

# Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: *Stūpa* Inscriptions and Miracle Stories\*

## A Preliminary Exploration

Aside from the mythological life of the Buddha and other highly legendary materials, Buddhist tradition in India appears to have produced only a limited amount of biographical writings. Chinese Buddhism in contrast produced a very large body of biographical writings. In fact, the extensive Buddhist historical writings produced in China largely consist of biographies. In the case of Ch'an Buddhism, its extensive literature presenting diverse theoretical viewpoints is frequently organized in the form of biographical writings. Students of Chinese Buddhist biographies need to face the very basic question of why Chinese Buddhism produced such a large body of biographical literature in any serious attempt to come to terms with their subject matter.

One strategy for exploring this large question is to examine the nature of the sources that lie behind these biographies, asking how the information concerning monks was first recorded, preserved, and then used by compilers of the biographical collections. The emphasis

---

\* This excerpt is reprinted with permission of the Publisher from *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*, edited by Phyllis Granoff and Kōichi Shinohara, 119–228. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1988. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Professor James R. Hightower of Harvard University for reading this paper carefully and giving me many valuable suggestions.

in such an exploration should first be on identifying the types of sources that were used frequently in the compilation of monks' biographies. Once identified, it should then be possible to focus on each of these types and attempt to understand what these sources can tell us about why the Chinese Buddhist community felt it important to write, preserve, and collect biographical records of important monks. This analysis should also show what forces were at work in drawing biographical sketches in these sources. By comparing these source materials with the corresponding biographies in the later collections, it should then be possible to examine the manner in which compilers of biographical collections used their sources. Such a study should help us understand how Chinese Buddhist biographies came to have their present form.

In this paper I shall examine two types of sources in some detail. I will first point to the importance of *stūpa* inscriptions as a source for Chinese Buddhist biographies. The reason for the unprecedented quantity of such biographies must lie at least in part in the fact that Chinese Buddhism adopted the well-established Chinese convention of writing biographies as tomb inscriptions, a convention which produced the remarkably large body of secular biographies in China. The practice of erecting *stūpa* inscriptions for deceased monks similarly resulted in the accumulation of a great deal of written biographical materials in Chinese Buddhism.

But the issue is a complex one. For one thing, though a majority of the biographies of Chinese Buddhist monks preserved in the extant large collections may have been based at least in part on *stūpa* inscriptions,<sup>1</sup> a considerable number of biographies in these same collections appear to have come from different sources.<sup>2</sup> I will attempt to

---

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Wright, commenting on Huijiao's 慧皎 (497–554) use of inscriptions, stated, 'We are perhaps safe in assuming that as a general rule, when he mentions the existence of a memorial inscription as a biographical fact, he had access to the data it contained'. The quotation is found in p. 427 of his classic study, 'Biography and Hagiography.' The same assumption may also be made with regard to the later collections.

<sup>2</sup> Compilers of biographical collections often mention other sources. As

throw some light on this complex issue through examining one other type of source for Chinese Buddhist biographies, namely, stories of miracles. A discussion of miracle stories and their relationship to *stūpa* inscriptions will hopefully enable us to gain further insight into the nature of the very extensive biographical literature in Chinese Buddhism. While compilers of Chinese Buddhist biographies also no doubt used sources other than *stūpa* inscriptions and miracle stories, a detailed discussion of those other sources must be postponed for a future occasion.<sup>3</sup>

A few more words on the general orientation of this investigation may be helpful.

(1) I consider biography to be an important form of religious literature in China and my aim is to investigate how the biographies of Buddhist monks were typically composed, revised, and preserved in China. In the final analysis the process of compilation, revision, and preservation must have varied from case to case, and the range of variation may have been considerable. Nevertheless, there appears to have been a pattern, a set of conventions that governed the composition of *stūpa* inscriptions, for example, and a certain consistency in the manner in which compilers of large collections collected and used the sources available to them. I am interested in identifying this pattern and describing the process ‘ideal-typically’. This is a difficult task, especially given the volume of existing Chinese Buddhist biographies and the paucity of the data on their sources. Here I must confine myself to offering a few general observations based on an analysis of isolated examples. These observations, it is hoped, will shed some light on certain specific but limited aspects of the process in question.<sup>4</sup>

---

we shall show in some detail below, a systematic examination of the biographies themselves also indicates that some biographies could not have come from *stūpa* inscriptions.

<sup>3</sup> Huijiao’s preface mentions, for example, temple records (*Yibu siji* 益部寺記, *Jingshi siji* 京師寺記) and biographical collections associated with certain geographical areas (*Dongshan sengzhuan* 東山僧傳 and *Lushan sengzhuan* 廬山僧傳).

<sup>4</sup> In the preface to the first collection of Chinese biographies of Buddhist monks, its compiler Huijiao comments on several earlier collections of biographies

---

and briefly describes the types of sources he used in producing his collection. A letter of Huijiao's lay friend, Wang Manying 王曼穎 (active 500s–520s), provides further information on sources (the text of the letter is found appended to the Taishō edition of the *Gaoseng zhuan* [T no. 2059, 50: 422b–c]; it is also included in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*, T no. 2103, 52: 275a–b; in both of these places the text of Wang Manying's letter is followed by Huijiao's reply). One prominent type of source among those that appear there is collections of miracle stories. Arthur Wright in the article mentioned earlier discussed the nature of Huijiao's collection by analyzing this preface in detail and supplementing the information given there with evidence from the collected biographies themselves. More recently, Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 (1912–2011) discussed this collection with a similar emphasis on the examination of earlier collections mentioned by Huijiao and the significance of Huijiao's classification of biographies (Makita, 'Kōsōden no seiritsu [jō]'; 'Kōsōden no seiritsu [ge]'). These two detailed studies of the sources of Huijiao's collection, however, have very little to say about inscripational sources, while recognizing that inscriptions were an important category of sources for Huijiao's work. Both Wright and Makita focused their study on determining the distinctive features of Huijiao's work. For such a study it suffices to examine the text in its immediate historical context by comparing it with other earlier compilations of biographical materials without asking where the biographical materials in earlier collections themselves ultimately came from. The investigation in this paper has a broader scope. When we turn to Huijiao's work later, we shall be interested in it as an example illustrating a general pattern which compilers of biographical collections followed. Thus, it is important to note that even in Huijiao's collection, a large number of biographies mention *stūpa* inscriptions, suggesting that these biographies are based on *stūpa* inscriptions. If that is the case, the nature of these biographies must have been determined to a large extent by this origin. Even in examining the earlier biographical collections and other sources explicitly mentioned in the preface, we would still need to take into account the possibility that they too may have been based on *stūpa* inscriptions, and that the biographies taken from these sources may have been conditioned indirectly by this ultimate origin. On the other hand, some biographies in Huijiao's collection appear to have had different origins. Some of the biographies, for example, come from collections of miracle stories. These biographies would then be expected to have a different nature from those that come from *stūpa* inscriptions.

(2) I shall limit my task to the examination of the biographies contained in the three most important collections of Chinese Buddhist biographies: Huijiao's 慧皎 (497–554) *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 [Biographies of Eminent Monks] (around 531),<sup>5</sup> Daoxuan's 道宣 (596–667) *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 [Further Biographies of Eminent Monks] (645 according to the compiler's preface but expanded later)<sup>6</sup> and Zanning's 贊寧 (919–1001) *Song Gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 [Song Biographies of Eminent Monks] (988). I shall examine the use of *stūpa* inscriptions and miracle stories in these collections.

(3) This paper is organized in the following manner. I will begin with a general and hypothetical discussion of Chinese *stūpa* inscriptions, emphasizing the relationship of *stūpa* inscriptions to the Chinese conventions of tomb inscriptions, and explore some possible ways in which it might have affected the nature of Chinese Buddhist biographies. In this context, I will contrast the secular or lay orientation of the composers of *stūpa* inscriptions with the monastic orientation of the compilers of the large biography collections. I will compare a small number of surviving *stūpa* inscriptions used by the

---

<sup>5</sup> For a more recent discussion of the date of this work, see Makita, 'Kōsōden no seiritsu [jō]', 103–104. Following the observation of Yamanouchi Shinkyō 山内晋卿 (1866–1945) that the generally accepted date 519 refers to the date of the latest material in the collection and not to the date of compilation, Makita dates the completion of the work around 531. Wright ('Biography and Hagiography', 400) gives the date 'about 530'. A French translation of the first three *juans* of this work containing the biographies of 'translators' is found in Shih, *Biographies des moines éminents*.

<sup>6</sup> Daoxuan actively collected new biographies in the last years of his life and the existing versions of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* contains a large number of these new biographies. According to Maekawa Takashi 前川隆司, Daoxuan had compiled a second collection of biographies of monks, the *Houji Gaoseng zhuan* 後集高僧傳 by 664, but his disciples incorporated the materials in this second collection in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* shortly after Daoxuan's death. See Maekawa, 'Dōsen no Kōshu Kōsoden ni suite.' Yanagida Seizan also discusses this question briefly in his monumental *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, 3–11.

compiler of the Song collection with the corresponding biographies in the collection to show how Zanning (and most probably his predecessors) used *stūpa* inscriptions. I will then make a systematic examination of explicit references to *stūpa* inscriptions in the three collections. This examination will reveal, among other things, that the three compilers relied heavily but by no means exclusively on *stūpa* inscriptions for their source material.

My discussion of miracle stories begins with a detailed comparison of preserved fragments from the miracle story collection *Mingxiang ji* 冥祥記 [Records of Mysterious Manifestations] and Huijiao's biographies that are at least partly based on this source. This comparison suggests that the relationship between miracle stories and the biographical format based primarily on *stūpa* inscriptions was a very complex one. This will be followed by a more detailed analysis of two examples in which the role of miracle stories in the development of biographies may be traced concretely.

### Hypothesis concerning *stūpa* inscriptions

Traditional Chinese biographies were composed in two contexts: as a part of the funeral rites which served the interest of the family and as a component of official dynastic histories.<sup>7</sup> The two contexts were closely interrelated, and we have evidence indicating clearly that by the Tang period (618–907), except in the cases of the highest ranking officials, the official biographies prepared for inclusion in dynastic histories were based directly on funerary documents.<sup>8</sup> After the death of an important personage, a document recording relevant facts in the life of the deceased (*xingzhuang* 行狀 [Account of Conduct]) was produced.<sup>9</sup> The family of the deceased then requested one

---

<sup>7</sup> The nature of traditional Chinese biographies is discussed in D.C. Twitchett, 'Chinese Biographical Writing'; Twitchett, 'Problems of Chinese Biography'; Nivenson, 'Traditional Chinese Biography'; Olbricht, 'Die Biographie in China'.

<sup>8</sup> For details, see Twitchett, 'Chinese Biographical Writing', 103–107.

<sup>9</sup> In theory, the Account of Conduct was an official government document

of the more well-known literary figures, generally occupying important government positions, to write the texts for the tomb inscriptions (generally called *muzhi ming* 墓誌銘 and *shendao bei* 神道碑). The texts, often in the calligraphy of another well-known figure(s), were then carved and placed in the appropriate places around the tomb. In addition, a copy of the Account of Conducts along with other funeral documents was sent to an office of the central government as material for the future compilation of the dynastic history.

Chinese Buddhist monks adopted the same steps with some modification in producing *stūpa* inscriptions. Relevant facts about the deceased monk were collected and the Account of Conduct was composed by his disciples, since the monk had renounced the householder's life and did not have a family of his own. Interestingly, in most cases it was still an eminent secular literary figure with a high government position who was asked to write the *stūpa* inscription (*ta beiming* 塔碑銘) and the practice of requesting another such figure to produce the calligraphy was also often followed. A very small number of biographies of Buddhist monks found their way into dynastic histories, but the normative collections of these biographies were compiled by monks Huijiao, Daoxuan, and Zanning as *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 [Biographies of Eminent Monks], *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 [Further Biographies of Eminent Monks], and *Song Gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 [Song Biographies of Eminent Monks]. These collections were eventually included in the imperially sanctioned Buddhist canon.<sup>10</sup>

---

to be prepared by the Department of Merit Assessments (*Kaogong si* 考功司) for members of the bureaucracy. Twitchett shows how the practice appears to have departed from theory and Accounts of Conduct were produced by family members, disciples, former subordinates, and local officials. Such Accounts of Conduct were prepared even for persons without office and of low status. The Account of Conduct became in effect a more 'private' document whose composition was closely connected with the family cult and funerary rites. For details, see Twitchett, 'Chinese Biographical Writing', 103–106.

<sup>10</sup> The Taishō edition of the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* (T no. 2061, 50: 709a–b) contains Zanning's memorial (*biao* 表) presented to the court accompanying the newly completed collection and the court's reply indicating that the order

The nature of Chinese Buddhist biographies must have been deeply affected by the process through which they came into being. Limiting our discussion to the biographies that came from *stūpa* inscriptions for the time being, this question may be explored hypothetically as follows. We noted that the *stūpa* inscriptions in most cases were written by secular men of letters. These secular authors of biographies of monks must in most cases have been sympathetic to Buddhism, and perhaps represent the lay Buddhist religiosity of the community. Nevertheless, these secular writers who admired these monks from a distance as lay followers must also have interpreted the lives of these religious men very differently from the way those committed to follow the path themselves as monks interpreted them. For example, many of the biographies in the three ‘Biographies of Eminent Monks’ collections place considerable emphasis on the relationship between these monks and the court. This emphasis is more understandable if we keep in mind that the authors of the inscriptions on which these biographies were based and perhaps a large part of their intended readership, those who visited the *stūpa* of the deceased monks, were themselves high officials or aspirants to high government offices. At the stage of *stūpa* inscriptions, the basic orientation of these biographies of monks was not simply ‘religious’ but ‘secular’ in important ways.

---

to include this collection was given to the Central Buddhist Registry. The *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* (*T* no. 2154, 55: 13.625a) mentions the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*. Here the note on the *Gaoseng zhuan* states that the work is mentioned earlier in Fei Zhangfang’s 費長房 (?–598+) *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 [Records of the Three Treasures through Ages (completed 598)] and that it was recently included in the canon (*xinbian ruzang* 新編入藏). The note on the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* similarly mentions that the work was earlier mentioned in Daoxuan’s *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 [Great Tang Record of Inner (Buddhist) texts (completed 664)] and that it was recently included in the canon. The *Lidai sanbao ji* mentions the *Gaoseng zhuan* in *juan* 11 (*T* no. 2034, 49: 100a). The *Da Tang neidian lu* mentions both the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*: *Gaoseng zhuan* in *juan* 4 (*T* no. 2149, 55: 267a) and *juan* 10 (331c); the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* in *juan* 5 (282b) and *juan* 10 (333a).

The compilers of the ‘Biographies of Eminent Monks’ collections were all seriously committed monks. They collected biographies recorded in *stūpa* inscriptions and other biographical sources and organized the large number of biographies they collected within a framework of ten categories of activities in which monks could attain eminence.<sup>11</sup> The underlying viewpoint behind these works was monastic and highly orthodox.<sup>12</sup> Thus, there was a significant gap between the basic orientation of the compilers of biographical

---

<sup>11</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the ten categories used by Huijiao, see Wright, ‘Biography and Hagiography’, 390–392, 405–407; Makita, ‘*Kōsōden no seiritsu (ge)*’, 230–244. Huijiao used the ten categories of (1) *yijing* 譯經 (translators), (2) *yijie* 義解 (exegetes), (3) *shenyi* 神異 (miracle workers or theurgists), (4) *xichan* 習禪 (meditation masters or meditators), (5) *minglü* 明律 (*vinaya* masters or disciplinarians), (6) *wangshen* 亡身 (self-immolators), (7) *songjing* 誦經 (reciters of scriptures or cantors), (8) *xingfu* 興福 (promoters of works of merits), (9) *jingshi* 經師 (hymnodist), (10) *changdao* 唱導 (sermonists). Daoxuan revised this list of categories as follows: (1) *yijing* 譯經 (translators), (2) *yijie* 義解 (exegetes), (3) *xichan* 習禪 (meditation masters), (4) *minglü* 明律 (*vinaya* masters), (5) *hufa* 護法 (protectors of dharma), (6) *gantong* 感通 (miracle workers), (7) *yishen* 遺身 (self-immolators), (8) *dusong* 讀誦 (reciters), (9) *xingfu* 興福 (promoters of meritorious works), (10) *zake shengde* 雜科聲德 (miscellaneous sermonists). Zanning used Daoxuan’s categories without modification. For studies of biographies contained in the category of ‘self-immolators’ and that of ‘scriptural teachers’ (i.e., ‘hymnodists’) and ‘reciters’, see the two articles by Jan Yün-hua: ‘Buddhist Self-immolation in Medieval China’; and ‘The Power of Recitation.’

<sup>12</sup> Huijiao’s comment in his preface explaining why he chose to title the work biographies of ‘eminent’ monks rather than ‘famous’ monks may be interpreted as an expression of this basic attitude. Huijiao here is criticizing another monk’s work, Baochang’s 寶唱 (464–514+) *Mingseng zhuan* 名僧傳 [Biographies of Famous Monks] without mentioning the work itself explicitly. Yet, his criticism appears to express a specifically monastic point of view. The text of this criticism is found in *T* no. 2059, 50: 419a. For an English translation of this passage, see Wright, ‘Biography and hagiography’, 406. The relationship between Baochang’s *Mingseng zhuan* and Huijiao’s *Gaoseng zhuan* is discussed in Wright, ‘Biography and hagiography’, 408–412 and Makita, ‘*Kōsōden no seiritsu (jō)*’, 113–115.

collections and the original orientation of the materials they used for their collections: the biographies in *stūpa* inscriptions were compiled by secular authors and reflect their basic orientation; these same biographies in slightly modified forms were made to serve different purposes in the biography collections. The Chinese Buddhist biographical tradition was, to the extent that its sources were *stūpa* inscriptions, a product of this complex relationship and reflected the inherent tensions in it.

### Examples of *stūpa* inscriptions

A number of the texts of *stūpa* inscriptions and in some cases the stones on which they are carved<sup>13</sup> are still preserved. I have compared

---

<sup>13</sup> A few years ago I saw the rubbings of Li Yan's 李儼 (of 7th c.) inscription for Daoyin 道因 (587–658) (no. 1 in the list in appendix I), titled 'Yizhou Duobao si Daoyin fashi beiwen bing xu' 益州多寶寺道因法師碑文並序, and Pei Xiu's 裴休 (791–864) inscription on Duanfu 端甫 (770–836) (no. 10), titled 'Tang gu Zuojie senglu neigongfeng sanjiao tanlun yinjia dade Anguo si shang-zuo ci zifangpao Dada fashi Yuanmi taming bing xu' 唐故左街僧錄內供奉三教談論引駕大德安國寺上座賜紫方袍大達法師元秘塔碑銘並序 (a *beiming bing xu* 碑文並序), at the Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Dr. Shen Fu 沈複, Curator of Chinese Art of the Freer Gallery kindly informed me that these rubbings were given to the Gallery in 1936 and 1937 by the University of Peking and that the original stone stelae are still extant at Beilin 碑林 in Xi'an 西安. I also saw a rubbing of an interesting inscription by Cen Xun 岑勳 (d.u.) (in the calligraphy of Yan Zhenqing 顏真卿 [709–785]) entitled 'Da Tang Xijing Qianfu si Duobao fota ganying beiwen' 大唐西京千福寺多寶佛塔感應碑文 (also a part of the gift from the University of Peking). This inscription, dated in the eleventh year of Tianbao 天寶 period (753), describes miracles associated with the Duobao *stūpa* of the Qianfu si in Chang'an and includes a biographical passage on the monk Chujin 楚金 (698–759). Chujin's biography (*T* no. 2061, 50: 864c) based on Feixi's 飛錫 (726–805+) *stūpa* inscription for this monk (no. 12 in our list) is included in Zanning's collection and mentions the miracles associated with the Duobao *stūpa*. Since Chujin died in the second year of Jianyuan

the existing texts of *stūpa* inscriptions<sup>14</sup> with biographies in the ‘Biographies of Eminent Monks’ collections, and have so far identified 21 cases, all from Zanning’s Song collection, where the texts of the inscriptions on which the biographies are based are still preserved.<sup>15</sup>

---

建元 period (759) according to the biography, Cen Xun’s miracle inscription was erected in Chujin’s life time. Parallels between the two inscriptions, therefore, suggest that Feixi used Cen Xun’s inscription as a source in composing the *stūpa* inscription.

<sup>14</sup> I have selected biographical inscriptions about monks with titles that end with such terms as *bei* 碑, *beiwén* 碑文, *beiming* 碑銘, *beiming bing xu* 碑銘並序, *zan bing xu* 贊並序, *ta* 塔, *taming* 塔銘, *taming bing xu* 塔銘並序, *fenming bing xu* 墳銘並序, *fenta ming bing xu* 墳塔銘並序. These terms at the end of the title indicate clearly that the inscriptions were placed at the sites of the *stūpas* of the monks concerned. Chen Yuan 陳垣 (1880–1971), *Shishi yinian lu* 釋氏疑年錄, gives valuable information on many monks; Kasuga, ‘Zentōbun Bukkyō kankei senjutsu mokuroku,’ is helpful in identifying the texts of *stūpa* inscriptions contained in the *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 [Collected Tang Writings] compiled by Dong Gao 董誥 (1740–1818) and others in 1814.

<sup>15</sup> The details of these 25 cases are in the list appended below (Appendix I). Daoxuan’s *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, *juan* 23, preserves the texts of several inscriptions on very early monks, including Sengzhao’s 僧肇 (384–414) inscription for Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413) (*T* no. 2103, 52: 264b–265b), Xie Lingyun’s 謝靈運 (385–433) inscription on Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416) (*T* no. 21–3, 52: 267ab; mentioned in Huiyuan’s *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, *T* no. 2059, 50: 361b8f.), Huilin’s 慧琳 (431–504) inscription for Daosheng 道生 (355–434) (*T* no. 2103, 52: 265c–266b). Except for a loose parallel in the beginning of Huilin’s inscription, I found little evidence that the texts of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies were based directly on these inscriptions. I have not located some of the inscriptions on *Gaoseng zhuan* monks mentioned in Chen Yuan’s work (eg., Peng Bin’s 彭濱 [d.u.] inscription for Buddhahadra 佛陀跋陀羅 (359–429) [Chen, *Shishi yinian lu*, 10] and the Qixia si 棲霞寺 inscription containing information for Fadu 法度 [437–599] [ibid., 29ff.]). Liu Yuxi’s 劉禹錫 (772–842) inscription for Farong 法融 (594–657) (*Quan Tang wen* 606.6117b–6118a) has significant parallels in content with the beginning section of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography (*T* no. 2060, 50: 603c–605b), but I found little concrete

In 13 of these 21 cases, the biographies in the Song collection mention the existing inscriptions explicitly. In the other eight cases,<sup>16</sup> the comparison of the texts shows the dependence of the biography on the *stūpa* inscription beyond any doubt.

Other types of inscriptions and similar materials were also used by Zanning as virtually equivalent to *stūpa* inscriptions in preparing his *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. In some cases, these inscriptions were composed in a manner that is virtually indistinguishable from *stūpa* inscriptions. Some of these materials are also preserved: I have so far identified four such examples. Two inscriptions (called *bei* 碑 or *beiming* 碑銘 in their titles) ostensibly prepared for temple buildings were used by Zanning as sources for his biographies. In one case (the ‘Fahua si Jietan yuan bei’ 法華寺戒壇院碑 [Inscription for the Ordination Hall of the Temple of the Lotus Flower], ie., an inscription for a building in which the monk Xuanyan 玄儼 [675–742] lived for decades) Zanning mentions the inscription in the biography, indicat-

---

evidence indicating that the biography was in fact based on this inscription. Again there are several relevant inscriptions mentioned in Chen Yuan that I have not yet seen, including those for Tanxun 曇詢 (520–599) (*ibid.*, 50), Huiyuan of Jingying si 淨影寺 (523–592) (*ibid.*, 50ff.), Xinxing 信行 (540–594) (*ibid.*, 62), Sengyoung 僧勇 (d.u.) (*ibid.*, 66). A large number of inscriptions on monks whose biographies are included in the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* has survived. Many of these, including some which are explicitly mentioned in the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biographies (which often mentions more than one inscription, but seems to have chosen one as its primary source), do not show significant parallels with Zanning’s biographies. I have tried to isolate those inscriptions which I can be sure actually did serve as the basis of the corresponding *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. My list here remains provisional, though it is useful for the limited purpose of discerning a broad pattern of relationship between the inscriptions and *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biographies.

<sup>16</sup> These cases involve biographies of Shanwuwei 善無畏 (637–735), Zongmi 宗密 (780–841), Yicun 義存 (822–908), Daoguang 道廣 (d.u.), Shenwu 神悟 (689–751), Jiaoran 皎然 (i.e. Qingzhou 淸晝; 720?–800?) (which mentions the name Jiaoran, but not explicitly as the author of the inscription), Daocun 道存 (d.u.), and Shenhao 神皓 (717–791).

ing that he had in fact treated this inscription as a *stūpa* inscription. In another (‘Xijing Xingshan si Chuanfa tang beiming’ 西京興善寺傳法堂碑銘 [Inscription for the Transmission of the Teaching Hall at the [Da] Xingshan si in the Western Capital] associated with the monk Weikuan 惟寬 [755–817]<sup>17</sup>) Zanning does not mention the inscription, but the comparison of the inscription and the biography makes the dependence clear. The inscription primarily describes the life of the monk, and the building is only mentioned briefly as the place where the monk transmitted the teaching. I believe that these inscriptions were understood both by their authors and contemporary readers as the equivalents of *stūpa* inscriptions. The only difference is that they were probably not actual tomb inscriptions, but must originally have been placed at the sites of the temple buildings with which the subjects had been closely associated. Here, then, we have an example of biographical inscriptions, themselves not *stūpa* inscriptions proper, which were nevertheless written in the manner of *stūpa* inscriptions.

Another example—‘Songyue Gui chanshi Yingtang ji’ 嵩嶽珪禪師影堂記 [Record of the Image Hall of the meditation master Yuangui 元珪 (644–716) of Mount Song]—describes a miracle, but again the story of the miracle centers around the monk (Yuangui), and the life of this monk is described in a manner similar to that of *stūpa* inscriptions.<sup>18</sup>

The fourth example is a text entitled ‘a biography’ (*zhuan* 傳). The ‘Tang Huzhou Zhushan Jiaoran zhuan’ 唐湖州杼山皎然傳 [Biography of Jiaoran of Mount Zhushan in Huzhou of the Tang] is a short biography of a monk Jiaoran 皎然 (i.e. Qingzhou 淸晝; 720?–800?), who appears to have been a well-known writer of *stūpa* inscriptions. Many *stūpa* inscriptions he composed were used by Zanning as sources for his *Song Gaoseng zhuan*. I have so far been unable to determine the status of this document. Since it does not use the standard terms

---

<sup>17</sup> I discussed this inscription by a famous Tang poet Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846) in Shinohara, “Structure” and “Communitas” in Po Chu-yi’s tomb inscriptions’.

<sup>18</sup> This inscription is found in the *Quan Tang wen* 790.8267b–8269a.

for designating a *stūpa* inscription in its title, we cannot conclude that this short text was in fact a *stūpa* inscription. Zanning, however, treats it in exactly the same manner as he handles *stūpa* inscriptions, and his biography is a word for word copy of this text.<sup>19</sup>

Since these four examples of biographical sources appear to have been treated as equivalent to *stūpa* inscriptions by Zanning, and their content is very similar to *stūpa* inscriptions, I believe it is appropriate at least initially to take this material into consideration in our examination of *stūpa* inscriptions. Later, I will return to one of these four examples, the miracle inscription associated with Yuanguai and examine it in some detail. I shall pay special attention to the complex question of the relationship between *stūpa* inscriptions and miracle stories in my later discussion.

If we include these four examples, our sample expands to 25 cases. Instead of examining each of these inscriptions individually, I will here comment generally on the form of *stūpa* inscriptions and the use made of them by the biographer Zanning.

*Stūpa* inscriptions normally follow a conventional form. They begin with a highly rhetorical passage that uses symbolic expressions, sometimes obviously Buddhist, but sometimes not<sup>20</sup>, and locate the life of the deceased monk within a broad context of cosmic processes described by these symbols. This is followed by a narrative of the life of the deceased monk, culminating with the description of his death

---

<sup>19</sup> Fulin's 福琳 (703–784) biography, reproduced word for word by Zanning, begins by stating that Qingzhou was the tenth-generation descendant of the famous poet Xie Lingyun, and mentions that there was a 10-juan collection of his writings. Qingzhou obviously had a reputation for being a literary figure and was a typical example of what appears to have been a rather small group of monks who wrote *stūpa* inscriptions. We shall return to this topic briefly later in our survey of authors of *stūpa* inscriptions mentioned in the three 'biographies of eminent monks' collections. Fulin's own biography appears as a subsidiary biography (*biezhuan* 別傳) attached to Qingzhou's biography in Zanning's collection.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, the beginning lines of the preparatory remark in Daoyin's inscription. Buddhist themes are introduced at a later point in this preparatory passage.

and funeral, and then usually a verse (*zan* 贊), glorifying his life in highly rhetorical and symbolic language. Very often, either at the beginning or the end, one finds a passage describing the circumstances of the composition of the inscription.<sup>21</sup>

In most of these 25 cases, the text of the biography follows the text of the inscription virtually word for word through the main, historically informative sections. When other information is available, the biography occasionally expands the narrative in the inscription.<sup>22</sup> What is most striking in comparing the text of the biography with the inscription is the fact that the rhetorical and symbolic passages at the beginning and end of the inscription are usually not copied in the biography. Generally speaking, the compilers appear to use inscriptional sources for historical facts and events.

The compilers of the ‘Biographies of Eminent Monks’ also wrote rhetorical passages, using highly symbolic language. Each of the ten categories in which compilers classified their biographies ends with a section designated as ‘*lun*yue’ 論曰 (‘The critical estimate says’<sup>23</sup>). These sections describe the significance of the categories of accomplishments under examination and comment on and evaluate the biographies collected in the respective categories. These passages, therefore, correspond in function to the rhetorical passages in the inscriptions, and what the compilers did in fact was to separate the historical and rhetorical passages more clearly and systematically.

---

<sup>21</sup> See, for example, the first several lines of Bai Juyi’s inscription on Shangheng 尚衡 (d.u.). These lines state that after the death of this monk, his disciples and other admirers, both monks and lay people, came with a text of *xingzhuang* and a large sum of money and requested him to write the inscription for the deceased teacher. He turned down the request twice, but when they returned for the third time, after the stone *stūpa* had been completed, he produced the text, and the inscription was erected in the following year.

<sup>22</sup> For an example of this collaboration, compare Faqin’s 法欽 (715–793) inscription in the *Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 512, with the biography in *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2061, 50: 9.764b–765a.

<sup>23</sup> This is Arthur Wright’s translation of the term. See Wright, ‘Biography and Hagiography’, 391.

Whereas the rhetorical introductions in *stūpa* inscriptions tended to be highly eclectic, sometimes using expressions that come from Confucian or Daoist scriptures, the ‘*lunyu*’ passages describe the broad religious significance of the collected biographies in a unified, orthodox, and clearly Buddhist language.

### References to *stūpa* inscriptions in the collected biographies

Many of the biographies in the three collections mention explicitly the *stūpa* inscriptions composed and erected for their subjects.<sup>24</sup> Circumstances of the construction of inscriptions probably varied from case to case, and, moreover, different, often highly rhetorical expressions are used in describing this process. This makes the comparison of related cases and generalizing about the practice of erecting inscriptions difficult. In most cases, it appears that it was the disciples of the deceased monk who took the initiative and prepared a document listing relevant facts in their master’s life (*xingzhuang* 行狀 [Account of Conduct]). In many cases, the passage mentions the name(s) of well-known literary figures as authors of the *stūpa* inscriptions. The disciples of the deceased monk must have approached these well-known figures and requested them to compose the *stūpa* inscriptions. Sometimes, a name of a monk particularly known for his literary accomplishments is mentioned. In some cases, the name of the calligrapher is also mentioned.<sup>25</sup> The text was then carved on stone and placed at the site of the deceased monk’s *stūpa*.

---

<sup>24</sup> The biographies’ descriptions of the circumstances around the erection of the *stūpa* inscriptions were in most cases based on the description in the inscriptions themselves.

<sup>25</sup> For example, the calligrapher of Jingying Huiyuan’s 淨影慧遠 (523–592) inscription was Yu Shiji 虞世基 (of 6th c.) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 491c1); that of Sengyuo’s 僧祐 (445–518) inscription, Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 (557–641) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 584a23); that of Daoyin’s inscription, Ouyang Tong 歐陽通 (?–691) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 717b21, 22); that of Lingyou’s 靈祐 (?–858) inscription, Li Shangyin 李商隱 (c. 813–858) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 777cll: *ti’e* 題額); that of Zanghuan’s

As I noted above, this use of famous secular writers for composing monks' inscriptions was a well-established secular convention adopted by Chinese Buddhists for their *stūpa* inscriptions. As in the case of tomb inscriptions in general, the names of well-known authors must have enhanced the value of these inscriptions. Since such writers would not necessarily have agreed to compose a *stūpa* inscription for just any monk, a *stūpa* inscription by a well-known writer points to the social importance of the deceased monk. Moreover, as an example of a famous personage's literary composition the text of the inscription must have acquired greater visibility and its chance of preservation over a long period must have improved considerably. The same consideration must have motivated the practice of having a well-known calligrapher draft the copy of the inscription to be carved on stone.

The compilers of the biographical collections either saw the *stūpa* inscriptions themselves or at least had a copy of these inscriptions as their source. The compilers must have paid attention to the names of the authors of these inscriptions. It is probably safe to assume that they mentioned the names of the authors in cases where these names were widely recognized and likely to enhance the prestige of the subjects.<sup>26</sup>

---

藏奂 (790–866) inscription, Shao Lang 邵朗 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 779a25: *ti'e* 題額); that of Zangyi's 藏巖 (798–879) inscription, Wu Chongyu 吳重裕 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 780b16); that of Dajia's 待駕 (d.u.) inscription, Yu Di 于頔 (d. 818) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 834c8); that of Huaidao's 懷道 (d.u.) inscription, Chu Changwen 褚長文 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 834c20); that of Daguang's 大光 (?–805) inscription, Yang Kui 楊夔 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 866c4); that of Master Zhen 真法師 (?–749) inscription, Hong Yuanshen 洪元奩 (?–756+) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 890c15) and that of Jiran's 寂然 (d.u.) inscription, Liu Yuxi 劉禹錫 (772–842) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 880a1 9).

<sup>26</sup> The review of cases in which Zanning's biographies were based on inscriptions preserved in the *Quan Tang wen* summarized above indicates that a large part of the biographies which do not mention *stūpa* inscriptions explicitly must also have been based on them. It also indicates that in many cases the decision to mention the inscriptions and their authors must have been made rather arbitrarily.

