

THE JOURNAL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

*Roger Jackson*  
*Dept. of Religion*  
*Carleton College*  
*Northfield, MN 55057*  
*USA*

EDITORS

*Peter N. Gregory*  
*University of Illinois*  
*Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA*

*Alexander W. Macdonald*  
*Université de Paris X*  
*Nanterre, France*

*Steven Collins*  
*Concordia University*  
*Montréal, Canada*

*Ernst Steinkellner*  
*University of Vienna*  
*Wien, Austria*

*Jikidō Takasaki*  
*University of Tokyo*  
*Tokyo, Japan*

*Robert Thurman*  
*Columbia University*  
*New York, New York, USA*

*Volume 14*

*1991*

*Number 1*

# CONTENTS

## I. ARTICLES

1. The *Pratītyasamutpādagāthā* and Its Role in the Medieval Cult of the Relics, by *Daniel Boucher* 1
2. Notes on the Devotional Uses and Symbolic Functions of *Sūtra* Texts as Depicted in Early Chinese Buddhist Miracle Tales and Hagiographies, by *Robert F. Campany* 28
3. A Source Analysis of the *Ruijing lu* ("Records of Miraculous Scriptures"), by *Koichi Shinohara* 73
4. Pudgalavāda in Tibet? Assertions of Substantially Existent Selves in the Writings of Tsong-kha-pa and His Followers, by *Joe Bransford Wilson* 155

## II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *The Dawn of Chinese Pure Land Buddhist Doctrine: Ching-ying Hui-yüan's Commentary on the Visualization Sūtra*, by *Kenneth K. Tanaka* (Allan A. Andrews) 181
2. Three Recent Collections: *The Buddhist Heritage*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski; *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr.; and *Reflections on Tibetan Culture*, ed. Lawrence Epstein and Richard Sherburne (Roger Jackson) 191

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 195

# A Source Analysis of the *Ruijing lu* ("Records of Miraculous Scriptures")<sup>1</sup>

by Koichi Shinohara

## 1. Introduction

Toward the end of his life, the Vinaya master Daoxuan (596–667) of the Ximingsi temple in the capital city of Chang'an compiled a collection of miracle stories, entitled *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* ("Collected Records of Three Treasure Miracles in China"). In the colophon written by Daoxuan himself and attached to the end of this collection, Daoxuan noted that he hurriedly completed this work on the 20th day of the sixth month of the first year of Linde (664); after remarking that the collection is not a complete one, Daoxuan referred to the "recently" completed *Fayuan zhulin* ("Jade Forest in the Garden of Dharma") in one hundred fascicles (*juan*) by the Vinaya Master Daoshi of the same Ximingsi temple.<sup>2</sup> Daoxuan and the compiler of the *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoshi (?–668?), were known to have been close collaborators.<sup>3</sup>

The *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* is in fact a collection of smaller collections of miracle stories. The *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* in the Taishō collection consists of three fascicles.<sup>4</sup> The first fascicle begins with a brief preface, which ends by noting that the work consists of three fascicles, listing first *stūpa* miracles, then miracles connected with Buddha images, and thirdly stories of supernatural events associated with temples, scriptures, and monks. The main part of the first fascicle contains stories about *stūpa* miracles: a collection of stories headed by a table of contents listing 20 items is followed by a section that bears its own titled preface and forms an independent collection of miracle stories about *stūpas*. This is the *Zhendān shenzhou fo sheli gantong xu* ("Records of Buddha Relic Miracles in

China”), and it gives a list of miracle stories, possibly in an abbreviated form. The second fascicle contains accounts of miracles associated with images of the Buddha. It is headed by a table of contents listing 50 items. The third fascicle begins with a collection of stories about “supernatural temples” (*shensi*), which is followed by a titled collection of accounts of miracles about scriptures (*Ruijing lu*) and a titled collection of miracle stories about “supernatural monks” (*Shenseng gantong lu* [“Record of miracles concerning supernatural monks”]). The classification of miracle stories in this work obviously has a connection with its overall title: the title indicates that the work is a collection of miracle stories associated with the Three Treasures, i.e., the Buddha, the Teaching, and the Monastic Community. The Buddha is here represented by relics and images (the first and second fascicles), the Teaching, by scriptures (*Ruijing lu*), and the Monastic Community, by stories of supernatural temples and monks (the first part of the third fascicle and the *Shenseng gantong lu*).

The above cursory review of the contents of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* suggests that this work was in fact a collection of several smaller collections of specific types of miracle stories. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that on a number of occasions Daoxuan prepared similar lists or collections of miracle stories. Towards the end of his life he appears to have attempted to compile a more comprehensive collection of miracle stories by revising these earlier lists/collections and bringing them to a larger synthesis. The work had to be carried out in a hurry, and the outcome was the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* in three fascicles. His collaborator at the Ximingsi temple, Daoshi, was at that time compiling the massive Buddhist encyclopedia, the *Fayuan zhulin*, and was also compiling classified collections of miracle stories as a part of this project. There appears to have been a good deal of communication between Daoxuan and Daoshi as they compiled their separate collections of miracle stories.

One important evidence for this hypothesis is the fact that the smaller units of miracle stories in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* are reproduced as sets of related miracle stories in several miracle story sections that are found in different parts of the *Fayuan zhulin*. The *Fayuan zhulin* is a massive encyclopedia

(*lei shu*) in which numerous excerpts from the canonical literature are arranged around one hundred topics. One of the distinctive features of this encyclopedia is the sections on stories of miracles that occurred in China (“*Ganying yuan*”) that are attached to virtually all of the one hundred topical sections. At least one important part of the project of compiling this encyclopedia must have been a major effort to collect these miracle stories and classify them according to the categories used in this work. Daoxuan and Daoshi appear to have been working closely together in compiling the miracle story collections in their respective works.

In the two earlier articles mentioned above (footnote 2), I investigated the relationship between the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* in some detail. The majority of the smaller units of miracle stories in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* are found as comparable units in a variety of sections in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The sources for the stories in these units in the *Fayuan zhulin* are not noted in the text, a rather conspicuous fact, since the *Fayuan zhulin* in the case of other miracle story collections generally notes the sources for each story meticulously. In the light of other often quite unambiguous evidence, I interpreted this relationship between the passages in these two works as follows: Daoxuan’s collection was prepared first, and Daoshi used this collection by Daoxuan extensively in compiling his encyclopedia; since Daoxuan’s collection generally does not specify the sources of the stories included in it, Daoshi could not give the sources for each of the stories taken from there as he had for the miracle story sections of the *Fayuan zhulin*; the material collected by Daoxuan was not yet titled when Daoshi made use of it, or for some other unknown reason, Daoshi chose not to give the title of Daoxuan’s work, i.e., *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, as the source for the blocks of material he copied from there as the main substance of many of the groups of miracle stories embedded in the *Fayuan zhulin*.

The detailed comparison of the contents of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* showed also that while the relationship described above holds for the bulk of the material in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, an entirely different relationship appears to exist between the contents of the last two sections of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and the *Fayuan*

*zhulin* parallels to them. Both in the case of the *Ruijing lu* and the *Shenseng gantong lu* ("Records of Miracles about Supernatural Monks"), the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels are not found in comparable collections of related materials. Parallels are found in a more scattered manner in various parts of the *Fayuan zhulin*, suggesting strongly that Daoxuan and Daoshi worked with the same body of source materials.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the *Fayuan zhulin* indicates the sources of these scattered stories meticulously, in the same manner in which it generally indicates the sources of the miracle stories included in it. It appears that when Daoshi compiled the *Fayuan zhulin*, the two smaller collections now attached at the end of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* may not have existed as distinctive collections, at least in the same way in which other collections in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* did. It thus may be instructive to examine more closely the relationship between these two collections and the parallel material in the *Fayuan zhulin*. Since the sources for the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels are noted rather meticulously for each of the stories included in the two collections, it is possible to investigate this relationship in some detail.

The evidence from these two smaller collections is particularly important for us, since these references in the parallel *Fayuan zhulin* passages enable us to trace the sources that either Daoshi alone, or with Daoxuan, or perhaps even as a member of a team of learned monks engaged in a joint effort at the Ximingsi temple, used to compile the relevant sections of the *Fayuan zhulin* (or, possibly, earlier sets of small collections which Daoshi then used in compiling the corresponding parts of the *Fayuan zhulin*). The various parts of the *Fayuan zhulin* containing material paralleling the *Ruijing lu* were probably compiled at different stages in the long and complicated process of compiling this massive encyclopedia. Thus, in some cases the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels, compiled relatively early, might have been the sources that Daoxuan used in compiling the *Ruijing lu*. In other cases, Daoshi may have used Daoxuan's earlier collection (i.e., *Ruijing lu*), in compiling the parallel *Fayuan zhulin* passages, which were compiled relatively late in the compilation of the encyclopedia. There is also the distinct possibility that Daoxuan and Daoshi may have collaborated closely, or that the parallel passages might have been prepared by a team of monks without any specific reference to either one of the two collec-

tions. Below, I will attempt to throw some light on these complex and in many ways obscure questions concerning the sources and procedures that Daoxuan and Daoshi followed in compiling their larger bodies of miracle stories.

In this paper, I will concentrate my attention on the first of these two smaller collections, the collections of miracle stories associated with scriptures (*Ruijing lu*). This collection, in virtually identical form but with a different title, *Lidai zhongjing yinggan xingjing lu* (“Records of Awe-inspiring Miracles About Scriptures that Occurred Under Various Dynasties in the Past”), is also found in the tenth fascicle of Daoxuan’s catalogue of Chinese Buddhist literature under the title *Datang neidian lu* (T. Vol. 55, 338a–342a). The preface of the *Datang neidian lu* bears the date of the first year of the Linde period (664–665) (219a3). Since, as we noted above, the colophon at the end of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* states that Daoxuan completed this work on the 20th day of the sixth month of the same year, Daoxuan appears to have produced both the *Datang neidian lu* and the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* around the same time. Two stories in the *Ruijing lu* (nos. 15 and 38) are absent in the *Lidai zhongjing yinggan xingjing lu*. Since no specific reason appears to explain this absence, these two stories may have been added later, and this would suggest that the *Lidai zhongjing yinggan xingjing lu* was compiled first, and that this same collection was renamed *Ruijing lu*, slightly expanded with the addition of two stories, and incorporated into the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. I will examine the sources that lie behind this collection in some detail through identifying the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels and tracing the source of the stories included there through the notes attached to these *Fayuan zhulin* parallels. I will begin my detailed discussion by focusing on the sources mentioned in the *Fayuan zhulin* passages.

## 2. Preliminary Observations Concerning the Relationship Between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*.

The *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* does not generally indicate the sources from which the individual stories were taken. The *Ruijing lu* generally follows this practice and tells the stories without identifying their sources, though in several cases the sources



are indicated as part of the main text, generally at the end of a story.<sup>6</sup> The sources of each of the stories are meticulously indicated in the *Fayuan zhulin*. Thus, the fact that there is some identification of the sources might in some cases serve as a clue as to which of the compared versions was the original, if we can determine on other bases that the two versions are directly related to each other. In the cases where we can be certain that the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions of the same stories are directly related, and the *Ruijing lu* does not indicate the sources for a story, the *Fayuan zhulin* versions of the stories themselves could not have been copied from the *Ruijing lu*. If Daoshi copied these stories from the present version of the *Ruijing lu* versions, he would not have been able to specify the source of the story without consulting other sources.<sup>7</sup>

In a small number of exceptional cases, the relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* is stated explicitly in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The *Fayuan zhulin* mentions a work called the *Sanbao gantong lu* as the source for its stories on Daoji (corresponding to *Ruijing lu* story no. 17), Yisu (no. 20),<sup>8</sup> Shi Heshi (*Ruijing lu* story no. 21), Linghu Yuangui (*Ruijing lu* story no. 22), Tanyun (*Ruijing lu* story no. 23), and the Scripture written in the sky in Yizhou (*Ruijing lu* story no. 36).<sup>9</sup> These six stories are found together in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. The *Sanbao gantong lu* must refer to the same work as the present *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, which appears also to have been known as *Dongxia sanbao gantong ji*.<sup>10</sup> Daoxuan's miracle story collection, bearing either one of these known titles, must have existed in some form when Daoshi compiled this section of the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. Furthermore, since these stories are not found elsewhere among the materials collected in other parts of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, the work that Daoshi used in preparing this part of the *Fayuan zhulin* must have been the *Ruijing lu*. The text of these six stories in the 18th fascicle in the *Fayuan zhulin* is virtually identical to that of the *Ruijing lu*.<sup>11</sup>

The relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* appears to have been rather complex. Since the *Fayuan zhulin* passages containing stories that correspond to *Ruijing lu* stories are found scattered in a number of different fascicles of that massive encyclopedia, we can safely assume that these passages



may have been composed separately at different stages in the compilation of the encyclopedia. Thus, it is quite possible, as we noted above, that some of these *Fayuan zhulin* passages containing stories very similar to those in the *Ruijing lu* were compiled earlier, before the *Ruijing lu* was compiled by Daoxuan, and that Daoxuan used them as sources for the *Ruijing lu*. In contrast, other *Fayuan zhulin* passages may have been compiled later, well after the *Ruijing lu* had been produced as a part of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, and Daoshi may have relied on the *Ruijing lu* in preparing these passages. This complex relationship again suggests that Daoxuan and Daoshi must have collaborated very closely in preparing their respective miracle story collections.

A closer examination of the *Fayuan zhulin* stories that are said to have come from the *Sanbao gantong lu* enables us to trace the general process through which at least some of the stories, which could not have been copied directly from the *Fayuan zhulin*, came to be collected by Daoxuan before they were eventually included in the *Ruijing lu*. Four of the six stories under examination here, i.e., the Daoji story (no. 17), the Yisu story (no. 20), the Shi Heshi story (no. 21), and the Tanyun story (no. 23) are found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. Passages that parallel nos. 20 and 21 word-for-word constitute the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Yisu (“reciters of scripture” section, 690ab) and these stories are both about the tongues of reciters of the *Lotus Sūtra*, which did not decay after burial.<sup>12</sup> Story no. 17, about the monk Daoji, is an abbreviated version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography that appears in the “reciters of scripture” section (the seventh in the section, 687c–688a).<sup>13</sup> Story no. 23, about the monk Tanyun, loosely parallels a passage (593b4–11) in the longer *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of the same monk (“meditation masters” section, 592c–593c).<sup>14</sup> The other two stories, i.e., the story about Linghu Yuangui (no. 22) and the story about a student called Xun, who wrote the *Diamond Sūtra* in the sky (no. 36), are stories about laymen, and therefore it is not surprising that these stories are not found in Daoxuan’s *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, which, as its title (“Further Biographies of Eminent Monks”) indicates, was a collection of monks’ biographies.<sup>15</sup> All of the evidence suggests that Daoxuan must have played a central role in the development and transmission of these stories: in

some cases he visited the site where the miracle had occurred and probably collected the stories at that time. He appears to have been interested in such stories and had assembled them over a long period while preparing his biographical collection.

