V. and V.V. Gokhale

1982 *Vinaya-sūtra and Auto-commentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha : Chapter 1- Pravrajyā-vastu*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Bell, Charles

1931 *The Religion of Tibet*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cabezón, José I.

1997 The Regulations of a Monastery. In *Religions of Tibet in Practice*. Donald S. Lopez, ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 335-51.

Carrasco, Pedro

1959 *Land and Polity in Tibet*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Cassinelli, C.W. and Robert B. Ekvall

1969 *A Tibetan Principality: The Political System of Sakya*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cech, Krystyna

1988 A Bonpo *bča 'yig*: the Rules of sMan-ri Monastery. In *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 4th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Schloss Hohenkammer -Munich 1985*. Helga Uebach and Panglung Jampa Losung, eds. Munich: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: 69-85.

Chapman, F. Spencer

1984 [1938] *Memoirs of a Mountaineer: Lhasa the Holy City*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton.

Collins, Steven

1998 *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities: Utopias of the Pali Imaginaire*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dargyay, Eva K.

1982 *Tibetan Village Communities: Structure and Change*. Warminster: Aris & Philips LTD.

Das, Sarat Chandra

1965 [1893] *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya.

Dreyfus, Georges

2003 *The Sound of Two Hands Clapping: The Education of a Tibetan Buddhist Monk*. Berkeley: California University Press.

Ellingson, Ter

1989 Tibetan Monastic Constitutions: The bCa' yig. In *Reflections on Tibetan Culture: Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*. Lawrence Epstein and Richard F. Sherburne, eds. Lewiston: The Edward Mellen Press: 205-29.

Fjeld, Heidi

2008 Pollution and Social Networks in Contemporary Rural Tibet. In *Tibetan Modernities: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the IATS, 2003*. Robert Barnett and Ronald Schwarz, eds. Leiden: Brill: 113-37.

Gernet, Jacques

1995 [1956] *Buddhism in Chinese Society: an Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Goldstein, Melvyn

1986 Reexamining Choice, Dependency and Command in the Tibetan Social System: "Tax Appendages" and Other Landless Serfs. *Tibet Journal* 11/4: 79-112.

1998 The revival of monastic life in Drepung monastery. In *Buddhism in Contemporary Tibet: Religious Revival and Cultural Identity*. Melvyn Goldstein, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 15-52.

2009 Tibetan Buddhism and mass monasticism. In *Moines et moniales de par le monde: la vie monastique au miroir de la parenté*. A. Herrou and G. Krauskopff, eds. Paris: L'Harmattan. English version at: www.case.edu/affil/.../Tibetan_Buddhism_and_Mass_Monasticism.doc

Gombo, Ugen

1983 The Traditional Tibetan Economy: An Overview Analysis from a Socio-Anthropological Perspective. *Tibetan Review* 13: 18-22.

Gombrich, Richard

2006 [1988] *Theravada Buddhism: a Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*. London: Routledge.

Grothmann, Kirstin

- 2012 Migration Narratives, Official Classifications, and Local Identities: the Memba of the Hidden Land of Pachakshiri. In *Origins and Migrations in the Extended Eastern Himalayas*. Toni Huber and Stuart H. Blackburn, eds. Leiden: Brill: 125-51.

Gyatso, Sherab

- 2003 Of Monks and Monasteries. In *Exile as Challenge: the Tibetan Diaspora*. Dagmar Bernstorff and Hubertus von Welck, eds. Hyderabad: Orient Longman: 213-43.

Huber, Toni

- 2004 Territorial Control by “Sealing”(rgya sdom-pa). A Religio-Political Practice in Tibet. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 33: 127-52.

Iwao, Kazushi

- 2012 Organisation of the Chinese Inhabitants in Tibetan-ruled Dunhuang. In *Old Tibetan Studies: Dedicated to the Memory of R. E. Emmerick, Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the IATS 2003*. Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, ed. Leiden: Brill: 65-75.

Jansen, Berthe

- 2013 How to Tame a Wild Monastic Elephant: Drepung Monastery According to the Great Fifth. In *The Tibetans that Escaped the Historian’s Net*. Charles Ramble, Peter Schwieger, and Alice Travers, eds. Kathmandu: Vajra Books: 111-39.

forthcoming a) Monastic Organizational Guidelines. In *Brill’s Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*. Jonathan Silk, ed. Leiden: Brill.

forthcoming b) The Monastery Rules: Monastic Organization in Pre-modern Tibet (PhD dissertation), Universiteit Leiden.

Kawaguchi, Ekai

- 1909 *Three Years in Tibet: With the Original Japanese Illustrations*. Madras: The Theosophist Publishing Society, Benares and London.

Kolas, Ashild.

- 2003 “Class” in Tibet: Creating Social Order before and During the Mao Era. *Identities* 10/2: 181-200.

Kvaerne, Per

1970 Remarques sur l'administration d'un monastère Bon-Po. *Journal Asiatique* 258: 187-92.

Mumford, Stan

1989 *Himalayan Dialogue: Tibetan Lamas and Gurung Shamans in Nepal*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Ramble, Charles

2008 *The Navel of the Demoness: Tibetan Buddhism and Civil Religion in Highland Nepal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rauber-Schweizer, Hanna

1976 *Der Schmied und sein Handwerk im traditionellen Tibet*. Rikon: Tibet-Institut.

Richardson, Hugh

1983 Notes and Communications. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 46/1: 136-38.

Risley, Herbert H.

1894 *The Gazetteer of Sikkim*. Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Press.

Sandberg, Graham

1906 *Tibet and the Tibetans*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Schopen, Gregory

1995 Death, Funerals, and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code. In *Buddhism in Practice*. Donald S. Lopez, ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 473-502.

2010 On Some Who Are Not Allowed to Become Buddhist Monks or Nuns: An Old List of Types of Slaves or Unfree Laborers. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130/2: 225-34.

Smith, E. Gene

2001 *Among Tibetan Texts: History and Literature of the Himalayan Plateau*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Snellgrove, David L. and Hugh Richardson

1986 [1968] *A Cultural History of Tibet*. Boston: Shambhala.

Surkhang, Wangchen Gelek

1986 Government, Monastic and Private Taxation in Tibet. *The Tibet Journal* 11/1: 21-40.

Thargyal, Rinzin

2007 *Nomads of Eastern Tibet Social Organization and Economy of a Pastoral Estate in the Kingdom of Dege*. Leiden: Brill.

Tsering, Tashi and Gaku Ishimura

2012 A Historical Overview of Education and Social Change in Spiti Valley, India. *International Association For Ladakh Studies* 28 June: 4-16.

Vermeersch, Sem

2008 *The Power of the Buddhas: The Politics of Buddhism During the Koryŏ Dynasty (918-1392)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.