It was a natural consequence of the convention of having a well-known and highly placed literary figure compose tomb inscriptions that the evaluation of the worth of the subject of a tomb inscription was linked to the status of its author. This consequence introduced a peculiar distortion in the Buddhist context. In the final analysis, it implies that secular criteria, that is, the official status and literary fame of the authors of the inscriptions entered the evaluation of the worth of monks' lives.

We may be able to explore this development further by examining systematically the references to the authors of inscriptions in the three collections of 'Biographies of Eminent Monks'. As a first step in such an exploration, I counted the number of these references in each-of the ten categories of biographies. The most striking fact that emerged was the concentration of biographies that mention the names of authors of *stūpa* inscriptions in certain categories. In Huijiao's first collection, these biographies are mostly found in the category of 'exegetes' (*yijing* 譯經, 19 of the total of 25 inscriptions mentioned); in Daoxuan's collection, they are again found in greatest number in the category of 'exegetes' (*jiejing* 解經, 41 out of the total of 69), but both the categories of 'meditation masters' (*xichan* 習禪, 15) and 'vinaya masters' (*minglü* 明律, 6) also contain a significant number; in Zanning's collection, it is the category of 'meditation masters' (45 out of the total of 112) that contains by far the largest number of these biographies, that of 'vinaya masters' (20) follows it, and categories such as 'exegetes' (11), 'miracle workers' (*shenyi* 神異, 11), and 'promoters of works of merits' (*xingfu* 興福, 9) contain a significant number of them.<sup>27</sup>

---

The same author, for example Bai Juyi, was frequently mentioned explicitly, but sometimes not. His inscriptions for Shangheng 上恆 (740–816) (A.5 in the Appendix I) and Sengcou 僧湊 (d.u.) (A.6) are explicitly mentioned in Zanning's biography, but his inscription for Weikuan 惟寬 (755–817) (B.2: 'Chuanfa tang beiming' 傳法堂碑銘) is not.

<sup>27</sup> The complexity of terminology that appears in the biographies makes it difficult to determine whether the references in some cases are to *stūpa* inscriptions or to other kinds of writings. The term *zan* 贊 for example may mean a verse

It is probably safe to conclude that the categories with the largest numbers of biographies that mention the authors of the inscriptions represent the most respected and important classes of Buddhist monks in the eyes of the secular leaders during the period of time covered by each of the three collections. The changes in the categories from collection to collection represent the shift in the secular leaders'

---

in praise of the monk written at the end of a *stūpa* inscription or a verse written without any direct connection with a *stūpa*. Here I am assuming that Sun Chuo's 孫綽 (314–371) *zan* mentioned frequently (e.g., *T* no. 2059, 50: 326b5ff, 346c25ff, 347b17ff., 350a25ff., 354a12ff., 355al ff., 357b17ff) were not from *stūpa* inscriptions, and thus I did not count these references as indicating the existence of *stūpa* inscriptions. When the term appears in connection with the term *zhuan* (biography), I took it as referring to *stūpa* inscriptions (e.g., *T* no. 2059, 50: 357a7, 370a13, 387c3). I included references to *zhuan* mentioned with the name of the author in the numbers of *stūpa* inscriptions (e.g., *T* no. 2059, 50: 349c7, 367a18), but excluded references to *xiang* 像 ('image') (e.g., *T* no. 2059, 50: 326c20f., 350a8, 382a21ff). There are also references to inscriptions at places other than a *stūpa* (e.g., outside of a city gate, *T* no. 2059, 50: 326c23, or at the temple, 382a21, 402cl). I have also excluded these references from the numbers given below. Where more than one *stūpa* inscription was mentioned, I counted each of them separately (e.g., *T* no. 2059, 50: 381b20f., 382a19ff., 382b17ff). Since the references were often unclear as to whether they meant *stūpa* inscriptions or some other kinds of writings, the figures given here remain highly tentative. Nevertheless, they are useful in describing a general tendency. I have counted the following instances of references to *stūpa* inscriptions. *Gaoseng zhuan* (total: 25): exegetes (19); miracle workers (*shenyi* 神異) (1); meditation masters (1); *vinaya* masters (1); cantors (*songjing* 誦經) (1); promoters of meritorious works (*xingfu* 興福) (2). *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* (total: 69): translators (1); exegetes (41); meditations masters (15); *vinaya* masters (6); protectors of the teaching (1); miracle workers (*gantong* 感通) (1); reciters of scriptures (*dusong* 讀誦) (1); promoters of meritorious works (2); miscellaneous sermonists (*zake shengde* 雜科聲德) (1). *Song Gaoseng zhuan* (total: 112): translators (4); exegetes (11); meditations masters (45); *vinaya* masters (20); protectors of the teaching (3); miracle workers (11); self-immolators (4); reciters of scriptures (2); promoters of meritorious works (9); miscellaneous sermonists (3).

views of Buddhism, which must have indirectly and at least partially reflected the changes in the nature of Chinese Buddhism itself. The interests of Chinese Buddhists, both monastic and lay, were initially, at least in the South where Huijiao collected his sources, directed toward philosophical exegesis; this emphasis continued, but other forms of orthodox Buddhist practices, such as meditation and strict observances of monastic rules, also became important during the period that Daoxuan's collection covers. In the subsequent period covered by Zanning's collection, the rise and dramatic expansion of Chan Buddhism changed the emphases and it was then the meditation masters who attracted the most attention.

A systematic investigation of the backgrounds of the authors of these *stūpa* inscriptions would probably shed considerable light on the nature of the *stūpa* inscriptions which served as sources for biographies. As an initial step toward such an investigation, the following observation may be helpful.<sup>28</sup> Huijiao's collection contains 25 references to *stūpa* inscriptions that mention their authors. One author<sup>29</sup> wrote three of them. Daoxuan's collection has 69 references. To list those who are mentioned as authors of tomb inscriptions on multiple occasions, one author, a layman,<sup>30</sup> wrote five; another author, also

---

<sup>28</sup> References to authors of inscriptions are, as we noted earlier, often given in a flowery language, and since these inscriptions are for the most part no longer extant, in some cases I had to guess as to the relationship between the names mentioned and the inscriptions they wrote. The figures given below are, therefore, tentative. These figures are nevertheless useful for our purposes here in indicating the general pattern of practice.

<sup>29</sup> Liu Xie 劉勰 (?–473) wrote inscriptions for Sengrou 僧柔 (431–494) (*T* no. 2059, 50: 378c27), Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518) (*T* no. 2059, 50: 402c29), and Chaobian 超辯 (420–492) (*T* no. 2059, 50: 408b22). Liu Xie's case is rather unusual. According to his biography in the *Liang shu* (50.710–713), Liu Xie lived with the famous monk Sengyou for over ten years. Toward the end of Liu Xie's life he renounced the householder's life, acquiring the monk's name Huidi 慧地 (465–520). Liu Xie's biography is also found in *Nanshi* 72.1781ff.

<sup>30</sup> Prince Yi of Xiangdong 湘東王 (蕭) 繹 (508–554) wrote inscriptions for Sengmin 僧旻 (467–527) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 463b1–2), Fayun 法雲 (427–529)

a layman,<sup>31</sup> wrote four; five authors, two laymen<sup>32</sup> and three monks,<sup>33</sup> wrote three each; and five authors, two monks<sup>34</sup> and three laymen,<sup>35</sup>

---

(*T* no. 2060, 50: 464c26), Zhizang 智藏 (458–522) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 467b12; *ming* 銘), Huichao 慧超 (c. 435–526) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 468b19), Sengfu 僧副 (464–524) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 550c6). There is also a reference to an inscription by this author in Huicheng's 惠成 (of 6th c.) biography (*T* no. 2060, 50: 557b28), but this inscription is said to have been erected inside the palace (*gongnei* 宮內) and therefore it was not a tomb inscription.

<sup>31</sup> Yu Shinan 虞世南 (558–638) wrote inscriptions for Zhituo 智脫 (541–607) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 499cl–2), Zhiju 智聚 (538–609) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 503b14), Huijue 慧覺 (554–606) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 516cl6–17), and Zhuli 住立 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 695b24).

<sup>32</sup> Li Baiyao 李百藥 (564–648) wrote inscriptions for Fachang 法常 (567–645) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 541b23), Sengyong 僧邕 (543–631) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 584a22), and Xuanwan 玄琬 (563–637) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 617b24). I took the expression '*zhibe*' 製碑 here to mean that he wrote the text of the inscription. Yu Zhining 于志寤 (588–665) wrote inscriptions for Tanzang 曇藏 (567–635) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 526a9–10), Kongzang 空藏 (569–642) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 689c19), and Daomei 道美 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 697cl).

<sup>33</sup> Mingze 明則 (?–615?) wrote tomb inscriptions for Huizang 慧藏 (560–656) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 498b28), Jingxuan 靖玄 (569–611) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 502b12), and Tanxun 曇詢 (520–699) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 559cl–2). Mingze's name is also mentioned as the author of the *xingzhuang* 行狀 in the biography of Tanqian 曇遷 (543–608) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 574b5). I have interpreted this as a reference to a separate and independent biography of Tanqian that was written by Mingze. The reference to Tanqian's tomb inscription appears earlier (*T* no. 2060, 50: 574al7), without naming the author of the text. Faxuan 法宣 (d.u.) wrote tomb inscriptions for Huikuang 慧曠 (543–613) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 503c17), Huilong 慧隆 (501?–601) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 515c5), and Guanding 灌頂 (561–632) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 585b10–11). Xingyou 行友 (d.u.) wrote the tomb inscription for Daoxun 道愍 (556–630) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 533c10), and 'biographies' for Haishun 海順 (589–618) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 525c5–6: '*zhu*' 傳) and Zhitong 智通 (548–611) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 577c20: '*benzhu*' 本傳). The biography for Haishun probably was an inscription; the nature of the biography for Zhitong seems less clear, but I have included it in my calculation.

wrote two each. Zanning's collection contains 112 references. Again to list those who are mentioned on more than two occasions, three authors, two laymen<sup>36</sup> and one monk,<sup>37</sup> wrote 4; two authors, one layman<sup>38</sup> and one monk,<sup>39</sup> wrote three each; and five authors, three

---

<sup>34</sup> Falun 法論 (536–608) wrote tomb inscriptions for Zhiwen 智文 (509–599) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 609c28–29) and Facheng 法稱 (560–605) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 701c11: *'muzhi'*). From the contexts I interpreted the *'xingzhuang'* for Jingsong 靖嵩 (537–614) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 501a23) and Zhinian 志念 (535–608) (*T* no. 2060, 50: 509b16, 17, 18), written by Daoji 道基 (576–637), as tomb inscriptions and included them in the present calculation.

<sup>35</sup> Wang Yun 王筠 (481–549) wrote the tomb inscriptions (*mingzhi* 銘誌) for Fayun 法雲 (467–529; *T* no. 2060, 50: 464c24) and Huiyin 慧因 (539–618; *T* no. 2060, 50: 470a12); Cen Wenben 岑文本 (595–645) for Luoyun 羅雲 (594–616; *T* no. 2060, 50: 493b26: *zhipei* 製碑) and Fakong 法空 (d.u.; *T* no. 2060, 50: 536b1: *zhixu* 制序); Xiao Jun 蕭鈞 (d.u.) for Huiyin (*T* no. 2060, 50: 522b25) and Xuanwan 玄琬 (563–637; *T* no. 2060, 50: 617b23, 24: *zhiming* 製銘).

<sup>36</sup> Liu Ke 劉軻 (772–840) wrote tomb inscriptions for Xiqian 希遷 (d.u.; *T* no. 2061, 50: 764a21), Ruhui 如慧 (d.u.; *T* no. 2061, 50: 773b14–15), Tianran 天然 (739–824; *T* no. 2061, 50: 773c5–6) and Puyuan 普願 (748–835; *T* no. 2061, 50: 775b4–5: no explicit reference to an inscription, but the expression *'zhuide songmei'* 追德頌美 appears to indicate that he wrote an inscription); Bai Juyi wrote tomb inscriptions for Chonggui 崇珪 (755–840; *T* no. 2061, 50: 765c21–22), Shangheng 上恆 (740–816; *T* no. 2061, 50: 806c27), Shencou 神湊 (744–817; *T* no. 2061, 50: 807b14–15), and Jiran 寂然 (d.u.; *T* no. 2061, 50: 880a1 8: *'weiji'* 為記).

<sup>37</sup> Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然; 720?–800?) wrote tomb inscriptions for Shouzhi 守直 (700–770; *T* no. 2061, 50: 798a6), Bianxiu 辯秀 (714–780; *T* no. 2061, 50: 801a14), Shenhao 神皓 (717–791; *T* no. 2061, 50: 803a13) and Huiming 慧明 (673–754; *T* no. 2061, 50: 876c4–5).

<sup>38</sup> Li Yong 李永 (d.u.) wrote tomb inscriptions for Xuanyan 玄晏 (743–800; *T* no. 2061, 50: 758b14–15), Daoxuan (*T* no. 2061, 50: 791b13–15), and Wengang 文綱 (636–727; *T* no. 2061, 50: 792b18).

<sup>39</sup> Xuantai of Nanyue 南嶽玄泰 (c. 850–912) wrote tomb inscriptions for Yuanzhi 圓智 (769–835; *T* no. 2061, 50: 776a11–12), Benji 本寂 (840–901; *T* no. 2061, 50: 786c2–3), and Quanhuo 全豁 (828–887; *T* no. 2061, 50: 856c25–26).

laymen<sup>40</sup> and two monks,<sup>41</sup> wrote two each. These figures suggest that there was a significant concentration of authorship on a limited number of writers. There was probably only a small number of writers who were known as being particularly competent and willing to draft *stūpa* inscriptions.<sup>42</sup> The majority of these, and especially those who were prominent among them, were secular figures, perhaps, lay followers of Buddhism. But some monks, not particularly known for their spiritual accomplishments,<sup>43</sup> also wrote a significant number of

---

<sup>40</sup> Wan Qirong 萬齊融 (d.u.) wrote tomb inscriptions for Daoliang 道亮 (628–706; *T* no. 2061, 50: 757c28: ‘*mingji*’ 銘記) and Xuanyan 玄儼 (675–742; *T* no. 2061, 50: 796a11: ‘*shuosong de bei*’ 說頌德碑); Lu Jianqiu 盧簡求 (788–864), for Lingyou 靈佑 (771–853; *T* no. 2061, 50: 777c9) and Qi’an 齊安 (d.u.; *T* no. 2061, 50: 777a5: the expression ‘*jianta*’ 建塔 may not mean that he wrote the inscription himself; I have included this case into my calculation nevertheless); Li Xuan 李鉉 (d.u.), for Zhilang 智朗 (871–947; *T* no. 2061, 50: 885a13) and Zhijiang 智江 (885–958; *T* no. 2061, 50: 885cl).

<sup>41</sup> Huicheng 惠成 (d.u.) wrote tomb inscriptions for Daofu 道甫 (d.u.; *T* no. 2061, 50: 787b3–4) and Quanfu 全怱 (d.u.; *T* no. 2061, 50: 787c12); Zanning, for Deshao 德韶 (891–972; *T* no. 2061, 50: 789b5) and Wang Luohan 王羅漢 (869–968; *T* no. 2061, 50: 852b8: ‘*zuo beiji*’ 作碑記).

<sup>42</sup> It might also mean that inscriptions written by well-known authors had a better chance of survival and eventual inclusion in the ‘Biographies of Eminent Monks’ collections, as we noted earlier. Thus these figures may be interpreted as clues for determining the nature of our collections of the biographies of ‘eminent monks’. They indicate that these well-known and willing writers played an important role in determining the choice of biographies to be included in them.

<sup>43</sup> Of the five monks whose names are mentioned more than once as authors of inscriptions in Daoxuan’s collection, only one, Daoji 道基 (576–637), has a biography (exegete section, *T* no. 2060, 50: 532b–c) in the same collection. Neither Daoxuan’s collection nor Zanning’s collection contains any biography of the other four monks. Compilers’ comments on some monks who were known as writers of inscriptions are found in *T* no. 2060, 50: 502b (Daoxuan [and Xue Daoheng 薛道衡 (535–604)] on Mingze 明則 [?–615?]) and *T* no. 2061, 50: 721c (Zanning on Qingzhou and Feixi 飛錫 [d.u.]).

inscriptions. This fact suggests that certain monks, known mainly for their literary gifts, began to write *stūpa* inscriptions: most probably following the model of those written by secular authors.

### References to death and funerals in the collected biographies

The next question I should like to address is the problem of how universal the reliance on *stūpa* inscriptions written by lay admirers or monks really was. A closer examination of the biographical collections reveals that not all biographies contained in them arc based on *stūpa* inscriptions.

In all three collections, by far the largest number of biographies mention the death of the subjects and often describe the circumstances of their death and funeral in considerable detail. In many cases, as those examined above, the description of the funeral includes a reference to *stūpa* inscriptions. One can assume that in most of these cases, the compiler had at least the rubbings of *stūpa* inscriptions at his disposal and that the biographies were based on the inscriptions.

All three collections, however, also contain a considerable number of biographies which do not mention the death of their subjects, and in some cases it is clear that the subjects were still alive at the time of the composition of the biographies.<sup>44</sup> These biographies obviously could not have been based on *stūpa* inscriptions. Even more impor-

---

<sup>44</sup> For example, biographies of Huijing 慧淨 (578-?; ‘currently he is 83 years old’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 446b22); Huixiu 慧休 (548-?) (‘At the present time in the 19th year of Zhenguan 貞觀 era, he is 98 years old... and as healthy as ever’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 545a12ff); Daochuo 道綽 (562-645) (‘Chuo is 84 years old this year’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 594a29); Daoliang 道亮 (398-?) (‘Now in the 19th year of Zhenguan, he is 77 years old’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 619b27); Mingdao 明導 (d.u.) (‘In the present year, he is over 60 years old’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 624a22); Tanguang 曇光 (d.u.) (‘At present in the second year of Linde 麟德 period [665], he is preaching and guiding disciples in the Eastern Capital...’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 624b8ff); and Fachong 法衝 (595?-687?) (‘At present in the Linde period, he is 79 years old’, *T* no. 2060, 50: 666c23ff).

tantly, a significant number of biographies in all three collections end with a brief statement to the effect that the circumstances of the subjects' death are unknown. Since *stūpa* inscriptions usually describe the circumstances of the subjects' death and funeral in considerable detail, we must assume that all these biographies which explicitly state that such facts were unknown must have been based on sources other than *stūpa* inscriptions.<sup>45</sup> As we shall examine further below, one such source may have been records of miracles.

In order to explore this question further, I prepared a list giving the number of the biographies in question according to the ten categories used by the compilers of these biographical collections. Focusing our attention on the number of biographies which explicitly state that the circumstances of the subjects' death were unknown, the findings of this work may be summarized as follows. In Huijiao's collection the categories of 'translators' (10=28.6% of all biographies in this category) and 'miracle workers' (8=40%) are particularly notable for the number of biographies which explicitly state that the circumstances of the subjects' death were unknown.<sup>46</sup> In Daoxuan's collection the category of 'miracle workers' (24=20%) is particularly notable.<sup>47</sup> In Zanning's collection, we note the cate-

---

<sup>45</sup> As we have noted earlier, compilers often mention a variety of sources other than *stūpa* inscriptions. Except for the case of Huijiao's preface, this information is found in the biographies themselves. These sources included *biezhuan* 別傳 biographies, records of miracles, and local traditions about a temple.

<sup>46</sup> These biographies are distributed as follows: 10 biographies in the 'translators' section; 4 biographies in the 'exegetes' section; 8 biographies in the 'miracle workers' section; one biography in the '*vinaya* masters' section; one biography in the 'self-immolators' section; 3 biographies in the 'reciters of scriptures' section; 3 biographies in the 'promoters of meritorious works' section.

<sup>47</sup> The biographies that explicitly state that it is not known how the subject ended his life are distributed in this collection as follows: 2 biographies in the 'translators' section (out of the total of 15 biographies); 3 biographies in the 'exegetes' section (161 biographies); 5 biographies in the "meditation masters' section (95 biographies); 3 biographies in the 'protectors of the teaching' section (18 biographies); 24 biographies in the 'miracle workers' section (118 biog-

gories of ‘translators’ (10=31%), ‘miracle workers’ (16=17.9%), and ‘reciters of scriptures’ (8=19%).<sup>48</sup> Finally, if we take the total numbers of these biographies, we note that in Huijiao’s collection the number is 30 (out of 257; 11.7%), in Daoxuan’s collection it is 40 (out of 485; 8%)<sup>49</sup> and in Zanning’s collection it is 53 (out of 531; 9.98%).<sup>50</sup>

My interpretation of the significance of these figures is as follows.

(1) In all three collections the category of ‘miracle workers’ is characterized by the notable number of these biographies in which it is stated that the circumstances of the subject’s death are unknown. This suggests that there is something particular about miracle stories and the way they shape a biography. In fact, I shall later contend that many of the biographies in the miracle worker sections maybe based on sources originally written as miracle stories and lack information concerning the death of the monks involved.

(2) In Huijiao’s and Zanning’s collections, the category of ‘translators’ contains a notable number of the biographies which

---

raphies); one biography in the ‘self-immolators’ section (12 biographies); one biography in the ‘reciters of scriptures’ section (14 biographies); two biographies in the ‘miscellaneous sermonists’ section (12 biographies).

<sup>48</sup> The figures for this collection are as follows: 10 biographies stating explicitly that the circumstances of the death of the subject are unknown in the ‘translators’ section (out of the 32 biographies in this section); 7 in the ‘exegetes’ section (72); 4 in ‘*vinaya* masters’ section (58); one in the ‘protectors of the teaching’ section (18); 16 in the ‘miracle workers’ section (89); 8 in the ‘reciters of scripture’ section (42); 4 in the ‘promoters of meritorious works’ section (50); 3 in the ‘miscellaneous sermonists’ section (45).

<sup>49</sup> Daoxuan’s preface mentions the figure of 340 biographies (*T* no. 2060, 50: 425b) as the total number of biographies included in his collection. However, as we noted above, Daoxuan continued to add further materials to his collection after its completion and the present work contains a considerably larger number of biographies.

<sup>50</sup> Zanning’s preface mentions the figure 533 as the total number of biographies in the collection (*T* no. 2061, 50: 710a). The figures given at the beginning of each *juan* corresponding to the number of biographies included in the *juan* add up to 531.

explicitly state that it is unknown how the monks concerned ended their lives.<sup>51</sup> (3) None of the three central categories of monks, i.e., ‘exegetes’, ‘meditation masters’, and ‘*vinaya* masters’ contains notable numbers of this type of biographies. This probably indicates that monks known for their accomplishments in these areas were probably widely known and that their biographies were mostly based on *stūpa* inscriptions written by prominent literary figures.

---

<sup>51</sup> There may have been a more or less distinct genre of writing that recorded pilgrims’ travels to the West in search of scriptures. Huijiao mentions a work by Sengbao 僧寶 (d.u.) which contained biographies of pilgrims (*youfang* 遊方) exclusively (*T* no. 2059, 50: 418b26), but no further information is available about this work (ref., Wright, ‘Biography and Hagiography’, 416; Makita, ‘*Kōsōden no seiritsu* (jō)’, 106). Yijing’s 義淨 (635–713) *Da Tang Xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳 (*T* no. 2066, vol. 51) compiled between 689 and 691 was a collection of 60 biographies of pilgrims. Biographies of translators sometimes take the form of an extended account of their travels to the West (for example, the biography of Tan Wujie 曇無竭 (Dharmōdgata; Fayong 法勇 [?–420+]) which ends with a comment that it is not known how he ended his life). Some of these biographies may have come from pilgrims’ travel stories. Suwa, ‘Chimō narabini Hōyu no guhō gyōki ni tsuite,’ examines the biographies of Zhimeng 智猛 (d.u.) and Tan Wujie (Chinese name Fayong 法勇) and suggests that their biographies in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (*T* no. 2145, 55: 113b–c and 113c–114a) and *Gaoseng zhuan* (*T* no. 2059, 50: 343b–c and 338b–339a) may have been based on their own records of the travels. Suwa traces the source for Zhimeng’s biography to a text written by Zhimeng himself called ‘*You waiguo zhuan*’ 有外國傳 mentioned in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, *juan* 8, *T* no. 2145, 55: 60b. The quotation from this work given in this passage in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (*T* no. 2145, 55: 60b14–22) roughly parallels a passage in Zhimeng’s biography (*Chu sanzang ji ji*, *T* no. 2145, 55: 15.113c4–10; the *Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 343b26–c2). The source for Tan Wujie’s biography is identified as the work called ‘*Waiguo zhuan*’ 外國傳 mentioned in *Lidai sanbao ji*, *T* no. 2034, 49: 10.92c. The note on this title states that Tan Wujie described his experiences in the West in this work and the summary of its content given here matches the content of his biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and the *Gaoseng zhuan*. The biography also explicitly states that there existed a separate record of Tan Wujie’s travels.

(4) The categories, ‘reciters of scriptures’, contain biographies that often tell stories of miracles. Thus, the large number of biographies that acknowledge the absence of information about the subjects’ deaths in these categories may be explained in the same way as in the case of miracle workers.<sup>52</sup>

(5) The fact that the ratio of these biographies remains substantial and stable in the later collections by Daoxuan and Zanning may be significant. It suggests that Chinese Buddhist biographies were never based exclusively on *stūpa* inscriptions and that compilers of these biographies always used other materials, such as miracle stories, as an important though clearly secondary source.

It should be clear from all of the above that miracle stories are of particular interest in an investigation of the nature and sources of Chinese Buddhist biographies. Chinese Buddhist biographies contain a large number of miracle stories. They are found not only in biographies in the miracle workers section but also in all other sections. Thus, the prevalence of miracle stories is an important major characteristic of Chinese biographies of monks. Some accounts of miracles are found in *stūpa* inscriptions: a good example here may be the *stūpa* inscription for the monk Duanfu 端甫 (770–836) composed by Pei Xiu 裴休 (791–864)<sup>53</sup> which reports a number of miracles associated with relics. Other accounts of miracles in monks’ biographies were based on independent miracle stories. It is these independent miracle stories that will occupy my attention in this paper as I explore the sources of Chinese Buddhist biographies other than *stūpa* inscriptions. I shall be concerned with answering the question of how this material came to be incorporated into the biographies of monks in the *Gaoseng zhuan* collections, and I shall proceed by discussing a few specific examples of biographies in the light of their miracle story sources.

---

<sup>52</sup> One of the two cases of this type listed in the ‘miscellaneous’ section in Daoxuan’s collection (i.e., Daoji’s 道紀 [d.u.] biography, *T* no. 2060, 50: 701b24) and all the eight cases in the ‘reciters’ section of Zanning’s collection centre around miracle stories.

<sup>53</sup> *Quan Tang wen* 743.7694–7695.

### Miracle stories as a source for Huijiao's *Biographies of Eminent Monks*

As we noted above (footnote 4), in his preface to the *Biographies of Eminent Monks*, Huijiao lists diverse sources he used for his collection. Wang Manying's 王曼穎 (active 500s–520s) letter provides further information on sources.<sup>54</sup> Some of these sources are collections of miracle stories; for example, *Xuanyan ji* 宣驗記 [or *Mingyan ji* 冥驗記 (Records of Manifestations from the Unseen Realm)] and *Youming lu* 幽明錄 [Records of the Hidden and Visible Realms] both by Liu Yiqing 劉義慶 (403–444), Prince Kang of Linchuan 臨川康王 (403–444); *Mingxiang ji* by Wang Yan 王琰 (d.u.); Wang Yanxiu's 王延秀 (d.u.) *Ganying zhuan* 感應傳 [Account of Miraculous Responses]; Zhu Juntai's 朱君臺 (572–640) *Zhengying ji* 徵應傳 [Account of Signs and Responses]; *Soushen lu* 搜神錄 [Investigation into Deities], which is said to be by Tao Yuanming 陶淵明 (365?–427), though this attribution is questionable.<sup>55</sup> Though most of these sources are no longer extant in a complete form, a medieval Chinese Buddhist encyclopedia *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 [A Forest of Pearls from the Dharma Garden; completed by Daoshi 道世 (?–683) in 668] preserves in fragments a large part of the miracle collection called '*Mingxiang ji*' compiled by Wang Yan sometime after 479.<sup>56</sup> These fragments contain materials on monks whose biographies are found in Huijiao's collections. Some existing fragments from

---

<sup>54</sup> On the sources mentioned by Wang Manying, see Makita, 'Kōsōden no seiritsu (jō)', 112.

<sup>55</sup> For a discussion of Chinese Buddhist miracle stories, see Gjertson, 'The Early Chinese Buddhist Miracle Tale'. See also Kao (ed.), *Classical Chinese Tales of the Supernatural and the Fantastic*.

<sup>56</sup> See the preface to this work preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 14, *T* no. 2122, 53: 388c. See also Makita's comment on this work in Makita, 'Kōsōden no seiritsu (jō)', 108 and note 14 (p. 124). Gjertson ('The Early Chinese Buddhist Miracle Tale,' 293–294) states, 'The date of the collection's compilation is not certain, but tales attributed to it contain internal dates as late as 485, and it is known to have been in circulation before 501.'

*Youming ji*, *Xuanyan ji*, also contain similar materials.<sup>57</sup> Though not mentioned explicitly by Huijiao or by Wang Manying, three collections of Avalokiteśvara miracles rediscovered in Japan, Fu Liang's 傅亮 (374–426) *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* 光世音應驗記 [Accounts of Avalokiteśvara's Miracle Stories], *Xu Guanshiyin yingyan ji* 續光世音應驗記 [Further Accounts of Avalokiteśvara's Miracle Stories] by Zhang Yan 張演 (active first half of 5th c.), Lu Gao's 陸杲 (459–532) *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* 繫觀世音應驗記 [Accounts of Miracle Stories Affiliated with Avalokiteśvara]<sup>58</sup> likewise contain materials that are closely related to Huijiao's biographies. A comparison of the *Mingxiang ji* and other miracle stories with Huijiao's biographies provides us with some clues as to the role of miracle stories in the development of Chinese Buddhist biographies.

In addition to the miracle stories, there are also two earlier collections of biographical materials that shed light on a number of Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. Baochang's *Mingseng zhuan* 名僧傳 [Biographies of Renowned Monks], a large compilation of biographies of Buddhist monks completed in 514/515, some years earlier than Huijiao's collection (c. 531), was used extensively by Huijiao as a source, though Huijiao appears to have been highly critical of this work and it is not mentioned explicitly in his preface. This work too is now preserved only in fragments.<sup>59</sup> Huijiao also made extensive use

---

<sup>57</sup> These materials from *Mingxiang ji*, *Xuanyan ji*, and *Youming lu* are collected in Lu Xun's 魯迅 (1881–1936) *Gu xiaoshuo gouchen* 古小說鈎沉. A comprehensive list at the end of Mikita's 'Kōsōden no seiritsu (jo)' (115–123) lists the parallels between Huijiao's collection and other sources. I am heavily indebted to Makita's work in the discussion here, though where appropriate I supplemented Makita's information with my own findings (commented on in the list given as Appendix II below).

<sup>58</sup> These three related collections of Avalokiteśvara miracles, were rediscovered in the Seiren'in 青蓮院 in Kyoto, Japan. The edited text of these works with notes are found in Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*. The texts were first discussed in Tsukamoto, *Koitsu Rikuchō Kanzeon ōken ki no shutsugen*.

<sup>59</sup> The outline and fragments of the contents of this work is preserved in a copy, *Meisō denshō* 名僧傳抄, prepared by a 13th century Japanese monk Sōshō

of the biographies in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 [Collected Notes on the Translation of the Tripitaka] compiled by Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518).<sup>60</sup> In a small number of cases where parallel materials are preserved in these sources we can partially trace the process through which miracle stories were reshaped or incorporated into later biographies.

I have so far identified 26 cases of monks whose stories are found in the *Mingxiang ji* and whose biographies in the *Gaoseng zhuan* bear some relationship with the *Mingxiang ji* stories. I have also identified a smaller number of parallels between *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies and miracle stories in other existing miracle story collections or fragments from such collections. There are five cases for Lu Gao's *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*; three for the *Youming lu*; two for Fu Liang's *Guanshiyin yingyan ji*; one for the *Xuanyan ji*. In three cases (Daojiong 道冏 [d.u.], Zhu Fachun 竺法純 [of 5th c.], and Senghong 僧洪 [?-416+]) both the *Mingxiang ji* fragments and Lu Gao's *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* contain parallels to the same *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. In one case (Zhu Fayi 竺法義 [307–380]) the parallel material is found both in the *Mingxiang ji* and Fu Liang's *Guang shiyin yingyan ji*. In all cases where biographies in the *Gaoseng zhuan* have parallels in earlier miracle story collections, I have found that Baochang's *Mingseng zhuan* also contained biographies on the same subjects. Though the majority of these corresponding *Mingseng zhuan* biographies have now been lost, a comparison of the few *Mingseng zhuan* biographies preserved in the *Meisō denshō* (Zhu Fayi, Daowang 道汪 [?-466]), Zhu Fachun, and Senghong and the corresponding *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies indicates that Huijiao must have relied heavily on Baochang's biographies. Since by far the largest number of parallels between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies

---

宗性 (1202–1278), ZZ 2B: 7. This copy is discussed in Kasuga, 'Jōdokyō shiryō to shite no *Meisō den shijisshō*.' The *Mingseng zhuan* is discussed in Wright, 'Biography and Hagiography,' 408–412; Makita, '*Kōsōden* no seiritsu (ge)', 113–115, 233–235.

<sup>60</sup> Wright ('Biography and Hagiography', 421) dates the work as 'between 510 and 518'.

and miracle stories in earlier collections are found in the *Mingxiang ji*, here I will focus on the parallels between the *Mingxiang ji* and the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Where other parallel biographies or miracle stories are preserved, I will also take them into consideration. Finally, I shall comment briefly on related parallel versions found in miracle story collections other than the *Mingxiang ji*, but not in the *Mingxiang ji* itself.

A comparison of the materials in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Mingxiang ji* shows that there are three distinct modes of relationship between these two texts.