The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Yisu consists of two stories about the tongues of the *Lotus Sūtra* reciters Yisu and Shi Heshi, which were dug out ten or more years after the death of these two monks; the tongues had not rotted despite the passage of time. Thus, this biography in fact consists in a small thematically unified collection of miracle stories of the kind that Daoxuan later developed on a much larger scale in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. This example, thus, might serve as a minor piece of evidence suggesting that the project of compiling a large thematic collection of miracle stories began as a part of Daoxuan's earlier project to compile a massive collection of the biographies of monks. The story of Yisu's tongue must have originated after the 11th year of Zhenguan (637/38), when his body was exhumed and people learned that his tongue had not decomposed. Elsewhere, the date of the fifth year of Zhenguan period (631/32) is attached to the story of Linghu Yuangui. The story must have originated after this date. Finally, the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* reports that Tanyun died in the 16th year of Zhenguan (642/43). These dates are significant in pointing generally to the period in which Daoxuan may have begun collecting miracle stories of the kind later used in compiling the *Ruijing lu* in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*.

As we noted briefly above, since there appears to have been a close relationship between Daoxuan's miracle collections and his collaborator Daoshi's encyclopedia, the *Fayuan zhulin*, the notes attached to the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to the *Ruijing lu*, indicating the sources from which the stories were copied or abbreviated into the *Fayuan zhulin*, enable us to discuss the sources of the corresponding *Ruijing lu* stories with greater precision as well. These *Fayuan zhulin* parallels are found scattered in different parts of the encyclopedia, and the sources mentioned are also diverse. Yet, a detailed analysis of these complex materials points to a general pattern, which in turn throws some light on the nature of the *Ruijing lu* as a distinctive collection of miracle stories. I will attempt to reconstruct, albeit in a highly speculative and hypothetical form, the general process through which Daoxuan appears to have compiled this collection.

### 3. Gaoseng zhuan stories in the Ruijing lu

The main text of the *Ruijing lu* begins with a statement “The *Gaoseng zhuan* says...” (426b21), and first tells the story of Tan Wujie. As we will examine more closely below, there are some problems about this reference to the *Gaoseng zhuan* as the source of Tan Wujie story, but *Ruijing lu* stories numbered 2 to 6, 8, and 10 are ultimately based on the *Gaoseng zhuan*.

There is a good possibility that this statement, “the *Gaoseng zhuan* says,” at the beginning of the main body of the *Ruijing lu* was meant to apply not only to the Tan Wujie story but also to the series of stories that follows it. The stories about Dao’an (no. 2), Sengsheng (no. 3), Daojiong (no. 4), Puming (no. 5), Huiguo (no. 6), and Hongming (no. 8)<sup>16</sup> all begin with the conjunction *you* (“also”) and are all ultimately based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies. The story about Huijin (no. 7) does not have this conjunction at the beginning, and the passage identical to it in the 94th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* identifies its source as the *Mingxiang ji*.<sup>17</sup> The only other stories for which the *Fayuan zhulin* parallel designates the source as the *Gaoseng zhuan* are the story about Daolin (no. 10), which comes after these stories, and the story of the layman Sun Jingde, which is known from a variety of sources, including the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. Since the stories that begin with the conjunction *you* are in fact stories taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*, and the one story that interrupts this sequence appears to have been taken from a different source, it is probably safe to assume that these conjunctions (*you*) were meant to indicate that the initial note, giving the *Gaoseng zhuan* as source, was meant to apply to these subsequent stories as well. If that is the case, we may have excavated an earlier form of this section of the *Ruijing lu*: Daoxuan began his compilation of the *Ruijing lu* with stories based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* and listed the stories nos. 1–6, and 8;<sup>18</sup> later he inserted the story about Huijin (no. 7) between the stories about Huiguo and Hongming, and possibly on yet another occasion added the story about Daolin from elsewhere to its present position.

In the earliest draft reconstructed here, then, the *Ruijing lu* designated explicitly the sources for its stories nos. 1–6 and 8 (which were given as the first seven stories). Daoxuan may even have begun this collection with the intention of designat-

ing sources for all stories to be included in the *Ruijing lu*. When he inserted the story about Huijin, however, he did not feel it necessary to designate its source, and the conjunction *you*, left hanging without explicit referent in front of story no. 8, about Hongming, dropped off in some editions (as in the Korean edition on which the Taishō text is based). As Daoxuan continued the draft for the *Ruijing lu* further, not identifying in detail the sources for the stories included, the meaning of the word *you* at the beginning also became unclear.<sup>19</sup>

If the *Ruijing lu* existed earlier in the form reconstructed here, and if Daoshi had access to this early version, then he could easily have compiled the corresponding passages in the *Fayuan zhulin* by copying from this early version and providing the note on the sources of stories from it. In connection with the main body of the *Gaoseng zhuan* stories which appear in closely related forms in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*, we cannot assume as elsewhere that the absence of a note on the sources in the *Ruijing lu* precludes the possibility that Daoshi's *Fayuan zhulin* versions could have been based on the *Ruijing lu*. If the *Ruijing lu* existed in an earlier form as we reconstructed it here, explicitly identifying the stories as being based on the *Gaoseng zhuan*, it is possible that Daoshi may have used it as his source in compiling the corresponding sections of the *Fayuan zhulin*.

*Ruijing lu* stories numbered 3 to 8 and 10 appear to be intimately related to the corresponding biographies in the 12th fascicle of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, and though only seven biographies were chosen from the 21 biographies in this "reciters" section of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, the items are given in the same order in which they appear in the *Gaoseng zhuan*.<sup>20</sup> This fact may be significant. If Daoxuan copied these stories directly from the *Gaoseng zhuan*, he must have had the "reciters of the scripture" section of the *Gaoseng zhuan* in front of him when he compiled this section of the *Ruijing lu*. It also appears to suggest that the *Ruijing lu* may have developed as an expanded and modified version of the "reciters of scripture" section of the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Since scripture miracles (or "miraculous scriptures," *ruijing*) are commonly, though not exclusively, associated with the practice of reciting scriptures, it is quite understandable that Daoxuan's collection began in this manner by focusing on materials that are found in the "reciters" section of the *Gaoseng zhuan*.

Yet, this very fact also might suggest that Daoxuan was initiating a new development in Chinese Buddhist historiography by compiling a collection that overlaps significantly with a well-established category of the normative biographical collection. Daoxuan, who in fact compiled his own major collection of monks' biographies as the second effort in the series of normative collections succeeding the *Gaoseng zhuan*, might have come to recognize that there was room and possibly the need for a different type of collection. Daoxuan's shifting sensitivity might also reflect at least some of the changes that Chinese Buddhism was undergoing in the middle of the seventh century.

In his monumental work on the history of early Chan historiography, Yanagida Seizan calls attention to a number of scripture miracle collections that appeared after Daoxuan had completed his *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, stating that the early Chan histories developed in the same environment. Yanagida is interested in these collections as signs of profound changes in Chinese Buddhism: the well-established tradition of Chinese Buddhist historiography, represented most recently by Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* was transformed in these collections into something new and different. Our discussion of the *Ruijing lu* shows that this new tradition of "scripture miracle collections" had its root in Daoxuan himself.<sup>21</sup>

A comparison of the *Ruijing lu* with the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* passages results in a complex set of observations. In cases where the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions of the stories are identical and both of these versions diverge from the *Gaoseng zhuan* originals, we can conclude that the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions must have been directly related to each other. However, as noted earlier, since both the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* indicate the sources for the particular stories we have been considering, it is not possible to determine which of the two versions of the same story was dependent on the other.

If either the *Ruijing lu*, as is generally the case, or the *Fayuan zhulin* gives an abbreviated version of the *Gaoseng zhuan* story which is reproduced more faithfully in the other, we might assume that the fuller version of the story in that form could not have been directly based on the abbreviated one; it must have been based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* original. If for some specific reason we can assume that one of the fuller versions and the ab-

breviated version are directly related to each other, we will be able to conclude that the abbreviated version was dependent on that fuller version. Otherwise, we will not be able to determine whether the abbreviated version was based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* original or its faithful copy in one of the two other sources being compared.

a) *The Tan Wujie story (no. 1)*

The first story in the *Ruijing lu*, the story of Tan Wujie (no. 1), is an ambiguous case: the passage in the *Ruijing lu* is identical with that in the *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 65, 786a), yet the former gives the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the latter the *Mingxiang chi* as the source of the story. The version common to the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* is a good deal shorter than the *Gaoseng zhuan* passage (V,338b–339a) and concentrates on one incident told toward the end of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.<sup>22</sup> Unless the *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* passages are exact copies of the otherwise unknown *Mingxiang ji* passage, they are probably directly related with each other. In this case, since both the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* passages give different sources, there must have been a mistake in one of these identifications, and we cannot say which of the two passages is more likely to have been the original.

b) *The story about Dao'an (no. 2)*

The *Fayuan zhulin* contains a passage that is identical to the *Ruijing lu* story about Dao'an (*juan* 18, 418a). The Dao'an passage in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* appears at the beginning of the section containing six stories which are said to have come from the "*Liang gaoseng zhuan* or other records" (418b28). This short passage on Dao'an is clearly based on one section of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography (especially, 353b17--23).<sup>23</sup> This story is a good example of cases in which we can be certain that the *Ruijing lu* story and the parallel *Fayuan zhulin* story are directly related with each other, but we cannot determine which of these two closely related versions was the original.

c) *The story about Sengsheng (no. 3)*

In this case again, the *Ruijing lu* and the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* passages appear to be directly related. The stories

about Sengsheng in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 18 [“Paying respect to the Teaching”], 418ab) are clearly based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography and follow its text word for word for the most part. But the last section of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography is omitted both from the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* passage, and the two versions end in exactly the same way.

d) *The story about Daojiong (no. 4)*

A variety of sources concerning Daojiong’s biography have been preserved, and the relationships among these sources are rather complex.<sup>24</sup> The *Fayuan zhulin* contains three passages on this monk: one in *juan* 17 (408c–409a), another in *juan* 35 (567bc), and still another in *juan* 65 (784c–785a). The 35th fascicle version is explicitly said to be based on the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*, and it is indeed a faithful reproduction of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of this monk (407ab). The 17th and 65th fascicle stories appear to have been taken from the *Mingxiang ji*, and tell different stories. The *Ruijing lu* story (no. 4) of Daojiong centers around two stories which are told together in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, but separately in greater detail in the two *Mingxiang ji* fragments. The phraseology of the *Ruijing lu* story is similar to that of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. Thus, it would be safe to conclude that the *Ruijing lu* story about Daojiong is an abbreviated version of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, either taken directly from the *Gaoseng zhuan* itself, or possibly from its copy in the 35th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. Since the *Ruijing lu* story is an abbreviated version of the *Gaoseng zhuan* / *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 35) passage, the parallel passage in the 35th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* could not have been copied from the *Ruijing lu*.

e) *The story about Puming (no. 5)*

The *Fayuan zhulin* parallel to the *Ruijing lu* story about Puming is found in the 17th fascicle, immediately after the story about Daojiong.<sup>25</sup> This *Fayuan zhulin* passage is identical to the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, and the *Ruijing lu* story matches the first half of this story in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the 17th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. Again, since the *Ruijing lu* is an abbreviated version of a well-known story, the *Fayuan zhulin* version could not possibly have been based on the *Ruijing lu* version.

f) *The story about Huiguo (no. 6)*

The 94th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* begins with a story about Huiguo (983bc) that is very similar to the *Ruijing lu* story about this monk. The *Fayuan zhulin* story is said to be based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, and it is in fact identical with the biography of this monk (407bc) in the “reciters of scripture” section of the collection. The *Ruijing lu* story appears to be a slightly abbreviated version of this biography. Here again, the *Fayuan zhulin* is unlikely to have been based on the abbreviated version in the *Ruijing lu*.

g) *The story about Huijin (no. 7)*

A passage identical to the *Ruijing lu* story about Huijin is found in the 95th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (“sickness,” 989ab), and here the source of the passage is given as the *Mingxiang ji*. The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huijin follows this *Mingxiang ji* story very closely, though there are some differences in phraseology and the former gives the date of the monk’s death as the third year of the Yongming period of the Qi dynasty (585–486) and specifies his age at the time of death more precisely as eighty-five. In this case, the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* stories appear to be directly related to each other.

h) *The story about Hongming (no. 8)*

The *Fayuan zhulin* contains two passages on Hongming (no. 8): one passage is found in *juan* 28 (“Miracles” [*shenyi*], 492bc) and the other in *juan* 94 (“impurities,” 983c). The notes give the *Tang gaoseng zhuan* (498a29 in *juan* 28) and the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* (983c15) as their sources, but the *Tang gaoseng zhuan* mentioned in the 28th fascicle is clearly a mistake for the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*, or simply *Gaoseng zhuan*. The 28th fascicle story is clearly an abbreviated version of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography.<sup>26</sup> The 94th fascicle story, which tells the same story very briefly, is identical to the *Ruijing lu* version. Again, the *Ruijing lu* passage and the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* passage appear to be directly related to each other.

i) *The story about Daolin (no. 10)*

The *Fayuan zhulin* story about Daolin (*juan* 42, 617a) is virtually identical, word for word, with the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of this monk, and mentions the *Gaoseng zhuan* as its



source (“*Liang gaoseng zhuan*,” 617a17); one difference is that the name of the scripture he recited is given as *Weimo jing* in the *Fayuan zhulin* version and as *Jingming jing* in the *Gaoseng zhuan*. The *Ruijing lu* story about Daolin is an abbreviated version of the account in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Fayuan zhulin*, and here the name of the scripture is given as *Jingming jing*, as in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. We may assume that the *Ruijing lu* story is an abbreviated version of the *Gaoseng zhuan* original, and that the *Fayuan zhulin* version was prepared independently on the basis of the same *Gaoseng zhuan* original.