(I) Huijiao simply rewrote the material in the *Mingxiang ji* (seven cases: Fa'an 法安 [?405+] from the exegetes section; Zhu Fatai 竺法汰 [320–387] and Jiantuole 撻陀勒 [d.u.] from the miracle workers section; Sengqun 僧群 [?–417] and Sengyu 僧瑜 [412–455] from the self-immolators section; Faxiang 法相 [d.u.], and Huijin 慧進 [d.u.] from the reciters of scriptures section). Stories about monks in the *Mingxiang ji* are written in the form of biographies, but in each case the biography contains a story or stories about miraculous feats and/or events. Though written in the form of biographies, Wang Yan obviously collected these materials as records of miracles. My hypothesis is that these materials were originally transmitted as records of miracles, the biographical format appearing clearly only when they were written down, or at some later stage of rewriting and editing, as a matter of convenience. From the very beginning what was important in these materials was the descriptions of the miracles, and references to person, place and time were included because these details served an important function. In records of miracle stories written as biographies such information as the secular surname of the monk and his place of origin, even when not specifically relevant to the miraculous events themselves, would nevertheless enhance the verisimilitude of the accounts. In these cases, the distinction between miracle stories and biographies becomes blurred. Huijiao sometimes took these miracle stories written as biographies and incorporated them into relevant sections of his collection.

(II) Huijiao's biographies parallel for the most part the *Mingxiang ji*'s story, but also contain additional information (eleven cases: Zhu Shixing 朱士行 [203–282], Kang Falang 康法朗 [of the Jin dynasty],

Yu Falan 于法蘭 [of the Jin dynasty], Zhu Fayi 竺法義 [307–380], Zhu Senglang 竺僧朗 [325?–410?]) from the exegetes section; Shan Daokai 單道開 (255?–360?), Qiyu 耆域 [d.u.] from the miracle workers section; Zhu Fachun, Daojiong and Huiqing 慧慶 [a.k.a. 惠慶; 391–452]) from the reciters of scriptures section; Senghong from the promoters of meritorious works section). In these examples the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies generally report the same miracles as the *Mingxiang ji* stories. In some cases, it adds further miracles (Yu Falan, Qiyu, Huiqing 慧慶), and in some cases details of the same events are different (e.g., Yu Falan, Qiyu, Zhu Shixing, Zhu Fayi).

Several of these biographies have parallels in other existing sources, giving us a glimpse into the history behind the miracles stories and biographies in question. The clues here to unraveling the complex relationships between the various accounts and understanding the development of the biography are the unmistakable relationships in matters of content and the relative dates of the works. The *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* is a reconstruction of materials that were first collected before 399;<sup>61</sup> the *Mingxiang ji* was completed shortly after 479; the *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* was completed in 501;<sup>62</sup> the *Mingseng zhuan* in 513;<sup>63</sup> the *Chu sanzang ji ji* between 510 and 518, and the *Gaoseng zhuan* around 531. Thus, for example, where the contents of the biographies in the *Mingxiang ji*, the *Mingseng zhuan*, and

---

<sup>61</sup> The preface to Fu Liang's collection states that he wrote down what he remembered of an earlier collection by Xie Fu 謝敷 (313–362) which had been lost during the confusion caused by Sun En's 孫恩 (?–402) rebellion in 399. This suggests that the substance of the stories goes back earlier than 399.

<sup>62</sup> Lu Gao's preface states that the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* was completed in the year 501. See Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 26.

<sup>63</sup> In some cases, one sentence summaries of biographies in the *Meisō denshō* are also relevant. In the case of Yu Falan biography, the summary is quite different from the stories preserved in the *Mingxiang ji* and the *Gaoseng zhuan*; in another (Huijin), the summary is different from the *Mingxiang ji* and *Gaoseng zhuan* versions in one important regard. Wright, 'Biography and Hagiography', 411, points out that none of the fragments from the *Meisō denshō* 'can be certainly identified as a complete biography from the *Mingseng zhuan*'.

the *Gaoseng zhuan* show unmistakable mutual dependence, we must understand that the account of the *Mingxiang ji* must have been the earliest account, which was known at least to Baochang and possibly to Huijiao as well.

I will here examine six cases that are of particular interest.

### Zhu Shixing biography

To begin with an example from the ‘translators’ section, Zhu Shixing biography is found in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang ji ji* and as in other cases of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biographies, Huijiao’s *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based directly on Sengyou’s biography. Though there are frequent minor differences in the choice of characters and phraseology, the relationship between these two biographies is unmistakable. The miracle story in the *Mingxiang ji* also is quite similar to those in the two biographies. In the *Mingxiang ji* version, however, the circumstances that explain why Zhu Shixing embarked on the trip to obtain the original text of the *Perfection of Wisdom* scripture, given in virtually the same words in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography and Huijiao’s *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, are not mentioned, and there are some differences in the account of the central miracle. There may have been a general tradition about the miracle performed by this Chinese monk who died in Central Asia, and the accounts in the *Mingxiang ji* and the *Chu sanzang ji ji* may represent two different versions that come from this tradition. Sengyou, in that case, might not have known the *Mingxiang ji*’s story. It is also possible that Sengyou knew the *Mingxiang ji* version of the miracle story and that he revised it, perhaps on the basis of another account known to him.

### Zhu Fayi biography

In the second example, Zhu Fayi from the ‘exegetes’ section, the material in the *Mingxiang ji* story<sup>64</sup> tells a story in which ‘a man of the Way’, probably Avalokiteśvara, appears in a dream and cures Zhu Fayi’s disease by taking out his inner organs and washing them.

---

<sup>64</sup> As found in *Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 17.409b24–29.

This material was incorporated into the *Mingseng zhuan* biography, which in turn formed the basis of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. There is a significant difference in the number of disciples listed: over 100 according to the *Mingxiang ji* story and the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, but over 40 according to the *Mingseng zhuan* biography. There is also a quotation attributed to Fu Liang in the *Mingxiang ji* story ('My father had contacts with Zhu Fayi'). Every time Zhu Fayi told him the story, he felt frightened and renewed his respect for him') and the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography (the quotation is slightly modified here). The quotation is absent in the *Mingseng zhuan* biography. These observations confirm that Huijiao also had access to the *Mingxiang ji* and revised the account of the *Mingseng zhuan* biography using this source.

In this example there is another source of the same story preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 95<sup>65</sup> where the origin of this version of the story is attributed to a work called the *Shuyi ji* 述異記 [Notes of the Extraordinary].<sup>66</sup> In this section of the *Fayuan zhulin* a story virtually identical with that in the *Mingxiang ji* is told in different words, with a different date of death, and with a differently worded quotation of Fu Liang's words. Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 (1912–2011) showed that this passage is in fact a quotation from the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* and not the *Shuyi ji* as claimed by the *Fayuan zhulin*.<sup>67</sup> According to the preface of the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, the seven stories recorded there are based on what its editor Fu Liang remembered of an earlier collection. Xie Fu 謝敷 (313–362) of the Eastern Jin dynasty compiled a work of the same name consisting of over ten stories and sent it to Fu Liang's father, but due to the confusion caused by Sun En 孫恩 (?–402) rebellion (399) the work was lost; failing to find the work anywhere, Fu Liang wrote down the seven stories that he remembered.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>65</sup> *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 988b.

<sup>66</sup> For a complex history of this work, see *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 142.2961ff.

<sup>67</sup> *Taiping guangji* (110.766) also attributes the passage to the *Shuyi ji* 述異記, perhaps following the *Fayuan zhulin*.

If we accept this account of the origin of Fu Liang's text given in this preface, the oldest existing source of the story about Zhu Fayi<sup>69</sup> describing a miracle that occurred in the year 372 according to the *Gaoseng zhuan*<sup>70</sup> would be Xie Fu's *Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, to be dated some time earlier than 399. We must then assume that Fu Liang's comment about his father's contact with Zhu Fayi was added to what he remembered of Xie Fu's version by Fu Liang himself; he added this information as the compiler's comment, using the first person pronoun 'yu' 余. This statement was preserved as a rather abruptly introduced quotation from a statement of a famous person in the *Mingxiang ji*. There is, however, nothing in the *Mingxiang ji* account that explains the relationship between this famous person Fu Liang and the content of the story. This obscure quotation was then dropped in the *Mingseng zhuan* biography, but Huijiao, who probably knew both the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* and *Mingxiang ji* stories, restored it with some changes in wording in his *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. In this case of Zhu Fayi we are thus able to trace the miracle story preserved in the *Mingxiang ji* to an earlier source (ie., the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji*), though the precise relationship between the two is still largely obscure.

---

<sup>68</sup> Toward the end of the *Fayuan zhulin* passage, there is a statement saying that the six stories starting with that of Zhu Changshu 竺長舒 (d.u.) ending with that of Zhu Fayi 竺法義 (307–380) were compiled by Fu Liang. Fu Liang's *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* begins with a story about Zhu Changshu and ends with that of Zhu Fayi. Though this work contains seven rather than six stories, this reference to Fu Liang's compilation and the close parallel in wording between the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* and the *Fayuan zhulin* passages prove beyond reasonable doubt that the *Fayuan zhulin* passage is based on the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji*.

<sup>69</sup> These dates are based on the *Gaoseng zhuan*. The *Fayuan zhulin* passage attributed to the *Shuyi ji* gives the date of death 382, but this date is not found in the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* passage.

<sup>70</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 350c22–23.

### Zhu Senglang biography

The biography of another ‘exegete’, Zhu Senglang, in the *Gaoseng zhuan* appears to be based on the *Mingxiang ji* material.<sup>71</sup> The wording of the two stories reporting Senglang’s extraordinary ability to know things happening at distant places is very similar. Yet, other incidents in his life are reported in both sources in different words (eg., the account of how Senglang’s temple was spared at the time of the persecution of Buddhism under Fu Jian 苻堅 [338–385] of the Former Qin 前秦 dynasty). There also is a fair amount of information in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography which is not found in the *Mingxiang ji*. The *Mingxiang ji* fragment in the *Fayuan zhulin* may be itself an abbreviated version of the original story in this collection, or we must surmise that Huijiao had before him another rather extensive source.

### Zhu Fachun biography

A rich body of material has survived around the three ‘reciters of scriptures’ biographies, ie. those of Zhu Fachun, Dao Jiong, and Huiqing.

Thus, the same central story is told in the *Mingxiang ji*, *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji*,<sup>72</sup> *Mingseng zhuan*, and *Gaoseng zhuan*. Zhu Fachun runs into a storm on his trip to buy materials for repairing temple walls; when he recites the *Guanshiyin ching* [*Avalokiteśvara sutra*], a large boat appears and he is able to board it and reach the

---

<sup>71</sup> *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 428bc; 592ff.

<sup>72</sup> The *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* by Lu Gao was completed in 501 makes use of other works such as the *Xuanyan ji* and *Mingxiang ji* (cf. Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 8). Zhu Fachun’s story in this collection ends with a statement which says that other stories about storms are also (‘you 又’) found in the *Xuanyan ji* by Liu Yiqing. This suggests that the story recorded here is based on the *Xuanyan ji*, a relatively early work from which only a small number of fragments is preserved. If the story in fact comes from the *Xuanyan ji*, this version may represent its earliest form. The text of the story unfortunately appears to be somewhat corrupt in part and we cannot compare these parts in detail with other versions.

other side of the river safely. In all four versions the same description of the geographical and chronological setting appears; we are given the same name of his temple Xianyi si 顯義寺<sup>73</sup> and the same period during which the incident occurred, namely ‘during the Yuanxing 元興 period of the Jin dynasty (402–404)’. This common description of the setting points to a close relationship among these accounts. In the *Mingxiang ji* and *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji*, Zhu Fachun is explicitly said to have been the head of the temple (*sizhu* 寺主). In the *Mingseng zhuan* he is said to have been diligent in ascetic practice and accomplished in meditation and therefore was asked to become the head of the temple. The *Gaoseng zhuan* account mentions Zhu Fachun’s ascetic practice and virtue but not the fact that he was the head of the temple. The *Gaoseng zhuan* story contains certain key expressions<sup>74</sup> that are also found in the *Mingseng chuan* but not in the other two earlier sources, suggesting that here as elsewhere Huijiao depended heavily on the *Mingseng zhuan*. Two expressions<sup>75</sup> are shared in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, *Mingseng zhuan*, and *Mingxiang ji* versions of the story, indicating that at least Baochang, and possibly both Baochang and Huijiao, were acquainted with the *Mingxiang ji* story, and that they relied less on the *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* version of the story. One obscure phrase that appears only in the *Mingxiang ji* (起寺行牆) and *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* (起寺行牆) in slightly different forms due probably to textual corruption, suggests that these two earlier accounts were probably both based on a common source.

---

<sup>73</sup> The same name of the place where he went to obtain building materials (or ‘building materials of an old building’ [*guwu cai* 故屋材] in the *Mingseng zhuan*, or simply ‘an old building’ [*guwu* 故屋] in the *Gaoseng zhuan*), Lan-shang, appears in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (where the order of the two characters are reversed as Shanglan 上蘭), *Mingseng zhuan*, and *Mingxiang ji* versions.

<sup>74</sup> In addition to the expression ‘old house’ and the reference to the ‘ascetic practice’ mentioned above, both of the texts describe the time when Zhu Fachun set out into the late as *mu* 暮, ie., ‘evening’.

<sup>75</sup> ‘Chuanxiao 船小’: ‘the boat was small’ referring to the first boat on which Zhu Fachun wanted to cross the lake and ‘e 俄’: ‘suddenly’ in describing the manner in which the large boat appeared.

Only the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography mentions that Zhu Fachun was good at reciting the ‘old *Weimo* 舊維摩 (Vimalakīrti)<sup>76</sup> scripture. Perhaps Huijiao had another source for this information.

The above analysis suggests the following relationship between the four available versions of Zhu Fachun’s story. There was a common tradition of this story on which all four versions are based, though the two earlier versions, ie., those of the *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* (possibly the earliest) and *Mingxiang ji*, show significant differences in phraseology. These differences make it clear that both the *Mingseng zhuan* and the *Gaoseng zhuan* versions are based on the *Mingxiang ji* account. The compiler of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, Huijiao, based his biography of Zhu Fachun on Baochang’s *Mingseng zhuan* biography. He was possibly also acquainted with the *Mingxiang ji* story about Zhu Fachun. Huijiao seems to have had another source of information about Zhu Fachun’s recitation of the Vimalakīrti scripture.

This framework enables us to interpret two interesting features of the four available versions of Zhu Fachun’s story in a manner that might shed some light on the process in which compilers of biographical collections used miracle stories and also on the development of miracle stories themselves.

Perhaps the most important difference between the *Mingxiang ji* and *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* versions of this story is the reference in the *Mingxiang ji* to the building material as belonging to a woman. We learn that Zhu Fachun was crossing the lake on a small boat with the woman who owned the materials when the storm arose. The *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* does not mention this fact. The *Mingseng zhuan* biography elaborates on the fact that Zhu Fachun was in the same boat with a woman, and states explicitly that he was particularly fearful that if the boat sank his body would be found beside that of a woman. The seriousness of this embarrassment, or the suspiciousness of the fact that a monk should be sharing a small boat with a woman, is reflected in the care that both the *Mingxiang ji* and *Mingseng zhuan* take to

---

<sup>76</sup> This probably refers to the oldest Chinese translation of the scripture, ‘*Gu weimojie jing*’ 古維摩詰經, 2 *juan*, by Yan Fodiao 嚴佛調 (d.u.) in the fifth year of Zhongping 中平 period (188). This work is now lost.

explain her presence by saying that she was the owner of building materials that Zhu Fachun was purchasing. This detail is no doubt inserted in order to make it clear that Zhu Fachun was not guilty of any misconduct. This twist to Zhu Fachun's story, namely that he was not only afraid of perishing in storm, but was doubly threatened since he was with a woman, is probably an elaboration that was introduced to increase the story's dramatic effect at some point in the course of its development. The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography does not mention the fact that Zhu Fachun was in the same boat with a woman. Huijiao eliminated this twist from his biography, perhaps mindful of the fact that there are other versions which do not mention it (he was possibly acquainted with the *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* version itself) or perhaps because he considered this reference to a woman distasteful.

Another interesting feature of Zhu Fachun's biography is the comments on the nature of the large boat that saved him. The *Mingxiang ji* version says that since it was night time and no one else was traveling, such a boat could not have just happened to be on the lake, and that Zhu Fachun suspected it to be miraculous in nature (*shenli* 神力 [supernatural power]). The story ends simply by saying that they reached the other shore quickly on this boat. The *Xi Guanyin yingyan ji* version reports that Zhu Fachun later showed the large boat which saved him to many people, but no one turned tum up claiming to be its owner (*wuzhu* 無主). The *Mingseng zhuan* version says that although he looked for the owner (*zhu* 主) of the new boat, he could not find him. The boat is said to have been the result of the cosmic response to his sincere recitation/meditation. The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography says that he sought but could not find the owner (*zhu* 主), that the boat disappeared in a short while, and that both monks and lay people admired the miraculous results of this monk's effort. The miraculous nature of the event is suggested and highlighted through two different devices in the earlier accounts: the reference to the unlikelihood that such a boat would appear at night, as in the *Mingxiang ji*, and the story that no one turned up to claim it, as in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*. In this case the two biographers, Baochang and Huijiao, both preferred the second explanation: in their retelling of the story, the miraculous nature of the event is emphasized not only by stating this fact explicitly but also by devising further details.

### Daojiong biography

As shown in detail in the list in my Appendix II, the *Fayuan zbulin* preserves two fragments about Daojiong from the *Mingxiang ji*. The *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* also preserves two fragments about Daojiong. The relationship between these fragments and the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is rather complex. I will first summarize the contents of each fragment and then compare them with the content of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.

The *Mingxiang ji* fragment in the *Fayuan zbulin*, *juan* 17, contains three stories:<sup>77</sup>

(i) In the ninth month of the second year of the Yuanjia 元嘉 period (425) while the monk was performing the Samantabhadra ceremony (*Puxian zhai* 普賢齋), a man riding a horse appeared and later disappeared, and a bright red light was seen all over the sky.

(ii) In the twelfth month of the third year of the same period (427) Daojiong was performing the Samantabhadra ceremony in a layman's house. Two ordinary looking monks came to worship. People did not pay attention to them, but a layman, Zhang Dao 張道, noted something unusual about them and followed them when they left the ceremony. After walking a short distance, they flew up in the sky and disappeared.

(iii) In the seventh year of the same period (430), Daojiong went to the capital with his fellow students. While he was staying at the Nanjian jingshe 南澗精舍 residence, four people appeared at night riding in a new carriage and took him to the Chenqiao 沈橋 bridge. There he saw a nobleman, surrounded by hundreds of assistants and guards, all wearing yellow robes. The nobleman was surprised and said that he only wanted to know where the man of the Way who practiced the *banzhou* 般舟 [*pratyutpanna*] meditation, that is, Daojiong, lived. He asked his attendants why they had brought Daojiong over, and ordered them to take him back. When they came back to Daojiong's residence, the guards disappeared leaving him outside the building. He knocked on the door, and the monks inside, frightened, opened the door to let him in. The door of Daojiong's room was also still locked as usual.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 17.408c28–409a20.

The second *Mingxiang ji* fragment from the *Fayuan zhulin*, from *juan* 65, tells the following stories<sup>78</sup>:

(i) In the 18th year of the Hongshi 弘始 period of Jin (416)<sup>79</sup> Taojiong's teacher Daoyi 道懿 (480?-420?) sent him and his fellow student Daolang 道朗 (d.u.) and two others to gather stalactites at Mount Huo 霍山 in Henan. They went into the grotto with torches in their hands. Three miles into the grotto, they ran into a deep body of flowing water. They used a piece of wood to cross it. Daojiong went first and safely crossed the water, but when the three others tried to cross, the piece of wood sank and they all died. The torch also went out. Daojiong recited the Guanshiyin 觀世音 (Avalokiteśvara)<sup>80</sup> scripture and vowed to hold a ceremony for 100 monks (*bairén huì* 百人會). At the close of the night, a bright light that looked like a firefly appeared, and suddenly the grotto was lit up. Daojiong saw the path and came out from under a huge rock.

(ii) In the 19th year of the Yuanjia period (442) Prince Kang of Linchuan (i.e. the abovementioned Liu Yiqing), based in Guangling 廣陵, asked Daojiong to perform certain ceremonies. In the ninth month Daojiong was performing a ten-day Avalokiteśvara ceremony. After they had completed nine days of the ceremony, at three o'clock in the morning all the monks were asleep. Daojiong rose to worship and as he returned to his seat to meditate, the heads and top torsos of numerous monks emerged from the four walls. Daojiong also saw a Buddha clearly. An awesome looking elder, wearing a hair dress and riding pants, and holding a long sword in his hand, picked up some incense and gave it to Daojiong. Daojiong first did not accept it, but the monks in the wall told him to accept the incense as a protection

---

<sup>78</sup> *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 65.784c22-785a10.

<sup>79</sup> The ruler of the Later Qin 後秦, Yao Xing 姚興 (366-416) died in the first month of this year, and his heir Yao Hong 姚泓 (388-417) changed the name of the period to Yonghe 永和. Thus, if the date given here is correct, the incident must have happened in the first month of this year, which falls to February and March of the year 416 according to the Western calendar. The 18th year of the Later Qin period corresponds to the 12th year of the Yixi 義熙 period of the Eastern Jin dynasty.

for his patron (*zhuren* 主人). Suddenly everything disappeared. Then the numerous monks who emerged from the walls were no longer seen. Only the Śākyamuni image was seen that had been placed there.

The first fragment in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* (no. 6) reports an incident in the seventh year of the Yuanjia period of the Song dynasty (430). Daojiong was travelling with four fellow students crossing the Yellow River on ice at Mengjin 孟津. The ice broke and first one student fell and died, and shortly after that three more fell. Daojiong was a diligent practitioner of the Buddhist path and recited the Guanyin scripture 觀音經. Thereupon, he felt something under his feet that supported him, and he was able to avoid falling into the water. He made a vow saying that if he could cross the river he would perform a ceremony for fifty monks. He then saw a red light in front of him, and following it in a straight line, he was able to reach the other shore.

The second fragment in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* (no. 60) reports the incident that took place in a stalactite grotto during the 18th year of the Hongshi period of Qi (416).<sup>81</sup> The story told here is virtually identical in form to the one in the *Mingxiang ji*, though with a number of differences in phraseology.

The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Daojiong consists largely of the following stories:

(i) The stalactite grotto incident, told in a similar manner as in the *Mingxiang ji*, *juan* 65 and the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, but, as in

---

<sup>80</sup> Identical with the Avalokiteśvara chapter in Zhu Fahu's 竺法護 (231–308) *Zheng fabua jing* 正法華經, *T* no. 263, 9: 10.128ff; Kumārajīva's *Miaofa lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華經, *T* no. 262, 9: 7.56–57; the *Tianpin fabua jing* 添品法華經 by Jñānagupta (She'najueduo 闍那崛多; 523–600/605?) and Dharmagupta (Damojiduo 達摩笈多; ?– 619), *T* no. 264, 9: 7.191–193. On Avalokiteśvara worship during the Six Dynasties period, see Satō, 'Rikuchō jidai no Kannon shinkō'; Kobayashi, 'Shinkō no Kannon'.

<sup>81</sup> This date is here restated as the 'tenth year of the Yixi 義熙 period of the Jin dynasty', using the chronology of the Eastern Jin dynasty. This latter date translates into 414 and since the first designation 'the 18th year in the Hongshi 弘始 period' translates into 416 there appears to be a slight discrepancy between the two dates given here.

the case of all the following stories, Huijiao omits the reference to the date of the incident (416). Daojiong's promise to perform the ceremony for 100 monks is not mentioned. This version mentions that the light that guided him out of the grotto looked like a firefly. This comparison is mentioned in the *Mingxiang ji* version, but not in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*. The explicit statement that the torch light went out that appears immediately following the drowning of the three fellow students in the *Gaoseng zhuan* retelling of the story, on the other hand, is also found in the same context, though phrased in different words, in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*. This statement is not found in the *Mingxiang ji* version.

(ii) Miracles that occurred during the Samantabhadra ceremonies, involving a foreign monk or a man riding on a horse. Here Huijiao may be summarizing the two Samantabhadra stories in the first *Mingxiang ji* fragment summarized above, though the themes in these stories, ie., the red light and flying into the sky are not mentioned. These incidents are given the dates of 425 and 427 in the *Mingxiang ji*, but again no dates are mentioned in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.

(iii) The story of Daojiong's crossing the Yellow River on ice. Here the story (dated 430) in the first *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, not paralleled in the *Mingxiang ji* fragment, is summarized.

(iv) The story in which Daojiong is taken to a man sitting at the Chenqiao bridge in a carriage. Here Huijiao is retelling the story found in the first *Mingxiang ji* fragment in a manner that closely parallels that version. The *Mingxiang ji* gives the date of 430 to this incident, but no date is mentioned in the *Gaoseng zhuan*.

(v) There is a reference to the fact that Liu Yiqing took Daojiong to Guangling in the 20th year of the Yongjia era of the Song dynasty (443). We saw above the reference to the service that Daojiong provided Liu Yiqing in the second *Mingxiang ji* fragment. Huijiao's statement may be related to this reference in the *Mingxiang ji*, but the date given in the *Mingxiang ji* is the 19th year of the Yongjia period, which would indirectly contradict the information given here. This statement is followed by a comment that Daojiong ended his life there in Guangling.

A few observations may be made on the basis of the above com-

parison of the content of the three sources on Daojiong:

(a) The close relationship between the stories (i), (ii), and (iv) in the *Gaoseng zhuan* summary above and the corresponding materials in the *Mingxiang ji*, second fragment (i), first fragment (i), (ii), and (iii), shows that Huijiao, or possibly Baochang, if Huijiao was copying from Baochang, relied heavily on the *Mingxiang ji* in writing the biography of Daojiong.

(b) The story about crossing the Yellow River on ice, which is story (iii) in the above summary of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Daojiong, has a parallel in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, but not in the *Mingxiang ji*. This fact indicates that Huijiao, or again possibly Baochang, was familiar with the story in the first *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* fragment. The parallel between the story (i) in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the second *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* fragment, both stating explicitly that Daojiong's torch went out, may also be significant in this context.

(c) It is striking, as we noted above, that the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography omits the references to the year and month attached to the incidents recorded there, except in the case of the item (v) which speaks about Daojiong's relationship to Prince Kang of Linchuan in Guangling and then concludes by stating that Daojiong died in Guangling. All the miracle story fragments examined here give the dates of the incidents with meticulous care. If we restore these dates to the stories adopted in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, however, it becomes clear that these stories are in fact arranged in the proper chronological sequence. Huijiao, or again perhaps Baochang, must have known these stories in versions that gave the dates of the incidents and so was able to arrange them in chronological order, yet at the same time removing all chronological references except for one. The one date given in connection with the comment that Daojiong went to Guangling and ended his life there may have an important function as a part of the overall framework of the biography. As we have seen above, Chinese biographies of monks often emphasize details of the circumstances of the subject's death. Since the date of Daojiong's death appears not to have been known to Huijiao, the date of Daojiong's move to Guangling may have been given as the last known date that approximates the date of his death. We have also

noted above that the date given here conflict with the one given in one of the miracle stories in the *Mingxiang ji*.

This analysis of Daojiong's biography has shown how the compiler of biographical collections used two different sources (or sources based on or related to them) and organized a number of stories into a coherent biography.

### Huiqing 慧/惠慶 (391–452) biography

In the case of Huiqing, a short story describing how his boat escaped a storm when he recited and meditated on the *Guanshiyin ching* scripture is told in different words but in the same sequence and with the same details in the *Mingxiang ji* and the *Mingseng zhuan*.<sup>82</sup> The *Mingseng zhuan*, however, also contains other information concerning his study of scriptures (*Fabua* 法華, *Shidi* 十地, *Weimo* 維摩, and *Siyi* 思益 scriptures). The brief *Gaoseng zhuan* biography mentions both the story of the storm and his study of scriptures, adding an interesting detail to the latter, that when he recited the scriptures at night the snapping of fingers and voices of praise were heard in the darkness. These details must have been included because they were regarded as being quite extraordinary: they probably were meant to indicate that the gods were praising the monk. What we see here may be an example of the development of a biographical detail into a miracle story: a reference to the reciting of a scripture leads to a story of an intensive study of scriptures, which in turn occasions a story describing how well he recited scriptures.

### (g) Senghong biography

The case of the 'promoter of meritorious works', Senghong, is rather unusual. In other cases where the sources for the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies are preserved in both the *Mingxiang ji* and the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* (Zhu Fayi, Zhu Fachun, and Daojiong) the comparison of biographies and miracle stories indicates that the *Mingseng zhuan* and/or *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies draw more

---

<sup>82</sup> *Mingxiang ji*, T no. 2122, 53: 785c27–86a4; *Mingseng zhuan*, ZZ 2B: 7: 12b1–12.

directly from the *Mingxiang ji* than from the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*. But in the case of Senghong, the comparison of the texts of the two miracle story versions, the *Mingxiang ji* and the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, with the *Mingseng zhuan* biography shows that though the two miracle story versions tell the same story with little difference in content, Baochang's biography is more closely related in phraseology to the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* version, while Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is clearly based on the *Mingseng zhuan* biography.<sup>83</sup>

With this we conclude our investigation of those cases in which Huijiao based his biography primarily on the *Mingxiang ji*, but also used other material. We move now to a consideration of the third way in which he seems to have used materials in the *Mingxiang ji* in writing his *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies.

(III) In some cases, Huijiao based his biography on a source other than the *Mingxiang ji*, but the *Mingxiang ji* miracle story was incorporated into this larger framework (eight cases: 1. Zhu Tanmoluoche 竺曇摩羅刹 [Dharmarakṣa; Fahu 法護; 230–316]; 2. Tan Wujie 曇無竭 [Dharmōdgata; Fayong 法勇 (?–420+)] and 3. Qiunabamo 求那跋摩 [Guṇavarman; 367–431] from the translators section; 4. Zhi Daolin 支道林 [314–366], 5. Huiyuan 慧遠 [334–416], 6. Huiyan 慧嚴 [363–443], and 7. Daowen 道溫 (398–466) from the exegetes section; and 8. Huida 慧達 [345–436] from the promoters of meritorious works section). In general (with the exception of Huida's biography to be examined in some detail below and perhaps also of the Guṇavarman biography), the biographies here were not originally written as records of miracles. The subjects were well known as translators or exegetes, and the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies often quote directly from their writings. In the case of the translators, the biography takes the form of a record of the subject's travel to the West.

---

<sup>83</sup> The last line in the *Mingseng zhuan* biography (ZZ 2B,7: 13d13), differently phrased in the *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, is repeated with only minor difference in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography (T no. 2059, 50: 410b29–411a). *Mingseng zhuan* gives Senghong's 僧洪 name as Senggong 僧供.

Let me again discuss the relationship between the *Gaoseng zhuan* and *Mingxiang ji* biographies with a few examples from this group. The three *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies of the ‘translators’ in the above list are based on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biographies compiled by Sengyou. In the two cases of Tanmoluocha (Fahu) and Tan Wujie, the relationship among these three sources is relatively straightforward: the *Gaoseng zhuan* parallels the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biographies closely with only minor differences in phraseology and the miracle story in the *Mingxiang ji* is already found in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography.<sup>84</sup>

The Qiunabamo (Guṇavarman) biography presents a more complex situation. Although the broad outline of the biography in the *Gaoseng zhuan* parallels that of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, suggesting that the former is ultimately based on the latter, the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is a great deal longer and contains many stories of miracles associated with different places that Guṇavarman visited in his travels. The *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography only mentions his taming of wild animals and the miraculous occurrences at the time of his death. When he died, he looked as if he were in meditation and an extraordinary fragrance pervaded the air; everyone saw a dragon-like creature go up to heaven. The story about Qiunabamo’s death is found in more or less the same form in the quotation from the *Mingxiang ji* in the *Fayuan zhulin*, but that is the only miracle reported in that fragment. It is possible, however, that the original entry on miracles associated with this monk in the *Mingxiang ji* included accounts of other miracles. The *Gaoseng zhuan* repeats the same story and also tells the story about taming wild animals differently and with vivid details.<sup>85</sup> This biography also contains many other stories of miracles

---

<sup>84</sup> Zhu Tanmoluocha’s *Gaoseng zhuan* biography quotes Zhi Daolin’s verse referring to the miracle. This verse is not mentioned in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*; it is mentioned in a shorter form in the *Mingxiang ji*, which also describes the miracle itself in an abbreviated form. This relationship seems to indicate that Huijiao, or Baochang if the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography was copied from the *Mingseng zhuan* biography, had direct access to the *Mingxiang ji* story as well as to the fuller text of Zhi Daolin’s verse.

<sup>85</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 340c: ‘When he met the tiger, he patted its

which must come from sources other than the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and probably also other than the *Mingxiang ji*.<sup>86</sup>

The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huiyuan ('Exegetes' section), tells two miracle stories associated with a spring in Mount Lu 廬山 where this important scholar monk lived a secluded life. The outline of Huiyuan's biography in the *Gaoseng zhuan* is based on the biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, but the biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* lacks any story of the spring in Mount Lu. Perhaps its compiler, Sengyou, was not familiar with such stories, or possibly he was acquainted with them but did not consider them trustworthy or worthy of inclusion into his biography. The same two stories associated with the spring in the Lushan mountain are also told in a fragment from the *Mingxiang ji* preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin*.<sup>87</sup>

---

head with his staff and played with it before parting' 或時值虎，以杖按頭，弄之而去。

<sup>86</sup> The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Guṇavarman was translated by Émmanuel-Édouard Chavannes (1865–1918) in Chavannes, 'Guṇavarman (369–431 p.C.)'.

<sup>87</sup> The story is about the origin of the Longquan Jingshe 龍泉精舍, the Dragon Spring Temple, which was established by the monk Huiyuan. When Huiyuan first came to the south he liked the area and wanted to build a temple. Before he decided on a site he dispatched his disciples to look for a suitable place in a forest or a valley. When they came to the spot of where he later built the Dragon Spring Temple, they stopped and rested. The monks were all thirsty. Huiyuan made a vow saying, 'If this is the place to build the temple, let the supernatural power produce an auspicious spring here'. He then hit the ground with his staff. A pure spring welled up and water accumulated to form a pond. That is why he built the temple building there. Later there was a drought. Huiyuan led monks and recited the *Longwang jing* 龍王經 [The Scripture of Dragon King; possibly the *Longwang xiongdì jing* 龍王兄弟經 translated by Zhiqian 支謙 [active 222–253], *T* no. 597, vol. 15) and prayed for rain for the sake of the people. Before the recitation ended, a creature that looked like a large dragon (or snake according to the *Gaoseng zhuan* version) emerged from the spring and went up to the sky. Suddenly, from heaven rain poured down four times. The temple was named Dragon Spring Temple because of this miracle.

In the existing summary of Huiyuan biography in the *Mingseng zhuan* there is a reference to the first and perhaps the more important of these two stories about the spring in the Lushan mountain.<sup>88</sup> At least the first story about this spring then was already present in Baochang's biography. Baochang, the compiler of the *Mingseng zhuan*, may have taken the reference to the spring (one or two stories) either from the *Mingxiang ji* or from another source<sup>89</sup> and incorporated it into the biography of Huiyuan. Huijiao, the compiler of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, might then have followed Baochang and included the two stories about this spring in his biography of Huiyuan. If the *Mingseng zhuan* biography told only one story about the spring, Huijiao could have expanded it to the full two story version using the *Mingxiang ji* or another source. As we noted earlier, there is also the possibility that the miracle stories of the spring existed in a common source that lay behind the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography and was also accessible to the compilers of the *Mingxiang ji*, the *Mingseng zhuan* and *Gaoseng zhuan*. We would then have to assume that they are missing in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* because its compiler Sengyou had intentionally suppressed them. Even if this happens to be the case, the complex relationship between these sources would highlight the fact that the miracle story as a compact unit was highly portable, and could make its way in and out of biographies with remarkable ease. I suspect it to be in fact an interloper in the biography of Huiyuan.

Up to this point in my discussion I have been concentrating on

---

<sup>88</sup> The summary, found in the appendix to the *Meisō denshō* 名僧傳抄, called *Meisōden setsushō* 名僧傳說抄 (ZZ 2B: 7, 15a4–5), reads as follows: 'Huiyuan struck the ground with his monk's tin staff (*xizhang* 錫杖) and clear water flowed. He built a temple building and called it the Dragon Spring Temple' (惠遠以錫杖扣地, 清流涌出, 構立堂房, 遂號龍眾精舍事). It may be significant that this summary does not include any reference to the second miraculous incident associated with the reciting of the *Longwang jing* scripture and rising of a dragon to heaven. The name of the temple is given here as 'Longzhong Jingshe' 龍眾精舍. I emended this awkward phrase, assuming that the character 'zhong 眾' (literally: 'many') resulted from a scribal mistake for the character *quan* 泉 in the original text.

the relationship between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies and the *Mingxiang ji* miracle stories. I will, however, conclude this analysis by commenting briefly on the same *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies which have parallels not in the *Mingxiang ji* but in other miracle story collections.

Fu Liang's *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* contains a story about Bo Faqiao 帛法橋 (256–345) which appears to have been the main source for Huijiao's biography (perhaps mediated through Baochang's *Mingseng zhuan* biography).<sup>90</sup> The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography centers around the story of Avalokiteśvara's miraculous gift of a strong voice to Bo Faqiao, and though the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji* story is extensively rewritten, parallels in details between the two versions point to a close relationship between them.

The *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* materials on Sengbao 僧苞 (?–440?) and Daowang 道汪 (?–466) tell one story in each case that is incorporated as a part of the more extensive *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. Daowang's case is of interest because Lu Gao's *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji* story ends with an explanation that Lu Gao heard the story from Daowang's disciple Daoxian 道僊 (480?–600?). This authenticates the story in a manner found frequently in Chinese records of miracle stories,<sup>91</sup> enabling us to trace the source of one anecdote in a *Gaoseng zhuan* biography to its origin in oral transmission.

<sup>89</sup> The stories in these sources are told in different words. Thus it is not possible to determine whether Baochang/Huijiao rephrased the *Mingxiang ji* version rather freely or the *Gaoseng zhuan* version was based on a different parallel account of the two miracles.

<sup>90</sup> The list of summaries for *juan* 23 of the *Mingseng zhuan* in the *Meisō denshō*, ZZ 2B: 7, 4b8–6, includes the following item: 'the story about Avalokiteśvara answering the requests of beings in this world' 觀世音菩薩能救苦厄. This item may at least in part refer to the story of Bo Faqiao 帛法橋 (256–345).

<sup>91</sup> There are numerous examples of such notations in the sources. For a few random examples, see *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 315a11ff, 316b9–11, 331a23ff (written origin), 332c18–20; *Huayan jing zhuanji*, T no. 2073, 51: 166b7–9, 167a15–17, 28–29, 177b23ff.

In the three parallel cases from the *Youming lu*, the stories in the miracle story collection again parallel portions of the longer *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. An Qing's 安清 (a.k.a. An Shigao 安世高 [active 148–170]) biography is worthy of special attention. The main portion of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, based closely on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography, tells the story of An Qing that is known from the *Youming lu*, but in greater detail, showing several close parallels to the *Youming lu* in phraseology. Since Liu Yiqing, who compiled the *Youming lu*, lived between 403 and 444, the *Youming lu* version of the story must have existed by the time the *Chu sanzang ji ji* version was composed (early 6th c.). The parallel in the case of Zhu Falan is close in content but brief; that of Fotucheng 佛圖澄 (233–349) is a minor, almost negligible one.

The *Xuanyan ji* tells two stories involving Kang Senghui. These stories are found both in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. These parallels between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies and miracle collections other than the *Mingxiang ji* are significant, but the small number of parallel cases makes it difficult to draw broader conclusions from them concerning the relationship between biographical and miracle collections.

To return to the parallels between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies and the *Mingxiang ji* miracle stories, our analysis indicates that miracle stories were an important source of Chinese Buddhist biographies. In roughly two thirds of the parallel cases, the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based primarily on the miracle story in the *Mingxiang ji*. In other cases, the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is primarily based on a source not particularly oriented to recording miracles, but even in these cases Huijiao shows a strong tendency to expand the biography by borrowing miracle stories from other sources such as the *Mingxiang ji*.<sup>92</sup> It appears that Huijiao had little hesitation in using available

---

<sup>92</sup> The comparison of parallel accounts of miracles, often divergent in details, also suggests that rich traditions of miracles associated with certain monks existed in medieval China. These traditions must have given rise to a number of different stories of the same miracles. The divergent accounts found in the preserved fragments probably originated in this way.

accounts of miracles associated with Buddhist monks as a source for his biographical collection.<sup>93</sup>

The different patterns of relationships between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies and miracle stories suggest that the *Gaoseng zhuan* collection contains different types of 'biographies'. Some of the biographies (illustrated in the present discussion by the examples in the category III, but certainly numerous other examples exist in the *Gaoseng zhuan* as a whole) are of wellknown and clearly important Buddhist leaders. Rich biographical traditions existed around these figures, and Huijiao composed his biographies using a number of sources available to him. Other biographies (especially those illustrated by the examples in category I and in some cases those in category II; again there must be other examples of this type in the *Gaoseng zhuan* as a whole) are different in nature. The subjects of the biographies based exclusively on miracle stories in the *Mingxiang ji* must have been monks who were known only or primarily from their connection to these miracle stories. In these cases, the stories were probably better known than the monks. When these stories associated with specific monks were adopted into collections of biographies, the relative emphasis on monks and stories was reversed and, reading biographical collections without the knowledge of this background, we are left with the impression that these monks were also well-known leaders in their own right.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> This finding somewhat contradicts Arthur Wright's ('Biography and Hagiography,' 385ff) suggestions that stories of miracles played only a minor role in Huijiao's biography. Wright comments, 'He (Huijiao) was less concerned to awe the simple with accounts of miracles than to persuade the nobles and literati that Buddhism was intellectually respectable and that its clergy had led useful, creative, and well disciplined lives'. The difficulty with this analysis lies in the assumption that 'the simple' and 'the nobles and literati' had two entirely different religiosities. Perhaps, 'the nobles and literati' were equally interested in miracles as the 'simple', and our analysis suggests that Huijiao was fully aware of the interests in miracles on the part of the 'nobles and literati'. On the distinction between popular and elite religiosities, see Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, 3–21.

The detailed analysis of the parallels above also sheds some light on the manner in which compilers of biographical collections used miracle stories. In one case (Daojong) we saw how the biographer (Baochang or Huijiao) constructed a biography by collecting several isolated miracles from different sources, stories associated with the subject, and arranging them in chronological order. In the case of Huiqing we saw details of a miracle story develop as the story was incorporated in the biographies written by Baochang and Huijiao. Zhu Fachun's miracle stories and biographies showed how different ideas were developed and also dropped in the course of the repeated retelling of the story (the device for highlighting the miraculous nature of the large boat and the female companion theme). The examples of Tanmolocha, Tan Wujie, and Zhu Shixing in which the *Mingxiang ji* miracle stories were seen to have been incorporated into the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biographies, either directly from the *Mingxiang ji* itself or from other parallel sources, reveal the compiler Sengyou's openness to miracle stories as sources for biographies. The biography of Qiunabanuo and that of Huiyuan in particular showed how Baochang and Huijiao shared the same openness and expanded the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biographies with further miracle stories.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> This does not mean, however, that miracle stories about monks were all mechanically turned into biographies by compilers of biographical collections. The comparison of the existing fragmentary materials from the *Mingxiang ji* with the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies reveals that many stories involving monks in the *Mingxiang ji* were in fact not adopted by Huijiao.

<sup>95</sup> Our discussion also shed light on the manner in which the miracle stories were transmitted and developed. Thus, for example, Lu Gao's comment on Daowang's story called our attention to the fact that these stories were transmitted orally through personal contact before they were written down. Fu Liang's preface mentioning that the original compiler Xie Fu sent his collection to Fu Liang's father and Fu Liang's comment in the Zhu Fayi story about his father's contact with him illustrate how miracle stories, even in their written transmission, depended on personal contacts. The materials reviewed here also illustrate another significant fact concerning the preservation and transmission of miracle stories and this is their association with special locations. One obvious example

---

is the miracle story that was incorporated in Huiyuan's biography, which describes a legend associated with the Dragon Spring Temple on the western side of Mount Lu. But many of the miracle stories reviewed in analyzing the parallels between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies and *Mingxiang ji* miracle stories also specify their geographical setting carefully. To give a few examples to illustrate this point, the location of Senglang's 僧朗 (of 4th c.) temple is said to be known as 'Master Lang's valley' 朗公谷 at the time of the recording of his miraculous abilities. Zhu Fodiao's biography describes miraculous events that occurred in the Changshan 常山 mountain. Sengqun's 僧群 (?-417) story about a spring of immortality is precisely set in Mount Huo. The story of Sengyu's 僧瑜 (412-455) self-immolation is associated with the Zhaoyin si 招引寺 in the same mountain. Zhu Fachun's experience took place in a lake around a place called Lanshang 蘭上. Each of Daojiong's stories mentions its geographical setting meticulously: these miracles occurred at the Mengjin 孟津 crossing over the Yellow River, the stalactite grotto at Mount Huoshan, Luoyang, the Nanjian 南澗 residence in the capital, and Guangling. It is probably true that miracle stories often specified the places where the miracles happened as a device to increase their credibility. We have noted earlier that miracle stories often specified the names of the persons to whom the miracles occurred for the same reason, and that this practice explains the close relationship between miracle stories and biographies to some extent. The emphasis on the location may have had a different effect, however; in some cases, the stories must have been preserved at site of the miracle. People must have repeated the story of a miracle most frequently at the site at which it is said to have occurred. Thus, miracle stories must have been best known at these sites and in time inscriptions describing these miracles may have been erected in these places. We shall examine one local miracle inscription from a later period below. In an informal conversation Professor J. R. Hightower called my attention to an 'Liuzhou Luochi miao bei' 柳州羅池廟碑 [Inscription for the Temple at Luochi in Liuzhou] by Han Yu 韓愈 (766-824). In this inscription Han Yu describes miracles associated with Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773-819), who was believed to have become a god and for whom a temple was built at Luochi in Liuzhou. The story described here, though not Buddhist, may illustrate a general process in which miracle stories associated with a particular figure and a particular place were recorded in a stone inscription. For an English translation and a short discussion of this work, see Hightower, 'Han Yu as Humorist', 24-27.

Earlier, noting that some of the biographies in the *Gaoseng zhuan* collections state explicitly that the circumstances of the subjects' death are unknown, I suggested that some of these biographies must have been based on miracle stories. This question might be explored further by examining the references to death in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies that we can be relatively certain are ultimately based on the *Mingxiang ji*. Of the seven biographies in Huijiao's collection, which appear not to have sources other than the *Mingxiang ji* miracle stories (category I in the discussion above), two (the biography of Faan in the 'Exegetes' section and one of Jiantuole 捷陀勒 [d.u.] in the 'miracle workers' section) end with a note that we do not know how the subject ended his life. The other biography from the 'miracle workers' section (Zhu Fodiao) contains a reference to his apparent death, but that reference is a part of the miracle story which says that he was seen later by eight lay disciples and that when his grave was dug out it was discovered that his corpse had disappeared.<sup>96</sup> This then is a story that tells that the subject in fact did not die. Two others (Sengqun and Sengyou) are from the 'Self-immolators' section, and again the stories of the death of the subjects are an integral part of the miraculous events. Only two biographies, both from the 'Reciters of Scriptures' section Faxiang 法相 and Huijin) describe the death of the subjects in a brief but conventional manner.

Of the eleven biographies that appear to be primarily based on *Mingxiang ji* stories (category II in the discussion above), three state explicitly that the circumstances of the death are unknown (Kang Falang, Qiyu, Zhu Fachun). The other eight biographies contain some reference to the subject's death, though the reference is sometimes very brief—only the place of death (of Daojiong) or that he died of ascetic practices (Senghong).<sup>97</sup> The significant fact in

---

<sup>96</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 388a.

<sup>97</sup> The *Mingseng zhuan* biography of Senghong ends with a statement that the subject 'gave up his life' (*sheming* 捨命). Huijiao, who, as we have shown above, based his biography of Senghong on the *Mingseng zhuan* biography, rephrased this statement and ended his biography by saying that Senghong died of ascetic practices.

this group of biographies is that only three of the original *Mingxiang ji* biographies mention the circumstances of death (Zhu Shixing, Zhu Fayi, and Shan Daokai). In five cases (Yu Falan, Zhu Senglang, Daojiong, Huiqing, and Senghong), the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies supply some information about the death of the subject where that information is missing in the *Mingxiang ji* story. In the case of Huiqing, Baochang's *Mingseng zhuan* biography is preserved in the Meisōden shō, and this biography gives the same information as the *Gaoseng zhuan* about the subject's death. Furthermore, in the three cases where the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies state explicitly that the circumstances of the subject's death are unknown, the *Mingxiang ji* stories simply fail to mention the subject of death. This pattern seems to suggest that the compilers of biographical collections were particularly interested in the information about the subject's death and added this information to miracle stories where such information was available.<sup>98</sup> Otherwise, they stated explicitly that such information was not available.<sup>99</sup>

Out of the eighteen cases where miracle stories from the *Mingxiang ji* sources constitute the main source of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography (ie., categories I and II reviewed above), in five cases the *Mingxiang ji* accounts already contain some references to the circumstances of the subject's death (Faxiang, Huijin, Zhu Shixing, Zhu Fayi, and

---

<sup>98</sup> The example of Daojiong's biography examined above where the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography omits information on the year in which the miracle occurred and gives one date at the end, most probably as a substitute for the missing date of the subject's death, may be significant in this context.

<sup>99</sup> Huijiao did not always explicitly state that the circumstances of the subject's death were unknown even in cases where he did not know. Cf. biographies of Shemoteng 攝摩騰 (?–73) (322c–323a), An Qing 安清 (a.k.a. An Shigao 安世高 [active 148–170]) (323a–324b), Zhiloujiachen 支婁迦讖 (147–?) (324b), Weiqinan 維祇難 (Vighna [?–224+]; 326b), An Huize 安慧則 (active 310s) (389b), Beidu 杯度 (?–426) (390b–392b), Huitong 慧通 (415–c. 478) (393c–394a), Huili 慧力 (active 340s–350s) (410a–b), Huishou 慧受 (of 4th c.) (410b), Senghui 僧慧 (408–486) (410b–c), Sengliang 僧亮 (?–424+) (411a), Senghu 僧護 (405?–505?) (412a–b), and Fayue 法悅 (?–509) (412b–413a).

Shan Daokai). This fact may indicate that the tendency for including some information about the subject's death goes back further than the compilers of biographical collections. It suggests that miracle stories often used the conventional form of biographies. Thus the miracle stories in almost all fragments from the *Mingxiang ji*<sup>100</sup> begin by stating the name of the subject to whom the miracle occurred, in most cases capped with the name of the dynasty under which he lived and generally followed by a short description of his personal names and place of origin. Sometimes, in the case of secular subjects, some information about their ancestors are provided. This emphasis on the subject to whom the miracle happened and the way in which details about him are given appears to be derived from the conventions of Chinese biography. Here, then, the process analyzed above that transforms accounts of miracles into biographical records may be said to have already started in the manner in which the author of the *Mingxiang ji* recorded his material.

Although it is difficult to reconstruct this process from available fragments of miracle story collections, I might point out that some miracle story fragments from other collections do not begin in the same manner,<sup>101</sup> a fact indicating that the format of the *Mingxiang ji* fragments is not necessarily inherent in the genre of Chinese miracle stories. We must therefore ask why miracle stories came to be recorded using the format of biography. The answer has also been suggested above: it may be that this important form of historical writing was chosen because it tended to enhance the verisimilitude of the account by providing factual details about the subjects who experienced the miracles.

The relationship between biographies and miracle stories was as we have seen a very complex one. As noted earlier, some accounts of miracles were given in the *stūpa* inscriptions that appear to have determined the basic format of monks' biographies in China. On the

---

<sup>100</sup> The only exceptions are the fragment on Sengqun. See Lu, *Gu xiaoshuo gouchen*, 571; and the short fragment from *Taiping guangji* 131.933.

<sup>101</sup> See for example the fragments from the *Youming lu*, Lu, *Gu xiaoshuo gouchen*, 353–436.

other hand, some miracle stories were recorded using the well-established literary form of biographical writing. The distinction between biographies of monks and miracle stories must have become blurred in some cases.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> How sensitive was the tradition to this distinction? I have touched on this question in an earlier study of the miracles that appeared in connection with Renshou 仁壽 relic *stūpas*. On three occasions during the Renshou era (601–604), the Emperor Wen of the Sui dynasty 隋文帝 (r. 581–604) distributed what was believed to be Śākyamuni Buddha’s relics throughout the empire and built relic *stūpas* (*sheli ta* 舍利塔; not to be confused with the use of the term *stūpa* simply in the sense of a monk’s tomb as it is in the expression *taming* 塔銘, or ‘*stūpa* inscription’ above) in each district to which relics were brought. The building of these *stūpas* and the installation of the relics were accompanied by a variety of miracles. These miracles were reported to the government and records of these miracles associated with at least the two earlier occasions of the distribution of relics were eventually compiled and submitted to the court. Thus, the miracles on the first occasion of relic *stūpa* building [601] are recorded in the *Sheli ganying ji* 舍利感應記 [Records of the Relic Miracles] by Wang Shao 王劼 (?–610?), the Sui court historian. This work was probably presented to the court during the Renshou era. The miracles on the second occasion, in the second year of Renshou era (602), are recorded in the ‘Qing sheli ganying biao’ 慶舍利感應表 [Memorials Celebrating the Relic Miracles] by Prince Ande 安德王——[Yang] Xiong (楊) 雄 (541–612) of Sui and other officials. This work appears to have been presented sometime between the second year of Renshou period (602) and the fifth year of Daye 大業 period [609]. Both of these texts are now preserved in the *Guang Hongming ji* (dated 664), *T* no. 2103, 52: 213–221. Two other summaries of miracles, in a large part corresponding in content to these official records by Wang Shao and Yang Xiong, are found in Daoxuan’s *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* (dated 665), *T* no. 2106, 52: 411–412 and Daoshi’s 道世 (?–683) *Fayuan zhulin* (completed 668 after ten years of preparation), *T* no. 2122, 53: 40.601–605.

Daoxuan’s *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* [Further Biographies of Eminent Monks, completed in 645 according to Daoxuan’s preface but containing additional materials that may be as late as 667, the year of Daoxuan’s death], on the other hand, contains numerous biographies of monks who took the relics to each district by imperial order and experienced these miracles. These biographies are found

---

in the ‘miracle workers’, ‘exegetes’, and ‘*vinaya* masters’ sections. Most notably, one major part of the ‘miracle workers’ section (*juan 26*) is devoted to the biographies of these monks. The same miracles are described in these biographies as appear in the official reports, but interestingly the two descriptions often show significant differences. These differences between the descriptions of the same miracles may be interpreted as reflecting the changes that these miracle stories underwent over the period that separated the two types of sources. The descriptions in the two official reports are relatively early (between 601 and 609), while the accounts in the biographies are later. The material in the miracle workers section may come from later additional materials as suggested by one scholar (Yamazaki, ‘Tō no Dōsen no kantsu ni tsuite,’ 896). This would mean that they were collected between 645 and 667. The biographies also often make explicit references to other sources, presumably later than the official memorials presented shortly after the occurrence of miracles. Obviously, miracle stories and biographies are closely related to each other in Chinese Buddhist literature and sometimes miracle stories were preserved and developed in their rewriting in biographies.

Daoxuan’s treatment of the biographies of the monks chosen to take relics to designated districts appears to shed some light on the question raised above. These monks were mostly learned scholars not known for any supernatural feats of their own. Yet, some of the biographies of the monks who served on the first two occasions of the distribution of relics were gathered together in the section on miracle workers by Daoxuan. He obviously thought that these biographies were worthy of collection because of the importance of the Renshou *stūpa* miracles. Thus, Daoxuan, in fact, treated these biographies as miracle stories. On the other hand, a number of biographies in the ‘exegetes’ and ‘*vinaya* masters’ sections of Daoxuan’s collection mention that the subjects took relics to designated districts on one or two of the three occasions of the distribution of relics and record the miracles that occurred at that time. In these cases, Daoxuan treated the material as biographies of monks known in their own right as great scholars and thinkers. The *stūpa* miracle stories in these cases, though given in comparable detail, are less emphasized in the total context of each of these biographies. Thus, essentially similar types of materials were used in two different ways by Daoxuan, one as an equivalent of miracle stories and the other as biographies. Daoxuan seems to have known how to distinguish between the ‘biographies’ that were no more than miracle stories written in the form of biographies (i.e., ‘miracle workers’ biographies centered around Renshou relic *stūpa* miracles) and the

I have so far determined that *stūpa* inscriptions constitute probably the most important source of Chinese Buddhist biographies and that the form of these biographies is to a great extent determined by that of *stūpa* inscriptions. I have also shown, however, that the biographies could not have been based exclusively on *stūpa* inscriptions, and there can be no doubt that miracle stories generated biographies. Miracle stories were often written in the form of biographies, as was the case sometimes with the *Mingxiang ji*, and Huijiao, the first compiler of the standard biographies of Chinese monks, used this source extensively. I have also shown that miracle stories were fluid and were often elaborated in the course of rewriting. They were easily incorporated into the framework of existing biographies. Miracle stories thus may have been a more dynamic force in the development of biographies than the *stūpa* inscriptions that tended to be more fixed in form and content. I will explore this question further by examining in some detail two concrete cases that we have already encountered in the more general discussion above.

## Two Case Studies: Biographies of Yuangui and Huida

### Yuangui's Miracle Inscription and Biography

At the conclusion of this paper I present a list of 25 inscriptions (Appendix I). These inscriptions are found in collections of Tang writings and clearly constitute the source of Zanning's biographies collected in his *Song Biographies of Eminent Monks*. I noted above that one text written for the image hall of Yuangui, 'Song Yuangui chanshi Yingtang ji' 宋元珪禪師影堂記 (no. B, 3), tells a miracle story. This material is of particular interest here since it may be taken as an example in which a miracle story (in this case associated with a *stūpa*) is incorporated into an inscription and eventually becomes a part of an official biographical collection.

---

more authentic biographies, which also happened to contain stories of miracles (biographies in other parts of his collection mentioning Renshou relic *stūpa* miracles as matters of secondary importance).

The inscription in question<sup>103</sup> begins with a passage describing how the author Xu Chou 許籌 (d.u.), a Presented Scholar (*jinsshi* 進士), visited the sacred mountain Songshan 嵩山 and was shown a memorial building (*yingtang* 影堂 [image hall]) of master Yuangui. On this occasion Xu Chou was told that Yuangui miraculously moved cedar trees to the eastern part of the mountain where his *stūpa* was later built, but that this feat was not mentioned in his *stūpa* inscription. For this reason, Xu Chou was requested to write another inscription describing this event. Later he obtains a document (a *xingzhuang*) from two lay people, Yu Yingzhen 喻應真 (d.u.) and Chen Weifu 陳惟復 (d.u.), describing the miracle in detail. This brief introduction is followed by a short biographical passage. The passage gives Yuangui's monastic name, his secular surname (Li 李), place of origin (Yique district 伊闕縣), dates of birth (644), conferring of complete precepts (663) and death (716), and the age at death (73 years old). This in turn is followed by references to his earlier study of meditation and *vinaya* at the Xianju si 閒居寺, practice of meditation at the Shaolin si 少林寺, and later residence at the Pangwu 龐塢 village; finally, it is explained how shortly before his death Yuangui ordered his disciple Rensu 仁素 (d.u.) to build his *stūpa* in the eastern mountain that stood near the Xianju si (Xianju si dongling 閒居寺東嶺), explaining how he began his monk's career in that temple. In the eleventh year of Kaiyuan 開元 period (723) Rensu realized his master's wish by building the *stūpa*. This passage is then followed by the miracle story reported by Yu Yingchen and Chen Weifu.

Yuangui encountered the mountain deity of Mount Song and instructed him in Buddhist teaching. He conferred on him the five precepts and explained their meaning, using such concepts as 'no mind', 'no precepts', and 'no self'. He also discussed the differences between the mountain god's ten supernatural powers and the Buddha's ten supernatural powers, again using the Buddhist logic of negation. The mountain deity was impressed, recognizing that he had not

---

<sup>103</sup> The text of this inscription, entitled 'Songyue Gui chanshi Yingtang ji' 嵩嶽珪禪師影堂記 [Record for the Image Hall of the meditation master Gui of Mount Song] is found in *Quan Tang wen* 790.8267b–8269a.

understood the teaching of emptiness and, expressing gratitude for having received the five precepts, he offered to help Yuangui by using his superhuman powers. Yuangui first declined by saying that there was nothing he wanted, but after a short exchange mentioned the request to have the forest of large trees on the northern peak moved to the eastern part of the mountain (*dongling* 東嶺: referring to the mountain where Yuangui's *stūpa* was to be built as explained earlier). The eastern mountain served as the wind barrier to the temple, but there were no trees on it at that time. The mountain god agreed and warned Yuangui that there would be wind and lightening at night. The mountain god then took his leave, and when Yuangui followed him to the gate he saw that he was accompanied by a long line of guards as if he were a king. 'Blue smoke, red mist, purple wind, and white air' mixed and spread all over. Flags of different shapes filled the sky. There was a huge storm that night and the monks at the temple were frightened. Master Yuangui calmed the monks, explaining the agreement he had made with the mountain god to have the forest moved. In the morning they saw that the forest on the northern peak had been moved to the eastern part of the mountain. The master said, 'If someone builds a *stūpa* and erects an inscription after my death, and fails to mention this event, [something important about me] is covered up'.<sup>104</sup>

A brief *stūpa* inscription by Rensu is also preserved.<sup>105</sup> This inscription gives the monk's posthumous name (Yuangui), and place of origin ('Yique in Henan') and explains that in the second year of Shangyuan 上元 period (675) he was ordained on the occasion of the death of the Emperor Xiaojing 孝敬 (i.e., Crown Prince Hong 弘 who was allegedly murdered by his mother, Dowager Empress Wu 武后 [624–705]). Later he achieved enlightenment without a teacher.

---

<sup>104</sup> 'Songyue Gui chanshi Yingtang ji', *Quan Tang wen* 790.8269a: '而大師謂其徒曰: "吾歿,有塔我者、有碑我者,無紀是事,人將渙我也。"'

<sup>105</sup> This inscription, 'Da Tang Songyue Xianju si gu dade Gui chanshi taji' 大唐嵩岳閑居寺故大德珪禪師塔記 [Inscription of the *stūpa* for the late Great Virtue, Meditation Master Gui of Xianju si on Mount Song of the Great Tang], is found in *Quan Tang wen* 914.9527b.

After receiving further instruction at the Shaolin si (by the 'Shaolin zunzhe' 少林尊者), the subject spent his later years in Pangwu 龐塢 village where he instructed numerous monks and laymen. He died on the tenth day of the eighth month in the fourth year of Kaiyuan 開元 period (717) in Pangwu. He was 73 years old. On the thirteenth day Yuangui's remains were buried temporarily at the eastern side of the northern hill. Then in the eleventh year of Kaiyuan (723) a *stūpa* was built on the eastern side of the mountain. The text says that the master was attached (*weijing* 味淨) to this place and there were cedar trees there. There is no reference to the miracle described above.

This example illustrates how a biography might develop in connection with a miracle story. Precise details of this process cannot be reconstructed from the limited sources available to us now, but the difference between the two inscriptions is striking and suggests certain possibilities. We might speculate, for example, that the miracle story of moving the cedar trees might have developed some time after the death of Yuangui, perhaps in relationship to his *stūpa*, which had been built in the eastern part of the sacred mountain which boasted a magnificent cedar forest. The original motive behind the story could have been to illustrate the greatness of Yuangui by linking him to the unusually beautiful cedar forest at the site of his *stūpa*. It is even possible that he had loved this forest and requested his *stūpa* to be built there as Rensu's inscription suggests. The miracle story then would have developed as colorful and dramatic way of explaining the special relationship between Yuangui and this beautiful forest. Another rather speculative possibility is that some story about the origin of the forest had existed before Yuangui's *stūpa* was built, and that the story developed later into the present miracle story associated with Yuankuei after his *stūpa* became a prominent feature of this part of the mountain. Whatever the origin of the miracle story may have been, it was authenticated as a story of miracle that happened to Yuangui and his followers in the temple in a stone inscription by a highly respected secular writer. Thus, Xu Chou's inscription is a miracle inscription, designed to publicize and preserve for posterity the account of a miraculous event associated with a specific location and specific monk.

It is noteworthy that the compiler, Zanning, in producing his

biography of Yuangui, a ‘miracle worker’, chose to use this miracle inscription by Xu Chou, rather than the shorter *stūpa* inscription by Rensu, which we may assume was also available to him.<sup>106</sup> Rensu’s *stūpa* inscription does not mention any specific accomplishment of this monk, and the brief biographical passage in Xu Chou’s inscription mentions only in passing that Yuangui studied the *vinaya* and meditation. Clearly, it was the importance of the miracle associated with him that motivated Zanning to include his ‘biography’ in his collection and place it in the miracle workers section. Here, then, we have another example illustrating how a miracle story is preserved as a biography and a biography of a monk of rather limited local reputation ends up in a collection of ‘eminent monks’. As we noted above, compilers were often aware of the relative importance of the biography proper and miracle stories associated with the figure and treated the material accordingly, usually assigning this type of material to the category of biographies of ‘miracle workers’.<sup>107</sup>

### Huida’s Miracle Stories and Biographies

The biography of the monk Huida (secular name: Liu Sahe 劉薩河)<sup>108</sup> appeared earlier in our discussion above of Huijiao’s biographies in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and corresponding preserved fragments of the miracle story collection *Mingxiang ji*.<sup>109</sup> In that context we treated Huijiao’s biography of Huida as an example of the third categories of biographies: Huijiao based his biographies on sources other than the *Mingxiang ji*, but also included the miracle story

---

<sup>106</sup> Zanning’s biography of Yuangui is found in *juan* 19 of his collection (*T* no. 2061, 50: 828b–829b). *Juan* 19 contains part two of his collection of ‘Miracle Workers’ biographies.

<sup>107</sup> See note 102.

<sup>108</sup> The name Liu Sahe 劉薩河 is written slightly differently in many of the sources to be examined below. I have chosen to use the *Gaoseng zhuan* version of the name as the standard form of this name in this paper unless the variant forms used in a given source is particularly relevant. I will give the variant forms of the name used in the sources examined in footnotes.

<sup>109</sup> The name Liu Sahe is written in this source as Liu Sahe 劉薩荷.

taken from this miracle story collection in his biography. I should like to consider Huida's biography here in some detail, because in one respect it is quite unusual. His biography is also found in Daoxuan's *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* collection.<sup>110</sup> Daoxuan mentions Huijiao's earlier biography explicitly and then produces some new materials that constitute the main part of his biography. Thus we can reconstruct a chain of developing biographies for this monk. (i) The earliest datable material is the miracle story about Huida in the *Mingxiang ji*. Later summaries of this story contains details that are slightly different from the *Mingxiang ji* version, suggesting that the story existed in more than one version. (ii) Huijiao seems to have been aware of this story and presented a brief summary of a story similar but not identical to this *Mingxiang ji* version in the biography he produced for this monk.<sup>111</sup> Huijiao's biography centering around stories about Aśoka *stūpas* and images, however, is primarily based on other sources.<sup>112</sup> (iii) Daoxuan's biography of this monk in *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* mentions both (a) the miracle story, similar but not identical to the miracle story in the *Mingxiang ji*<sup>113</sup> and the *Gaoseng zhuan* summary of that story, and (b) Huijiao's earlier biography.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> The name Liu Sahe is written in this source as Liu Suhe 劉宰和.

<sup>111</sup> *T* no. 2059, 50: 409b.

<sup>112</sup> The summary of the *Mingseng zhuan* biography of Huida 慧達 (*juan* 28) in the *Meisō denshō* (ZZ 2B: 7, 17b7) states: 'there were indeed relics under the *stūpa* built by King Aśoka 阿育所起塔定有舍利事'. This short summary probably refers to the story of the Changgan si *stūpa*, the first story in the list of four miracle stories that constitute the substance of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida. Baochang's *Mingseng zhuan* biography of Huida may have consisted of this first story, or it may have included all the four stories told in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. In the latter case Sōshō, the Japanese monk who summarized the *Mingseng zhuan* biography, simply ignored the other stories.

<sup>113</sup> The biography says, 'The details of these activities are found in the *bie-zhuan*' (廣有別傳, 具詳聖跡; *T* no. 2060, 50: 644c21). The use of the term *bie-zhuan* might indicate that Daoxuan had access to a separate and independent biography of Huida that described his experience in a manner similar to the description in the *Mingxiang ji* story of Huida.

The main part of Daoxuan's biography of Huida, however, is based on materials taken from other sources.

The story about Liu Sahe/Huida seems to have been widely known in connection with the legend of Aśoka *stūpas*,<sup>115</sup> and other summaries of it and references to it have also survived. The *Liang shu* 梁書 [Book of the Liang], the official history of the Liang dynasty, completed by Yao Silian 姚思廉 (557–637) in 629, who had continued the work that had been begun by his father Yao Cha 姚察 (533–606), also records stories about Huida and his discovery of the locations and relics of Aśoka *stūpas*. These stories parallel certain themes in the accounts in the *Mingxiang ji* story and the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.<sup>116</sup> In Daoxuan's collection of miracle stories, called *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* 集神州三寶感通錄 [Record of Miraculous Responses to the Three Jewels in China] (664), a number of miracle stories associated with Aśoka *stūpas* and images of the Buddha are collected, and the stories about the Aśoka *stūpas* and the Buddha images included in Huida's biographical tradition appear among them.<sup>117</sup> This work also contains an important passage on

---

<sup>114</sup> The biography says, 'Details are given in the earlier biography' (備具前傳; *T* no. 2060, 50: 644c24). This probably refers to Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.