In five cases (Tan Wujie, Dao’an, Sengsheng, Huijin, Hongming), including the ambiguous case of the story about Tan Wujie, the *Ruijing lu* stories have identical parallels in the *Fayuan zhulin*. These parallels indicate that there was some direct relationship between the *Ruijing lu* stories and the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* stories. In three cases (Daojiong, Puming, Huiguo), the *Ruijing lu* version is abbreviated, while the closest *Fayuan zhulin* parallels reproduce the *Gaoseng zhuan* originals faithfully. In one case (Daolin), we could conclude that the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions were prepared independently of each other on the basis of the common *Gaoseng zhuan* original. Since the parallel passages in the *Fayuan zhulin* are found scattered in different parts of the encyclopedia,<sup>27</sup> the relationships among the various parallel passages of the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* might not have been uniform. In fact, the evidence we have collected indicates that in five cases there was a direct relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* passages, but that in one case we can be reasonably certain that there was no direct relationship between the parallel passages in these two works.<sup>28</sup>

In three cases, two stories that are found side by side or close to each other in the *Ruijing lu* have their parallels again side by side in the same order in the same fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (Dao’an and Sengsheng in *juan* 18 [418ab], Daojiong and Puming in *juan* 17 [408c–409a], and Huiguo and Hongming in *juan* 94 [983bc]).<sup>29</sup>

aa) The stories about Dao’an and Sengsheng in the *Ruijing lu* and the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* are identical with each other. Since both of these identical stories are different from the original *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies, there is little

doubt that the Dao'an and Sengsheng stories in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* were directly related to each other.

bb) Both the stories about Daojiong and Puming appear in an abbreviated form in the *Ruijing lu*, while the *Fayuan zhulin*, at least in one passage (35th fascicle) in the case of Daojiong, reproduces the *Gaoseng zhuan* original more faithfully. We must note also that whereas the Daojiong and Puming stories appear together in the same order as in the *Ruijing lu* in the 17th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, the Daojiong story in that fascicle does not appear to be directly related to the *Ruijing lu* version. In fact, it is the 35th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* that reproduces the *Gaoseng zhuan* story of Daojiong, which is clearly the basis of the *Ruijing lu* story. In this case, therefore, it would be safe to conclude that the parallel between the Daojiong and Puming stories in the *Ruijing lu* and the 17th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* was accidental, and that there was no direct relationship between these two stories as distinct units of related stories. It is more likely that the parallels between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions of these two stories occurred through independent copying of the *Gaoseng zhuan* originals.

cc) The situation of the two sets of parallel stories in the *Ruijing lu* and the 94th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is more complex than the two cases reviewed above. The Huiguo story in the *Ruijing lu* is a shortened version of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, which is also reproduced faithfully in the 94th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. The other story in the 94th fascicle, the story of Hongming, is identical with the *Ruijing lu* version and distinct from the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of the same monk. Whereas the Huiguo and Hongming stories appear side by side as the first two stories in the miracle stories section of that fascicle in the *Fayuan zhulin*, the story about Huijin appears between these two stories in the *Ruijing lu*. As noted above, the *Fayuan zhulin* parallel to the Huijin story (95th fascicle) is identical to the *Ruijing lu* story, and gives as its source the *Mingxiang ji*.

It is difficult to interpret the significance of the complex evidence of the 94th fascicle parallels. None of the three logical possibilities that need to be considered for cases where only the *Ruijing lu* version is abbreviated can be ruled out conclusively:

(1) The parallel between the *Ruijing lu* and the 94th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* might have been accidental, as appears to have been the case in the parallels in the 17th fascicle discussed above; (2) the *Ruijing lu* version might have been directly dependent on the *Fayuan zhulin* version, in which case Daoxuan at some point must have revised this part of the *Ruijing lu* and inserted Huijing's story between those of Huiguo and Hongming; (3) the *Fayuan zhulin* version might have been based on the hypothetical earlier version of the *Ruijing lu*, and the *Ruijing lu* underwent further revision later, and at that time the Huiguo story was abbreviated and the Huijin story inserted.

The biography of Huijin appears as the 13th biography in the 12th fascicle of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, between those of Huiguo (10th) and Hongming (14th). It is conceivable that Daoxuan was aware of the order in which the stories paralleling the "reciters of scriptures" biographies in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (12th fascicle) were arranged in the *Ruijing lu*, and that he felt it necessary to arrange them in the order in which they appear in the *Gaoseng zhuan*.

It is somewhat puzzling, however, that Daoxuan, who must then have been consulting the *Gaoseng zhuan* original, used at this point the *Mingxiang ji* version of the story, in the form in which it is reproduced in the 95th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, and not the *Gaoseng zhuan* version. Since his contemporary collaborator Daoshi, who worked at the same Ximingsi temple as Daoxuan, quotes freely from the *Mingxiang ji*, Daoxuan must also have had direct access to the *Mingxiang ji* himself, and it is conceivable that he used this version because the *Mingxiang ji* stories date earlier and were used as an important source when Huijiao prepared his *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies.<sup>30</sup>

The evidence reviewed above concerning the *Gaoseng zhuan* stories in the *Ruijing lu* and the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* passages is complex, and does not enable us to deduce one simple conclusion concerning the relationship among these sources. The fact that the main body of the *Gaoseng zhuan* stories in the *Ruijing lu* is drawn from the section of the "reciters of scriptures" in the 12th fascicle of the *Gaoseng zhuan* and that the stories appear in the same general order as the biographies in that section of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, appears to indicate that Dao-

xuan must have been consulting this section of the *Gaoseng zhuan* himself, when he compiled this section of the *Ruijing lu*. The present text of the *Ruijing lu* suggests that the text may have been revised at least once and on that occasion a *Mingxiang ji* story corresponding to a *Gaoseng zhuan* biography was inserted at a point where the biography in question appears in the “reciters of scripture” section of the *Gaoseng zhuan*.

Later, I will present an argument, based on further evidence concerning other parts of the parallels between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*, that in compiling the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* Daoshi appears to have copied certain materials from the *Ruijing lu*. From this broader point of view, it will become possible to conclude that at least in the case of the two stories from the *Gaoseng zhuan* that are found in identical forms in the *Ruijing lu* and the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (stories about Dao’an and Sengsheng), it was the *Ruijing lu* version that was the original.

#### 4. The Xu gaoseng zhuan stories in the Ruijing lu

The *Ruijing lu* stories about Sun Jingde (no. 9), Zhizhan (no. 11), the anonymous monk at the Wuhosi temple (no. 12), the lips dug out of the ground at Mt. Dongkan (no. 13), the eunuch who grew a beard (no. 14), Daoji (no. 17), Baogui (no. 18), Kongzang (no. 19), Yisu (no. 20), Shi Heshi (no. 21), Tanyun (no. 23), and Tanyan (no. 26) are based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. The *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 18 (419c–420a), contains a passage that is identical to the story in the *Ruijing lu* (no. 16) of an anonymous monk and a novice who returned from the realm of the dead and specifies its source as the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*, but the story does not appear to exist there. As in the case of *Gaoseng zhuan* stories, the *Ruijing lu* stories based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* were mostly, though not exclusively, taken from the “Reciters of scripture” section, and the order of the materials taken into the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* parallels the order in which they appear, though not always immediately one after another, in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*.<sup>31</sup>

##### (a) The Xu gaoseng zhuan biography of Zhizhan

*Ruijing lu* stories No. 11 to 14 were taken from the biography of Zhizhan (the first biography in the “reciters of scrip-

ture" section in the 28th fascicle, 686ab). A note at the end of the story about the eunuch (no. 14) in the *Ruijing lu* states that "these were all (*bing*) taken from Hou Junsu's *Jingyi ji*" (427c1).<sup>32</sup> Here, the referent of the note is ambiguous. It is attached to the story about the eunuch, but the adverb "*bing*" implies that there was more than one story preceding this note; in the present context this adverb appears to suggest that the five stories listed before were also taken from the same source. But we have seen above that the first of these five stories, that of Daolin, was actually taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*.<sup>33</sup>

In fact, this note about the *Jingyi ji* appears to have been copied *verbatim* from Zhizhan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography (686b14). The adverb "*bing*" ("all") in this *Xu gaoseng zhuan* note indicates that all the stories listed there, possibly but not necessarily including Zhizhan's biography itself, were drawn from this work. Daoxuan compiled the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, which contains the *Ruijing lu* in the third fascicle, toward the end of his life, in the first year of Linde (664–665), while the first draft of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* was completed sometime after the 19th year of the Zhenguan period (645–646).<sup>34</sup> Though there is evidence indicating that Daoxuan kept working on his biographical collection until the end of his life, the fact that the adverb *bing* makes perfect sense in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* but that its meaning becomes unclear in the *Ruijing lu*, enables us to conclude that Zhizhan's biography existed by the time Daoxuan compiled the *Ruijing lu*.<sup>35</sup> If there was any direct relationship between these two passages on Zhizhan in the two separate works compiled by Daoxuan, it was the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* that was the source, and the *Ruijing lu* was dependent on it.

The date of Zhizhan's death is not given, but the biography states that his *stūpa* in Mt. Rentou still existed at the "present time," suggesting the possibility that Daoxuan himself had visited the location. The extraordinary phenomenon surrounding Zhizhan's death was the fact that after he died one finger of each of his hands was extended, indicating that he had attained the "First Fruit" (the rank of the "stream winner"). The two stories that follow that of Zhizhan, about the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple and the lips and tongue dug out at Mt. Dongkan (no. 12 and 13), both center around tongue miracles; the last story (no. 14) in this small collection of mira-

cle stories attached to Zhizhan's biography is about the beard that grew on a eunuch.

We have seen above, in discussing the *Sanbao gantong lu* note in the *Fayuan zhulin* on the *Ruijing lu* stories of Yisu and Shi Heshi (nos. 20 and 21), that tongue miracle stories were appended to a biography of the monk Yisu. Both the biography of Yisu and that of Zhizhan are found in the "reciters" section (the first and thirteenth biographies in the section). Daoxuan was obviously interested in these miracles and was preparing small collections of these stories as appendices to his *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biographies of "reciters."

The *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to Zhizhan's biography and the stories appended to it are found in two places: the 18th and the 85th fascicles. In the 85th fascicle, Zhizhan's biography and three of the appended stories (corresponding to the *Ruijing lu* stories, nos. 12b, 13, 14) are given as one block of material, just as in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. This block of material appears as the second large item in the miracle stories section of this fascicle, and a note in small characters appended at the end of the Zhizhan stories reads: "The above two stories appear (*jian*) in Hou Junsu's collection" (i.e., the *Jingyi ji*).<sup>36</sup> I am inclined to believe that the immediate source for the group of stories associated with Zhizhan's biography in the 85th fascicle was in fact the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan, and that the note on *Jingyi ji* as the source for the 85th fascicle stories was copied from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. The use of the expression *jian* ("appear" or "seen in") in the note, to be discussed in greater detail below, is an important clue. If Daoshi had collected these two stories directly from the *Jingyi ji*, he probably would have written this note using the verb *chu* ("come from") as he did consistently in writing the notes indicating the sources of the miracle story passages he had collected. When he edited the 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoshi took these stories from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* original and understood the meaning of the note at the end of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan in the strongest possible sense as indicating that both Zhizhan's biography and the appended stories were taken from the *Jingyi ji*.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the text of the Zhizhan story in the 85th fascicle appears to be directly dependent on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biog-

raphy; it is a somewhat abbreviated version, but the text of the parallel stories is even closer to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version than the *Ruijing lu* version is. Since this 85th fascicle passage includes elements in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography that were not included in the corresponding *Ruijing lu* passage (e.g., reference to Guṇavarman as the founder of the Xiancaosi temple (909c26; ref., *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 686a4,5), it probably was not copied from the *Ruijing lu*. The reference to Guṇavarman is also missing from the other *Fayuan zhulin* passage in the 18th fascicle. Thus, the 85th fascicle version does not appear to have been based on the 18th fascicle version, either.

The *Ruijing lu* passage on the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple (no. 12) is marked as one story in the table of contents given at the beginning of the *Ruijing lu* (426b14), but this passage in fact consists of two stories: the story about the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi is followed by an independent story about a monk in Yongzhou, who retired into Mt. Bolu ("White Deer"). The version in the 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* reproduces the second of these stories, but not the first. This indicates that the *Ruijing lu* could not have been dependent on the 85th fascicle story. The 85th fascicle version of Zhizhan's biography and appended stories appear to have been independently based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography.

The passage on Zhizhan's biography and appended stories in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is virtually identical to the corresponding *Ruijing lu* passage. In this passage, however, the conjunction *you* ("again", "and") that appears at the beginning of the story about the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple (427b16) and the story about the eunuch who grew a beard (427b26) is in both cases changed to *hou* ("later") (418b19 and 29). Since the conjunction *you* also appears at the corresponding points in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version (686a13, b8), it might be safe to assume that it was the editor of the 18th fascicle version in the *Fayuan zhulin* who changed the conjunction *you* to *hou*.<sup>38</sup> If this assumption is correct, the close parallel in the contents of these passages would indicate that the *Ruijing lu* was the original that was copied by the editor of the 18th fascicle collection of the *Fayuan zhulin*.

In the 18th fascicle, Zhizhan's biography and appended stories are given as separate items and immediately following

three stories that can be shown to have been taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*.<sup>39</sup> After Zhizhan's biography and the two stories about tongue miracles a note is inserted stating that the six preceding stories come from "the Liang collection of the Lives of Eminent Monks (*Gaoseng zhuan*) and other miscellaneous records" (418b28). Since the three entries immediately preceding this note, i.e., the stories about Zhizhan, the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple, and the lips and tongue dug out from the ground at Mt. Dongkan, are all based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan, this note giving their source as *Liang gaoseng zhuan* is obviously faulty.

The passage on the eunuch (no. 14) immediately follows this set of six stories, and the *Jingyi ji* is given as its source. In editing this section of the miracle story collection in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoshi appears to have read the now familiar source note (which ultimately goes back to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*) differently and taken it to refer only to the last story among those appended to Zhizhan's biography. The note itself is revised in the 18th fascicle and the adverb *bing* ("all") is here dropped (427c1).

Daoshi's rewriting of this note makes some sense if we assume that he was copying this material from the *Ruijing lu* and if we take into account the two different contexts in which the passage on Zhizhan and the appended stories appeared in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and the *Ruijing lu*. In the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, where biographies of monks are listed one after another as discrete units of the text, there is little room for misunderstanding the reference of the adverb *bing* that appears at the end of Zhizhan's biography: it refers either to the appended stories, or, at most, to everything included in the section on Zhizhan's biography. When the same note containing the same adverb was copied into the miracle story collection *Ruijing lu*, Zhizhan's biography was read as one of the many stories included in the collection, and the stories appended to Zhizhan's biography acquired independence from the biography itself, because they too were read as stories of the type collected in the *Ruijing lu*. One consequence of this transformation was, as we noted above in commenting on the text of *Ruijing lu*, that the reference of the note with the adverb *bing* that was found at the end of this body of material became unclear.



If the reader is not familiar with the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* background of these stories, there would be no reason to suspect that the reference is meant to extend only to Zhizhan's story at most. When he copied the passage and the note into the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoshi appears not to have been aware of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* background of these stories and thus might have felt that the adverb *bing*, with its indeterminate reference, was inappropriate here; he might have chosen to read the note most conservatively as referring only to the story to which the note was attached, and dropped the adverb from the note; he would then have looked for the sources for other stories elsewhere and introduced the error mentioned above.

The analysis, of the way in which the note giving the source for the group of stories under examination as *Jingyi ji* appears in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, the passages in the 18th and 85th fascicles of the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Ruijing lu*, leads to the following conclusions: (1) it was Daoxuan who collected this material from the *Jingyi ji* and this work was done when he compiled the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan; (2) Daoxuan then abbreviated this material and included it together with the mechanically copied note in the *Ruijing lu*; (3) Daoshi used the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography itself as his source when he compiled the relevant material in the 85th fascicle; (4) Daoshi relied on the *Ruijing lu* without the awareness of its ultimate dependence on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography when he compiled the relevant material in the 18th fascicle.