<sup>115</sup> For a study of the Aśokan *stūpas* in India, Central Asia, China, and Japan, see Ishizaki, 'Aiku ō tō ni kansuru kenkyū (ichi, ni).'

<sup>116</sup> This passage in *Liang shu* 54.790–793 is also reproduced in the *juan* 68 (*Funan zhuan* 扶南傳), 1954–1956 of the *Nanshi* 南史, the official history of the Song 宋, Qi 齊, Liang 梁, and Chen 陳 dynasties, compiled by Li Yanshou 李延壽 (of 7th c.) of the Tang dynasty (completed in 659). The *Nanshi* passage on the Aśoka *stūpa* in Danyang 丹陽 is discussed with special attention to the architectural features of the *stūpas* mentioned in Kosugi, 'Rikuchō jidai no Buttō nioke-ru Busshari no anchī ni tsuite.' Kosugi considers this account as an historically reliable one, and believes that it describes a *stūpa* that actually existed. In these sources the name Liu Sahe is written as Liu Sahe 劉薩何.

<sup>117</sup> This material in Daoxuan's 道宣 (596–667) collection is reproduced in the *Fayuan zbulin* (completed in 668), where *stūpa* miracles are collected in *juan* 38 and image miracles in *juan* 13. The *Fayuan zbulin*, *juan* 38, discussion of *stūpas* as it is found in the Taishō edition (*T* no. 2122, 53: 584c–587b) is rather confus-

ing: the table of contents given at the beginning does not seem to correspond to the contents of the miracle stories that follow. The corresponding *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version (*T* no. 2106, 52: 404a28–410a21) also begins with a table of contents which is virtually identical with that of the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 38 section on *stūpa* miracles. Except for the widely diverging final section, the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version parallels the *Fayuan zhulin* version word for word for the most part, but it also contains other materials inserted at different points in the main body of the text. In this longer version of the text, the list of stories given in the table of contents corresponds perfectly with the miracle stories told in the main body of the text. Since both the *Fayuan zhulin* and *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* versions of the text are accompanied with a virtually identical table of contents, and this table of content corresponds neatly with the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version but not with the *Fayuan zhulin* version, it is probably safe to conclude that the *Fayuan zhulin* (completed 668) version is an awkwardly abbreviated copy of the corresponding passage in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* (compiled 664). The image miracle stories are found in the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juans* 13 and 14, *T* no. 2122, 53: 383–397. Again the first part of this material roughly parallels the section on image miracles in Daoxuan's *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, *T* no. 2106, 52: 413a–423a, and is probably based on this latter work. At the very end of the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* a comment by Daoxuan states that he compiled this work on the 20th day of the 6th month in the summer of the first year of Linde 麟德 period (664). Here Daoxuan also mentions 'the *Fayuan zhulin* recently compiled by the *Vinaya* master Dao[shi] of the Ximing si 西明寺' and refers the reader to this work for materials not included in his collection. Since Daoxuan died in 667 and the preface of the *Fayuan zhulin* (*T* no. 2122, 53: 269b10f) states explicitly that this work was completed on the 30th day of the third month of the first year of the Zongzhang 總章 period (668), Daoxuan here must be referring to a nearly final version of the *Fayuan zhulin* that was available to him. There appears to have been a close relationship between Daoxuan (596–667) and the compiler of the *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoshi. Both Daoxuan and Daoshi specialized in the *vinaya*, and the *Song Gaoseng zhuan*'s biography of Daoshi describes Daoshi's work as that of assisting and spreading widely the authority of Daoxuan (*T* no. 2061, 50: 726cl6f.). When the Ximing si was built in the capital city Chang'an in 658, Daoxuan was moved there and appointed as the head monk (*shangshou* 上首). Daoshi was also invited and moved to this same temple. There was a large collec-

Liu Sahe/Huida in its section on miracle-working monks (*shenseng* 神僧).<sup>118</sup> Daoxuan's autobiographical account of his own encounter with gods toward the end of his life also includes passages on the *stūpas* and images associated with Huida.<sup>119</sup> A reference to the Aśoka

---

tion of Buddhist literature in this temple. The *Ximing si lu* 西明寺錄 listed in the *Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 100.1023c may refer to a catalogue, now lost, of works contained in that collection. Daoxuan's catalogue of Buddhist works, *Da Tang neidian lu*, appears to have been based on the collection at the Ximing si (cf. Kamata, ed., *Chūgoku Bukkyōshi jiten*, 238; Mizuno, *Kyōten*, 224. The specification of the location of works in the library of canonical works given in the third section of this catalogue by Daoxuan, *T* no. 2149, 55: 302b–312c, is based on the Ximing si library). Since the two monks lived in the same temple, they may well have had access to each other's materials, and they may possibly have shared a certain body of common source materials. It is tempting to speculate further that there may have been some important connection between the emphasis on miracle stories in the *Fayuan zhulin* on the one hand and Daoxuan's growing interest in miracle stories toward the end of his life. Yamazaki Hiroshi discussed Daoxuan's interests in miracles in his 'Tō Seimeiji Dōsen risshi kō.' See also Takao, 'Kantsū setsuwa shū to shite mitaro Sanbō kantsū roku.'

<sup>118</sup> *T* no. 2106, 52: 434c2–435a9. This material is reproduced in the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 31, *T* no. 2122, 53: 516c22–517a29. The name Liu Sahe is written in these passages as Liu Sahe 劉薩何.

<sup>119</sup> The autobiographical account of Daoxuan's miraculous encounter with gods and the exchanges between them are found in the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu* 道宣律師感通錄, *T* no. 2107, a work which is also known as the *Lüxiang gantong lu* 律相感通錄, *T* no. 1898. The *Fayuan zhulin* contains several long quotations from the account of Daoxuan's encounter with gods, but interestingly these quotations are attributed to a work or works with slightly different titles from the existing works mentioned above and the content of these quotations does not always parallel the account in the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*/*Lüxiang gantong zhuan*. So far I have identified the following quotations: *T* no. 2122, 53: 353c22–355b18 (no title); 316a25ff (*Daoxuan lüshi gantong ji* 道宣律師感通記); 393b17–397b6 (title mentioned for the second half of this long quotation: *Xuanshi gantong ji* 宣師感通記, 394a2); 560a24–563b29? (no title, but the first line includes the two expressions 'zhuchi' 住持 and 'ganying' 感應 that appear

*stūpa* in Maoxian 鄮縣 in the Siming 四明 mountain discovered by Liu Sahe is also found in the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Weize 惟則 (751–830).<sup>120</sup> A detailed comparison of all these sources enables us to reconstruct partially the process through which the biography

---

frequently in titles given for other quotations); 568a18–24 (*Daoxuan lüshi gantong ji*); 589b14–591a5 (*Xuanshi zhuchi ganying* 宣師住持感應); 597c28–598b13 (*Daoxuan lüshi gantong ji*); 1008a16–1009a9 (‘Daoxuan lüshi zhuchi ganying’ 道宣律師住持感應). The complex relationship between the *Fayuan zhulin* quotations and the existing version of the record of this incident suggests that at one time the story about Daoxuan’s miraculous experience existed in more than one version. The quotations in the *Fayuan zhulin* may represent a relatively early version of this story. The event is said to have taken place in 667 (‘in the second month of the second year of the Qianfeng 乾封 period’, *T* no. 2122, 53: 353c26) several months before Daoxuan’s death in the same year (‘the third day of the tenth month of the second year of Qianfeng’, *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Daoxuan, *T* no. 2061, 50: 791a20); the *Fayuan zhulin* according to its preface was completed in 668. I will postpone the detailed discussion of this interesting material to another occasion, and here comment briefly on the case of two quotations closely related to the other *Fayuan zhulin* materials mentioned earlier. The last part of the *Fayuan zhulin* discussion of the *stūpa* miracles in *juan* 38 (*T* no. 2122, 53: 589b14–591a5) is a quotation from the record of Daoxuan’s miraculous experience. The source of this quotation is given as ‘Xuanshi zhuchi ganying’ 宣師住持感應, *T* no. 2122, 53: 589b14. The second half of this quotation parallels roughly the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*, *T* no. 2107, 52: 438c19–439a29 and *Lüxiang gantong zhuan* 律相感通傳, *T* no. 1898, 45: 878cl–879a8. No passage paralleling the first of half of the quotation (*T* no. 2122, 53: 589b14–590b10) is found in the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*/*Lüxiang gantong zhuan*. The last part of the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 13 and 14 section on image miracles (*T* no. 2122, 53: 394a–397b) is also based on Daoxuan’s autobiographical account of his miraculous conversation with supernatural beings. Here the name of the source of this section is given as ‘Xuanshi gantong ji’, 394a2. The content of this section roughly corresponds to the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*, *T* no. 2107, 52: 436a9–439c9; *Lüxiang gantong zhuan*, *T* no. 1898, 45: 875bl–879b16.

<sup>120</sup> *T* no. 2061, 50: 880c16f. The name Liu Sahe is written here as Liu Sahe 劉薩訶.

of Liu Sahe/Huida developed in connection with the development of local miracle stories.

### The Miracle Story in the *Mingxiang ji*

The story in the *Mingxiang ji* describes an unusual experience of the layman Liu Sahe, which is as follows.<sup>121</sup>

When this man of the Lishi 離石 district of the Xihe 西河 commandery was young he travelled extensively on military duties, did not follow the Buddhist teaching, and was fond of hunting. At age 31 he died of sickness, but was revived after seven days and told the following story. When his life was about to expire, two people appeared to him. They bound him with a rope and took him in the northwest direction. There were trees on both sides of the road, and a man holding a bow in his hand and wearing a sword on his body was standing in the middle of the road. He told them to go in the western direction. Then Liu Sahe saw many houses with white walls and red pillars. When he entered one of these houses he saw a woman wearing beautiful clothes. Liu Sahe asked for food, but a voice was heard from the sky: 'Do not give him food'. A man jumped out of the ground and tried to hit him with an iron hammer. Liu Sahe fled and went to another house. But the same thing happened there again. He went through more than ten houses. But he could not get any food in the end. Going further in the northwestern direction, Liu Sahe saw an old woman riding in a carriage; she gave him a book in one *juan*. Going further west, he reached a beautifully decorated house. An old woman who had tiger's teeth in her mouth was sitting outside the house. The house was also beautifully decorated inside with curtains, carpets, bamboo seats and tables. Again a woman was there and asked Liu Sahe whether he had brought the book. When he offered her the book, the woman took it and compared it with other

---

<sup>121</sup> The *Mingxiang ji* fragment on Liu Sahe/Huida is preserved in the *Fayuan zhubin*, *juan* 86 ('repentance section'), *T* no. 2122, 53: 919b20–920b8. It is collected by Lu Xun in his *Gu xiaoshuo gouchen*, 596–598.

books. Suddenly Liu Sahe saw two monks who asked whether he knew them. Liu Sahe said no, and the monks said, ‘You should now take refuge in the Śākyamuni Buddha’, and Liu Sahe decided to obey their words and seek salvation through the Buddha. He therefore followed the monks and they all walked off together. He then saw a large city at a distance.

The city looked like the earthly city of Chang’an but its colour was black. It was an iron city. He saw that the people there were very tall, their skin was black, and that they dragged their long hair on the ground. The monks said that they were the creatures (*gui* 鬼) of hell. The place was very cold and pieces of ice flew around cutting the heads and limbs off people. The two monks said this was the hell of cold ice. Liu Sahe then suddenly remembered that he knew these monks in his previous life. They were his teachers in the past at the time of the Weiwei fo 維衛佛 (*Vipaśyin*) Buddha. In that birth he had committed offenses as a novice and could not receive the precepts. Even though there was a Buddha in the world, he could not get to see him. Later he twice attained rebirth as a human being, once among non-Chinese people and now he was reborn among Chinese people. Liu Sahe also saw his uncle in this hell. The uncle said, ‘When I was in the city of Ye 鄴城, I failed to serve the Buddha. I saw a man pouring water over a Buddha’s image and tried it myself a bit. But I did not become a Buddhist myself. So, I am receiving punishment here. I will later draw the merit of pouring water over an image and be reborn in heaven’. Liu Sahe then saw the sword hell, and one by one he saw many hells peopled with numerous sinners just as they are described in scriptures.

When he had finished seeing the hells, he suddenly saw a man, two *zhang* 丈 tall, whose golden body was beautifully decorated. There was a crowd of people on either side of this man; they said that the man was the great being Guanshi dashi 觀世大士 (*Avalokiteśvara*). Everyone rose and paid respect to him. There were two monks who looked just like each other. They walked eastward together. After Liu Sahe finished paying his respects to the bodhisattva, the bodhisattva preached a sermon of over one thousand words for him. This sermon ended with a number of instructions; on how to relieve his relatives of their punishments in hell;<sup>122</sup> how to remove the karmic conse-

quences of misconducts; on how great were the merits of building *stūpas* and temple buildings; and how failing to remove weeds and other unsightly objects that a person sees around *stūpas* and temple buildings results in annihilating the merits acquired by worship. The bodhisattva also commented on the merits of the *Perfection of Wisdom (Bore boluomi jing 般若波羅蜜經)* and *Shou lengyan jing 首楞嚴經* scriptures. When Liu Sahe took his leave, the bodhisattva said, ‘You ought to receive numerous punishments through the period of many *kalpas*. But because you have once listened to the teaching of the scripture and experienced the feeling of joy, you will now be punished only lightly and then released. When you are revived you should become a monk. In each of the five places, i.e., Luoyang 洛陽, Linzi 臨淄, Jianye 建業, Maoyin 鄆陰, and Chengdu 成都, there is a *stūpa* built by King Aśoka. In addition, in the Wu 吳 area there are two stone images which were built by supernatural beings (*guishen* 鬼神) sent by King Aśoka. These images are really perfect and those who go there and worship them will not fall into hell.’ Having said these words, the bodhisattva went away towards the east. Liu Sahe worshipped him and left.

He came out to the main road going south. The road was more than ten paces wide and there were numerous people walking on it. At the road side there was a high seat, more than ten *zhang* above the ground. A monk was sitting there. And there were numerous other monks lined up on either side of him. A man stood up facing north and holding a pen. He asked Liu Sahe, ‘Why did you kill a deer when you were in Xiangyang 襄陽?’ Liu Sahe knelt down and answered, ‘Other people shot the deer. I only injured it. Moreover, I did not eat its meat. Why should I be punished for it?’ Thereupon, the place where he had killed the deer appeared. Grasses, trees, mountains, and creeks filled the horizon, and the black horses on which hunters rode all spoke, all testifying that on such and such a month and day Liu

---

<sup>122</sup> *T* no. 2122, 53: 919c24–29. This instruction is quoted with a summary of Liu Sahe’s temporary death and encounter with Avalokiteśvara but without mentioning the source *Mingxiang ji* in *Shishi yaolan*, *T* no. 2127, 54: 3.304b22–c1 compiled by Daocheng 道誠 (d.u.) of the Song dynasty (completed in 1019).

Sahe had killed the deer. Liu Sahe was frightened and had no reply. Shortly afterward a man picked him up with a spear and threw him into a cauldron of boiling water. Liu Sahe saw his limbs crumble and fall apart. A wind blew gathering pieces of his body together at the edge of the cauldron, and suddenly his body was restored to its original form. The man with a pen spoke again, 'You shot a pheasant and also killed a goose'. As soon as he finished speaking, Liu Sahe was again thrown into the boiling cauldron with a spear. He was cooked in the same manner again. After these punishments Liu Sahe was let go. He entered a large city. There was a man sitting there who said to Liu Sahe, 'You received light punishments and are also brought back to life. This is because the force of merits assisted you. Do not commit sins any more'. He then ordered a man to take Liu Sahe back. Liu Sahe saw his old body from a distance and he did not wish to go back, but the man who was accompanying him gave him a push and pull. After a long while Liu Sahe was again attached to his old body and he was revived.

The *Mingxiang ji* story ends by briefly noting that Liu Sahe served the Buddhist teaching diligently, and renouncing the householder's life became a monk called Huida. He lived in the capital city at the end of the Taiyuan 太元 period (376–396). Later he went to Xuchang 許昌. It was not known how he ended his life.

The story of Liu Sahe in the *Mingxiang ji*, thus, is a story about karmic consequences. The story obviously was told to teach that the evil deeds a person commits in this world will be punished in hell after his death, and that good deeds, such as worshipping *stūpas* and images, will be rewarded. This lesson is taught through reporting the experience of a man who died once and was miraculously revived after seeing how sinners were punished in the many hells after their death. This basic plot is found in many existing examples of medieval Chinese Buddhist miracle stories, in most cases teaching the lesson of karmic consequences. Thus, the *Mingxiang ji*'s story about Liu Sahe is best characterized as an example from this familiar group of medieval Chinese Buddhist miracle stories.

This story of Liu Sahe's experiences in hell appears in a shorter form in other sources. The passage on Liu Sahe in the official history *Liang shu* begins in a manner that parallels closely the beginning of

the *Mingxiang ji* version, saying that Liu Sahe's body was warm for seven days after his death, when he woke up again. It also mentions the two officials who came to fetch him and his travel in the north-west direction. It then states that Liu Sahe saw the punishments in the eighteen hells, and heard Avalokiteśvara's words telling him to go and worship the Aśoka *stūpas* in Luoxia 洛下, Qicheng 齊城, Danyang 丹陽, and Kuaiji 會稽. Though the locations are identified by different names from those used in the *Mingxiang ji* story, they are in fact identical with the first four locations mentioned in that list: Luo Xia is a different name for Luoyang, Qicheng for Linzi, Danyang for Jianye, and Kuaiji for Maoyin. The last location in the *Mingxiang ji* list, Chengdu, is not mentioned in the *Liang shu* list. The stone images that floated on the Changjiang 長江 river mentioned in the *Mingxiang ji* passage are also not mentioned in the *Liang shu* passage.<sup>123</sup>

In the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* on the Aśoka *stūpa* in the Maoxian district,<sup>124</sup> Liu Sahe's experience is described by quoting an earlier biography (*qianzbuan* 前傳).<sup>125</sup> Here it is said that he was born in a family that lived by hunting and fishing; he died and saw a 'foreign monk', who told him that his sins were grave enough to send him to hell. but since Liu Sahe was unaware of the graveness of those sins he would take pity on him and would release him temporarily; the monk then told him that if he found and worshipped in Luo Xia (Luoyang). Qicheng (Linzi). Danyang (Jianye), and Kuaiji (Maoyin) the old *stūpas* and the stone images that came floating on the Changjiang river, all built and produced by the order of King Aśoka, he would be able to avoid punishment in hell. Though this list identifies these places with different names, the places mentioned here in fact match those in the *Mingxiang ji* list (except for the reference to Chengdu in the latter). The list of the location of the Aśoka *stūpas*

<sup>123</sup> *Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 920a18–19.

<sup>124</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 404b12–586a4; also found in the *Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 585a24–586a4.

<sup>125</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 404b14; *Fayuan zbulin*, T no, 2122, 53: 525a26.

here is identical to that in the *Liang shu* passage, but the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage also mentions the two stone images that floated on the Changjiang river.

The *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage on Liu Sahe summarizes the background of Liu Sahe,<sup>126</sup> specifying his place of origin differently as the Wencheng Commandery and not as Lishi in Xihe or Bingzhou 並州 region, as is given in all the sources reviewed above. In the account of Liu Sahe's death and his experiences in the netherworld, this passage mentions Avalokiteśvara and the Aśoka *stūpas* in Luoxia, Qicheng, Danyang, and Kuaiji. The floating stone images are not mentioned here.

The summary of Liu Sahe's background and his experience in hell in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, to be described below, gives a shorter list of locations of the Aśoka *stūpas*. The brief summary of Liu Sahe's background in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* gives 'south east of Xianyang 咸陽' as his place of origin and later mentions the Wencheng Commandery 文成郡 as his place of birth. Though this biography mentions Liu Sahe's experience in hell, it does not give a list of Aśoka *stūpas* and refers the reader to a source called 'biezhuan' 別傳 (a separate and independent biography) for details.

These parallel accounts of Liu Sahe's story indicate that the story was widely known among medieval Chinese Buddhists and many versions existed side by side, mentioning essentially the same list of Aśoka *stūpas*' locations in different forms. The stability of the list points to the existence of firmly established and widely known local traditions about Aśoka *stūpas* in the Wuyue 吳越 region.

### The *Gaoseng zhuan* Biography

Huijiao's biography of Huida in the *Gaoseng zhuan* begins by summarizing the story of Liu Sahe's visit to hell.<sup>127</sup> The outline of the story is quite similar to the long story in the *Mingxiang ji* and

---

<sup>126</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 434c2–435a9, also found in the *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 31.516c22–517a29.

<sup>127</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 13.409b–410a.

shorter summaries in other sources reviewed above, but there are also some differences. The bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara is here called simply a ‘man of the Way’ (*daoren* 道人) and the list of Aśoka’s *stūpas* and image(s) in his instructions to Liu Sahe mentions Danyang, Kuaiji, and Wu Commandery.

The main part of Huijiao’s biography consists of a series of miracle stories involving the *stūpas* and images. We read there of the rebuilding of the Aśoka *stūpa* at the Changgan si 長干寺 in the capital city Jiankang during the Ningkan 寧康 period (393–375); of the image in the same temple originally produced by Aśoka’s fourth daughter, but discovered during the Xianhe 咸和 period (326–334) by the governor of Danyang, Gao Kui 高愷 (active early 4th c.); and of the stone images that came floating down the Changjiang river in the first year of Jianxing 建興 period (313). There is also an undated story of the rebuilding of the Aśoka *stūpa* in Kuaiji.

The first two stories involving the Changgan si probably were meant to correspond to the first location, Danyang, in the list given by the ‘Man of the Way’ at the beginning of the biography, and the last two stories are associated with the two other locations mentioned in the list, Wu Commandery and Kuaiji. The order of the two locations, however, is reversed in the telling of miracle stories. This may be because the biography describes the miracles as events that took place as Huida travelled from one place to another, and the three locations of Danyang, Wu Commandery, and Maoxian district in Kuaiji stand in that order in a line that runs in the southwestern direction.

The first three miracle stories mention the dates of the incidents, perhaps reflecting the common preoccupation with such details in the telling of miracle stories. Earlier, in examining Daojiong’s biography, we noted that Huijiao seemed to have constructed that biography by arranging known miracle stories associated with the figure according to their dates in the miracle story collection, and at the same time dropping the references to the dates of the individual miracles that existed in his sources. In the case of Huida’s biography under examination here, the miracle stories were not arranged according to chronological order and perhaps for that reason the dates of the miracles were kept in the biography.

Each of these miracle stories is independent of each other in con-

tent, and the examination of their parallel sources shows that they existed as independent miracle stories outside of the *Gaoseng zhuan*. We shall therefore examine them separately, focusing on one miracle story at a time and comparing it with its parallels in other sources.

### The Changgan si *Stūpa*

During the Ningkan period (373–375) of the Eastern Jin dynasty, Huida went to the capital, Jiankang. Earlier Emperor Jianwen 簡文帝 (r. 371–372) had constructed a three story *stūpa* at the Changgan si. After the *stūpa* was completed light appeared from it every night. Going up to the place called Yuecheng 越城, Huida saw from a distance an extraordinary colour at the tip of this *stūpa* and worshipped it frequently by going there day and night. At night he saw a light appearing at the base of the *stūpa* and told men to help him dig there. When they dug about three *zhang* (about 7 meters) deep they obtained three stone inscriptions. The middle piece covered an iron box. Inside the iron box was a silver box, and inside the silver box was a golden box. The golden box contained three pieces of relics, one finger nail and one piece of hair. The hair was several *chi* 尺 (about 2 meters) long and curled like the Buddha's hairs. All these pieces were shining brightly. During the reign of King Jing 周敬王 (520–477 B.C., or King Xuan 周宣王 who reigned 827–782 B.C., according to a variant reading) of the Zhou dynasty, King Aśoka had built 84,000 *stūpas*. The relics and other objects obtained by Huida had come from one of them. Both monks and laymen were filled with wonder and built a *stūpa* to the west of the older *stūpa* and placed the relics there. On the sixteenth year of the Taiyuan 太元 period (391), Emperor Xiaowu 孝武 (r. 372–396) expanded the *stūpa* to a three story *stūpa*.

In the *Liang shu* passage on Huida, the story of Huida's discovery of the Aśoka *stūpa* in Danyang 丹陽, that is, Jiankang 建康, is placed in a larger context that begins by describing the legend of the Aśoka *stūpa* ('After the death of the Buddha, King Aśoka used supernatural beings and produced 84,000 *stūpas* in one day and one night'), and focuses on the rebuilding of the *stūpa* later by Emperor Wu (r. 502–549), the founder of the Liang dynasty, during the Datong period (535–546). The early history of the Danyang *stūpa* is described as follows. During the period in which the area was ruled by the Wu

吳 Kingdom, a nun lived at the site of the Aśoka *stūpa* and there was a small temple (*xiao jingshe* 小精舍) there. After the *stūpa* was destroyed by Sun Chen 孫綝 of the Wu Kingdom, some monks rebuilt the *stūpa* at the original spot. Emperor Yuan 元帝 (r. 317–322), who reestablished the Jin dynasty in the South, repaired this *stūpa*. During the Xian'an 咸安 period (371–372), Emperor Jianwen ordered the monk Ancheng 安成 (d.u.) to build a small *stūpa*, but the monk died before completing the task, and his disciple Sengxian 僧顯 (fl. 318–321) continued the work and finished the *stūpa*. In the ninth year of the Taiyuan period (384), Emperor Xiaowu placed the golden rings on top of the *stūpa*. Liu Sahe/Huida's story appears at this point, summarizing his experiences in hell and the instructions he received from Avalokiteśvara.

The story of Huida's discovery of the Aśoka *stūpa* is told in this text in a manner similar to what we have seen from the *Gaoseng zhuan* passage. One important difference is that at the beginning of this *Liang shu* passage which describes the incident, there is no direct reference to an existing temple or a *stūpa*. Huida went to Danyang, following Avalokiteśvara's instructions, but he did not know the location of the Aśoka *stūpa*. He climbed to Yuecheng and looked around in the four directions. He saw that there was an extraordinary atmosphere (*you yiqi se* 有異氣色) in the Changgan li 長千里 area, and therefore he went there to worship. This was the location of the Aśoka *stūpa*. He saw light shining forth from the spot from time to time, and so he knew that there must be relics buried in that place. He gathered people and dug at the spot and found the three stone tablets and the relics. The passage then says that Huida moved the relics northward, and built a one story *stūpa* to the west of the *stūpa* built by Jianwen. In the 16th year of Taiyuan (391), Monk Shangjia 尚伽 (d.u.) expanded this structure into a three-story *stūpa*.

The main theme of the *Liang shu* passage is Emperor Wu's rebuilding of this *stūpa*, an event which is described in some detail. The date is given as the eighth month of the third year of the Datong 大同 period (537). The contents of the relic container are described in detail, along with the three major ceremonies performed to honour the relics. We learn that on the 27th day of the eighth month the Emperor went to the temple; on the fifth day of the ninth month

one relic was brought to the palace, and on the 15th day of the ninth month, the relics were placed under the two newly built *stūpas*. The *Liang shu* passage also mentions that in the second year of the Datong period (536), the Emperor had opened the *stūpa* in the Maoxian district in Kuaiji and brought its relics to the palace. We will return to this information later.

Daoxuan wrote a long discussion of this *stūpa* in his *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* later (664).<sup>128</sup> Daoxuan appears to have personally visited the site. The location of the *stūpa* is given in detail as ‘in the precinct of the now defunct Changgan si (*fei Changgan si* 廢長干寺) in the old Yuecheng 古越城, which in turn was situated to the south east of the Zhuque 朱雀 gate of the old city Yangdu 揚都 in the Jiangning 江寧 district of the Runzhou 潤州 region’. Daoxuan then says that in the old village of Changgan li (*Changgan jiuli* 長干舊里) was the site of one of the ancient *stūpas* built by King Aśoka. It may be significant that Daoxuan refers to ‘the Changgan si’ in specifying the location of the *stūpa*, but uses the expression the ‘old village of Changgan li’ in reference to the original site of the Aśoka *stūpa*. This distinction, perhaps deliberately, communicates the impression that at the time when the original Aśoka *stūpa* existed (and for some time after that) no temple existed in the village Changgan li, but that later a temple called Changgan si was established there. By Daoxuan’s time this temple had become defunct. In the *Liang shu* version only the expression ‘Changgan li village’ is used, and we have noted earlier that Huida’s discovery of the relics is described there without any reference to an existing *stūpa* nearby.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> The text is found in *T* no. 2106, 52: 405b–406a. The name Liu Sahe is given in the edition used by Taishō collection as Liu Xiehe 劉屑荷.

<sup>129</sup> The *Liang shu* 54.791 passages gives the impression that the Jianwen 簡文 *stūpa* mentioned both before and after the story of Huida’s discovery of Aśoka relics stood at some distance from the site of discovery in the Changgan li 長干里 village. In the first paragraph giving the background of the Aśoka *stūpa*, there is no indication that the Jianwen’s *stūpa* existed in Changgan village. Later, it is explicitly said that the relics discovered by Huida were moved north to the place of the new *stūpa* standing to the west of the Jianwen *stūpa*.

Daoxuan's account continues. During the Wufeng 五鳳 period (254–256) the *stūpa* was destroyed by Sun Chen 孫綝 (231–259)<sup>130</sup> and its relics disappeared underground. After the Wu Kingdom was conquered, monks resided in the place which they thought incorrectly was the site of the original Aśoka *stūpa*.<sup>131</sup> There they built a three-story *stūpa*, but they did not find the foundation of the old *stūpa*. By that time nothing remained of the old *stūpa* and nobody knew anything about it. The statement that the monks did not find the foundation should probably be interpreted as another way of saying emphatically that the location at which the monks built their three-story *stūpa* was not the original site of the Aśoka *stūpa*. In the second year of the Xian'an 咸安 period (372), Emperor Jianwen constructed a three-story *stūpa*. Emperor Xiaowu 孝武帝 (r. 372–396) placed the golden rings at the top of the *stūpa*. At this point Daoxuan introduces a quotation from the *Mingxiang ji*<sup>132</sup> which says that Emperor Jianwen planned to build a *stūpa* but died before he could accomplish the task. Thus, Daoxuan says, the threestory *stūpa* that existed when Huida arrived was not the *stūpa* built by Emperor Jianwen, but the *stūpa* built earlier by the monks who did not find the foundation of the original Aśoka *stūpa*.

The parallels between the *Liang shu* passage and Daoxuan's account suggest that Daoxuan may have been familiar with the *Liang shu* passage written earlier, but the differences in detail also suggest that Daoxuan had other sources at his disposal. The *Liang shu* passage, for example, gives the date of Jianwen's building of the *stūpa* only as 'during the Xian'an period'; Daoxuan gives a more precise date 'the second year of Xian'an', and at the same time he introduces doubt about this whole story, suggesting that Emperor Jianwen did not actually build the *stūpa* at all. The *Liang shu* story

---

<sup>130</sup> Written mistakenly as Sun Lin 孫琳 in the Taishō edition, 405b15.

<sup>131</sup> This is my interpretation of the somewhat obscure passage 'Zhuseng poyi guchu erju' 諸僧頗依故處而居 (*T* no. 2106, 52: 405b16). I have taken the crucial word *po* 頗 to mean 'incorrectly'.

<sup>132</sup> This information is not found among the preserved fragments of the *Mingxiang ji*.

that the monk Ancheng, whom Emperor Jianwen ordered to build a small *stūpa*, died before he completed the work is probably related to Daoxuan's story based on the *Mingxiang ji* that the Emperor himself died before he could build the three-story *stūpa* generally attributed to him. It is also important to note that, though the stories may be related, the implications of the two stories are entirely different. According to the *Liang shu* the Jianwen *stūpa* was in the end completed; according to Daoxuan, the *stūpa* was never built.

Daoxuan's comment on Emperor Jianwen's *stūpa* serves an important purpose in his overall story. We should recall that, while the *Liang shu* passage simply says that monks rebuilt the *stūpa* at the original site after it had been destroyed during Sun Chen's persecution, Daoxuan's account states that they could not identify the original site of the *stūpa*. If the three-story *stūpa* generally attributed to Emperor Jianwen was in fact not built by the Emperor, then it must have been the *stūpa* built by the monks who could not identify the original site. Thus when Liu Sahe arrived, nobody knew the original site of the Aśoka *stūpa*. In introducing this detail, Daoxuan therefore is skillfully preparing the setting for the dramatic story that follows about Liu Sahe's miraculous discovery of the foundation of the original Aśoka *stūpa* and its relics.

Resuming our story, then, toward the end of the Taiyuan 太元 period (376–396) of Emperor Xiaowu, the monk Liu Huida from the Xihe area of the Bingzhou 並州 region, whose original personal name was Sahe, arrived looking for the ancient *stūpa*. For details on this monk, Daoxuan refers to a source called 'biographies of monks' (*sengzhuan* 僧傳), probably meaning Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan*. From this we can assume that Daoxuan's account of Huida's discovery of the Changgan si Aśoka *stūpa* in his miracle story collection *Ji Shen-zhou sanbao gantong lu* that we are examining here must have at least in part been based on Huijiao's biography.

We saw earlier that in the *Liang shu* account the name of Changgan li village was not mentioned in connection with the *stūpa* built by monks at the original site of the Aśoka *stūpa*, nor with Jianwen's *stūpa*. Similarly, now in Daoxuan's account the name Changgan does not appear in the discussion of the *stūpa* built by the monks who could not locate its original foundation. In both these accounts the

name is introduced as an essential part of the story of Huida's miraculous discovery. Perhaps the name is introduced at this later point in order to suggest indirectly that the site of the original Aśoka *stūpa* discovered by Huida was at some distance from that of the existing *stūpa* rebuilt by the monks. There is also a passing note, both in the *Liang shu* and Daoxuan's miracle story account, which appears to indicate that the new *stūpa* built after Huida's discovery was located to the north of the original spot of the Aśoka *stūpa* and to the west of the existing *stūpa*, which would be the Jianwen *stūpa* in the case of the *Liang shu* story and the Aśoka *stūpa* rebuilt by the monks in the case of Daoxuan's story. Daoxuan states at this point that this *stūpa* was expanded into a three-story *stūpa* by Emperor Xiaowu, repeating the information that is found both in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Liang shu* accounts, both of which give the date for this event as the sixteenth year of Taiyuan (391). Daoxuan concludes this section of his account by saying that there were thus two *stūpas* in the temple, and that the western *stūpa* was the ancient Aśoka *stūpa*.