(b) *The Sun Jingde story*

The reference to the *Jingyi ji* also appears in a variety of sources mentioned for story no. 9, about Sun Jingde's Avalokiteśvara image. The same story, in virtually the same but slightly more detailed wording, appears as well in the image miracle collection in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* (story no. 31, 420ab). Daoxuan thus included this story twice, in two separate parts of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, first in the image miracle section in the second fascicle and then in the scripture miracle collection entitled *Ruijing lu*.<sup>40</sup> The last sentence in the *Ruijing lu* gives the source of this story as "the *Qi shu*." In the image miracle collection in the second

fascicle, the source of this story is given as “Records such as the *Qi zhi* and the *Jingyi ji*” (420b5). The story of Sun Jingde also appears in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, among the image miracle stories appended to Sengming’s biography (692c22–693a9). The source of the story is not indicated there. This *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version is very closely related to the version found in the image miracle collection in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. The two versions are of equal length, giving virtually the same details; the phraseology is identical for the most part, though at a number of places the two versions make the same points in different words. There is also an entry on this story in Daoxuan’s *Shijia fangzhi*, compiled in the first year of Yonghui (650) (T. Vol. 52, 972b18–28). This version, again, is quite similar to the versions mentioned above, sharing the same phraseology at a number of points, but it is significantly shorter, and a distinctive feature of this version is the passage at the end which mentions that there were numerous stories about people who, during the period when Southern and Northern China were divided and ruled by different dynasties and kingdoms, had escaped from similar predicaments by reciting the names of the Buddhas. The *Shijia fangzhi* does not indicate the source for this story.

The comparison of the four versions of the story of Sun Jingde’s Avalokiteśvara image in three works compiled by Daoxuan, i.e., two versions of this story in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version, and the *Shijia fangzhi* version, suggests the following relationship among the stories.

(i) Since the longer version of the story in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* appears to be related to the probably earlier version in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, it may be safe to conclude that this was the earlier version, which Daoxuan abbreviated to produce the corresponding passage in the *Ruijing lu*.

(ii) One sentence toward the end of the version in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* mentions that after he was released Sun Jingde hosted a vegetarian feast to honour the vow he had made earlier (420b3,4). This information is missing in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version, but is repeated in a slightly modified form in the *Ruijing lu* version (“he hosted a vegetarian feast and welcomed the image, i.e., brought the

image to the place where the feast was held," 427b1). This evidence suggests that the *Ruijing lu* version was directly related to the version in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, rather than to the probably earlier *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version.

(iii) Daoxuan probably used the "records such as the *Qi zhi* and the *Jingyi ji*," mentioned at the end of the version of the story in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, in preparing this longer version of the story. This version might well have been first written when he compiled the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* appendix to Sengming's biography. The "*Qi shu*" mentioned in the note found in the *Ruijing lu* version probably refers to the *Qi zhi* in the longer note in the second fascicle version, and this might have been the principal source that Daoxuan used in compiling the longer *Xu gaoseng zhuan* / *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, second fascicle, version.

(iv) The *Shijia fangzhi* version was also an abbreviated and revised version, prepared on yet another occasion, probably in the first year of the Yonghui period (750–751) when the *Shijia fangzhi* was compiled, assuming that the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version already existed by then.<sup>41</sup> There appears to be no direct relationship between the two shorter *Shijia fangzhi* and *Ruijing lu* versions. The comment on many similar miracles, a distinctive feature of the *Shijia fangzhi* version, is missing from the *Ruijing lu* version.

In the *Fayuan zhulin*, the story appears twice: in the 14th fascicle, it appears in a form identical to the version in the image miracle section of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*; in this version, the note on the source, identical to the one in the image miracle section of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, is given in small characters at the end (389c). In the 17th fascicle, a shorter version of the story is given; a note found at a later point in the collection states that this story was taken from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (411bc). But this 17th fascicle version is in fact identical to the short version that is found in Daoxuan's *Shijia fangzhi*, mentioned above. It is a shorter version than that of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* passage, though, as suggested above, the *Shijia fangzhi* version might well have been originally produced by abbreviating the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* account.

We have remarked that the note in the 14th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* on the source of Sun Jingde's story is given at the

end of the story in small characters. The miracle story sections of the *Fayuan zhulin* generally give the sources of the stories in a note attached at the end of each story, and in smaller characters. Thus, it might be tempting to conclude that here the version in the 14th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is the original and that Daoxuan, in copying this material into the 2nd fascicle of his *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, neglected to give the source in smaller characters. There is, however, another, stronger consideration that points to a different conclusion. In the *Fayuan zhulin*, these notes are usually given in a standard formula which uses the character *chu* (“to come from”) in specifying the source. The notes generally read as “the above one [or more, according to the context] story comes from such and such source.” The note on the Sun Jingde story in the 14th fascicle begins with a character *jian* (“[this story] is found in”) (*Fayuan zhulin*, 389c24; ref., *Ruijing lu*, 427c1; *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, 420b5).<sup>42</sup> The reference to the *Jingyi ji* in the material associated with Zhizhan’s biography examined above also was given in a note that begins with the character *jian* (*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 686b14; *Fayuan zhulin*, 418c4, 910a24). In the case of the stories given in Zhizhan’s biography, we are relatively certain that the reference to the *Jingyi ji* first appeared in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and then was copied into other versions, including the two passages in the *Fayuan zhulin*. Furthermore, in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan, the reference to the *Jingyi ji* is given in regular characters as the last sentence of the main text (686b14). In the two locations in the *Fayuan zhulin*, i.e., in the 18th and 85th fascicles, the note on the *Jingyi ji* is given in smaller characters. Daoshi must have taken a sentence in the main text of Daoxuan’s *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography and transformed it into notes on the source of the quoted passage that look very similar to other notes on sources that he composed elsewhere in the *Fayuan zhulin*. If this analysis is correct, then it was Daoxuan rather than Daoshi who first used the character *jian* in giving the sources for the story attached to Zhizhan’s story. The use of the same character, *jian*, in the case of the Sun Jingde story suggests therefore that Daoxuan may have used this same character consistently in giving sources for the stories he collected and that it was again Daoxuan who was the original author of the source note mentioning the *Jingyi ji* for the Sung Jingde story.<sup>43</sup>

Sun Jingde's story probably existed in one more or less standardized form: the phraseology of the existing versions is remarkably similar, though they mention different sources. At the moment I am not able to determine what the titles *Qi shu*, and *Qi zhi* refer to, but the standardized version may well have been found in the *Jingyi ji* as well. In a more comprehensive review of the development of stories concerning the *Gaowang guanshiyin jing*, i.e., the scripture that is said to have been given to Sun Jingde and to have saved his life in the end, Makita Tairyō noted that it was Daoxuan who introduced the name Sun Jingde into this story and that this same story had existed by that time for roughly a hundred years as the story of an event that befell another, more prominent person<sup>44</sup>

It appears very likely, therefore, that it was Daoxuan who produced the earlier versions of the story about Sun Jingde. Daoshi copied the version of the story in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* when he compiled Sun Jingde's story in the 14th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. Daoshi seems to have copied the *Shijia fangzhi* version of the story when he compiled the story in the 17th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. As noted above, this *Shijia fangzhi* version might originally have been prepared on the basis of the version found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Sengming. For a reason that is not clear, Daoshi gave the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* as the source of the story of Sun Jingde in the 17th fascicle version.

(c) *The Sanbao gantong lu stories*

Earlier, I discussed briefly the stories about Daoji (no. 17), Yisu (*Ruijing lu* no. 20), Shi Heshi (no. 21), and Tanyun (no. 23). These stories are ultimately all based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, but they appear side by side in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, where their source is explicitly said to be the *Sanbao gantong lu*. The *Fayuan zhulin* contains other passages on the stories about Daoji (*juan* 64, 779b), Yisu and Shi Heshi (*juan* 85, 910c–911a). In both cases the source is explicitly said to be the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*.

The 64th fascicle story about Daoji is a slightly abbreviated and in places extensively reworded version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. In one place, the shorter version in the *Ruijing lu* and the 18th fascicle preserves the original wording of the *Xu*

*gaoseng zhuan* biography (*shi bu fu chou*, *Fayuan zhulin*, 421a11; *Ruijing lu*, 427c19; *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 687c28), whereas the 64th fascicle version shows a number of revisions (*shi bu chou huai*, 779b23, 24). This might constitute a small piece of evidence pointing to the conclusion that the shorter version in the *Ruijing lu*/18th fascicle was prepared directly from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography.

The 85th fascicle story about Yisu and Shi Heshi is again an abbreviated version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Yisu. The beginning section of Yisu's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, reproduced in an abbreviated form in the *Ruijing lu*/18th fascicle version of this story, is entirely missing from the 85th fascicle version. This indicates that the *Ruijing lu*/18th fascicle version could not have been prepared on the basis of the abbreviated version in the 85th fascicle. It was, again, prepared directly from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography.

To summarize the relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* parallels examined so far, in eight out of the nine cases examined, I arrived at the conclusion that the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels which can be shown to be directly related to the *Ruijing lu* stories were copied from the *Ruijing lu*: the stories about Zhizhan (no. 11), the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple (no. 12), the lips and tongue dug out from the ground at Mt. Dongkan (no. 13), and the eunuch who grew a beard (no. 14) use the expression *hou* ("later") instead of the usual *you* ("and"); the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to the *Ruijing lu* stories about Daoji (no. 17), Yisu (no. 20), Shi Heshi (no. 21), and Tanyun (no. 23) state explicitly that they are based on the *Sanbao gantong lu*. In one case, that of the story about Sun Jingde (no. 9), a closer examination indicated that the *Ruijing lu* version was a rather independent, and probably late version, not directly related to either one of the two *Fayuan zhulin* versions.

#### (d) Other parallels

The evidence is more complicated in the remaining three *Xu gaoseng zhuan* stories in the *Ruijing lu*. Baogui's story (*Ruijing lu* no. 18) appears in the 55th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (709b), where it is said to have been taken from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*. This *Fayuan zhulin* story about Baogui is in fact an abbreviated and slightly reworded version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*

version. The *Ruijing lu* story about Baogui is an even shorter version, but it contains phrases that clearly go back to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography (e.g., *wu ta fangshu*, 427c22 [*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 688a12], *bushizhe zhong*, 427c24 [*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 688a21]) which are not found in the longer version in the 55th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. Thus, the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* stories on Baogui appear to have been independently abbreviated from the common original *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography.

Kongzang's story (*Ruijing lu* no. 19) appears twice in the *Fayuan zhulin*. Both that in *juan* 63 (766a) and *juan* 85 (910c–911a) are said to have been based on the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*. The 63rd fascicle version is virtually identical to the *Ruijing lu* story, though it is slightly more detailed toward the end. One phrase in the 63rd fascicle story preserves the phraseology in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, and thus suggests that the 63rd fascicle version might be the original copied by Daoxuan into the *Ruijing lu*.<sup>45</sup> This evidence is rather fragmentary, and in itself it is perhaps not quite sufficient to support this conclusion firmly. But the *Ruijing lu* version of the story does not specify its source, and therefore, as I suggested at the outset of my discussion, it is unlikely to have served as the source for its *Fayuan zhulin* parallel (in this case the passage in the 63rd fascicle), which specifies the source correctly as the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*. Since the version in the 63rd fascicle and the *Ruijing lu* version are very similar, and both are drastically abbreviated versions of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, we may conclude that the 63rd fascicle version was the earlier version that was copied by Daoxuan with minor revisions into the *Ruijing lu*.

The 85th fascicle passage on Kongzang is also an abbreviation of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. Interestingly, this passage focuses on the part of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography that was not excerpted in the parallel versions in the *Ruijing lu* and the 63rd fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. This 85th fascicle passage on Kongzang appears as the first part of a clearly marked unit of stories, which along with three preceding stories about monks is said to have been taken from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. Within this clearly marked unit, Kongzang's story is immediately followed by the stories about Yisu and Shi Heshi (nos. 20 and 21). We have noted that the Yisu and Shi Heshi passages in the 85th fascicle appear to be independently excerpted from

the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and not directly related to the 18th fascicle version directly copied from the *Ruijing lu*. Thus, none of the three stories about Kongzang, Yisu, and Shi Heshi in the 85th fascicle appears to be directly related to the *Ruijing lu*. The corresponding section of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (juan 28, 689b–690b) contains the biographies of Kongzang, Huiquan, and Yisu (with an appendix that includes the story of Shi Heshi). Thus, the sections in the *Ruijing lu* and the 85th fascicle that contains the materials on Kongzang, Yisu and Shi Heshi may have been independently based on this *Xu gaoseng zhuan* passage. This would explain why the stories about Kongzang, Yisu, and Shi Heshi appear side by side in the *Ruijing lu* and again appear side by side in the same order in the 85th fascicle.<sup>46</sup>

The *Ruijing lu* story about Tanyan (no. 26) centers around a miracle story: upon Tanyan's request, brilliant light appeared from both ends of the shaft of the scroll on which the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* was copied and from the large relic *stūpa*, and the light reached the sky, illuminating everywhere in the four directions; both monks and laymen everywhere around the temple thought that a fire had started at the temple and came running in great panic, only to realize their mistake upon arrival.

The story about Tanyan appears in the 24th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (467c), and his biography is found in the eighth fascicle of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* ("exegetes" section, 488a–489c). The *Fayuan zhulin* story is obviously an excerpt from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography (488a3–5, a25–b10, 489b14–16), and both the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography and the *Fayuan zhulin* story lack one detail of the story, that people mistook the miraculous light for fire in the temple. There may have been some direct relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*/*Fayuan zhulin* versions, but the phraseology of these two versions is significantly different. Thus, the *Fayuan zhulin* could not have been based on the *Ruijing lu* version. Since the *Ruijing lu* version tells the story about the miraculous light differently, it might have been directly based on a different source that is mentioned in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, i.e., Lü Shuding's inscription or the *Bie zhuan* biography (489b29, c25). If this happens to be the case, though the parallel *Fayuan zhulin* story was based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, the *Ruijing lu* story would have been prepared independently from an earlier source.



If this is so, the *Ruijing lu* story about Tanyan would not have been based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, and we must consider this case as not belonging to the group of stories in the *Ruijing lu* that are based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biographies, and which constitute the subject of the present investigation.

In summary, the *Ruijing lu* contains twelve stories that are closely related to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biographies. In eight cases, the stories about Sun Jingde (no. 9), Zhizhan (no. 11), the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple (no. 12), the lips and tongue dug out from the ground at Mt. Dongkan (no. 13), the eunuch who grew a beard (no. 14), Daoji (no. 17), Yisu (no. 20), Shi Heshi (no. 21), and Tanyun (no. 23), the *Ruijing lu* appears to have been the source for the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* stories; in one case, the story of Kongzang, the *Fayuan zhulin* story in the 63rd fascicle appears to have been the original that was copied by Daoxuan into the *Ruijing lu*; in two cases, the stories about Sun Jingde, and Baogui, the *Fayuan zhulin* stories do not appear to have any direct relationship with the *Ruijing lu*; the situation is rather unclear in one case, that of Tanyan, but here again the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions were prepared independently of each other, and the *Ruijing lu* story was based at least partly on sources other than the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*.

This detailed examination of the materials in the *Ruijing lu* that are ultimately based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biographies shows again that the main part of these stories was taken from the “reciters of scripture” section of that collection, and that the majority, though not all, of these *Ruijing lu* stories were first prepared by Daoxuan on the basis of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biographies that he had himself compiled earlier. In these cases the *Ruijing lu* story first prepared by Daoxuan was later copied by Daoshi into the *Fayuan zhulin*.

### 5. *The Mingbao ji stories*

The third major source for the stories collected in the *Ruijing lu* is the *Mingbao ji*, completed by Tang Lin (?600–659?) sometime between the years 653 and 655.<sup>17</sup> Tang Lin, a high government official who presumably was also a devout lay Buddhist, compiled this collection of miracle stories by collecting a large

number of stories that circulated as oral stories during his life time.<sup>48</sup> The title of this collection and its preface indicate that Tan Lin collected these stories in order to show how karmic retributions work.<sup>49</sup> Thus, *Mingbao ji* is a very different kind of work from the *Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* mentioned above, and Daoxuan's reliance on this source needs to be carefully taken into account in evaluating the nature of the *Ruijing lu*.

*Ruijing lu* stories nos. 24, 25, 27–35 appear to have been taken from this source.

*Ruijing lu* story no. 24 is about the monk Sengche, and the *Fayuan zhulin* contains an identical story in the 95th fascicle (989bc), where the source of the story is given as the *Mingbao shiyi*, Lang Yuling's collection that was probably completed around 663.<sup>50</sup> The significance of the *Fayuan zhulin*'s reference to the *Mingbao shiyi* is not entirely clear. It is possible that the *Fayuan zhulin* was mistaken in this attribution. A longer version of this story is found in the Taishō edition version of the *Mingbao ji* (788c–789a).<sup>51</sup> In his reconstruction of the original *Mingbao ji*,<sup>52</sup> Gjertson lists it as the third story. It is also possible, however, that the version of the Sengche story reproduced in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* was in fact taken from the *Mingbao shiyi*. As Gjertson explains in some detail, the *Mingbao shiyi* often took stories that were found in the *Mingbao ji*, recapitulating their contents and adding further details to them.<sup>53</sup> Since the *Mingbao shiyi* is no longer extant in its entirety, we cannot investigate this possibility any further; Sengche's story is not found among the list of *Mingbao shiyi* fragments collected by Gen Zhongmian.<sup>54</sup>

The story about the nun from Hedong, “who was diligent in practice” (*Ruijing lu*, no. 25) is also found in the 27th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (486c), where the source of the story is said to be the *Mingbao ji*. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is identical to the *Mingbao ji* text reproduced in the Taishō collection (789ab), except for the beginning and the end. In the Taishō *Mingbao ji*, Tang Lin explains that he heard the story from the monk Faduan, the other principal figure in the story, and adds a note saying that he had forgotten the name of the nun. The *Fayuan zhulin* passage begins by naming the nun as Faxin, and ends with two lines commenting generally on the miraculous effects

of copying scriptures. These lines are not found in the Taishō *Mingbao ji* text, and thus appear to have been added by Daoshi, along with the name of the nun which Tang Lin had forgotten, when he copied the story from the *Mingbao ji*.<sup>55</sup> The *Ruijing lu* version is an abbreviated version, which does not mention the name of the nun Faxin, and ends with a note that says that Tang Lin himself told the story. This *Ruijing lu* version appears to be related directly to the *Mingbao ji* passage, and not copied from the corresponding passage in the *Fayuan zhulin*. Gjertson lists this story as the 4th story in his reconstruction.<sup>56</sup>

The *Fayuan zhulin* does not contain any story about Daosun that corresponds to the story about this monk in the *Ruijing lu* (no. 27). A story about this monk is found in the Taishō text of the *Mingbao ji* (789b). Gjerston lists Daosun's as the 5th story.<sup>57</sup> Daosun's biography is included in Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (*juan* 14 ["exegetes" section], 532c–533a). Though there are frequent differences in phraseology, for the most part the *Ruijing lu* story parallels the *Mingbao ji* story. The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography is a good deal longer, and in one passage tells what appears to be an entirely different version of the *Ruijing lu*/*Mingbao ji* story (533b8–23). Thus, there is little doubt that Daoxuan compiled the *Ruijing lu* version of this story on the basis of the *Mingbao ji* story.

The *Ruijing lu* story about Zhiyuan (no. 28) gives basically the same account as the Zhiyuan story in the *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 18, 420c–421a). The *Fayuan zhulin* story gives its source as the *Mingbao ji*, and the corresponding passage in the Taishō *Mingbao ji* text (789c) is virtually identical to the *Fayuan zhulin* excerpt. The *Ruijing lu* version appears to have been an abbreviated summary of the *Mingbao ji* story. Gjerston lists Zhiyuan's story as the 7th.<sup>58</sup>

Yan Gong's story in the *Ruijing lu* (no. 29) describes him as a man of the Jiangzhou Prefecture. The 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* contains a story about Yan Gong of the Yangzhou Prefecture, which it says has been taken from the *Mingbao ji*. The *Mingbao ji* story about Yan Gong in the Taishō collection (790bc) also describes the man as Yan Gong of the Yangzhou Prefecture. The *Fayuan zhulin* passage is a slightly modified copy of this *Mingbao ji* story. The main body of this *Mingbao ji* story is about a strange experience that Yan Gong and his par-

ents had: Yan Gong went to Yangzhou on a boat with 50,000 pieces of money that his parents had given him. He bought from the captain of another boat fifty large turtles that had been destined to be sold at the market and killed. Yan Gong then set the turtles free. Later, the boat of the captain who sold the turtles sank, and the captain was killed. On the same day, fifty guests, all dressed in black, appeared at the home of Yan Gong's parents and gave back the 50,000 pieces of money. Upon Yan Gong's return, everyone realized that the fifty guests were in fact the large turtles that Yan Gong had set free. It is then said that Yan Gong and his parents moved to Yangzhou, built a temple (*jingshe*) and concentrated on copying the *Lotus Sūtra*. The family prospered, and the building was expanded. A large number of scribes worked for them. Several short stories then follow. Gjerston lists this story as the 11th story in the reconstructed *Mingbao ji*.<sup>59</sup>

The *Ruijing lu* story about Yan Gong tells three of the stories told in the last part of this *Mingbao ji* story, i.e., the story about the 10,000 pieces of money reluctantly loaned to someone and mysteriously returned following a shipwreck; the story about the dream in which the god of the Gongting hu (Gong hu) lake returned the offerings of a merchant, telling him to present them to Yan Gong to cover the costs of copying the scripture; and the story about the 3,000 pieces of money presented to Yan Gong by an apparition when Yan Gong found himself short of money for buying paper. Another story then follows, which describes how a fisherman who saw a floating flame in the river and went to welcome it on a boat found a box containing a scripture copied by the Yan family. This story is not found in the *Mingbao ji* story, neither in the original text nor in the *Fayuan zhulin* copy of the story in the 18th fascicle. Since the *Ruijing lu* was a collection of stories about scripture miracles, it is understandable why Daoxuan, when he prepared his entry on Yan Gong, chose to drop the long story at the beginning and concentrated on the stories that were related to the Yan family's business of copying scriptures. The story about the fisherman, not found in the *Mingbao ji* version, suggests that Daoxuan used additional sources in preparing his *Ruijing lu* story on Yan Gong. The description of Yan Gong as a man of Jiangzhou may also come from a source other than the *Mingbao ji*.

The *Fayuan zhulin* story about Li Shanlong (*juan* 20, 436abc) that corresponds to *Ruijing lu* story no. 30 gives its source as the *Mingbao ji*. The Taishō edition of the *Mingbao ji* contains the Li Shanlong story (795c–796b), and the comparison of the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Mingbao ji* passages indicates that the *Fayuan zhulin* passage is in fact a copy of the *Mingbao ji* story. The *Ruijing lu* story is an abbreviated version of the *Mingbao ji* story. Gjertson lists the Li Shanlong story as the 29th story in his reconstructed *Mingbao ji*.<sup>60</sup>

*Ruijing lu* story no. 31 is about Li Siyi. The story about Li Siyi does not appear in the Kozanji manuscript of the *Mingbao ji*, reproduced in the Taishō collection, but according to Gjertson it appears in the Maeda manuscript, the other of the four known manuscripts of this work that is relatively easily accessible to scholars.<sup>61</sup> Consequently, Gjertson lists this story as story A in his reconstructed *Mingbao ji*.<sup>62</sup>

The *Ruijing lu* story describes Li Siyi's experience in the realm of the dead, and gives the date of this incident as the first month of the 20th year of the Zhenguan period (646). The *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 91 (p. 938), records a story about Li Siyi which is said to have been quoted from the *Mingbao shiyi*. The incident reported here occurred in the fifth month of the third year of Yonghui (654). At the beginning of this story in the *Ruijing lu*, it is said that what Li Siyi reported after the first time he was revived from death, in the first month of the 20th year of Zhenguan, is found in the *Mingbao ji*. Since the date of the incident in the *Ruijing lu* passage and this reference to the *Mingbao ji* story agree, there is little doubt that the original *Mingbao ji* contained a story about Li Siyi, and that Daoxuan must have taken his *Ruijing lu* story from that source. In a typical fashion described by Gjertson, the *Mingbao shiyi* appears to have supplemented this *Mingbao ji* story by reporting what happened Li Siyi later, and it was this later *Mingbao shiyi* story that was reproduced by Daoshi in the *Fayuan zhulin*.

The story about Lady Doulu in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (421c) is a longer version of *Ruijing lu* story no. 29. The *Fayuan zhulin* version gives its source as the *Mingbao ji*. The story appears in the *Mingbao ji* text reproduced in the Taishō collection (795bc). There is, however, one revealing difference between the *Fayuan zhulin* version and the *Mingbao ji* text repro-

duced in the Taishō collection: the *Mingbao ji* at the end states that the subject, aged 80, was still alive at the time the record is made (between 653–655) and that Tang Lin heard the story from Lady Doulu herself; the *Fayuan zhulin* states that the subject died at the age of 80. Lady Doulu probably told this story to Tang Lin when she was 80 years old, and she died in the same year; Daoshi must have copied the story from the *Mingbao ji* after Lady Doulu passed away, and since the story mentions that her younger brother Lord Rui predicted on his death bed that Lady Doulu would live until the age of 100, Daoshi might have felt obliged to mention the fact that she died sooner, at age 80. Here again Daoshi appears to have added a new detail to the *Mingbao ji* passage in his characteristic fashion, and Gjertson mentions this as a good example of this practice.<sup>63</sup> The *Ruijing lu* version is an abbreviation of the *Mingbao ji* / *Fayuan zhulin* story. Neither the statement that Lady Doulu is still alive (*Mingbao ji*) nor that she died at age 80 (*Fayuan zhulin*) appears in the *Ruijing lu* passage, and thus we cannot determine whether the *Ruijing lu* was copied from the *Mingbao ji* directly, or from the revised *Fayuan zhulin* copy. Gjertson lists this story as no. 28.<sup>64</sup>

A longer version of the *Ruijing lu* story about Cen Wenben (no. 33) is found in the *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 56 (712c-713a), and its source is given there as the *Mingbao ji*. The version of the story found in the *Mingbao ji* text in the Taishō collection (795a) is virtually identical to the *Fayuan zhulin* version, which must have been copied from it. The *Ruijing lu* gives an abbreviated version of the *Mingbao ji* story. Gjertson lists this story as the 25th story in his reconstructed *Mingbao ji*.<sup>65</sup>

The story about the maid servant seen by Su Chang (*Ruijing lu*, no. 34) is found in a fuller version in the *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 18, 421c), which gives the source as the *Mingbao ji*. The Taishō edition of the *Mingbao ji* reproduces the same story twice (794b and 795a), with slight differences in phraseology and content. Some mistake must have occurred in the transmission of the version of the *Mingbao ji* that survived in the Kōzanji manuscript. The statement that the box containing the *Lotus* Scripture became wet outside but remained dry inside (after it had drifted in turbulent waters, being held on her head by the pious maid servant) appears only in the second passage in the Taishō text. This point is made both in the *Fayuan zhulin* and

the *Ruijing lu* versions. The original *Mingbao ji* version of this story must have mentioned this point, and both the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Ruijing lu* versions must have copied it from there.

The *Ruijing lu* story about Dong Xiong (no. 35) is virtually identical to the *Fayuan zhulin* version of the same story (juan 27, 485ab), which gives its source as the *Mingbao shiyi*. The Taishō edition of the *Mingbao ji* contains a version of the same story (794c–795a), but this *Mingbao ji* version is somewhat more detailed and is accompanied by a long note explaining how Tang Lin, the compiler of the *Mingbao ji*, first heard about it from Li Jingxuan and then confirmed the story by speaking to Dong Xiong himself. Gjertson lists this story as no. 24 in his reconstruction.<sup>66</sup>

As I noted in earlier similar cases, the Dong Xiong story, which appeared in the *Mingbao ji*, might have appeared in an abbreviated version in the *Mingbao shiyi* as well, and it is possible that it was this abbreviated version that was copied by Daoxuan and Daoshi into the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*. In the present case, however, since the *Ruijing lu* / *Fayuan zhulin* version adds no further details, and even though it is clearly an abbreviated version of the *Mingbao ji* original, and preserves the original phraseology faithfully in the unabbreviated sections, it is also possible, and perhaps more likely, that the note in the *Fayuan zhulin*, giving the source of the story as the *Mingbao shiyi*, was a mistake. This would mean that the *Ruijing lu* / *Fayuan zhulin* passage was taken directly from the *Mingbao ji*. If this was the case, the *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* versions, which are abbreviations of a single source and are virtually identical with each other, must have been directly related to each other.

Furthermore, one minor difference between the *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* versions enables us to determine that the *Ruijing lu* must have been dependent on the *Fayuan zhulin*. The story of Dong Xiong centers around a miracle. An Assistant Minister of the Court of Judicial Review, Dong Xiong, who was involved in an incident that angered the Emperor greatly, was chained and placed in the same room as fellow prisoners Li Jingxuan, another Assistant Minister of the Court of Judicial Review, and Rectification Clerk Wang Xin. He had recited the *Pumen* chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra* three thousand times, and

when he was reciting the *sūtra* in the middle of the night, his chains spontaneously fell to the ground.<sup>67</sup> Investigating Censor Zhang Shouyi, who was spending the night in official quarters that night, was amazed, and having chained Dong Xiong and locked the chain, he sealed the lock with a paper.<sup>68</sup> But Dong Xiong recited the *sūtra* until five o'clock in the morning, and the chain fell to the ground again. Dong Xiong was afraid, and he informed his fellow prisoners of what had happened. In the *Mingbao ji* text in the Taishō collection, a somewhat obscure sentence follows here; it probably means that the fellow prisoners said that they should not report anything to the jail officers, and when they looked together after dawn, they discovered the lock and the chain on the ground, separated from each other. The lock was still closed and the paper seal unbroken. The corresponding passage in the *Fayuan zhulin* is, if anything, even more obscure, but it appears to indicate that his fellow prisoners told Li Jingxuan about what had happened and Li discovered that the lock had been opened without breaking the paper seal.<sup>69</sup> In the corresponding passage in the *Ruijing lu*, Dong Xiong and his fellow prisoners are said to have told Zhang Shouyi about the miracle in the morning, and it is Zhang Shouyi who is said to have seen that the lock had been opened without breaking the seal. The meaning of the passage appears to have been changed dramatically: in the *Mingbao ji*, the fellow prisoners did not wish the official to know about the second miracle; in the *Ruijing lu*, the miracle was confirmed by the official himself. I am inclined to believe that Daoxuan emended the rather obscure passage in the *Fayuan zhulin* (or possibly in the *Mingbao shiyi* summary copied faithfully by Daoshi into the *Fayuan zhulin*) and that he could not have been aware of the original *Mingbao ji* passage at this point, since, if he had he known the original passage, it seems unlikely that he would have changed the meaning into its opposite at this point. This would mean that it was either Daoshi or the compiler of the *Mingbao shiyi* who first abbreviated the *Mingbao ji* story, and that Daoxuan then revised Daoshi's abbreviated version slightly in producing his *Ruijing lu* version.