It is noteworthy that both the *Liang shu* and the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* stories appear to suggest that Huida discovered the original site of Aśoka's *stūpa* in the Changgan li village, which stood at some distance from the site of what was then believed to be the rebuilt Aśoka *stūpa*. The impression is that at the time of Huida's discovery Changgan li was an ordinary village without any special religious significance. This impression contrasts rather strikingly with Huijiao's earlier account in the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Huijiao talked only about the Changgan si and mentioned the light that was seen after the Jianwen *stūpa* was completed there. This earlier account also suggests that the relics were found right at the bottom of this Jianwen *stūpa*.

Daoxuan continues his account of the Changgan *stūpa* with a series of later stories. The governor of Danyang Wang Ya 王雅 (d.u.) was a follower of the Five Peck of Rice Daoism, and Daoist priests were constantly telling him that he should persecute Buddhism and destroy *stūpas*. An imperial edict was issued ordering the Daoist follower Wang to visit the Changgan si and observe the relics. When monks brought out the relics in front of Wang Ya, miracles occurred. The monks held the relic container upside down in mid-air and hit it repeatedly, but the relics stuck to the container and did not fall;

Wang Ya, stating that he did not believe in Buddhism, challenged the spirit of the Buddha to perform some miracle, and immediately the relics sent forth light. These miracles persuaded Wang Ya not to speak ill of Buddhism again.

During the Datong 大統 period (535–546) of the Liang dynasty, an astrological pattern (月犯五車老人星見 [the Moon entered the Five Vehicle Stars configuration and the South Polar Star was seen]) led to the rebuilding of the Aśoka *stūpa* in the Changgan si. The relics, hair and nail were brought out. The Emperor issued an edict celebrating this event and arranged a large religious feast. The text of the Emperor's edict is given, but other details of this event recorded carefully in the *Liang shu* passage are not found in Daoxuan's account.<sup>133</sup>

Daoxuan reports that at the time he was writing, in the old site in the Jiangning district in the Runzhou region only the foundation (of the three-stories *stūpa*) and the Buddha hall remained. The place was overgrown with small trees and bushes, and tigers (*dachong* 大蟲) lived there. Those who tried to excavate the foundation of the *stūpa* often died unnaturally.<sup>134</sup> This description of the old site appears to have been based on what Daoxuan saw himself, since he then tells us how he brought the relics from the base of the Changgan si *stūpa* to the Riyan si 日嚴寺 in the capital city, Chang'an. The relics were buried under the *stūpa* in this temple with an inscription placed on top. Daoxuan at this point mentions the charge of 'over fifty great monks in the south' that the relics under the *stūpa* in the capital were not from the Aśoka *stūpa*, suggesting that there was a controversy about the reliability of this story about the transfer of relics. In the seventh year of the Wude 武德 period (625), the Riyan si temple was closed down, and its relic *stūpa* was left unprotected. Daoxuan and ten of his students were transferred to the Chongyi si 崇義寺. They dug under the Riyan si *stūpa* and found three relics, one nail, dozens

---

<sup>133</sup> The complete text of the edict is found in Daoxuan's collection of historical documents, *Guang Hongming ji*, T no. 2103, 52: 15.203c.

<sup>134</sup> This information is also given in a passage in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*, T no. 2103, 52: 15.201c–202a.

of hairs and other treasures. The hairs were not curled as in the Buddha image (*luofa* 螺髮) and the nails were yellow and small like human nails and not like the Buddha's nails, which were believed to be bigger and of red copper colour. The description of the hair here contrasts with that of the hair discovered by Huida, which was said earlier to have been curled, matching the conventional description of the Buddha's hair. Daoxuan and his students placed the objects they found at the Riyan si *stūpa* in a large copper box and lowered it under the *stūpa* southwest of the Buddha hall of the Chongyi si. Old monks told Daoxuan that the nail and hairs were those of Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty, but they did not know about the relics.

This story, together with the emphasis on Emperor Wu's rebuilding of the Changgan si *stūpa* in some of our accounts, points to a symbolic process in which the image of this Chinese Emperor is gradually overlaid on top of the image of the Indian King Aśoka in this cycle of relic *stūpa* stories. Though the relics were mostly transferred to the capital city, miracles continued to occur in the site of the original *stūpa*, and thus Daoxuan recorded materials regarding both these sites. This last story about the transfer of the relics is of particular interest since it shows Daoxuan's personal interest in and direct connection with the Changgan si miracle stories.

We have noted earlier that the parallels between the *Liang shu* passage on the Danyang *stūpa* and Daoxuan's discussion of this *stūpa* in his miracle story collection suggest that Daoxuan may have known the earlier *Liang shu* passage. We also noted that the differences in detail even in parallel passages from these two sources suggest that Daoxuan must have had other sources at his disposal. Many stories about the later history of this *stūpa* suggest further that a growing tradition of stories about this *stūpa* circulated within the monastic community. It is possible that the *Liang shu* passage, probably based in part on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, also made use of records preserved at the central government. Daoxuan's sources may have supplemented this *Liang shu* passage with other monastic records. At any rate the existence of stories about the Changgan si *stūpa* which describe events that took place after Huida's discovery of the relics there suggests that the story of Huida's (or Liu Sahe's) discovery of the Aśoka *stūpa* relics in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography may itself have

been part of a larger local tradition, and that this tradition continued to develop after Huijiao.

### Gao Kui's Image

The *Gaoseng zhuan's* second miracle story is about an image and not a *stūpa*. During the Xianhe 咸和 period (326–334) of the Eastern Jin dynasty, the Governor of Danyang, Gao Kui, obtained a golden image at the beach near the Zhanghou qiao 張侯橋. It lacked the decorative halo and base (*guangfu* 光趺) but the craftsmanship was of a very high quality. According to an earlier Sanskrit source, this image was created by the fourth daughter of King Aśoka.<sup>135</sup> Gao Kui carried

---

<sup>135</sup> The story of Aśoka's fourth daughter is summarized in Daoxuan's *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*, T no. 2107, 52: 439b9–22; *Lüxiang gantong zhuan*, T no. 1898, 45: 879a16–29. The same passage is quoted in *Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 14.397a13–27. According to this passage, the fourth daughter of King Aśoka was ugly and was always troubled by this fact. She made an image of the Buddha, whose physical features were not like those of the Buddha but rather were like those of herself. After the image was completed she uttered these words which were like a vow: 'The Buddha's physical features are superior to and different from those of human beings. How could the Buddha look like me?' The logic of this vow appears to be this. She has made the features of the Buddha look like her own, but it is a given that the Buddha cannot be ugly. Therefore, if the Buddha is to look like her and still be a Buddha, he must make her beautiful. She performed ascetic practices and waited for a long time. Suddenly the Buddha caused a miracle to happen, and her features were transformed. Her father, King Aśoka, asked her about this, and she told him about the vow she had made earlier. The passage then states that the images in the Yuhua si 玉華寺 in Beishan 北山, the Changsha si 長沙寺 in the Jingzhou 荊州 region, the image discovered by Gao Kui 高慳 (d.u.) of the capital city of the Yangzhou 揚州 region (i.e., Jiankang 建康) as well as the image in the present day Chongjing si 崇敬寺 (in the capital city Chang'an) are all (copies of!) this image. Someone wrote an inscription on the decorative halo and base (*guangfu* 光趺). The inscription is written in a foreign language and very few Chinese people can decipher it. King Aśoka used this image to cause supernatural beings to realize the truth of the Buddha's teaching (this last sentence phrased differently in sources is obscure and my translation tenta-

this image to the street in front of the Changgan si. At this point the ox stopped and could not be controlled by the men. When they let the ox go as it wished, it went to the Changgan si. A year or so later, a fisherman called Zhang Xishi 張係世 (otherwise unknown), who lived in Linhai 臨海, found a copper image base decorated with lotus flower petals (*tong lianhua fu* 銅蓮華趺) that was floating on the ocean. He presented it to the district office, which sent it to the higher office. When the base was placed under the golden image discovered earlier, the base and image matched perfectly. Later five Central Asian monks told Gao Kui, 'We obtained an image made under King Aśoka in India, but when we brought it to Ye, we encountered political disorder. So we hid it near a river. After the road became passable again, we went back, but could not find the image any more. Recently we had a dream in which we were told that the image had reappeared and was in the possession of Gao Kui in the Jiangdong 江東 area. So we have come across mountains and ocean hoping to see the image and worship it again'. Gao Kui then took them to the Changgan si. The five monks cried aloud and shed tears when they saw the image, and light appeared from the image illuminating the whole hall. The five monks said, 'Originally there was a round decorative halo (*yuanguang* 遠光). It is somewhere faraway now. But it will reappear soon.' In the first year of Xian'an 咸安 period (371) of the Eastern Jin dynasty Dong Zongzhi 董宗之 (d.u.), a man who dived for pearls at the Hepu 合浦 district of Jiaozhou 交州 region, found one decorative halo of a Buddha's image (*foguang* 佛光) at the bottom of the sea. The Regional Inspector reported this discovery, and Emperor Jianwen of the Jin dynasty ordered the halo to be fitted to the golden image. The image and the decorative halo fit together

---

tive). The images listed above all have female features. As we shall point out again below, the setting of Daoxuan's autobiographical miracle stories in the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu/Lüxiang gantong zhuan* is such that the stories told in the text must have been unknown until they were introduced in this text for the first time. What we see here then is likely to be a process of developing legends concerning the images attributed to Aśoka's fourth daughter. See also *T* no. 2107, 52: 438a8/*T* no. 2122, 53: 396a23.

perfectly. Thus all the pieces of this Buddha image were brought together through various miracles in the course of over forty years.

This story of Gao Kui's image is also told in the *Liang shu*, immediately following the story of the Danyang and Maoxian *stūpas*.<sup>136</sup> Though the name Liu Sahe is mentioned explicitly in the preceding two stories of these *stūpas*, his name does not appear in the *Liang shu*'s story of Gao Kui's image. The story of the discovery of the image itself, its base, and its halo at different places over a period of 'more than thirty years' is told in a manner that closely parallels the *Gaoseng zhuan* account, but in the *Liang shu* passage, two new details are introduced.

Monk Huisui 慧邃 (d.u.) of the Wagan si 瓦官寺 wanted to copy this image, but the head of the Changgan si, Sengshang 僧尚, feared that Huisui might damage the golden colour of the image, and said that if Huisui could make the image send forth light and turn toward the west he would give him the necessary permission. Huisui prayed to the image, earnestly requesting this miracle, and in the following night the image sent forth light and turned toward the west. The next morning, he received his permission and copied the image.

The second detail is an elaboration on one passage in Huijiao's account. Huijiao's account mentions at one point that the image had a Sanskrit inscription saying that it was made by Aśoka's fourth daughter. The *Liang shu* states that the base of the image had an inscription in foreign letters, which nobody could decipher. Later Tripitaka Guṇavarman deciphered it as saying that King Aśoka made it for his fourth daughter.

Daoxuan also records the story of the image discovered by Gao Kui in the image miracle section of the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*.<sup>137</sup> This story appears to have been based on both the *Gaoseng*

---

<sup>136</sup> The passage is found in *Liang shu* 54.792–793. It is also found in the *Nanshi* 78.1956–1957.

<sup>137</sup> *T* no. 2106, 52: 414a26–c18. This same passage is also found in *Fayuan zbulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 13.383c–384b. The Taishō index volume, volume 30, page 127, gives the term Gao Kui mistakenly as a name of a temple. Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji* (*T* vol. 52: 15.202b) also contains a summary of the story

*zhuan* biography and the *Liang shu* passage. Daoxuan includes in his account the two new stories introduced in the *Liang shu* passage, about Guṇavarman and Huisui respectively. Interestingly the text of the old Sanskrit inscription on the ‘flower base’ (*huatai* 花臺) of the image is here given as ‘the image was made by Aśoka’s fourth daughter’ as it was in Huijiao’s biography. This version also conforms to the new legend of Aśoka’s daughter introduced by Daoxuan elsewhere in his writing.

As in the case of the Changgan *si stūpa*, Daoxuan’s account of the origin of this image, which is based on Huijiao’s biography as well as the *Liang shu* passage, is followed by a long account of other miracles that occurred later. During the reign period of Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty (502–549), images of seven deities performing music and two bodhisattvas were added above the halo. In the second year of Yongding 永定 period of the Chen dynasty (558), Wang Lin 王琳 (d.u.) encamped his soldiers at the beach of the Changjiang river facing the capital city of Jinling. Emperor Wu ordered his generals to attack them.

When the soldiers were about to leave, the image moved and could not be stabilized. This strange development was reported to the court and the Emperor examined the image himself and found the report to be true. Suddenly, before the soldiers crossed swords, Wang Lin’s army scattered, and Wang Lin fled northward by himself. Emperor Wu’s army followed him upstream and pacified the whole region. During the Tianjia 天嘉 period (560–566) there was a rebellion in the Southeastern region. When the emperor prayed in front of the image; requesting that the rebels be rejected, the image shone and illumined the hall. Shortly after that the difficulties in the region were removed. Monk Huixiao 慧曉 (active in the later half of 6th c.) rebuilt the building and in the beginning of the Zhide 至德 period (583–587) built a square base for the image. The rulers of five dynasties, from the Jin dynasty to the Chen dynasty, all paid respect

---

of Gao Kui’s image. The story of this image is also included in Daoxuan’s discussion of miraculous images attached to the biography of Sengming 僧明 (562–642) in *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T 50: 29.693a28–b2l.

to this image, and in times of drought the image with oil poured over it was brought to the palace on the Emperor's carriage. While the image was *en route* to the palace, rain would fall. In the second year of the Zhenming 禎明 period (588), the image turned westward and even after people made it face in the correct direction, it again turned westward by itself. The Emperor took a jeweled hat and placed it on the head of the image, and then placed a silk hat on top of the jewelled one. In the morning the jeweled hat was hanging from the hand of the image, although the silk hat was still on its head. The Emperor burned incense and prayed, saying, 'If inauspicious things are to happen to the state, let the image take the jewelled hat again to indicate this unhappy state of affairs'. He then placed the jewelled hat again on the head of the image. In the morning the jewelled hat was again hanging from the image's hand as before. Both the ruler and ministers were frightened. Shortly after that the state of Chen was conquered by the state of Sui. The Emperor Wen of the Sui dynasty brought the image to the palace. Since the image was a standing image, the Emperor also stood and paid respect to it. Saying that he was old and could not stand for a long time, the Emperor ordered officials to prepare a sitting image with the same features, and sent the original standing image to the Da Xingshan si 大興善寺. The image was placed facing north, but in the morning it was found facing the south. People were amazed and moved it back again to the first location facing north. But the next morning it was again found facing south. People were amazed and realized that they had failed to pay proper respect to the image; they should have treated it as if it were the ruler, who always sat facing south. Daoxuan concludes this section by saying that he collected these stories of miracles from a variety of sources and that some stories were recorded briefly because he 'did not want to invent elaborate details for them.'

As in the case of the first story of the Changgan si *stūpa*, the record of miracles that happened later around this image found by Gao Kui point to the existence of a flexible and living local tradition. The absence of the reference to Liu Sahe/Huida in the *Liang shu* and *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* makes us wonder why this story was included at all in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida. The fact that the image was located in the Changgan si, which is the loca-

tion of the Aśoka *stūpa* discussed earlier, does not fully explain this anomaly. Perhaps the reference to King Aśoka was the crucial reason why this story became closely associated with Huida's *stūpa* stories and eventually entered his biography. Perhaps the *stūpa* and the image were known as two objects associated with King Aśoka in the Changgan si. The story about Gao Kui's image was thus always told locally in close association with that of the Aśoka *stūpa*. Huijiao may then have followed this local tradition in including the story about Gao Kui's image in his biography of Huida.<sup>138</sup> Thus, the accidental character of the relationship between the two stories suggests that these stories had a long history behind them before they became part of Huijiao's biography.<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> The treatment of this story in the *Liang shu* where it is told immediately following the two stories associated with Liu Sahe/Huida and with a concluding section commenting on the later renovation of the Changgan si may also reflect this local situation.

<sup>139</sup> Daoxuan's biography of Huizui 慧最 (d.u.) in his *Xu Gaoseng zhuàn* (T no. 2060, 50: 507b–c) contains a story about a Buddha image that closely parallels the story of Gao Kui's Buddha image under examination here. The story reports that this monk took the relics to the Longqian daochang 龍潛道場 hall of the Da Xingguo si 大興國寺 in the Jingzhou 荊州 region and later to the Fameng si 發蒙寺 in the Jizhou 吉州 region as the imperial emissary during the Renshou period. The text gives some details about the miraculous events that occurred on these occasions and then tells a story about a Buddha image that existed in the Fameng si. In the fifth year of the Daming 大明 period of the Song dynasty (461), monk Fachun 法純 (519–603) dreamt of an extraordinary golden image and heard the pure voice of the Buddha coming from somewhere off in the distance. He went to the Sanqu river 三曲江 and saw a Buddha image at the deep bottom of the river. The light from the image illuminated the surface of the water. He brought the image out of the river with the help of Governor Zhou Zhan 周湛 (?–461?). The image weighed 1,000 *jin* 斤 (about 20 to 60 kg) on a scale but (when it was carried) it was as light as several *liang* 兩 (about 70 to 200 g). It was six *chi* 尺 and four *cun* 寸 tall (about 160 cm) and was made of gold-plated copper. Later a halo and a base of a Buddha image were sent from the Changsha Commandery to the capital city (of Jiankang?). The Emperor Wen 文帝 ordered them to

be sent to the location of the image, and the halo, the base, and the image fitted each other perfectly. Altogether the height of the image was over nine *chi*. More than ten Sanskrit letters were written below the hem of the Buddha's clothing. People could not decipher them at the beginning. Later a monk from the Western regions read the inscription as saying 'The fourth daughter of King Aśoka of the state of Jiaweiluowei 迦維羅衛國 (Kapilavastu) made this'. After reading the inscription, the monk suddenly disappeared.

Later toward the end of the Tianjian 天監 period of the Liang dynasty (502–519), the image sent out light and illumined the room in which it was placed. Emperor Wu 武帝 (464–549) requested that the image be brought to the capital, but circumstances prevented this transfer. In the seventh year of Datong 大同 period (541) the body of the image sweated. In that year Liu Jingxuan 劉敬宣 (371–415) became a rebel and burnt down the Commandery. The fire reached the temple and everything in the temple was burnt down except the Buddha Hall. This 'Commandery' mentioned here probably refers to the Luling 廬陵 Commandery which was an old centre established by Sun Ce 孫策 (175–200) during the Three Kingdoms period (220–280) in the area where the Jizhou region was established later during the Sui dynasty. According to the *Liang shu* (3.87), a citizen of the Ancheng Commandery 安成郡, Liu Jinggong 劉敬躬 (?–542) rebelled as a leader of a heretical teaching (*yaodao* 妖道) in the first month of the eighth year of the Datong 大同 period (542) and attacked Luling, proceeding further toward the Yuzhang 豫章 Commandery. The name of the rebel leader is given as Liu Jinggong 劉敬宮 in the biography of Zhang Wan 張綰 (500–560) in *Liang shu* 34.504 and *Nanshi* 56.1389. See also *Zizhi tongjian*, *juan* 158 (*Liang ji* 梁紀 14). The rebellion of Liu Jingxuan mentioned in the story of the golden image in the Fameng si in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* must refer to the incident mentioned in these secular historical sources.

In the tenth year of the same period (544) the Prince of Xiangdong 湘東王 brought the image to Jiangling 江陵 and prayed for good fortune and the image sent forth light. The title Prince of Xiangdong here must refer to Xiao Yi 蕭繹 (508–555), the seventh son of Emperor Wu 武帝 (r. 502–549) who later ruled as Emperor Yuan 元帝 during 552–554. In the twelfth year of the same period the image was brought back to the Fameng si. When it reached the temple the image sent forth light and continued to do so for three days. In the sixth year of the Tianjia 天嘉 period of the Chen dynasty (565) further decorations were added to the image. Because of many stories of miracles that have been transmitted, the

### The Two Floating Stone Images in the Wu district

To return to the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, we learn that Huida, encouraged by these miracles associated with a *stūpa* and an image of the Buddha, then went to the Wu district. When the Western Jin dynasty (265–316) was about to end, in the first year of Jianxing 建興 period (313), a stone image came down floating to the point where the Hutu, down-stream of the Song-cbiang river of the Wu area, enters the ocean. Fishermen mistook it for the ocean god and sent a female medium to welcome it. Thereupon strong winds began to blow and waves rose high, and the medium returned, frightened by the change. A man who worshiped Huanglao 黃老 said that the image was the god of Heavenly Masters' Daoism.<sup>140</sup>

---

image was copied in many places. Since this appears to be the only other existing example of the story about the golden image made by King Aśoka's fourth daughter and since there are some remarkable parallels between the story of Gao Kui's image and this story of the Fameng si image, it would be appropriate to infer that the two stories must have been somehow directly related with each other. The Fameng si image is here said to have been discovered in the year 461. According to the *Gaoseng zhuan* the pieces of Gao Kui's image had been brought together by 371. I am inclined to believe that the author(s) of the Fameng si image story was familiar with the story of Gao Kui's image, which by then had become fairly widely known. The records of later incidents associated with this image in the Fameng si suggests that once this story about the origin of the image was firmly established, further stories of miracles about the image evolved in this location in a manner similar to the case of the later stories associated with Gao Kui's image. It may be significant that these later stories were associated with an obviously widely known event and with a very important figure.

<sup>140</sup> In the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* text, to be examined below, the Daoist is described as 'the follower of the Huanglao of the Way of the Five Peck of Rice' 奉五斗米教之徒 (*T* no. 2106, 52:413c26; *Fayuan zbulin* version: *T* no. 2122, 53:383al). M. Strickmann ('The Mao Shan Revelations', 6–8) describes the relationship between the ecstatic cults of the exorcists *wu* renowned for displays of possession and the Way of Heavenly Masters that arrived after 311 from the North. The relationship between the local medium cult and Heavenly Masters Daoism

They took him to welcome the image, but again he encountered wind and waves. Later a man in the Wu district<sup>141</sup> called Zhu Ying 朱應 (otherwise unknown), who worshipped the Buddha as a lay Buddhist, heard about this and said, ‘Couldn’t this be a miraculous intervention of the Great Awakened One (the Buddha)?’. He purified himself and together with the nun Boni 帛尼 (?) of the Dongyun si 東雲寺 and several lay Buddhists came to the point where the Hu down-stream entered the ocean. Bowing their heads and expressing utmost reverence, they chanted Buddhist verses praising great virtues. Then the wind and tide calmed down, and at a great distance they saw two human shapes come floating towards them. These were the stone images. On the back of the images were inscriptions saying that one was called Weiwei 維衛 (the past Buddha Vipas̥yin) and the other Jiaye 迦葉 (the past Buddha Kāśyapa). Welcoming these images, they took them to the Tongxuan si 通玄寺. Many people in the Wu area, both high-born and lowborn, were impressed by this miracle and numerous people were converted. Huida stayed at the Tongxuan si for three years altogether, and diligently performed reverent rites.

Avalokiteśvara’s instruction to Huida in the *Mingxiang ji*<sup>142</sup> had mentioned ‘the two stone images in the Wu area’, which were said to have been ‘created by Aśoka, using supernatural beings (*guishen*)’. The corresponding passage in the parallel account in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* mentions ‘the stone images that floated on the Changjiang river’, which were again said to have been made by King Aśoka.<sup>143</sup> Although Huida’s biography does not mention King Aśoka in connection with these stone images, the reference to Aśoka in the earlier *Mingxiang ji* indicates that the

---

in this story appears to correspond closely to the relationship described by Strickmann.

<sup>141</sup> The *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* gives the location as the Huali 華里 village in the Wu Commandery 吳郡.

<sup>142</sup> *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 920a18f.

<sup>143</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 404b18; *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 585bl.

story of these stone images and their connection with King Aśoka must have been quite well-established by the time of Huijiao.<sup>144</sup> The discussion of these two stone images in the parallel passages in *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* consists of two stories. The first and longer story parallels the *Gaoseng zhuan* story summarized above closely except for a few new details. The images were very heavy, and when people tried to lift them, a storm arose again. Later several tens of people could not move them, but when they requested the images politely to move, people suddenly could move them. A central Asian monk called Fayuan 法淵 (or Fakai 法開 [459–523] according to the *Fayuan zhulin* version) said that there was a scripture that spoke of two images and Aśoka *stūpas* in the east that free those who worshipped them from sins committed during many previous world ages.<sup>145</sup>

The second story states that twelve Indian monks brought the images to the Commandery. The images then stood on water, not sinking and not going any further. When this incident was reported to the court, permission was granted to let the images stay in the Commandery. The entry on these images in Daoxuan's *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* is accompanied by a note saying that these stories come from Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* and Hou Bai's 侯白 (of the Sui) *Jingyi ji* 旌異記 [Records of Unusual Manifestations].<sup>146</sup> Since

---

<sup>144</sup> There is also the remote possibility that the reference was interpolated into the existing *Mingxiang ji* fragment by the compiler of the *Fayuan zhulin*, who, as we noted, makes this connection explicit in the other reference which parallels a section in Daoxuan's collection of miracle stories.

<sup>145</sup> A summary of the story of the two stone images also appear in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*, T no. 2103, 52: 15.202b.

<sup>146</sup> For a brief comment on this collection completed under the Emperor Wen (r. 581–604) of the Sui dynasty, see Gjertson, 'The Early Chinese Buddhist Miracle Tale', 294. Lu Xun's collection of the existing fragments from this collection reproduces from the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 13 the whole section on the two stone images consisting of the two stories summarized above. I am inclined to believe that not all of this material was based on the *Jingyi ji*. No other independent fragment on these images from the *Jingyi ji* is found in Lu Xun's collection.

the first of the two stories does indeed correspond closely with the *Gaoseng zhuan* version, my suspicion is that the second story only briefly summarized here is based on a story in the *Jingyi ji*.<sup>147</sup>

In this case of the two stone images in the Wu Commandery later parallels to the *Gaoseng zhuan* story and other references including the earlier one in the *Mingxiang ji* point to a well-established local tradition, precisely as we have seen in the other miracle stories about Huida that we have examined thus far.

### The Maoxian *stūpa*

The last miracle story in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is again about a *stūpa*. After a while Huida went to Kuaiji and paid respect to the *stūpa* at the place called Mao.<sup>148</sup> This *stūpa* also had been built by King Aśoka. The place had been deserted for many years and the foundation of the *stūpa* had been covered over. Huida meditated with concentration and saw a flame of miraculous light there. Therefore he built a stone *stūpa* (*kanqi* 龕砌) at the place from which the light emanated. Birds did not dare to nest in it. Those who hunted

---

<sup>147</sup> The *Fayuan zhulin* generally mentions the sources for materials reproduced in it, while Daoxuan's *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* generally does not mention its sources. The reference to the sources in a note embedded in the texts of both the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* accounts of the two stone images of the Wu Commandery thus follows a format that is typical of the *Fayuan zhulin* entries but quite unusual for the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. This fact gives rise to the suspicion that in this case, perhaps as an exception, the *Fayuan zhulin* version of the story may have been written first and that Daoxuan may have copied this *Fayuan zhulin* version into his miracle collection later. As we noted earlier, the *Fayuan zhulin* entries generally appear to be based on Daoxuan's account.

<sup>148</sup> An obscure character is used for the place name in the *Gaoseng zhuan* account (*T* no. 2059, 50: 410a). But the place is explicitly said to be in Kuaiji 會稽 and the comparison with the *Mingxiang ji* list (*T* no. 2122, 53: 920a17f.) and the *Fayuan zhulin*/*Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version (*T* no. 2122, 53: 584c29, 585a24; *T* no. 2106, 52: 404a28, b12) shows that the character should have been Mao 鄗 as indicated here.

and fished near the *stūpa* were never successful. Monks and laymen spread stories about the miracles here and everyone believed in its power. Later, Commandery Governor Meng Yi 孟顛 (?–450) cleared and populated the area to a greater extent.

Wherever Huida went (and found relics from the Aśoka *stūpas*),<sup>149</sup> there were frequently miracles. He was diligent in Buddhist practice all his life. It is not known where he went after these events.

The story of the Maoxian *stūpa* in Kuaiji is assigned to the Western Jin (265–316) period and, appears at the beginning of the *stūpa* miracle section of Daoxuan's *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*<sup>150</sup> and the corresponding section in the *Fayuan zbulin*.<sup>151</sup> In these texts the accounts of Liu Sahe's experiences in hell, the instructions to him by the 'foreign monk' to worship the *stūpas* and stone images built by King Aśoka, and Liu Sahe's renunciation of the householder's life, which are said to be based on an 'earlier tradition or biography' (*qianzhuan* 前傳), are immediately followed by the story of Huida's quest for the Maoxian *stūpa*.

Huida went to Kuaiji and looked for the *stūpa* everywhere in the mountains and rivers there but could not find it. When filled with sorrow and distressed he threw himself on the ground, he heard the sound of bells from under the ground. He immediately marked the place and placed a piece of wood (?) as the symbol of a *stūpa* (*cha* 刹). Three days later a jewelled *stūpa* and relics appeared from the ground. The colour of the *stūpa* was dark green (*qing* 青 [blue]), and though it looked as if it was made of stone that was not the case. Its height was one *chi* 尺 and four *cun* 寸 (c. 40cm) and each side was

---

<sup>149</sup> The meaning of the original expression *jinli* 覲禮 here is obscure. Here I tentatively took the implicit object of this verb to be Aśoka relics.

<sup>150</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 404b–405b. The name Liu Sahe is given in the edition adopted for the Taishō collection as Liu Sahe 劉薩荷. A variant reading from the Song edition gives the name as Liu Xiehe 劉屑荷.

<sup>151</sup> *Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 585a–586a. The name Liu Sahe in the edition adopted for the Taishō collection is given as 劉薩何, a form identical to that given in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version of this story. A variant reading in the Ming edition gives the name as Liu Sahe 劉薩訶.

seven *cun* (c. 20cm) long. It had a five layered rings on top. The *stūpa* looked like those built in the Central Asian kingdom Yutian 于闐. The open windows on each of its sides were decorated with heavenly bells and in the middle of the *stūpa* hung a copper *qing* 磬 bell. Huida suspected that the sound of the temple bell that he had heard earlier must have been the sound of this *qing* bell. All around the *stūpa* images of Buddhas, bodhisattvas, guardians holding *vajra*, and holy monks were carved in fine detail. When you looked at the *stūpa* closely, hundreds of thousands images immediately appeared in your field of vision. The details of each of the images were perfectly executed, a feat that was clearly beyond the reach of men, and must certainly have been accomplished by gods. During Daoxuan's time this *stūpa* was kept within a larger wooden *stūpa* building and on the eight days of seasonal changes (*bawang ri* 八王日) it was carried around the villages. The relics were kept at the base of the wooden *stūpa*. To the eastern side of this *stūpa* were many ancient sites of miracles (*guji* 古跡).<sup>152</sup>

This account of the Maoxian *stūpa* is followed by a long entry, based on local gazetteers, of miracles and other notable incidents in the general region around the *stūpa*. The details of this account are too long to be summarized here, but the following entry is particularly notable for our purposes here. The old city of Maoxian, located over 300 *li* 里 (over 150 km) to the east of Gouzhang 句章, was the capital of the Min 閩 and Yue 越 kingdoms in the past. The miraculous *stūpa* (*lingta* 靈塔) is located at the district border in the Xiaoyi *xiang* 孝義鄉 village. According to the Local Gazetteer (*diji* 地記), this *stūpa* is one of the 84,000 *stūpas* King Aśoka built. Meng Yi, the administrator for Kuaiji under the Song dynasty, repaired this *stūpa*. There is a rock cave in the mountain, three *chi* (c. 75 cm) in height and width. The water there is pure, and warm in winter and cool in summer. Another Gazetteer (*yudi zhi* 輿地誌) says the following. King Aśoka was a disciple of Śākyamuni, and was capable of controlling supernatural beings (*guishen* 鬼神). In one night he

---

<sup>152</sup> The story of the Maoxian *stūpa* is also found in a summary form in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*, T no. 2103, 52: 15.201b25–29.

created 84,000 treasure *stūpas* of the Buddha's bones in the Realm under Heaven. These *stūpas* all appeared from the ground. According to monk Huida of the Jin dynasty, there are two Aśoka *stūpas* in Eastern China; one *stūpa* is here and the other is in Pengcheng 彭城. The *stūpa* that is now located in the Changgan si in Moling 林陵 (i.e., Danyang) is also an Aśoka *stūpa*. Thus, there are three *stūpas* altogether (in the Eastern China?). After an obscure passage, the account of Aśoka *stūpas* continues, quoting from a document called the *Kuaiji Gazetteer* 會稽記. According to Wang Dao 王導 (276–339), prime minister of the Eastern Jin dynasty, when he was crossing the Changjiang river, he met an ordinary looking monk (*daoren* 道人) who said that he had come from across the ocean, and that in the past he had travelled to Maoxian with King Aśoka and lowered authentic relics of the Buddha in the ground and built a *stūpa* to protect it.<sup>153</sup> An obscure story concerning King Aśoka and an island of man-shaped stones follows this. Returning to the discussion of the Maoxian *stūpa*, this long and somewhat confusing account then mentions the rebuilding of the *stūpa* in the third year of Putong 普通 period (523) by the Emperor Wu, the founder of the Liang dynasty. We have noted that this incident was mentioned briefly in the *Liang shu* passage on Huida's *stūpas* earlier, where the date of the second year of Datong 大同 period (536) and the names of monk Jingtuo 敬脫 (555–617) of the Guangzhai si 光宅寺 and Houseman (*sheren* 舍人) Sun Zhao 孫照 (d.u.) were mentioned.<sup>154</sup>

As in the case of the Changgan si *stūpa* discussed above, Daoxuan's account of this incident and the description of the same incident in the *Liang shu* passage are significantly different. In the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage, the beauty of the temple, renamed as the Aśoka temple (i.e. Ayuwang si 阿育王寺), is emphasized. This account also mentions an inscription by Editorial Director Gu Yinzu 顧胤祖 (d.u.), the miraculous appearance of the Buddha's footprints at places miles apart from each other, a miraculous pond to the north of the temple where an eel, called the 'Bod-

<sup>153</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 404c17–405a3.

<sup>154</sup> The original passage is found in *Liang shu* 54.792.

dhisattva Eel', lived and performed extraordinary deeds, and other miracles associated with the *stūpa*.