This review of the *Ruijing lu* materials drawn from the *Mingbao ji* shows that in six out of a total of the eleven cases, the *Fayuan zhulin* version, identical or very similar to the *Ming-*



*bao ji* original, appears in an abbreviated form in the *Ruijing lu*: stories about the nun from Hedong (no. 25), Zhiyuan (no. 28), Li Shanlong (no. 30), Lady Doulu (no. 32), Cen Wenben (no. 33), and Su Chang (no. 34). Generally speaking, it is not possible to determine whether the *Ruijing lu* version was based on the *Mingbao ji* original or the materials collected for compiling the *Fayuan zhulin*. But we noted in examining the story about the nun from Hedong that the *Fayuan zhulin* version gives the name of the nun which Tang Lin had forgotten, and lacks the note in the *Mingbao ji* that explains the origin of this story; the *Ruijing lu* passage does not mention the name of the nun, but ends with a note on the origin that appears to have been related to the *Mingbao ji* passage. The story of this nun in the *Ruijing lu* thus appears to have been directly based on the *Mingbao ji* version.

In one case, the *Ruijing lu* passage appears to be dependent on the *Mingbao ji*/*Fayuan zhulin* version, but it also appears to have had other sources. The Yan Gong story in the *Ruijing lu* (no. 29) contains materials paralleling sections of the *Mingbao ji* passage on Yan Gong, which in turn is reproduced more or less faithfully in the *Fayuan zhulin*, but it describes Yan Gong as a man of Jiangzhou, and not as a man of Yangzhou, as in the *Mingbao ji*/*Fayuan zhulin* version, and it also contains additional details toward the end.

In two cases, the *Fayuan zhulin* does not contain a story corresponding to the *Ruijing lu*, and only a direct comparison with the *Mingbao ji* story shows that the *Ruijing lu* stories were taken from that source. Thus, Daoxuan must have copied the *Ruijing lu* story of Daosun (no. 27) directly from the *Mingbao ji*; he did so also in the case of Li Siyi, while Daoshi copied his story about Li Siyi from the *Mingbao shiyi*.

In two cases, the stories about Sengche and Dong Xiong (*Ruijing lu* nos. 24 and 35), the *Ruijing lu* stories are virtually identical to the *Fayuan zhulin* version, which gives the source as the *Mingbao shiyi*. The same stories are found in a more detailed form in the *Mingbao ji*. We cannot determine whether (1) the versions of the story common to the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* were based on summaries of the original *Mingbao ji* stories that were found in the *Mingbao shiyi*, or (2) the attribution to the *Mingbao shiyi* is mistaken, and the common versions in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* were directly related to

each other. In either event, we were able to determine that in the case of Dong Xiong's story the *Ruijing lu* story was dependent on the *Fayuan zhulin* version (which might be reproducing the *Mingbao shiyi* summary faithfully), and not *vice versa*.

Four of the eleven stories under examination here appear in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*: the stories about Zhiyuan (no. 28), Yan Gong (29), Lady Doulu (32), and Su Chang's maid servant (34). In the case of three of these stories (nos. 28, 32, and 34), the *Ruijing lu* version of the story is abbreviated from the longer version in the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Mingbao ji* in the Taishō collection. In one case (no. 29), the *Ruijing lu* version reproduces a part of the longer version in the corresponding *Mingbao ji* / *Fayuan zhulin* version, but contains other materials that must have been taken from another source. In the case of these stories, Daoxuan could have taken his material for the *Ruijing lu* from the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, or its earlier draft, abbreviated them, and in the case of the Yan Gong's story, added further material taken from elsewhere. It is also possible that both the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (fascicle 18) were independently based on the *Mingbao ji* original: the *Ruijing lu* version was abbreviated (and expanded in other ways with other materials in the case of the story about Yan Gong [no. 29]), and the *Fayuan zhulin* was not.

Two stories, those about the nun from Hedong and Dong Xiong, appear in the 27th fascicle. We have noted that the *Ruijing lu* story about the nun from Hedong appears to have been copied directly from the *Mingbao ji*, and not made from its revised *Fayuan zhulin* copy. The *Ruijing lu* story about Dong Xiong appears to have been copied either from the *Fayuan zhulin* version, or from the *Mingbao shiyi* version, which the *Fayuan zhulin* passage gives as its source. In this case, therefore, the evidence is somewhat contradictory, and does not point to any close relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and the 27th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*.

Parallels to the other four stories, whose ultimate origin can be traced to the *Mingbao ji* through their *Fayuan zhulin* versions, are scattered in different fascicles: the Li Shanlong story (no. 30) is found in the 20th fascicle; the Cen Wenben story (no. 33) in the 56th fascicle; Li Siyi story (no. 31) is referred to

briefly in the *Fayuan zhulin* excerpt from the *Mingbao shiyi* in the 91st fascicle; and the Sengche story (no. 24) is found in the 95th fascicle.

The accounts in the *Mingbao ji* are of particular interest to us because the origins of these stories, in many cases oral statements by the parties directly involved in them, are indicated carefully at the end of the stories. Many of the incidents recounted in these stories had taken place relatively recently, and stories often mention dates from the Zhenguan period: the story about the nun from Hedong (no. 25) mentions the second year (628–629), the Daosun story (no. 27) mentions the fourth year (630–631), the Zhiyuan story (no. 28) mentions the 13th year (639–640), the Li Siyi story (no. 31) mentions the 20th year (646–647), and the Dong Xiong story (no. 35) speaks of the “Zhenguan period.” This part of the *Ruijing lu*, along with the material to be reviewed below, gives the *Ruijing lu* a very distinctive character.

### 6. Contemporary stories

The last two stories of the *Ruijing lu* (nos. 37 and 38) both bear dates that are close to the date given for the completion of the text: the story about a descendant of Gao Biaoren (no. 37) begins with the date of the 27th day of the first month of the third year of Longsu (February 27, 663); the story about Cui Yiqi (no. 38) with that of the 20th day of the sixth month of the same year (July 30, 663). Story no. 38 also mentions the even more recent date of the first month of the first year of Linde (664). The colophon attached to the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* (435b) gives the date of the compilation of the work as the 20th day of the sixth month of the first year of Linde (July 18, 664).

I noted above that a version of the *Ruijing lu*—which according to Daoxuan’s note appears to have been completed earlier, by the first month of the fourth year of Longsu (which is the same year as the first year of Linde)—constitutes the last section of Daoxuan’s catalogue of Buddhist works, the *Datang neidian lu*. In general, the two versions of this same collection in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and the *Datang neidian lu* are

very close to each other, but rather significantly, story no. 38, the last story in the *Ruijing lu*, is missing in the *Datang neidian lu* version of the collection.<sup>70</sup> Obviously, story no. 38, which describes an incident that took place during the vegetarian feast at the residence of General Xie in the first month of the first year of Linde (664), was not available to Daoxuan when he was completing his compilation of the *Datang neidian lu*, in the same month. Daoxuan then seems to have augmented his text later in the sixth month of the same year when he compiled the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and included the *Ruijing lu* in the third fascicle of that work.

A variant and longer version of these stories is included in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The note at the end of the *Fayuan zhulin* version of Gao Fayan's story (no. 37) indicates that the story was widely known at the time.<sup>71</sup> The note at the end of the story about Cui Yiqi's wife, the daughter of Xiao Keng, indicates the location of the residence, and states that Daoshi visited the place and observed the articles used by the maid servant, who could recite three scriptures (The *Diamond*, *Bhaiṣajyaguru*, and *Lotus sūtras*) in Sanskrit (912a26, 27).

No literary sources are given for these two stories in the *Fayuan zhulin*, and their location at the very end of the *Ruijing lu* probably indicates that they were supplementary material added to a work that was for the most part based on well-known literary sources. Daoxuan probably took two familiar contemporary stories of scripture miracles and added them one by one to his collection, possibly by summarizing easily available (and perhaps oral) versions of the stories in question. He may have understood this practice, moreover, as a continuation of Tang Lin's *Mingbao ji* project: as we saw above, Tang Lin had recorded many miracle stories that he had heard directly himself. Many of these stories, widely known among pious contemporary Buddhists, were incorporated into the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*. In incorporating the two stories under examination here into the *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoshi used different longer versions, a fact that may be interpreted as evidence of the fluid condition of the stories, which must have been easily available in different forms to these compilers.

6. *Summary and Concluding Remarks: The Fayuan zhulin parallels*

We have examined the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to the *Ruijing lu* in order to reconstruct as far as possible the process through which Daoxuan compiled the *Ruijing lu*. This same analysis, however, also throws some light on a different but related question: how did Daoshi, the compiler of the *Fayuan zhulin*, use the *Ruijing lu* material in compiling his encyclopedia? If, for example, the same story is given in the same form in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*, and if that form is different from the form in which the story is told in the source identified in the *Fayuan zhulin*, we might conclude that, in compiling the *Fayuan zhulin* version of the story, Daoshi copied directly from the *Ruijing lu*, and not from the source identified in the *Fayuan zhulin* passage. If, on the other hand, the *Fayuan zhulin* version is identical or closer to the form in which the story is told in the source the passage identifies, and different from the form in which the story is told in the *Ruijing lu*, then Daoshi must have copied it (or abbreviated it) directly from the source identified in the passage. With this slightly different focus, let me review briefly the analysis we have conducted above.

i) In many cases, the text of the parallel stories in the *Fayuan zhulin* is closer to the *Ruijing lu* text than to the version given in the sources that the *Fayuan zhulin* passage identifies:

no. 1, Tan Wujie story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* versions are identical, but they give different sources for the passage.

no. 2, Dao'an story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* versions are identical. This is particularly significant, since they are both based on one small section of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, and it is highly unlikely that the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* excerpted this passage from a long biography independently.

no. 3, Sengsheng story. The *Fayuan zhulin* text is corrupt, but the contents are the same as the longer *Gaoseng zhuan* version.

no. 7, Huijing story. It is possible that both the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions are based directly on the *Mingxiang ji*, but more likely that the *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the *Ruijing lu*.

no. 8, Hongming story. The version in the 94th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhu lin* is an exact copy of the *Ruijing lu* version.

no. 11, Zhizhan story. The *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (18th fascicle) versions are identical. This is significant because the text is an abbreviated version of the original *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography, which appears elsewhere in *Fayuan zhulin*, 85th fascicle, in a differently abbreviated form.

nos. 12–14, stories about the anonymous monk of the Wu-housi temple, the lips and the tongue dug out at Mt. Dongkan, and the eunuch of Wei who grew a beard. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) passages are identical. The use of the conjunction *hou* in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* indicates that this version was copied from the *Ruijing lu* version.

no. 15, the story about the scripture coming down from the sky during the persecution of Buddhism under Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou dynasty. The same text is found both in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 419b), but neither passage identifies the source. This story is not found in the version of the *Ruijing lu* in the *Datang neidian lu*.

no. 16, the story about an anonymous monk in Yangzhou. The same story appears in both the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18. 419c–420a). The *Fayuan zhulin* passage gives the source of this story and that of the story that appears immediately after it as the “*Tang gaoseng zhuan*” (420b1), but the corresponding passage is not found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. There appears to be a mistake in the *Fayuan zhulin* note, and the source of this story is unknown.

no. 17, Daoji story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) versions are identical, and both are based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, though the phraseology there is different. The *Fayuan zhulin*, juan 64, gives a longer version of the same story, which reproduces the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* original more faithfully.

no. 19, Kongzang story. The *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 63) versions are nearly identical, and there are some reasons to suspect that the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 63) version might have been the original that was copied into the *Ruijing lu*. This common version had been abbreviated from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. Another part of this *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography was excerpted into the 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, but this version appears to be entirely unrelated to the *Ruijing lu*.

no. 20, Yisu story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) versions are identical. A slightly different version appears in 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*. All these versions are based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, but the phraseology there is different from that of the parallel text in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18).

no. 21, Shi Heshi story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) versions are identical, and this common version is based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, though the phraseology is often different there. The *Fayuan zhulin* 85th fascicle version is the same story with different phraseology. It is closer to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version.

no. 22, Linghu Yuangui story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) versions are identical. As I discussed in some detail in a long note above (note 15), the source of this story appears to have been an oral report by Shentai, who was the chief administrator (*sizhu*) of the Ximingsi temple.

no. 23, Tanyun story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) versions are identical, and this common version is based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, though the phraseology is often different there. There is a related note in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin*, which states explicitly that in the eleventh year of the Zhenguan period (637–638) Daoxuan saw the miraculous scripture, copied by a supernatural being.

no. 24, Sengche story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 95) versions are identical, but the original version in the *Mingbao ji* is longer.

no. 35, Dong Xiong story. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 95) versions are identical, and this common version is based on the *Mingbao ji*, which contains a slightly different version of the story.

no. 36, the story about the *Diamond Sūtra* written in the sky in Yizhou. The *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 18) versions are identical. The source of this common version of the story is not known.

ii) In some cases, the *Fayuan zhulin* parallels are closer to the sources they mention than to the *Ruijing lu* versions:

no. 4, Daojiong story. The *Fayuan zhulin* gives three stories about this monk, one in the 17th fascicle, which is said to be

based on the *Mingxiang ji*, another in the 35th fascicle, which is based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, and the third in the 65th fascicle, the source of which is not identified. The *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of this monk appears to be based on the stories in the 17th and 65th fascicles, and the *Ruijing lu* excerpt is based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography. The *Fayuan zhulin* passages on this monk could not have been based on the *Ruijing lu*.

no. 5, Puming story. Both the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* stories are based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, but the *Ruijing lu* story corresponds to the first half of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, while the *Fayuan zhulin* story includes the second half. The note at the end of the *Fayuan zhulin* states that the story is based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, but this note is mistaken. Though two biographies of Puming are found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, neither of these monks is the same monk as the Puming who is the subject of the story in the *Ruijing lu*.

no. 6, Huiguo story. The *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 94) version of this story is very similar to that in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, while the *Ruijing lu* version is abbreviated.

no. 9, Sun Jingde story. Daoxuan appears to have been the original compiler of several versions of this story. The *Ruijing lu* version of this story appears to have been based on the longer version that is found in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*; the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 14) version is identical to the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* version, and the *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 17) version is identical to the *Shijia fangzhi* version, which appears to have been based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version.

no. 10, Daolin story. The *Fayuan zhulin* version of this story is said to have come from the *Gaoseng zhuan*, and the two texts correspond perfectly. The *Ruijing lu* story, also clearly based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography, is abbreviated.

no. 18, Baogui story. Both the *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* stories are abbreviated from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. But the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* original is abbreviated differently in these two versions.

no. 25, the story about a nun from Hedong. The *Fayuan zhulin* (juan 27) version is a slightly modified version of the *Mingbao ji* original; the abbreviated *Ruijing lu* version appears to have been prepared directly on the basis of the *Mingbao ji* passage.



no. 26, Tanyan story. The *Ruijing lu* version differs slightly from the *Fayuan zhulin* (*juan* 24) version that was taken from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. The *Ruijing lu* version contains one detail not found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version, on which it might be based for the most part, and thus the *Ruijing lu* version might have been based in part on another source.

no. 28, Zhiyuan story. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the *Mingbao ji*. The note at the end of the *Mingbao ji* entry, describing how Tang Lin confirmed this story in Youzhou, is incorporated into the main text in the *Fayuan zhulin* with a minor change. The *Ruijing lu* version is abbreviated, and thus different from the *Fayuan zhulin* version.

no. 29, Yan Gong story. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the *Mingbao ji* (minor differences in wording). The first part of the note at the end of the *Mingbao ji* story is incorporated into the main text in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The *Ruijing lu* gives a version of the story of Yan Gong different from the *Fayuan zhulin* / *Mingbao ji* version.

no. 30, Li Shanlong story. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the *Mingbao ji*. The *Ruijing lu* gives an abbreviated version of the *Mingbao ji* story; the *Ruijing lu* version is thus different from the *Fayuan zhulin* version.

no. 32, the story about Lady Doulu. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the *Mingbao ji*, with one minor difference: the *Mingbao ji* states at the end that the subject, aged 80, was still alive at the time the record was made (the *Mingbao ji* was compiled between 653 and 655 [Gjertson, p. 295, note, 54]); the *Fayuan zhulin* states that the subject died at the age of 80. The *Ruijing lu* gives an abbreviated version of the *Mingbao ji* story; the *Ruijing lu* version is thus different from the *Fayuan zhulin* version.

no. 33, Cen Wenben story. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the *Mingbao ji* (minor differences in wording). The note at the end of the *Mingbao ji*, explaining how Tang Lin heard the story, is turned into a part of the main text in the *Fayuan zhulin* version. The *Ruijing lu* gives an abbreviated version of the *Mingbao ji* story; the *Ruijing lu* version is thus different from the *Fayuan zhulin* version.

no. 34, the story about Su Chang's maid servant. The *Fayuan zhulin* version is copied from the second passage where

this story appears in the Taishō version of the *Mingbao ji* (795a). The *Ruijing lu* gives an abbreviated version.

iii) Only in two cases are stories that correspond closely to the *Ruijing lu* stories absent in the *Fayuan zhulin* (no. 27, the Daosun story and no. 31, the Li Siyi story).

iv) In the case of the two last stories in the *Ruijing lu*, both Daoxuan and Daoshi appear to have relied on oral sources, and thus the *Fayuan zhulin* does not specify the location of written sources of these stories.

The following comments may be made on the basis of this comparison.

i) Of the 20 cases where the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* versions are closer to each other than to the source identified in the *Fayuan zhulin*, 14 cases (nos. 2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 36) are in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, and two (nos. 7 and 24) in the 95th fascicle. Others are scattered: no. 1 (65th fascicle), no. 8 (94th fascicle), no. 19 (63rd fascicle), and no. 35 (27th fascicle). The *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to stories nos. 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 36 are explicitly said to have been based on the “*Sanbao gantong lu*,” which probably meant the *Ruijing lu* section of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. We have discussed in detail the relationship between *Ruijing lu* stories nos. 11–14 and their parallels in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, concluding that Daoshi probably produced the version of these stories in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* by consulting Daoxuan’s *Ruijing lu* version. Two stories (nos. 15 and 16) are found only in the *Ruijing lu* and the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, thus indicating that two documents must be closely related to each other. Four stories in this list of twenty stories (nos. 1, 2, 3, 8) had been taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*, and two of these stories (nos. 2, 3) are found in the 18th fascicle. In both cases, the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* stories are closely related to each other, though we cannot determine which of these versions is earlier.

These observations appear to indicate that Daoshi must have consulted the *Ruijing lu* (possibly in an earlier form)

extensively when he compiled the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*, and copied its version of the 14 stories under examination here from the *Ruijing lu* into the 18th fascicle. A closer examination of the manner in which the sources of these 14 stories are noted in the *Fayuan zhulin* serves to strengthen this hypothesis. The *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to *Ruijing lu* stories nos. 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 36 are explicitly said to have been taken from the *Sanbao gantong lu*. If our reading of the conjunction *you* (“again”) in the beginning section of the *Ruijing lu* is correct, the *Ruijing lu*, or its earlier version, noted explicitly that a group of stories at the beginning of this collection was taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*. This would account for the fact that Daoshi knew that stories nos. 2 and 3 had been taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Stories nos. 15 and 16 are clearly related to their *Fayuan zhulin* parallels, but the *Fayuan zhulin* curiously fails to note the source of story no. 15; the reference to the “*Tang gaoseng zhuan*” (420b1) for story no. 16 appears to be mistaken. Stories nos. 11 to 14 are ultimately based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan, but, as we examined in detail above, in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* Daoshi gives a version which appears to have been based on the *Ruijing lu*, and he adjusts the note that appears at the end of story no. 14 so that it would read as a note that applies only to this last story in the series of stories taken from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*; he also places the earlier stories (nos. 11 to 13) in a larger group whose sources are described vaguely as “the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* and other miscellaneous records.” By reading the ambiguous note in the *Ruijing lu* in the way he did, he was left with no clues concerning the sources of stories nos. 11 to 13, and he designated their sources in this vague and misleading manner in the 18th fascicle.

ii) Of the 13 cases where the *Fayuan zhulin* version is closer to the source they mention, four cases (nos. 28, 29, 32, and 34) are in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*; two cases (nos. 4 and 5) are in the 17th fascicle. Others are scattered: no. 10 in the 42nd fascicle, no. 18 in the 55th fascicle, no. 26 in the 24th fascicle, no. 30 in the 20th fascicle, and no. 33 in the 56th fascicle. All four stories that are found in the 18th fascicle are originally from the *Mingbao ji*, and the *Fayuan zhulin* passages mention their sources explicitly and correctly.

The 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is entirely devoted to a collection of Chinese miracles (41 stories) that constitute the last part of the section which begins in the middle of the 17th fascicle (411c29) called “Treating the Teaching with respect” (*jingfa*). Daoshi appears to have compiled this larger collection partly on the basis of the *Ruijing lu*, but he also had the original *Mingbao ji* in front of him when he compiled the 18th fascicle collection, and where he decided to include the *Ruijing lu* stories that were themselves based on the *Mingbao ji*, he substituted the *Ruijing lu* version of these stories with the original *Mingbao ji* version. If we take into account that the “Teaching” (*fa*) in the 17th and 18th fascicles refers to the Buddha’s teaching recorded in “scriptures” (*jing*), we would be justified in treating Daoshi’s collection of the “*jingfa*” collection in the 18th fascicle as an expanded version of Daoxuan’s *Ruijing lu*.

In my earlier article on the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, I noted that its collection of image miracles in the second fascicle is closely related to the miracle story collection in the 13th and 14th fascicles of the *Fayuan zhulin*, and, in fact, the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* collection appears to have served as a source for the collection in 13th and 14th fascicle.<sup>72</sup> The 13th and 14th fascicles of the *Fayuan zhulin* constitute the first half of the large section called “Treating the Buddha with respect” (*jingfo*) that ends in the middle of the 17th fascicle. In my article on the *Sengseng gantong lu*, I noted that the short collection of stories about “supernatural monks” that constitutes the last section of Daoxuan’s *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* is closely related to the miracle story collection in the 19th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*.<sup>73</sup> The 19th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* contains the section of the encyclopedia entitled “Treating monks with respect” (*jingseng*). A general pattern of relationship between the miracle story collections between the 13th to 19th fascicles of the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* emerges from this analysis: the sections in the *Fayuan zhulin* that focus on the theme of “treating with respect” the so-called “three treasures,” the Buddha, the Teaching, and Monastic Order or monks, contain miracle stories that appear to be closely related to important sections of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, or “Collected Records of Three Treasure Miracles in China.” Both Daoshi and Daoxuan appear to have been organizing miracle stories using the same framework of the “three treasures.”<sup>74</sup>

Another conclusion of my earlier studies was that the sections of the *Fayuan zhulin* that contain material parallel to the contents of the first two fascicles and the first section of the third fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, were probably compiled later by copying and sometimes summarizing the corresponding sections of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. The *Fayuan zhulin* parallels to the *Shenseng gantong lu* were compiled earlier, and Daoxuan probably compiled the *Shenseng gantong lu* using these *Fayuan zhulin* collections as his sources. The above analysis of the *Ruijing lu* suggests that the section of the *Fayuan zhulin* most closely related to it, the miracle story collection in the 18th fascicle, was based in part on the *Ruijing lu*.

A general picture of the relationship between Daoxuan's collection, *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, and the corresponding sections of the *Fayuan zhulin* emerges from this analysis. As his colophon at the end of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* states explicitly, Daoxuan compiled the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* quickly in the first year of the Linde period (664), a few years before he ended his life, in the second year of the Qianfeng period (667). Since all the three known titles of this work include the reference to the "three treasures," Daoxuan himself may have called the collection by a title that referred to the "three treasures."<sup>75</sup>

If Daoxuan was self-consciously preparing a collection of "three treasure miracles," he may well have begun this project by preparing a collection of the Buddha relic and image miracles (first two fascicles). He would then have proceeded to the task of compiling a miracle story collection associated with the Teaching, and for this he appears to have been able only to produce a shorter collection (*Ruijing lu*), which he used also in the related project of compiling the *Datang neidian lu*, a project that he was carrying out almost at the same time. It is possible that this collection, the *Ruijing lu*, was first produced in connection with the *Datang neidian lu* project and later incorporated into the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. This would explain the fact that this body of material is presented somewhat differently than in the earlier sections on the Buddha relic and image miracles. Here again, Daoxuan appears to have relied primarily on materials he collected himself. But at this point, Daoshi's

*Fayuan zhulin* project was well on its way to completion, and it is quite possible that Daoxuan took some material from a draft version of the collection.<sup>76</sup>

Finally, perhaps running short of time, Daoxuan may have quickly produced a collection of miracle stories about supernatural monks (*Shenseng gantong lu*), which was intended, possibly along with the “supernatural temples” (*shengsi*) section in the third fascicle, as the Monastic Order miracle stories, making use of the material that had already been collected by Daoshi for the *Fayuan zhulin*. Daoxuan’s reliance on the material that had been collected earlier for the *Fayuan zhulin* may have something to do with his comments in the colophon, where he invited readers to consult the *Fayuan zhulin*, which had been “recently compiled by Daoshi of the Ximingsi temple.”

However, the version of the *Fayuan zhulin* known to us had not been completed in the first year of the Linde period. I suspect that Daoshi incorporated the content of Daoxuan’s collection into relevant sections of the *Fayuan zhulin* before producing the final form of this encyclopedia. This would explain the frequent duplication of materials that are found in the 18th fascicle, parallel to the *Ruijing lu*, with material found elsewhere in the *Fayuan zhulin*. In these cases, the material found elsewhere is more directly related to the original sources than the stories in the 18th fascicle, which are frequently copied directly from the *Ruijing lu*. Daoshi appears to have been fully aware of the basic scheme of the “three treasures” miracles that Daoxuan used in organizing his collection, and incorporated the miracle stories taken from Daoxuan’s collection into the parts of his own encyclopedia that deal with the treatment of the “three treasures.”

## APPENDIX

*Ruijing lu* stories and their parallels

- no. 1, Tan Wujie *Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 65, 786a (from the *Mingxiang ji*).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 3, 338b–339a (especially, 338c14–28).  
*Neidian lu*, 338b.
- no. 2, Dao'an  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 18, 418a (from the group of six stories said to have come from  
the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* and other sources).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 5, 351c–354a (especially, 353b17–23).  
*Neidian lu*, 338bc.  
Ref., *Shenseng gantong lu*, story no. 12 (432c–433a).
- no. 3, Sengsheng  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 18, 418ab (from the group of six stories said to have come  
from the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* and other sources).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 12, 406c–407a.  
*Neidian lu*, 338c.
- no. 4, Daojiong  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 17, 408c–409a (from the *Mingxiang ji*).  
*juan* 65, 784c–785a.  
*juan* 35, 567bc (from the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* as its source).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 12, 407ab.  
*Neidian lu*, 338c.  
Ref., *Shenseng gantong lu*, story no. 21 (433c).
- no. 5, Puming  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 17, 409a (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 12, 407b.  
*Neidian lu*, 338c.
- no. 6, Huiguo  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 94, 983bc (from the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 12, 407bc.  
*Neidian lu*, 338c0339a.
- no. 7, Huijin  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 95, 989ab (from the *Mingxiang ji*).  
*Gaoseng zhuan*, *juan* 12, 407c–408a.  
*Neidian lu*, 339a.
- no. 8, Hongming  
*Fayuan zhulin*, *juan* 28, 492bc (mistakenly mentions the *Tang gaoseng zhuan* as its  
source).

juan 94, 983c (from the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*).

*Gaoseng zhuan*, juan 12, 408a.

*Neidian lu*, 339a.

no. 9, Sun Jingde

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 14, 389c (“*Jian qi zhi ji jingyi deng ji*”).

juan 17, 411bc (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 29, 692c22–693a9.

*Shijia fangzhi*, 972b18–28.

*Neidian lu*, 339a.

Ref., *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, juan 2, 420ab.

no. 10, Daolin

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan, 42, 617a (from the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*).

*Gaoseng zhuan*, juan 12, 409a.

*Neidian lu*, 339ab.

no. 11, Zhizhan

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 418b (mentions the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*, etc., as the source of the group of six stories).

juan 85, 909c (“*jian hou junsu ji*”, i.e., the *Jingyi ji*).

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, 686ab.

*Neidian lu*, 339b.

no. 12, the anonymous monk of the Wuhosi temple

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 418b (mentions the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*, etc., as the source of the group of six stories).

juan 85, 910a4 (“*jian hou junsu ji*”, i.e., the *Jingyi ji*).

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, “*Zhizhan zhuan*”, 686a13–17.

*Neidian lu*, 339b.

no. 13, the lips and tongue dug out at Mt. Dongkan

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 418b (mentions the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*, etc., as the source of the group of six stories).

juan 85, 910a (“*jian hou junsu ji*”, i.e., the *Jingyi ji*).