In Daoxuan's account of his own miraculous encounter with supernatural beings found in a text called *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*, the story of the Maoxian *stūpa* appears again.<sup>155</sup> In a rather obscure passage, the god explained that the relic of the Maoxian *stūpa* was the arm bone of the past Buddha Kāśyapa of the Age of the Wise, but that no human being has ever seen it. The god said further that the *stūpa* appeared from the ground to bring fortune to the ordinary people, that the two fish in the well were gods protecting the *stūpa*, that the marks of the Buddha on the rock were made by three earlier Buddhas, and that many people had lived in the area during the Zhou period in the past and that is why the *stūpa* had been built there. The stories told by gods to Daoxuan in this extraordinary text are of particular interest to us. The circumstances of the exchange imply that Daoxuan must have asked questions about things that he himself was familiar with, and perhaps these things that he asked were similarly known to his fellow Buddhists in medieval China as well. By contrast the stories that the supernatural beings told Daoxuan, must have been unknown to the great historian Daoxuan, and by implication to everyone else, until they were revealed to him through this miracle. Thus, we see in this text how new details of some relatively well-known stories evolved in the tradition. Daoxuan's reference to the Maoxian *stūpa* implies that the *stūpa* was known to the readers of this text; more importantly it also indicates that Daoxuan himself was keenly interested in this *stūpa* to the point that

---

<sup>155</sup> *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*, T no. 2107, 52: 439a1–12. The name Liu Sahe is given here as Liu Sahe 劉薩何. In the *Lüxiang gantong lu*, the passage is found in 878c11–23, and the name is given as Liu Sahe 劉薩訶. The *Fayuan zbulin* reproduction of this passage, giving the name as Liu Sahe 劉薩何, is found in T no. 2122, 53: 590b22–c2. This passage also mentions the Changgan si 長干寺 *stūpa* and explains the meaning of the word 'gan' in the name of the temple Changgan si as the local expression for a hill. There are some differences between the *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu* and *Fayuan zbulin* versions, and the passage is somewhat obscure.

he attempted to introduce new details of legends associated with the *stūpa*.

The Maoxian *stūpa* must also have enjoyed a wide-spread reputation later on. In the biography of Weize in the *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, there is a note that Weize heard about this *stūpa* and visited it to worship it. He then made a small model of the *stūpa*, which he later brought back to his home temple Fengci si 奉慈寺, built earlier during the Yuanhe 元和 period (808–820).<sup>156</sup> The story of Maoshan relic *stūpa* and miracles is told in the later Buddhist history, the *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [General Account of the Buddhas and Patriarchs] compiled by Zhipan 志磐 (of the 13th c.) over the twelve-year period between 1258 and 1269. The passage found in the fifty-third *juan* of this work mentions events around this *stūpa* that occurred after Daoxuan's lifetime, indicating that the tradition continued to develop well into the Song period.<sup>157</sup>

Let us briefly comment on the significance of the above investigation of the miracle stories for interpreting the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida. I will begin with a few comments on the text of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography itself.

The *Mingxiang ji*'s account of the layman Liu Sahe's extraordinary experience and the *Gaoseng zhuan*'s account of *stūpas* and images that the monk Huida visited are bound together by Avalokiteśvara's instruction to Liu Sahe to worship King Aśoka's *stūpas* and the two stone images. These instructions are given toward the end of the *Mingxiang ji*'s story. Our accounts are also tied together by references to King Aśoka and his daughter in three of the *Gaoseng zhuan*'s stories. Without the story of Avlokitesvara's instructions (or the instructions from the 'man of the Way' as in the *Gaoseng zhuan*), the string of miracle stories associated with *stūpas* and images that constitute the substance of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography would not at all constitute a coherent whole, at least in the form in which they are presented in this biography. In fact, Huida's role in these stories about *stūpas* and images is rather limited: in

<sup>156</sup> *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2061, 50: 880c.

<sup>157</sup> *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 461a–b.

the first and last stories about *stūpas*, he plays an important role as the person who identified the site of King Aśoka's *stūpa*, but in the second and third stories about images Huida in fact plays no role at all. The story about Gao Kui's golden image is embedded in the middle of Huida's biography without any explicit statement about its relationship with Huida until the very end of this passage, where a comment that Huida was greatly encouraged by the image and its miracle appears. The location Danyang is mentioned in the brief summary of Liu Sahe's story, but Huijiao's biography contains two stories from this location, the story of the Changgan si *stūpa* and that of Gao Kui's image also at the Changgan si. The second image story, the story about the stone images in Wu Commandery, is integrated into Huida's biography by the presumed fact that these are the images in the temple where Huida stayed for three years. Huida, however, again plays no role in the miracles associated with these images. It should also be noted that there are no internal relationships between the four stories about *stūpas* and images in this biography. If we limit our attention to the text of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography itself, these stories appear to be bound together rather artificially only by the force of the earlier reference to King Aśoka's *stūpas* and images in Liu Sahe's story.

The phenomenon that binds the *Gaoseng zhuan* miracle stories together, perhaps more closely than the text of this biography makes explicit, appears to have been the cult of King Aśoka's *stūpas* and Buddha images in China. The story about Gao Kui's golden image may have been inserted in Huida's biography because this image was believed to have been made by Aśoka's fourth daughter. As an image that was made by Aśoka's daughter this image may have been treated as a part of the group of *stūpas* and images associated with King Aśoka. The *Gaoseng zhuan* does not mention King Aśoka in connection with the two stone images in the Wu Commandery, but we have seen that the brief reference to these images in Avalokiteśvara's instructions in the earlier *Mingxiang ji* explicitly states that these images were made by King Aśoka using supernatural beings. Perhaps by Huijiao's time (early 6th c.) in south China a number of *stūpas* and Buddha images were widely known to have originated with this famous Indian King. Liu Sahe must have been widely known as an

actor in this legend, as the person who rediscovered Aśoka's *stūpas* in Danyang and Maoxian. The two stories of images associated with Aśoka may have become a part of Liu Sahe/Huida's biography because the stories of *stūpas* and images made by Aśoka were remembered together, and Liu Sahe occupied a prominent place in the collection of these stories as a whole. The fact that the list of the stories about Aśoka *stūpas* and images mentioned in the instructions given by Avalokiteśvara/'man of the Way'/'foreign monk' in the sources examined above appears to be basically stable, though containing minor variations including different ways in which the same places are named, tends to support this interpretation. Not only the cycle of legends but the locations of the *stūpas* and images may also have been relatively well established by the time the stories in the sources we have been discussing took shape.

Since existing parallel sources on these *stūpa* and image miracle stories examined above come from a period later than the *Gaoseng zhuan* and generally appear to be dependant on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida, it is difficult at this point to reconstruct the development behind the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography more precisely. But several relevant observations can be drawn from the review of these sources above.

(a) The *Liang shu* passage tells the story of the Liang Emperor Wu's rebuilding of the Changgan si *stūpa* in Danyang in detail and then adds a brief note that the Maoxian *stūpa* had also been rebuilt by Emperor Wu earlier. Liu Sahe's name is mentioned explicitly in connection with these *stūpas*. These discussions of the Aśoka *stūpas* are then followed immediately in the *Liang shu* by the story of Gao Kui's golden image. The passage explicitly quotes the words of the five foreign monks to the effect that this golden image had been made by Aśoka in India, but was lost while it was being transported to China by them and was rediscovered by Gao Kui. The story, on the other hand, does not mention Liu Sahe's name. A brief note at the end of this story describes the expansion of the Changgan si during the Datong period, thus giving the impression that the whole passage is first about Emperor Wu's rebuilding of the Aśoka *stūpas* and secondly about the Changgan si. The story of Gao Kui's golden image thus appears to have been included here as an explanation of

another important object associated with King Aśoka in the Changgan si:

Daoxuan's miracle story collection, *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, begins the discussion of *stūpa* miracles with the stories of the Maoxian *stūpa* and of the Changgan si *stūpa*, and these stories mention Liu Sahe's name explicitly. The stories of the two stone images in the Wu Commandery and of Gao Kui's image are placed separated in the subsequent section on image miracles, and there is no reference to Liu Sahe's name in these stories given there.

The treatment of the four miracle stories in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida in these two later sources shows that at least by the seventh century Liu Sahe's name was associated only with the Aśoka *stūpa* stories, and that the Aśoka image stories circulated without any reference to this monk.

(b) It is perhaps also significant that in the two *Liang shu* passages describing the Aśoka *stūpas*, the name of the person who miraculously located the *stūpas* is first given as Liu Sahe. In the story about the Changgan si *stūpa*, it is then said that Liu Sahe became a monk and changed his name to Huida. In the shorter reference to the Maoxian *stūpa* the name Huida is not mentioned at all. In Daoxuan's miracle story collection, the story of the Maoxian *stūpa* again first identifies the man by the name Liu Sahe and then says that he became a monk and changed his name to Huida. The Changgan si *stūpa* story briefly mentions the rediscovery of the original site of the *stūpa* by 'Liu Huida, whose original personal name was Xie (Sa)he'.<sup>158</sup> The emphasis on the complete secular name of the person in these stories may indicate that these stories circulated primarily as the stories of layman Liu Sahe and only secondarily as those of monk Huida. The monk's name Huida may have been introduced somewhat later, though the fact that the *Mingxiang ji* story ends with mentioning Liu Sahe's renunciation of householder's life and the monk's name Huida indicates that this theme must also have been introduced relatively early at least in some circles.

Without the story of his renunciation and the monk's name

---

<sup>158</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 405b22.

Huida, Liu Sahe's stories could not have entered the corpus of the biographies of monks. Thus it should be entirely natural that in our sources, which were after all mostly collected by compilers of biographies of monks, considerable emphasis would be placed on the name Huida. Huijiao explicitly states in his biography that Liu Sahe became a monk and changed his name to Huida and then travelled to the sites of *Aśoka stūpas* and images. Thus, according to this account the person who identified the *Aśoka stūpas* must have appeared at the sites as monk Huida. But perhaps the stories as they were retold in the sites where the *stūpas* were rediscovered were still better known as the stories of layman Liu Sahe in the seventh century. This may explain why the later miracle stories examined above continued to emphasize the layman's name in these stories. If the stories of Liu Sahe's rediscovery of the *Aśoka stūpas*, going back beyond Huijiao in origin, were preserved at the sites of these *stūpas* independently of Huijiao's biography, and if later historians knew these local stories of layman Liu Sahe, it would have been natural for them to keep emphasizing the layman's name as a way of calling the readers' attention to these local sources, while at the same time identifying the subject of these local traditions as the same as that of Huijiao's biography of Huida.

(c) The *Liang shu* stories of the Liang Emperor Wu's rebuilding of the Changgan si and Maoxian *stūpas* and its record of a later miracle associated with Gao Kui's golden image suggest that a rich tradition of miracle stories existed in each of these sites by the beginning of the seventh century, and thus before Daoxuan wrote his collection of miracle stories. Frequent references to local gazetteers in Daoxuan's account of later miracles at the Maoxian *stūpa* also indicate that these later stories were recorded and preserved at the site of this *stūpa*. Similar local traditions not included in our sources may also have existed at the other sites under examination here. Together this evidence suggests that by the seventh century, independent local traditions of *stūpa* and image miracles existed at the sites mentioned in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida. We have also seen evidence that at least some of these stories were well known before Huijiao's time, and that Huijiao used the earlier records of these traditions in composing Huida's biography. We have noted above, for example, that Huijiao's reference to Gao Kui's image in his biography

of Huida appears to be rather out of place until we focus on the fact that the image existed in the Changgan si and must have belonged to the cycle of stories associated with King Aśoka's *stūpas* and images. There appears to have been a local tradition at the Changgan si about King Aśoka's *stūpa* and image, and Huijiao in writing Huida's biography drew from this source without rigorously distinguishing from others the part involving Huida directly. The fact that an earlier source, the *Mingxiang ji*, mentions the floating images in the Wu Commandery as images made by Aśoka helps to explain why this story was also included in the same biography. Again the main reason why Huijiao included this story in Huida's biography must have been the connection between the images and King Aśoka. This connection must have been firmly established in the local tradition along with the accompanying miracle stories. We have also commented above that the frequent use of the layman's name Liu Sahe may mean that the stories going back beyond Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* biography existed at the sites of the *stūpas* in connection with the lay devotee.

(d) A very large part of the later materials on the Changgan si and Maoxian *stūpas* and the Gao Kui and Wu Commandery images appears to have survived through the effort of Daoxuan. Thus, we may conclude that Daoxuan must have been extremely interested in the story of Huida. In writing his biography of this monk, Daoxuan did not make use of the main part of the materials he collected that are directly related to Huida's biographical tradition, perhaps because these materials were primarily about the stories found in the earlier *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. I shall show below that for his *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida Daoxuan used other materials that were nevertheless similar in character to the miracle stories in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.

### **The *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography**

This biography begins by giving Huida's secular name as Liu Suhe 劉翠和. His place of origin is also given differently as 'Dingyang 定陽, northeast of Xianyang 咸陽'.<sup>159</sup> He is explicitly said to have been a foreigner of the Ji group (*jibu* 稽胡).<sup>160</sup> He originally did not follow

the Buddhist teaching and was illiterate. His personality was violent. He was strong and enjoyed hunting. He served as an elite cavalry man (*tuji* 突騎) at the city of Liangcheng 梁城 and defended the city of Xiangyang 襄陽. His parents and brother were all alive. His family was wealthy and his family members conducted themselves selfishly without regard to reason. Because of his drinking Liu Sahe became sick. After his life ended, he saw in detail the different ways in which sinners suffer in various hells. Daoxuan notes at this point that details of this story are found in the *biezhuan* 別傳 (a separate and independent biography). Since this source is mentioned in connection with Liu Sahe's experiences in hell, the content of *biezhuan* probably centered around the story of hell similar to the story we have seen in the *Mingxiang ji*.

Daoxuan's biography continues by stating that the subject renounced the householder's life and lived in his birth place in the Wencheng Commandery 文成郡 located in the plateau southeast of Cizhou 慈州. At the time Daoxuan was writing this biography, there

---

<sup>159</sup> *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 644c16.

<sup>160</sup> The meaning of the term *chi hu* is unclear. As we shall see later this reference appears to be based on the story about this group in the story of Liu Sahe in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 434c11–20 (*Fayuan zhubin*, T no. 2122, 53: 31.517a2–11). I read this as a story of an ordinary Chinese man, with a typical Chinese surname Liu, who had an extraordinary experience of returning from death and who after returning from death went to the community of Ji barbarian's 稽胡 and became a saint among them. Daoxuan appears to have read the story differently, if my hypothesis that Daoxuan's *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography is partly based on the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* story is correct, and concluded that Liu Sahe was a foreigner. Daoxuan did not call Liu Xie(Sa) he a foreigner in other passages where he mentions the name of this monk (see, T no. 2106, 52: 404b15 [*Fayuan zhubin*, T no. 2122, 53: 585a26], 405b22, 417c7 [387a7], 437c4 [395c17], 439a2 [590b23]). The *Liang shu* story of Huida's discovery of the Aśoka *stūpa* in Danyang 丹陽 also says that Liu Sahe was a foreigner (*huren* 胡人). The *Mingxiang ji* and the *Gaoseng zhuan* do not say explicitly that Liu Sahe was a foreigner and appear to take it for granted that he was a Chinese with the Chinese surname Liu.

was an image and shrine of Huida worshipped by both Chinese and non-Chinese people. The image and the shrine were located in the precinct of the Anmin si 安民寺 in the city where the local government was situated.

Huida's trips to Wu and Yue regions are mentioned with a note that the details of this trip are found in the 'earlier biography' (*qian-zhuan* 前傳). It is probably safe to assume that this refers to Huida's biography in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan*. In the first year of Taiyan 太延 period (435) of the Emperor Taiwu of Northern Wei dynasty 北魏太武帝 (r. 423–452), Huida returned to the West. When he arrived at a place northeast of the Fanhe Commandery 番禾郡 in Liangzhou 涼州 region, he looked toward the valley and bowed down toward it from a distance. People did not understand the meaning of this conduct, and asked for an explanation. Huida said, 'An image of the Buddha will appear at this cliff. If the image is complete, then the world will be at peace. If something is missing, there will be disorder and people will suffer.'

Huida reached the rocky stream seven *li* to the west of the city of the Jiuquan 酒泉 district in the Suzhou 肅州 region. His bones splintered into fragments the size of Sunflower seeds. It was possible to drill holes in them (to string them together?) and these bone fragments are now placed on the hand of a clay image at an old temple in the western part of the city. There is an inscription in the temple which says 'I am not a great sage; I made wandering and teaching my profession'. Daoxuan comments on this inscription that 'the text is not detailed' (文不具矣), without making it clear whether the inscription contained only the quotation given here or other information about Huida's life was also given, though briefly.

Eighty-seven years later, at the beginning of the Zhengguang 正光 period (520–525), there was a sudden great storm and the mountain surface was split by thunder and lightening, exposing a stone image, eight *zhang* 丈 (c. 20 m) tall. The body features of this image were handsome and awesome, but the image was headless. People selected an appropriate piece of rock, made a stone mason carve a separate head and placed it on top of the body, but the head would always fall. Finally, they let the image stand without the head. In the course of the Northern Wei period Buddhism declined slowly. The appearance

of this image confirmed Huida's earlier predictions. On the first year of Northern Zhou rule (557) in a creek seven *li* to the east of the city of Liangzhou, a light appeared illuminating the darkness around it. Those who saw it all found it extraordinary.

The source of the light was the head of a Buddha image. When they placed it on the image at the cliff, the head and body matched perfectly. The image had stood without the head for over 40 years and the head and body were found over 200 *li* apart. The image was restored to its wholeness and peace reigned in the world. In the first year of Baoding 保定 period (561) a temple called Ruixiang si 瑞像寺 (Temple of Auspicious Image) was officially established at this site. A light, like the light from a lamp, floated in the sky, illuminating the area, and the sound of bells was heard. This continued for a while ceaselessly, and people had no idea where the light and sound came from. On the first year of Jiande 建德 period (572), the head of the image fell many times. Prime minister (*da zhongzai* 大冢宰)<sup>161</sup> who was also Prince of Qi went to observe this phenomenon himself. He ordered the head to be replaced securely, but the head fell at night. This was repeated dozens of times. He also employed other objects to replace the original head, but the objects always fell in the end. Later, the Zhou dynasty persecuted Buddhism and within four years a neighboring state (Qi 齊) was conquered by the Zhou. Learned people understood the predictive power of the image. Although Buddhism was persecuted (in the conquered state of Qi as well), the image was left standing as a special exception. At the beginning of the Kaihuang 開皇 period (581–600, of the new Sui dynasty) Buddhist scriptures and images were promoted again. The stone image was redecorated and the temple was honored again. In the fifth year of Daye 大業 period (611), the Emperor Yangdi 煬帝 (r. 604–618) came to the site of the image and worshiped it. Offering many gifts,

---

<sup>161</sup> Prince Xian 憲, whose biography appears in *juan* 12 of *Zhou shu* 周書 [Book of the Zhou], had been given the title of the Duke of Qi 齊王 and later became the *da zhongzai* 大冢宰. In the miracle story version, Emperor Wu, presumably of the Northern Zhou dynasty (r. 560–578), is said to have sent him to confirm the miracle.

he changed the name of the temple to Gantong si 感通寺 (Temple of Supernatural Occurrences). Copies of the stone image were made but the exact size of the image could never be determined.<sup>162</sup>

Daoxuan concludes his biography of Huida by stating that in the beginning of the Zhenguan 貞觀 period (627–649) he travelled in the west (*guanbiao* 關表 [outside of the (Hangu 函谷) gate]) and visited Huida's main shrine (*benmiao* 本廟). He saw that the drawing of the image (*tuxiang* 圖像) of Huida was worshipped daily. In Shizhou 石州, Xichou 隰州, Cizhou 慈州, Danzhou 丹州, Yanzhou 延州, Suizhou 綏州, Weizhou 威州, Lanzhou 嵐州, and others, there were drawings of Huida's image and these drawings were worshipped as 'the Master Liu's Buddha' (Liu Shifo 劉師佛). Daoxuan notes that because of these drawings many non-Chinese people overcame their barbaric nature and followed the Buddhist precepts. The biography ends with a statement that Daoxuan saw an inscription on the rock image composed by a sixth century monk Yao Daoan.<sup>163</sup>

Huida's shrine that Daoxuan visited appears to have been the shrine around the Anmin si 安民寺 (or Anren si 安人寺) in Cizhou region.<sup>164</sup> The last section of Daoxuan's collection, *Ji Shenzhou*

---

<sup>162</sup> This passage (*Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 645a23ff.) is obscure. The present tentative summary is proposed in the light of the parallel passage in the miracle story version (*Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 417c25–26/*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 387a25–26).

<sup>163</sup> The author of the *Erjiao lun* 二教論 [A Treatise on Two Teachings] now preserved in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*, T no. 2103, 52: 136–143. His biography is found in *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 628a–630b. The exact dates of the birth and death of this monk are unknown, but the biography says that he died 'during the (Northern) Zhou period (557–581)' (*Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 629b24). Kamata, *Chūgoku Bukkyōshi jiten*, 271) infers from this reference that he must have died around the second year of Daxiang 大象 period (580).

<sup>164</sup> In the story of the rock image Fanhe Commandery 番禾郡 found in Daoxuan's *Shijia fangzhi* 釋迦方志 [Account of the regions of Śākya(muni)], T no. 2088, 51: 972a–b, the sentence in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography referring to Daoxuan's travel in the west at the beginning of the Zhenguan period (貞觀初)

*sanbao gantong lu*, is devoted to the records of ‘miracle-working monks’ (*shenseng* 神僧) and the last item in this section is an extremely interesting passage on Liu Sahe.<sup>165</sup> This story contains materials that parallel some sections in Daoxuan’s *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida, but the stories are told in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage in greater detail and in such a manner that suggests that the corresponding parts of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography must have been based on this material.<sup>166</sup> The passage begins by describing the location of the Liu Sahe’s shrine (*miao* 廟), suggesting that at least some of the materials included in this passage may have come from a source intended as an explanation of the special virtues of this shrine.<sup>167</sup> The location of the shrine is described as follows.

---

is mentioned with a phrase ‘which is located in a temple in Cizhou 慈州 region’ attached to the expression ‘original shrine’ (*benmiao* 本廟). See *Shijia fangzhi*, *T* no. 2088, 51: 972b16.

<sup>165</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, *T* no. 2106, 52: 434c2–435a9. This material is also preserved in the ‘recluse’ (*qiandun* 潛遁) section of the *Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 31.516c22–517a29. Whereas the table of contents for the section on miracle-working monks in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* refers to the passage in question as ‘Shi Huida’ 釋慧達, the table of contents for the recluse section of the *Fayuan zhulin* refers to the passage containing the same material as ‘the monk Liu Sahe of the Western Jin’. A variant reading recorded in *T* no. 2122, 53: 520a18 attributes this material to the *Liang Gaoseng zhuan* 梁高僧傳, that is to Huijiao’s *Gaoseng zhuan*. This attribution is also found in the *Sibu congkan* 四部叢刊 edition of the *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 41, 486a13). This material, however, is not found in Huijiao’s work.

<sup>166</sup> Though the close relationship between these sources appears to be unmistakable, there are also some significant differences between them. I noted above that while Daoxuan calls Liu Su(Sa)he a foreigner of the Ji group (*jibu*) himself, the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* story sees him as a Chinese who went to the Ji group and became a saint there. Other differences between these two sources will be commented upon briefly below.

<sup>167</sup> It is also possible that some of the materials in this passage may come from the *biezhuan* 別傳 (a separate and independent biography) mentioned at the beginning of Daoxuan’s biography (644c21).

The shrine existed to the west of the Anren si, which was located in the outside section of the city of Cizhou. The village where the temple and shrine were found was originally called the Wencheng Commandery, and was located in a high plateau not very far to the southeast of the city of Cizhou. These details closely parallel the corresponding passage at the beginning section of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* with the single exception that the name of the temple is given here as the Anren si, and not as the Anmin si as in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* account. There is, however, little doubt that the two names refer to the same temple.

At this point the name of Liu Sahe is mentioned again, specifying that Liu was his surname and Sahe his personal name. His shrine there is said to have been very impressive and beautifully decorated. A brief account of Liu Sahe's background and his experience in the netherworld is given. As a layperson there was nothing extraordinary about him. He frequently conceived the sinful thought of killing and did not honour the Buddhist teaching. Liu Sahe died because of an illness but came back to life and told the following story. He saw Avalokiteśvara in the netherworld, who said to him, 'Your sins were grave and you should be punished severely, but because you were ignorant about the gravity of these sins I will let you be revived. In Luoxia, Qicheng, Danyang, and Kuaiji there are *Aśoka stūpas*. Go there and worship the *stūpas*, and then you can escape from punishment for sins committed earlier.' Liu Sahe came back to life and changed his earlier way of life. There were no Buddhists in the area, and hearing that there were some in the outer city of Cizhou, he went there and questioned them in detail. These foreigners of the Ji group believed the story that Liu Sahe told them. A passage describing the religious celebration held in this foreign Buddhist community on the eighth day of the fourth month follows. It is then said that Liu Sahe renounced the householder's life and took the monk's name Huida. People looked up to him and respected him as if he were a buddha, and he performed many miracles. During the day he preached from a tall tower (*ta* 塔, a *stūpa*?) and at night he withdrew into a cocoon. In the morning he came out of the cocoon again. Thus, at first he did not live in a monk's residence. Thus he was called the holy man Suhe 蘇何. The word *sube* means cocoon

among the foreign Ji people. In the Buddha halls in the villages in the region there was always an image<sup>168</sup> called the ‘Teacher-of-Foreigners Buddha’ (*Hushi fo* 胡師佛).<sup>169</sup>

At the time when the passage was written there was an extremely awe-inspiring image of this Hushi fo in the Anren si. Local people frequently offered flowers and incense to this image, and every year during the new year’s celebration it was taken around neighboring villages on a carriage. It decided where to go by itself without any help from men. If the image wished to go to a certain village, two people could lift it. The wrinkles on the image’s forehead (*ewen* 額紋) disappeared and the face looked happy and friendly. This would mean that only a few people would die in that village during the coming year. If the image did not wish to go to a certain village, ten people could not move it. Deep wrinkles would form on the forehead of the image and the face would look gloomy and miserable. Then disastrous catastrophes always occurred in that village during the coming year. Thus, local people had always relied on the image to foretell the future. Local people also believed that Avalokiteśvara had comedown among the people, temporarily incarnated as the monk Huida, and that was why his name was called ‘Huida’ 慧達, a phrase which may be read as ‘wisdom reaches’ or as ‘compassion reaches’, with a common variant writing for ‘hui’ 惠 using the character meaning compassion.<sup>170</sup> There is a one *juan* scripture, describing this

---

<sup>168</sup> *Xiang* 像 (*Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 434c20/*Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 517a11). This ‘image’ is called *tuxiang* 圖像 (drawing) in Daoxuan’s biography (see *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 645a27).

<sup>169</sup> The meaning of this phrase is somewhat obscure. I took it to mean the saint who achieved Buddhahood and taught among foreigners. The phrase may also mean ‘Foreign Master Buddha’, that is, the foreign saint who achieved Buddhahood, or ‘Master Hu Buddha’, the master called Hu who has achieved the Buddhahood.

<sup>170</sup> The name is written with the character that means compassion in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version (T no. 2106, 52: 434c26) printed in the Taishō volume 52, with a note that the character wisdom is used in Song, Yuan, and Ming editions. In the Taishō edition of the *Fayuan zbulin*, the character wisdom appears.

act on the part of Avalokiteśvara, and it is popular among the local people. It is written in a foreign language. But it is written simply, so that anyone who reads it can understand it without any other help.

Daoxuan at this point introduces an autobiographical comment saying that he has heard the scripture recited himself. He says further that two years earlier (*wang ernian* 往二年) he travelled around the area extensively and investigated the cult of Huida there exhaustively.<sup>171</sup> In the eight regions of Cizhou 慈州, Xizhou 隰州, Lanzhou 嵐州, Shizhou 石州, Danzhou 丹州, Yanzhou 延州, Suizhou 綏州, Yinzhou 銀州, on both the eastern and western sides of the Yellow river, everyone worships this form of Avalokiteśvara as Huida and performs the rites described in that scripture. At the time when this record was written there was in every field in this area a earthen mound *stūpa* (*tuta* 土塔) with a cedar stick (*baicha* 柏剎) planted on top of it. A Cocoon of silkworm is attached to this cedar stick, to symbolize the place where Huida lived.

After spreading the Buddhist teaching in his place of birth, Liu Sahe travelled eastward to Danyang. After worshiping several *stūpas* there, he then went westward to the Fanhe (Commandery) in the Liangzhou region and, worshiping a mountain across the valley, brought an image out (on the surface of the mountain). Liu Sahe then went to the desert (*shali* 沙磧) to the west of the town of Jiuquan in the Suzhou 肅州 region and died there. His bones were small and fine, and looked like sunflower seeds. Each small piece had a hole in the middle and could be threaded through with a string. Even at the time this record was written local people who suffered from illnesses and other troubles went to the desert and looked for these small pieces of bones. If a person found a piece, his difficulty would disappear; if he did not, even the good fortunes that he possessed were lost. Once a man looked for a piece of Huida's bones and found nothing. He then stole a fragment from the image of Avalokiteśvara on the east side of the temple (where Liu Sahe's tomb was located and the bones were kept on the hand of an image?).

---

<sup>171</sup> This autobiographical comment in *T* no. 2106, 52: 434c27–28 is eliminated in the *Fayuan zhubin* version.

When night came the piece he had stolen disappeared. When he went back to the temple in the morning he found that the piece he had stolen had gone back to the image's hand.

Local people honored the image and the bone pieces even more greatly because of this incident.

In this story Liu Sahe is described an ordinary Chinese person, who after the experience of receiving instruction in hell, went to a foreign community seeking instruction in Buddhism and became a legendary religious figure there. Aside from Avalokiteśvara's instruction in hell, given herein a form very similar to that in the *Liang shu* version of Liu Sahe's experience, and a passing comment later that Liu Sahe went to Danyang to worship *stūpas*, there is no other reference to the *stūpas* and images built by Aśoka in this story. The other references to Avalokiteśvara here appear in very different contexts. The first reference identifies Huida with Avalokiteśvara, and the second makes the image of Avalokiteśvara the guardian of Liu Sahe/Huida's bone fragments, perhaps again hinting that Liu Sahe/Huida was an incarnation of Avalokiteśvara.

The frequent references to local practices and legends in this material are particularly noteworthy. We have noted earlier that Daoxuan in his *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida states that he visited the main shrine of Huida on his trip at the beginning of the Zhenguan period. In the Huida passage in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* Daoxuan again states that he visited the area himself two years earlier. These two passages must refer to the same visit.<sup>172</sup> Thus, if the phrase 'the end of the Zhenguan period' means the last year of Zhenguan period (649), and if my reading of the autobiographical comment in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* is correct, then the document was probably written around the year 651. At any rate, we may assume

---

<sup>172</sup> The reference to Cizhou region in the sentence in Daoxuan's *Shijia fangzhi* passage on Liu Sahe, which is virtually identical to the corresponding sentence in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography describing Daoxuan's visit to Liu Sahe's shrine in this trip, and the reference to Cizhou region in the initial sentence of the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage specifying the location of Liu Sahe's shrine indicate that the two passages must refer to the same incident.

that these stories about local practices and legends must have been collected on that occasion by Daoxuan himself. Repeated references to local beliefs and practices throughout the text may indicate that the compiler of the present text was an outsider who wrote the text using a variety of local sources. This compiler may well have been Daoxuan himself.

The material was then used by Daoxuan to compose his biography of Huida. Daoxuan appears to have been rather selective in using the information found in this material. He excised the story about the cocoon, which was probably based on some local foreign rite or custom. The name 'Hu Shifo' for Liu Sahe's image was changed to 'Liu Shifo' in Daoxuan's biography, perhaps to emphasize the point that the subject of this image was Liu Su(Sa)he. The miracle story about the image in the Huida shrine and another about Huida's bone pieces as well as the description of the celebration on the eighth day of the fourth month were also not included in the biography. The biography, by contrast, contains the material on the inscription on Huida at the temple in the Jiuquan district which is not mentioned in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* material. As I noted earlier, while Liu Sahe is treated as a Chinese who became a saint among the Chi foreigners in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* treats him as a foreigner himself.

It was noted above that Daoxuan at the end of his *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography mentions an inscription on the image by Yao Daoan.<sup>173</sup> This explicit reference suggests that Daoxuan was familiar with the text of this inscription and that the substance of Daoxuan's story about the rock image in the Liangzhou region was based on this inscription. In addition to the material summarized above, Daoxuan's miracle story collection, *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, also contains a story of the image that appeared from the mountain in Liangzhou.<sup>174</sup> This story parallels closely the story of the same image

---

<sup>173</sup> On the basis of the parallel comment in Daoxuan's miracle story about the rock image in Liangzhou, I interpreted this comment as referring to the rock image and not the image called the 'Master Liu Buddha', which is the subject mentioned immediately before the comment on Daoan's inscription.

in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huida and mentions also the inscription by Daoan.<sup>175</sup> This explicit reference to the inscription again suggests that the miracle story of the rock image in Liangzhou in this collection was also based on Daoan's inscription. Perhaps the parallel accounts of the rock image in Liangzhou in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the Ji shenzhousanbao gantong lu miracle story were both directly based on Daoan's inscription. One interesting fact about the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version of this story is that only the name Liu Sahe is mentioned. In one place where the text mentions the name Liu Sahe explicitly<sup>176</sup> the corresponding passage in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* changes the name to Huida<sup>177</sup>. This fact seems to strengthen our suspicion mentioned earlier that the miracle stories were originally known as stories of layman Liu Sahe.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 417c7–26. The name Liu Sahe is given here as Liu Sahe 劉薩訶 with a variant reading Liu Sahe 劉薩何 in the Yuan and Ming editions. This same passage is also found in the *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 13.387a6–26. Here the edition adopted for the Taishō collection gives the name as Liu Sahe 劉薩何, but the variant reading Liu Sahe 劉薩訶 is found in the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions. Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji* also contains a passage summarizing the story of the rock image in Liangzhou (T no. 2103, 52: 202c). In this passage the Taishō edition gives the name as Liu Sahe with a variant reading Liu Sahe 劉薩訶. The story of the rock image in the Fanhe Commandery is also found in another work by Daoxuan, *Shijia fangzhi*, which was composed in the year 650. The passage (T no. 2088, 51: 972abc) parallels the account in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* and also contains the brief description of Daoxuan's death, a reference to an inscription at a temple, and the story of 'Master Liu's Buddha' worshipped in Shizhou 石州, Xizhou 隰州, Cizhou 慈州, Danzhou 丹州, Yanzhou 延州, Suizhou 綏州, Yinzhou 銀州. These items, again given in virtually the same words as in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* are then followed by a miracle story of Sun Jingde 孫敬德 (of 6th c.) and his image of Avalokiteśvara. The name Liu Sahe is given here as Liu Sahe 劉薩何.

<sup>175</sup> 'Details are found in Daoan's inscription' (*Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 417c22–23/*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 387a22–23).

<sup>176</sup> *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T no. 2106, 52: 417c10: *He yue* 訶曰。

<sup>177</sup> *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 645a2: *Da yue* 達曰。

In Daoxuan's autobiographical account of his own encounter with supernatural beings, *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu*, Daoxuan had asked when the rock image that appeared from the mountain was originally made.<sup>179</sup> He was then told the following story. During the time of Kāśyapa Buddha, there was a bodhisattva called Libin 利寶 (d.u.), who saw that the people who lived in this mountain did not believe in the teaching of karmic retributions and made their living by killing living beings. At that time there were several tens of thou-

---

<sup>178</sup> Both the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, as collections of monks' biographies, had an obvious reason to use the monk's name Huida; the miracle story collection *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* did not have any reason to prefer either the monk's name or the layman's name. The use of the layman's name Liu Sahe in the miracle story version thus suggests that this version may have preserved the usage of the original Daoan's inscription more faithfully. The date of Daoxuan's trip mentioned in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography is 'at the beginning of the Zhenguan period (627–649)'. Since both *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* and *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* were written by the same author, Daoxuan, who probably collected a copy of Daoan's inscription during this trip, the dates of the miracle collection (completed in 664) and of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* (first draft, which may or may not have contained Huida's biography, was produced in 645) are not particularly relevant in the present context.

The miracle story also states at the beginning that Liu Sahe went to worship the Maoxian *stūpa* in the area south of the Changjiang river and then excavated the relics distributed by King Aśoka in Jinling 金陵 (i.e., Jiankang/Danyang). The order of Liu Sahe/Huida's travel is here thus reversed from that of Huijiao's account in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. It may be significant that Daoxuan begins his miracle story collection, *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, with the story of the Maoxian *stūpa* followed immediately by that of the Changan *si stūpa*. Another tradition may have existed by Daoxuan's time concerning Liu Sahe's itinerary on his visit to the Aśoka *stūpas*.

<sup>179</sup> *T* no. 2107, 52: 437b13–c5. The name Liu Sahe is given in this passage as Liu Sahe 劉薩何. In the *Lüxiang gantong lu*, this passage is found in *T* no. 1898, 45: 876c5–27, using the name Liu Sahe 劉薩訶. In the *Fayuan zbulin* the same passage is found in *T* no. 2122, 53: 395b26–c19. The Taishō edition gives the name as Liu Sahe 劉薩何 with a variant reading Liu Sahe 劉薩訶.

sands of households there, but none of them honored the Buddhist teaching. The bodhisattva Libin tried to bring salvation to them, and built a large temple. The god Brahma himself made the image for this temple. After the temple was completed bodhisattva Libin used his supernatural power and transformed this image into the Buddha himself, who travelled around teaching people. Yet the people still did not accept the Buddhist teaching. Thereupon, bodhisattva Libin held a large rock and threatened to drop it on people if they did not accept the teaching. People then were converted and worshipped the Buddha. All their instruments used for killing turned into lotus flowers. Bodhisattva Libin also ordered the people to build seven temples, covering the mountain and surrounding valleys with monks' residences and Buddha halls. The temple buildings were completed after thirteen years and 20,000 people renounced the householder's life to become monks and nuns who lived in these temples. After 300 years these people accumulated powerful good karma. The effects of the past evil karma took effect only lightly in their lives and after death they did not go to hell.

The creatures who had been harmed by them earlier lived in inferior realms of existence and made an evil vow, saying that they must take revenge on those who had harmed them earlier before those people achieved salvation. They spat fire, burning down the temple buildings that the residents of the mountain built as well as their villages, and killed all the survivors from this fire with a flood.

At that time the god of this mountain took the image out of the temple before the temple was destroyed and held it in space. After the temple was destroyed, the mountain god placed the image inside a rock cave and worshipped it there. After a very long period the cave disappeared.

As for Liu Sahe, the man who brought the image back to light by worshipping the mountain, he was the bodhisattva Libin in his earlier life.

The passage ends by noting that there is another story, not told here, that explains why the head and body were discovered apart from each other. As we noted earlier in commenting on the reference to the Maoxian *stūpa*, the stories in Daoxuan's *Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu* are of particular interest to us because these stories show

that Daoxuan was passionately interested in these miracle stories and illustrate how new legends were added to relatively well-known story cycles.

Both in Daoxuan's description of the Liangzhou rock image in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and in his newly introduced legendary account of its origin, there is no reference to King Aśoka and the legends concerning his *stūpas* and images. As we have seen above in examining the miracle stories Daoxuan collected concerning the Aśoka *stūpas* and images mentioned in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. Daoxuan was very well informed about the connection between Liu Sahe and Aśoka *stūpas* and miracles. But his *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography is written on the basis of materials that hardly mention this connection. Perhaps by the time of Daoxuan, the stories about Liu Sahe/Huida had spread more widely, going beyond the narrower circle of miracle stories associated with the Aśoka *stūpas* and images in the South, and they now included new stories that were set in different geographical contexts with little connection to Aśoka *stūpas* and images. This new situation may explain the fact that Daoxuan's biography consists primarily of stories about images and miracles in Northern China and the Northwestern frontier region that do not mention the Aśoka legend.

Daoxuan's reference to the circumstances of Huida's death gives his biography a more complete form—earlier accounts in the *Mingxiang ji* and *Gaoseng zhuan* both ended with a note saying that these circumstances were unknown. We must, however, also note that Daoxuan's account of Huida's death is itself a story of a minor miracle, describing the splitting of his bones into small fragments that could be threaded together. In the parallel account in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, the miraculous character of Huida's bone fragments is described in greater detail. Daoxuan in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography mentions a brief inscription that existed in the temple where Huida's bone fragments were kept. This inscription is mentioned right after the account of Huida's death, giving the impression to the reader that it was in fact Huida's *stūpa* inscription. The account of Huida's death in Daoxuan's *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the paralleling passage in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* may have been based on this inscription.

I believe, however, that this inscription was probably not the *stūpa* inscription for Huida. The story of Huida's bones told in different ways in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage reads more like another example of a miracle story associated with a specially venerated image. It explains where the fragments of bones that are found on the hand of the image came from and why they were believed to have supernatural powers. Aside from the fact that the inscription describes Huida very generally as a wandering monk, there is little in this miracle story that compels us to believe that its subject must have been the Liu Sahe/Huida whose biographical tradition we have been studying. Perhaps the story was another example of the miracle story associated with the widely-known Liu Sahe, and because the miracle was connected with Liu Sahe's own relics, the location of the image was said to be the site of Liu Sahe's death and an inscription possibly in the style of a *stūpa* inscription came into being. If this interpretation is correct, then we have here an example in which an essential feature of a biography developed in the form of a miracle story.

The biographies of Huida are of particular interest to us since a good deal of parallel material happens to have been preserved in miracle story collections and other sources.<sup>180</sup> Daoxuan appears to

---

<sup>180</sup> Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭 (1933–2016) mentions some passages in the Dunhuang manuscripts where references to Liu Sahe appear (see Tanaka, *Tonkō Zenshū bunken no kenkyū*, 83, 87, 88, 92, 95, 641). Most notably one text titled *Liu Sahe heshang yinyuan ji* 劉薩訶和尚因緣記 is recorded in three manuscripts, P. 2680, P. 3570, P. 3727. This text is particularly interesting to us: a number of familiar stories about Liu Sahe are told here but often with major differences in details. Liu Sahe is described as a man of Dingyang 定陽 in Danzhou 丹州. The place name Dingyang is given in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography as his place of origin, but there the location is described as northeast of Xianyang 咸陽, and the location given here as Danzhou does not match this description in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography. The story of Liu Sahe's visit to hell is told here in some detail and several themes in the *Mingxiang ji* version, such as the reference to the shooting of a deer, exchanges with his uncle, and the instruction of the bodhisattva Guanshiyin, also appear here. But the differences in the stories

have been keenly interested in this figure and the miracle stories associated with him, and perhaps a good part of the surviving materials was first collected by him. At any rate, the existing parallel materials enable us to trace how a biographical tradition developed along with local traditions of miracle stories and how the two types of traditions interacted with each other. The miracle story, now preserved in the fullest form in the *Mingxiang ji*, lies behind the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. Daoxuan clearly knows and depends on the miracle stories about Aśoka *stūpas* and images in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography in his own discussion of the same *stūpas* and images in his miracle story collection, *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. Daoxuan's treatment in

---

around these themes, and the presence of other themes which have no parallel in the *Mingxiang ji* version, indicate that this account must have been based on a different tradition from that of the *Mingxiang ji*. The account of Liu Sahe's activities after returning to life also includes a few familiar stories but it also refers to some events that are not mentioned in the earlier sources we have reviewed in this paper. There is a reference to Liu Sahe's image ('the image of the monk'), but the story is told somewhat differently here: it is said that the image could be lifted by one or two people if they had faith, but could not be lifted by over a hundred if they did not have faith. The section on the rock image in Fanhe mentions Daoan's inscription and though the story is mentioned only briefly here, the phraseology shows similarity to the corresponding passage in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* story (*T* no. 2106, 52: 417c). The story of Liu Sahe's death is told in a manner similar to the account in the *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* passage on Liu Sahe (*T* no. 2106, 52: 435a), mentioning a *stūpa* and the miracle of relics that appear to those who seek them with sincere devotion. The text ends with a reference to Liu Sahe's prediction about the Mogao caves 莫高窟 in Dunhuang. Since the Mogao caves are found near Jiuquan 酒泉 and the caves contained the library which included these three manuscripts discovered later, this brief reference appears to suggest that the Liu Sahe heshang yinyuan ji story may represent a local tradition that has been transmitted in some site(s) in this areas particularly closely associated with Liu Sahe. Finally, it is notable that in this text only the name Liu Sahe is used, though the name is used explicitly as the name of a monk (*heshang* 和尚). The name Huida does not appear at all.

this miracle story collection as well as other parallel sources indicates that the stories of miracles associated with these *stūpas* and images developed as local traditions at their respective sites. Finally, in Daoxuan's *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography, we saw how other miracle stories from entirely different regions were incorporated into the tradition of Huida's biography. We also saw in connection with the Aśoka *stūpas* in the Changgan si and the Maoxian district as well as the rock image in the Liangzhou region how Daoxuan himself attempted to introduce new legends through an account of his own miraculous experiences.

Two rather different types of miracle stories appear to have contributed to the development of the biographical tradition of Liu Sahe/Huida. As we have noted earlier, the *Mingxiang ji* story belongs to a recognizable type of medieval Chinese kanna story. The miracle stories that constitute the substance of both the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* on the other hand were stories about specific objects, *stūpas* and images. These stories enhance the sanctity of the object in question by explaining its ancient and extraordinary origin and also by recording the miracles that occurred around the object in the past. The most natural context for the development and preservation of these stories would have been the actual sites of these objects. Unlike the karma stories, these stories about specific objects do not teach any specific religious doctrine. At the present moment I am not prepared to enter into the difficult question of the relationship between these two different types of miracle stories as sources of Chinese Buddhist biographies. Perhaps the references to ghosts and hell in the karma story have some symbolic connection to the fact that the Aśoka *stūpas* and images that are the centerpiece of that other group of miracle stories were said to have been made by this king miraculously in one day and one night using supernatural beings (*guishen* 鬼神 [ghosts and gods]). It may be significant that in the case of Liu Sahe/Huida's biography, the oldest existing material is a karma story, and with its broader range the other type of miracle stories appears to have developed later.

Huida's biographies raise many as yet unanswerable questions. If a fictitious biography of this monk developed in connection with one sentence describing Avalokiteśvara's instruction in the miracle story,

as our analysis seems to suggest, was this process a unique development? Where did this sentence in the karma story come from? Was the story of Aśoka *stūpas* and images well-known in South China before the stories about Liu Sahe/Huida developed? Or did the story about Liu Sahe/Huida develop initially as an aspect of the Aśoka *stūpa* and image legends? What are the broader social and cultural developments that lie behind the expanding geography of Liu Sahe/Huida's biography? Huida is described as a wandering monk ('pilgrim?'). Can this analysis of Liu Sahe/Huida's biography shed any light on the stories and biographies of other wandering monks?

The analysis of two concrete examples of Yuanguai and Huida indicates that though the form of monk's biographies may have been determined by the form of *stūpa* inscriptions, these biographies often developed over time by incorporating miracle stories. In the case of Yuanguai the appeal of miracle stories was such that compiler of his standard biography chose to base his biographies on miracle story inscriptions rather than on *stūpa* inscriptions. We may note further that the miracle story in question here belongs to a now familiar type: a story of a miracle associated with specific object and location. In the other case of Huida, a miracle story teaching the lesson of karmic retributions provided the framework around which miracle stories of a different type, stories about specific objects such as *stūpas* and images, could be collected to constitute a biography. Furthermore, we also noted in this case that the miracle stories and biographies developed side by side over a long period of time and that each of these developing traditions drew freely from the other. Perhaps the two examples examined here constitute rather exceptional cases. But it would probably be safe to assume that miracle stories affected the development of biographies in a similar, but less extreme manner in a very large number of cases. Miracle stories were an important dynamic force in the development of Chinese Buddhist biographies.

### Concluding Remarks

The discussion in this paper began with an observation concerning the richness of Chinese biographies of Buddhist monks. I suggested

that a study of sources for these biographies might contribute to the discussion of the reason why Chinese Buddhism produced this large body of biographical literature. As a modest contribution to this discussion I examined in this paper two examples of these sources. I indicated that the well-established Chinese convention of erecting tomb inscriptions appears to have stimulated the production of *stūpa* inscriptions and that this material constituted one, and perhaps the most important, source for the compilation of biographies of Buddhist monks. I have also shown that *stūpa* inscriptions could not have been the only source of these biographies, and in examining one other important source, miracle stories, I called attention to the fact that miracle stories may have constituted an important dynamic force in the development of Chinese Buddhist biographies. It may be appropriate to conclude this discussion by calling attention again to the tentative character of my discussion. I am interested in certain general characteristics of Chinese Buddhist biographies. I have proposed a number of hypothetical generalizations, and I must stress the speculative nature of these generalizations. I believe, nevertheless, that an enterprise of this nature is necessary. Specific studies of individual biographies that have been done to date need to be interpreted and evaluated within a broader framework which treats the study of monks' biographies as a distinctive form of Chinese religious literature and an important religious phenomenon in its own right. I will conclude my preliminary discussion by mentioning a few possible directions of further investigation.

At different points in my discussion of *stūpa* inscriptions as an important source of Chinese Buddhist biographies I pointed out different directions in which further and more systematic analysis of this material may proceed. The investigation of *stūpa* inscriptions should be conducted within a broader context of a discussion of traditional Chinese tomb inscriptions in general. It also requires a fuller exposition and analysis of the nature of lay Buddhist religiosity among the literate elites of traditional Chinese society. A fuller analysis of the social and political situation of these elites and the content of the *stūpa* inscriptions might shed important light on the nature of Chinese Buddhist biographies in general.<sup>181</sup> An analysis of the symbolic dynamics of *stūpa* inscriptions, perhaps in the form of a detailed and

in-depth study of the often difficult rhetorical passages, may lead to a more substantial analysis of the complex relationship between the basic orientation of *stūpa* inscriptions and that of biographical collections compiled by monks.<sup>182</sup>

The analysis in this paper points to the importance of miracle stories as a dynamic force in the development of Chinese Buddhist biographies. This analysis needs to be supplemented by a fuller discussion of the nature of Chinese Buddhist miracle stories. We need to investigate, for example, how these stories developed, and how they were recorded and disseminated—perhaps these miracles were preserved in relation to specific locations where stone inscriptions were later established. The analysis of miracle stories thus may have to be based on an examination of temple records and other sources on local legends.

The relationship between biographies and miracle stories needs to be examined in greater detail using extensive biographical materials that developed around a large number of important Buddhist figures.<sup>183</sup> Our analysis indicated that the historical segment of *stūpa* inscriptions tended to be copied with only minor revision into biog-

---

<sup>181</sup> In fact, we need to investigate the social and political context of the entire process through which Chinese Buddhist biographies came into being. The example of secular biographies indicates that the writing of biographies and compiling official biographical collections was a highly political act. The composition, development, and preservation of monks' biographies similarly must have reflected specific social and political contexts. A study of this material therefore would not be complete without an adequate discussion of this relationship. For a very insightful analysis of a biography of monks that takes account of the local social-political context, see Yanagida Seizan's 柳田聖山 (1922–2006) biography of Linji Yixuan 臨濟義玄 (d. 866): Yanagida, 'The Life of Lin-chi I-hsuan'.

<sup>182</sup> My study of Bai Juyi tomb inscriptions mentioned earlier is a modest and limited attempt to place the analysis of *stūpa* inscription within a broader framework and examine its symbolic dynamics from the viewpoint proposed here.

<sup>183</sup> Albert Welter ('The Contextual Study of Chinese Buddhist Biographies,' 247–268) analyzes such materials that developed around Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (905–976).

ographies in standard collections. Typical information recorded in *stūpa* inscriptions may have been a rather static element in the biographical tradition. This hypothesis again needs to be examined in more detail using examples of multiple biographies on the same subjects.<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup> After I completed this paper, I learned from my colleague Dr. Jan Yunhua 冉雲華 that Prof. Jao Tsung-yi (Rao Zongyi) 饒宗頤 (1917–2018) of Hong Kong Chinese University had presented a paper on Liu Sahe at the International Conference on Dunhuang Grottoes in the fall of 1987. See Jao, ‘Liu Sahe shiji yu Ruixiang tu.’ The summary contains a number of points that are relevant to my discussion; Professor Jao refers to the ‘East Pagoda Yard’ (Dongta yuan 東塔院) in the Aśoka Guangli Temple 阿育王廣利寺 in Ningbo 寧波 which is said to have been the place where the relic that Liu Sahe worship appeared (*Ningbo fuzhi* 寧波府志, *juan* 33) (Jao, ‘Liu Sahe shiji yu Ruixiang tu’, 36ff, 52); Prof. Jao also comments on the possible relationship between the painting describing Liu Sahe’s miracles in Wu and Yue area in the Dunhuang cave no. 323 and the paintings by Zhang Yao 張繇 (d.u.), a native of Wu mentioned in *Liang shu* 54.793. I look forward to the publication of a fuller version of Prof. Jao’s article.

## Appendix I

### A. Existing inscriptions and similar materials on which the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biographies are directly based:

1. Taoyin 道因 (587–658) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 716c)  
Li Yan 李儼 (of 7th c.), ‘Yizhou Duobao si Daoyin fashi beiwen bing xu’ 益州多寶寺道因法師碑文並序 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 201). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiwen*.
2. Shanwuwei 善無畏 (637–735) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 714b)  
Li Hua 李華 (715–766), ‘Dongtu Shengshan si Wuwei sanzang bei’ 東土聖善寺無畏三藏碑 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 319). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *bei*.
3. Zhen Fashi 真法師 (?–749) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 890c)  
Wang Sui 王繼 (?–819), ‘Da Tang Kuaiji jun Yuyao xian Hua[]<sup>185</sup> sizhu Zhen fashi xingye zan bing xu’ 大唐會稽郡餘姚縣化口寺主真法師行業讚並序 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 363). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *zan bing xu*.
4. Fa Qin 法欽 (714–792) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 764b)  
Li Jifu 李吉甫 (758–814), ‘Hangzhou Jingshan si Dajue chanshi beiming’ 杭州徑山寺大覺禪師碑銘 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 512). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiming*.

---

<sup>185</sup> *Song Gaoseng zhuan* biographical note of Master Zhen is appended to Hui-ri’s 慧日 (680–748) biography. This biographical note mentions Xiuguang si 休光寺 as the monastery Zhen used to head. On the basis of this, the garbled name of his temple in the current edition of his *stūpa* epitaph can be reconstructed as Xiuguang si, assuming that *hua* 化 was an error for *xiu* 休 given their similarity in form.

5. Shangheng 上恆 (740–816) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 806c)  
Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846), ‘Tang Fuzhou Jingyun si gu lü dade Shanghong heshang shita beiming bing xu’ 唐撫州景雲寺故律大德上宏和尚石塔碑銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 678). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *shita beiming bing xu*.
6. Sengcou 僧湊 (d.u.) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 807a-b)  
Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846), ‘Tang Jiangzhou Xingguo si lü dade Cougong ta jieming bing xu’ 唐江州興果寺律大德湊公塔碣銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 678). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *ta beiming bing xu*.
7. Daguang 大光 (?–805) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 866a-c)  
Li Shen 李紳 (772–846), ‘Mozhao Chijing dade Shenyi beiming’ 墨詔持經大德神異碑銘 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 694). The inscription is mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiming*.
8. Qi’an 齊安 (?–842) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 776b)  
Lu Jianqiu 盧簡求 (788–864), ‘Hangzhou Yanguan xian Haichang yuan chanmen dashi tabei’ 杭州鹽官縣海昌院禪門大師塔碑 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 733). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *tabei*.
9. Zongmi 宗密 (780–841) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 741c)  
Pei Xiu 裴休 (791–864), ‘Guifeng chanshi beiming bing xu’ 圭峰禪師碑銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 743). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiming bing xu*.
10. Duanfu 端甫 (770–836) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 741a)  
Pei Xiu 裴休 (791–864), ‘Tang gu Zuojie senglu neigongfeng sanjiao tanlun yinjia dade Anguo si shangzuo cizi fangpao dada fashi Yuanmi [=Xuanmi 玄秘] ta beiming bing xu’ 唐故左街僧錄內供奉三教談論引駕大德安國寺上座賜紫方袍大達法師元秘塔碑銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen, juan* 743). The inscription is mentioned in the biography. Category: *ta beiming bing xu*

11. Zanghuan 藏奘 (790–866) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 778c)  
Cui Qi 崔琪 (d.u.), ‘Xinjing dashi bei’ 心鏡大師碑 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 804). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *bei*.
  
12. Yicun 義存 (822–908) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 781c)  
Huang Tao 黃滔 (840–911), ‘Fuzhou Xuefeng shan gu Zhenjue dashi beiming’ 福州雪峰山故真覺大師碑銘 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 826). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiming*.
  
13. Chujin 楚金 (698–759) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 864c)  
Feixi 飛錫 (?–765+), ‘Chujin chanshi bei’ 楚金禪師碑 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 916). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *bei*.  
Ref. Cen Xun 岑勛 (d.u.), ‘Da Tang Xijing Qianfu si Duobao Fota ganying beiwen’ 大唐西京千福寺多寶佛塔感應碑文 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 379).
  
14. Daoguang 道光 (682–760) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 797a)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Tang Hangzhou Huayan si da lüshi taming bing xu’ 唐杭州華嚴寺大律師塔銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 917). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *taming bing xu*.
  
15. Shenwu 神悟 (689–751) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 814a)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Tang Shiyi shan gu da chanshi taming bing xu’ 唐石埭山故大禪師塔銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 917). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *taming bing xu*.
  
16. Qihan 齊翰 (708–775) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 799c)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Tang Suzhou Dong Wuqiu si lüshi taming bing xu’ 唐蘇州東武邱寺律師塔銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 918). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *taming bing xu*.

17. Fashen 法詵 (718–778) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 736a)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Tang Hangzhou Lingyin shan Tianzhu si dade Shen fashi taming bing xu’ 唐杭州靈隱山天竺寺大德詵法師塔銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 918). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *taming bing xu*.
18. Bianxiu 辯秀 (714–780) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 800c)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Tang Suzhou Kaiyuan si lü heshang fenmin bing xu’ 唐蘇州開元寺律和尚墳銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 918). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *taming bing xu*.
19. Daozun 道遵 (714–784) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 879a)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Suzhou Zhixing shan Bao’en si da heshang bei’ 蘇州支硎山報恩寺大和尚碑 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 918). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *bei*.
20. Shenhao 神皓 (717–791) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 802c)  
Qingzhou 清晝 (i.e., Jiaoran 皎然 [720?–800?]), ‘Tang Dongting shan Fuyuan si lü heshang fen taming bing xu’ 唐洞庭山福願寺律和尚墳塔銘並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 918). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *fen taming bing xu*.
21. Zhenshu 甄叔 (?–820) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 770b)  
Zhixian 至賢 (?–820+), ‘Yangqi shan Zhenshu dashi bei ming’ 楊岐山甄叔大師碑銘 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 919). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiming*.

## B. Inscriptions about buildings:

1. Xuanyan 玄儼 (675–742) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 795a)  
Wan Qirong 萬齊融 (d.u.), ‘Fahua si jietan yuan bei’ 法華寺戒壇院碑 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 335). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *bei* for a building.

2. Weikuan 惟寬 (*T* no. 2061, 50: 768ab)  
Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846), ‘Xijing Xingshan si chuanfa tang beiming’ 西京興善寺傳法堂碑並序 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 678). The inscription not mentioned in the biography. Category: *beiming* for a building.
3. Yuangui 元珪 (644–716) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 828b)  
Xu Chou 許籌 (d.u.), ‘Songyue Gui chanshi yingtang ji’ 嵩嶽珪禪師影堂記 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 790). The inscription mentioned in the biography. Category: *yingtang ji*, a record for a building. May not have been an inscription.

C. A biography in a similar style but not an inscription:

1. Jiaoran 皎然 (i.e., Qingzhou 淸晝 [720?–800?]) (*T* no. 2061, 50: 891c)  
Fulin 福琳 (703–784), ‘Tang Huzhou Chushan Jiaoran zhuan’ 唐湖州杼山皎然傳 (*Quan Tang wen*, *juan* 919).  
This source not mentioned in the biography. Category: *zhuan*. This biography comes from the collected works of Qingzhou (*Jiaoran ji*) and most probably not an inscription.

## Appendix II

Parallels between the *Gaoseng zhuan* and miracle story collections (The number after a miracle collection refers to the story's location in Lu Xun, *Gu xiaoshuo gouchen*, unless noted otherwise).

### Translators Section:

Shemoteng 攝摩騰 (?–73)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 322c–323a

*Mingxiang ji*: 375/565 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 12.379b)

Relationship between the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Mingxiang ji* unclear.

Zhu Falan 竺法蘭 (?–67+)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 323a

*Youming lu*: 277/433f.

The *Gaoseng zhuan* parallel is found in 323a19–23.

An Qing 安清 (a.k.a. An Shigao 安世高 [active 148–170])

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 323a–324b

*Youming lu*: 274/430f. (*Taiping guangji* 295.2346–2347)

The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography in T no. 2145, 55: 95abc. The *Youming lu* story parallels Chu sanzang jiji, T no. 2145, 55: 95a28–c15; *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 323b14–323c29.

Kang Senghui 康僧會 (?–280)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 325a–326b

*Xuanyan ji* 367/554–6

The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography in T no. 2145, 55: 96a–97a. The *Xuanyan ji* stories parallel *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 325b14–c5; 326a17; *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T no. 2145, 55: 96b13–29, 96c21–a9.

Zhu Tanmoluocha 竺曇摩羅剎 (Zhu Fahu 竺法護 [239–316]) (III)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 326c–327a

*Mingxiang ji*: 576f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 63.764c–765a)

The *Mingxiang ji* fragment forms a part of the story about Yu Falan. The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography parallels the account of the fragment closely, *T* no. 2059, 50: 326c16–22. The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography in *T* no. 2145, 55: 97c–98b. Not marked in Makita's list (*Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*).

Tan Wujie 曇無竭 (Dharmōdgata; Fayong 法勇 [?–420+]) (III)  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 338b–339c  
*Mingxiang ji*: 424/614 (*Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 65.786a)  
 The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based on *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography, *T* no. 2145, 55: 113c–114a.

Qiunabamo 求那跋摩 (Guṇavarman; 367–431) (III)  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 340a–342b  
*Mingxiang ji*: 416/606f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 42.616c–617a)  
 The outline of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is based on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography, *T* no. 2145, 55: 104a-c.

#### Exegetes Section:

Zhu Shixing 朱士行 (203–282) (II)  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 346a–b  
*Mingxiang ji*: 376/566 (*Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 28.491a–b)  
 The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography based on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* biography, *T* no. 2145, 55: 97a–b.

Kang Falang 康法朗 (of the Jin dynasty) (II)  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 347ab  
*Mingxiang ji*: 385/575 (*Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 96.988a)

Zhi Daolin 支道林 (314–366) (III)  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 348b–349c  
*Mingxiang ji*: 402/592 (*Fayuan zhulin*, *T* no. 2122, 53: 72.833c)

Yu Falan 于法蘭 (of the Jin dynasty) (II)  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *T* no. 2059, 50: 349c–350a

*Mingxiang ji*: (384?)/576f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 63.764c–765a)

Mismarked in Makita's list. Makita's list gives the page number 384 for *Mingxiang ji* for 'Yu Fakai' 于法開 (of Eastern Jin dynasty; Yu Falan's disciple) that appears in the next line. There is no material on Yu Fakai in the existing *Mingxiang ji* fragments.

Ref., *Taiping guangji*, juan 87.

Just a reference to the monk in another place in the *Mingxiang ji*, 574 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 28.492a).

Zhu Fayi 竺法義 (307–380) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 350c–351a

*Mingxiang ji*: *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 17.409 (398/588f.)

*Guanshiyin yingyan ji*: Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 18 (no. 7)

The *Mingseng zhuan* biography is in *Meisō denshō*, ZZ 2B:7, 7d. The *Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 988b, gives a quote from the *Shuyi ji*.

Lu Xun tentatively reconstructed the *Mingxiang ji* story from the two *Fayuan zhulin* passages. Makita identified the second *Fayuan zhulin* quote in the *Guanshiyin yingyan ji*, Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 18 and showed that the reference to the *Shuyi ji* in the *Fayuan zhulin* and later in the *Taiping guangji* that accompany this quote was in fact a mistake. This may indicate that the passage in the *Fayuan zhulin*, juan 17, reproduces the *Mingxiang ji* story as the attribution there indicates.

Zhu Senglang 竺僧朗 (325?–410?) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 354b

*Mingxiang ji*: 402/592f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 19.428bc)

Mismarked in Makita's list which gives the page number 402 for Zhu Fatai 竺法汰 (320–387) that appears in the next line; there is no material on Zhu Fatai in the *Mingxiang ji*.

Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416) (III)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 357c–361b

*Mingxiang ji*: ?/576 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 63.764c)

The parallel passage is found in *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 358a23–28. This parallel is not marked in Makita's list.

Fa'an 法安 (?405+) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 362bc

*Mingxiang ji*: 412/602 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 19.428c)

Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416) (III)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 367b–368b

*Mingxiang ji*: 452/642f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 18.418c)

Huiyi 慧義 (372–444)

*Gaoseng zhuan*: T no. 2059, 50: 368c–369a

*Mingxiang ji*: 416/611 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 83.901a)

No common theme between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the *Mingxiang ji* story. The two materials may not be about the same monk.

Sengbao 僧苞 (?–440?)

*Gaoseng zhuan*: T no. 2059, 50: 369b–c; *Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*:

Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 39 (no. 31)

Senghan 僧含 (?–430+)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 370bc

*Mingxiang ji*: 428/617f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 6.314bc)

No common theme between the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography and the *Mingxiang ji* story. The two materials may not be about the same monk.

Daowang 道汪 (?–466)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 371c–372a

*Xi Guanshiyin yingyan ji*: Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 48f. (no. 53)

The *Mingseng zhuan* biography is preserved in the *Meisō denshō*, ZZ 2B: 7, 11c.

Daowen 道溫 (398–466) (III)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 372b–373a

*Mingxiang ji*: 443/633f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 17.408c)

#### Miracle Workers Section:

Fotucheng 佛圖澄 (233–349)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 383b–387a

*Youming lu*: 378 (Taiping yulan 370.1834a)

Only a loose parallel between one passage in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (384b12) and the *Youming lu* material. The *Gaoseng zhuan* sentence (384b12) paralleling the *Youming lu* story is only a passing remark in a longer story that describes the same incident in a very different manner.

Shan Daokai 單道開 (255?–360?) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 387bc

*Mingxiang ji*: 415/605 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 27.485a)

Zhu Fotiao 竺佛調 (of Eastern Jin) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 387c–388a

*Mingxiang ji*: 383/573f (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 28.491c–492a)

Qiyu 耆域 (d.u.) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 388abc

*Mingxiang ji*: 381/571ff (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 28.491bc)

Jiantuole 撻陀勒 (d.u.) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 388c–389a

*Mingxiang ji*: 384/574 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 28.492a)

#### Self-immolators Section:

Sengqun 僧群 (?–417) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 404a

*Mingxiang ji*: 381/571 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 63.764c)

Sengyu 僧瑜 (412–455) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 405ab

*Mingxiang ji*: 434/624 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 63.770ab)

Reciters of Scriptures Section:

Faxiang 法相 (d.u.) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 406c

*Mingxiang ji*: 403/593 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 19.428c)

Zhu Fachun 竺法純 (of 5th c.) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 406c

*Mingxiang ji*: 409/599 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 17.409c)

*Guanshiyin yingyan ji*: Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 29

The *Mingseng zhuan* biography in *Meisō denshō*, ZZ 2B: 7, 12a.

Daojong 道冏 (d.u.) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 407ab

*Mingxiang ji*: 425/615 (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 17.408c–

409a); 437/627f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 65.784c–785a)

*Xu Guanshiyin yingyan ji*: Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 28 (no. 6); 52 (no.60)

The entry on this monk appears twice in the *Mingxiang ji* fragments preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin*.

Huiqing 慧/惠慶 (391–452) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*: T no. 2059, 50: 407b

*Mingxiang ji*: /622 (*Fayuan zhulin*: T no. 2122, 53: 65.785c–786a)

Not marked in Makita's list.

The *Mingseng zhuan* biography in *Meisō denshō*, ZZ 2B: 7, 12b.

Huijin 慧進 (d.u.) (I)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 407c–408a

*Mingxiang ji*: 456/646f. (*Fayuan zhulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 95.989ab)

Promoters of Meritorious Works Section:

Huida 慧達 [345–436] (III)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 409b–410a

*Mingxiang ji*: 406/596–598 (*Fayuan zbulin*, T no. 2122, 53: 86.919b–920b)

A biography also found in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 644c (33).

Senghong 僧洪 (a.k.a. Senggong 僧供; ?–416+) (II)

*Gaoseng zhuan*: T no. 2059, 50: 410c–411a

*Mingxiang ji*: 457/647f.

*Guanshiyin yingyan ji*: Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 35 (no.22)

The *Mingxiang ji* story is also found in the *Bianzheng lun* 辯正論 (T no. 2110, 52: 537c). The *Mingseng zhuan* biography in *Meisō denshō*, ZZ 2B: 7, 13d.

Bo Faqiao 帛法橋 (256–345)

*Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 413bc

*Guanshiyin yingyan ji*: Makita, *Rikuchō koitsu Kanzeon ōken ki no kenkyū*, 14f. (no. 2)