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, “*Zhizhan zhuan*”, 686a19–29.

*Neidian lu*, 339b.

no. 14, the eunuch of Wei who grew a beard

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 418bc (mentions the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*, etc., as the source of the group of six stories).

juan 85, 910a (“*jian hou junsu ji*”, i.e., the *Jingyi ji*).

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, “*Zhizhan zhuan*”, 686b0–14.

*Neidian lu*, 339b.

no. 15, the scripture coming down from the sky during the persecution of Buddhism under emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou dynasty



*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 419b (no source mentioned).  
Not in the *Neidian lu*.

no. 16, an anonymous monk in Yangzhou  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 419c–420a (in the group of two stories said to have come  
from the *Liang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Neidian lu*, 339bc.

no. 17, Daoji  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421a (from the *Sanbao gantong lu*).  
juan 64, 779b (*Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, 687c.  
*Neidian lu*, 339c.

no. 18, Baogui  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 55, 709b (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, 688ab.  
*Fanyi mingyi ji*, juan 4, 1125ab.  
*Neidian lu*, 339c.

no. 19, Kongzang  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 63, 766a (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
juan 85, 910c–911a (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, 689b.  
*Neidian lu*, 339c–340a.

no. 20, Yisu  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18 (from the *Sanbao gantong lu*).  
juan 85, 910c–911a (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, 690a.  
*Neidian lu*, 340a.

no. 21, Shi Heshi  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421a (from the *Sanbao gantong lu*).  
juan 85, 911a (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).  
*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 28, 690b.  
*Neidian lu*, 340a.

no. 22, Linghu Yuangui  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421ab (from the *Sanbao gantong lu*; originally heard from  
Shenji of the Ximingsi).  
*Neidian lu*, 340ab.

no. 23, Tanyun  
*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421b (from the *Sanbao gantong lu*).  
*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 20, 592a–593b (especially, b4–11).  
*Neidian lu*, 340b.

no. 24, Sengche

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 95, 989bc (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 788c–789a.

Ref., *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 20, 595bc.

*Neidian lu*, 340b.

no. 25, a nun from Hedong

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 27, 486c (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 789ab.

*Neidian lu*, 340b.

no. 26, Tanyan

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 24, 467c (from the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*).

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 8, 488a–9a (especially, 488ab).

*Neidian lu*, 340bc.

no. 27, Daosun

*Mingbao ji*, 789b.

*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, juan 14, 532c–533c (especially, 533b8–23).

Ref., *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 489b24.

*Neidian lu*, 340c.

no. 28, Zhiyuan

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18 (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 789c.

*Neidian lu*, 340c.

no. 29, Yan Gong

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 419bc (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 790c.

*Neidian lu*, 340c–341a.

no. 30, Li Shanlong

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 20, 436abc (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 795c–796b.

*Neidian lu*, 341a.

no. 31, Lady Doulu

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421c (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 795bc.

*Neidian lu*, 341.

no. 32, Li Siyi

Related story in the *Fayuan zhulin*, juan 91, 958c (from the *Mingbao shiyi*).

*Neidian lu*, 341ab.

no. 33, Cen Wenben

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 56, 712c (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 795a.

*Neidian lu*, 341b.

no. 34, Su Chang's maid servant

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421c (from the *Mingbao ji*).

*Mingbao ji*, 794bc and 795a.

*Neidian lu*, 341b.

no. 35, Dong Xiong

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 27, 485ab (from the *Mingbao shiyi*).

*Mingbao ji*, 794c–795a.

*Neidian lu*, 341bc.

no. 36, a scripture written in the sky in Yizhou

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 18, 421bc (from the *Sanbao gantong lu*).

*Neidian lu*, 341c.

no. 37, Gao Fayan

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 46, 640bc–641a.

*Neidian lu*, 341c–342a.

no. 38, Cui Yiqi

*Fayuan zhulin*, juan 85, 911a.

Not in the *Neidian lu*.

## NOTES

1. This paper has resulted from a project on Chinese Buddhist biographies supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada.

2. I have commented elsewhere on the question of discrepancy in the dates of this colophon and that of the Li Yan's preface to the *Fayuan zhulin*, which gives the date of the completion of this encyclopedia as the 30th day of the third month of the first year of Zongzhang (668), that is, four years after the date of Daoxuan's colophon. See Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, eds., *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia* (Oakville, Ontario, 1988), p. 216, n. 110; "Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu: Some Exploratory Notes," *Kalyana-Mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume*, edited by V. N. Jha (Delhi, 1990), p. 203 and n. 4, and "Daoxuan's Collection of Miracle Stories about 'Supernatural Monks' (*Shenseng gantong lu*): An Analysis of Its Sources," *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, no. 3. (1990), p. 319.

3. Daoshi's close association with Daoxuan is mentioned in Daoshi's biography in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, 726c16,17.

4. The Taishō text, no. 2106, is based on the Korean edition, which was produced during the 15-year period between 1236–1251. The Song, Yuan and Ming editions are used for listing the variant readings of the text. The original Korean text, numbered as K 1069, is found in vol. 32, pp. 589c–635a of the recently published photographic edition of the canon.

5. There are a few exceptions (no. 27 “Daosun” in the *Ruijing lu*; no. 25 “Liu Ningzhi” in the *Shenseng gantong lu*) in which the materials corresponding to those in the two collections at the end of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* are not found in the *Fayuan zhulin*.

6. These exceptions include the following: the story of Tan Wujie (no. 1) is said to be a quotation from the *Gaoseng zhuan*; the Sun Jingde story (no. 9, 427ab) mentions a work called the *Qishu*; the story about the eunuch who grew a beard (no. 14, 427bc) is said to be based on the *Jingyi ji*; stories no. 22 and 23 indicate that the accounts were based on Daoxuan’s personal experience as witness; the story about the nun from Hedong traces the story to the monk Faduan. I shall examine in some detail other clues in the *Ruijing lu* which enable us to determine the immediate sources of the stories included.

7. Even if we take account of the possibility that the *Ruijing lu* might have evolved over a period of time, the fact that some of the stories in the present form of the *Ruijing lu* mention their sources explicitly indicates that there is only a very remote possibility that the sources of the stories were indicated in detail in a manner similar to the corresponding *Fayuan zhulin* passages in this hypothetical earlier version of the *Ruijing lu*. If the sources were indicated in a meticulous manner similar to the *Fayuan zhulin* in an earlier draft, and then removed when the final version of the *Ruijing lu* was produced, why should only a small number of source references have been left in the final version?

As we shall show in greater detail later, however, the *Fayuan zhulin* often identifies a source in an obviously mistaken manner, and at least in some of these cases, Daoshi did not appear to have had the correct information about the source of the passages in question. Thus, we cannot always assume from the source note in the *Fayuan zhulin* that Daoshi was copying the passages from the sources named. In some cases Daoshi may have been copying from the *Ruijing lu*, and yet at the same time mention a source which is incorrect. The principle mentioned above, therefore, needs to be applied carefully, and in connection with other evidence.

8. The *Ruijing lu* does not number the stories it contains, but I have assigned a number to each story for easy reference, starting with no. 1 for its first entry, on Tan Wujie, and continuing sequentially up to no. 38, assigned to its last story, on Cui Yiqi. The name of the subject for the first of the five stories attributed to the *Sanbao gantong lu* in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is given there as Daoyu, but a corruption of the text appears to have occurred here. I am reading the name as Yisu, following the variant reading attested in all four versions of the texts consulted in preparing the Taishō edition. See n. 9 in T. Vol. 53, p. 421.

9. The Taishō edition of the *Fayuan zhulin* (no. 2106) reproduces the text of the Korean edition (K 1406) as the base text and notes variant readings in four other texts (i.e., Song, Yuan, Ming, and Kunaichō Library editions) in the

notes. See *Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku* (reprint edition, Tokyo, 1979 [first edition: 1929]), p. 619c. The base text states that five stories in the 18th fascicle were taken from the *Sanbao gantong lu*. The variant reading of this same passage, shared in all four versions of the text consulted, gives the number of stories based on the *Sanbao gantong lu* as six. If we follow this reading, the set of stories in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* that was based on the *Sanbao gantong lu* begins with that of Daoji. The text of the Daoji story in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is virtually identical to that of the story on this figure (no. 17) in the *Ruijing lu* (i.e., the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*), though the note given in small characters in the *Fayuan zhulin* version—which states that this monk is called by a different name, Daoyuan, in another source—is not found in the *Ruijing lu* passage. I am here following the variant reading of this passage.

10. *Fayuan zhulin*, 1023c8; *Datang neidian lu*, 333a20.

11. Paradoxically, this explicit reference to the *Sanbao gantong lu* might appear to suggest that other *Fayuan zhulin* passages that are clearly related to corresponding passages in the *Ruijing lu* were not directly dependent on the *Ruijing lu*, since they fail to mention the *Ruijing lu* or the *Sanbao gantong lu* as their sources. They refer instead to earlier sources on which both the *Fayuan zhulin* and the *Ruijing lu* passages were ultimately based. Thus, in these cases the *Ruijing lu* passage might appear to have come into being later and to be dependent on the *Fayuan zhulin* passage. If the *Fayuan zhulin* passage was dependent on the *Ruijing lu* in these cases as well, Daoshi might be expected to have indicated its source as the *Sanbao gantong lu* in the same way in which he mentions this work in the six cases discussed above. As we shall show in some detail below, the relationship between the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* appears to be very complex, and needs to be determined for each story; the first question is of course whether the stories appear to be directly related at all; the next question is which of the two was the original. Thus, the consideration based on the explicit identification of the sources, or the absence of such identification, needs to be examined in connection with other relevant evidence based on the examination of the content of the stories themselves. On the basis of a detailed analysis presented below, I conclude that many other stories in the *Fayuan zhulin* were also dependent on the *Ruijing lu*.

12. Shi Heshi appears to have been a lay practitioner who recited the *Lotus Sūtra*, and Daoxuan included his biography as an appendix to the monk Yisu's biography. The stories about Yisu (the name given as Yiyu) and Shi Heshi appear again in the 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (910c–911a). The source for this passage in the 85th fascicle is given as the *Tang gaoseng zhuan* (911a20). The 85th fascicle passage is an abbreviated version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Yisu.

13. Another passage on Daoji appears in the 64th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (779b), where it is said to have been based on the *Tang gaoseng zhuan* (779c19). This passage is more detailed than the one in the 18th fascicle, and the first part of the story is a faithful copy of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. Extensive differences in phraseology appear in the second half of the story.

14. The *Ruijing lu* and the parallel *Fayuan zhulin* passages on this monk end with a related note indicating that Daoxuan saw the miraculous scripture

written by a supernatural being for Tanyun in the tenth year of the Zhenguan period (636–637) (428b20,21 in the *Ruijing lu*; 421b22,23 in the *Fayuan zhulin*).

15. According to a corrupted passage that appears in slightly different forms in the *Ruijing lu* (428b7,8) and the *Fayuan zhulin* (421b10), the source of the story about Linghu Yuangui appears to have been an oral report by the chief administrator (*sizhu*) of the Ximingsi temple, Shentai. The name of the monk is given as Shencha in the *Ruijing lu* and as Shenji in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The two characters that appear in these two names, *cha* and *ji* are similar, and thus there is little doubt that Shencha and Shenji are different versions of the same name. According to a passage in the 39th fascicle of the *Fozu tongji* (367ab), when the Ximingsi temple was built by the imperial order in the second year of the Xianqing period (657), Daoxuan, Shentai, and Huaisu were appointed as the head monk (*shangzuo*), the chief administrator (*sizhu*), and the ceremonial leader (*weina*) respectively. The character *tai* is also similar to the two characters *cha* and *ji*, and I suspect that the name given as Shencha and Shenji by Daoxuan and Daoshi is the same name as the one given as Shentai by Zhipan. I have so far not been able to find further information about this monk. The parallel note in the *Ruijing lu* and the *Fayuan zhulin* states that this monk saw the miraculous scriptures that survived fire with his own eyes, and told this story about the scriptures which Linghu Yuangui had arranged to have copied. Since both Daoxuan and Daoshi resided at the Ximingsi temple, we cannot determine from this note which one of the two versions of the story is the original one.

16. Here I am following the variant reading attested in the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions. The Korean edition reproduced in the Taishō collection lacks the *you* in front of Hongming's biographies but the variant reading that is found in all other editions includes this character.

17. This work was compiled by Wang Yan toward the end of the fifth century (some time between 485–501). A large number of fragments from this work, including Wang Yan's preface (*juan* 14, 388c), have been preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin*.

18. It is also possible that this collection of the *Gaoseng zhuan* was produced earlier by someone other than Daoxuan, and that in compiling the *Ruijing lu*, Daoxuan may have been simply using this earlier work as the basis of the first part of his collection. There is no conclusive evidence on this matter. I am inclined to believe that the person who began the main text of the *Ruijing lu* following its preface and the table of contents with a statement "The *Gaoseng zhuan* says..." was Daoxuan himself.

19. The conjunction "you" again appears at the beginning of the stories about the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi temple (no. 12), the eunuch who grew a beard (no. 14), and the Prajñāpāramitā scripture seen in the sky (no. 15). Stories nos. 12 and 14 are parts of the long passage in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan (686ab) from which *Ruijing lu* stories nos. 11–14 appear to have been taken and the conjunctions are present in the original *Xu gaoseng zhuan* text (686a13 and b8). Daoxuan appears to have used this expression frequently in places where he listed stories that belonged to the same category together.

20. They appear as biographies numbered 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, and 21 in the section on “reciters of scripture.”

21. *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1967), p. 60. Yanagida mentions a large number of new collections, including the *Hongzan fahua zhuan* compiled by Huixiang (not earlier than 706), the *Fahua zhuanji* compiled by Sengxiang (probably after 754), the *Huayan jing zhuan ji* compiled by Fazang (first compiled in 690 and revised until Fazang’s death in 712), the *Huayanjing ganying zhuan* by Hu Youzhen (originally compiled by Fazang’s disciple by Huiying, but revised by Hu Youzhen in 783), and the *Jingang banruo jiyANJI* by Meng Xianzhong (718).

22. The *Gaoseng zhuan* passage parallel to the main story told in the *Ruijing lu*/*Fayuan zhulin* passage is found in 338c24-28. The two passages are very similar, except that the reference to the *Guanshiyin jing* scripture found earlier in the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography (c23) is incorporated into the parallel passage in the *Ruijing lu* (426b22 and 24) and the *Fayuan zhulin* (786a5,6, and 8).

23. We saw above that there are six stories in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* which Daoshi says explicitly come from the *Sanbao gantong lu*. The *Fayuan zhulin* passage on Dao’an under discussion here is also found in the 18th fascicle. It is likely that there was a close relationship between the *Ruijing lu* passage on Dao’an and the Dao’an passage in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*.

24. I discussed the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Daojiong and its relation to the *Mingxiang ji* fragments on the same figure preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin* in some detail in my earlier article, “Two sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: *stūpa* inscriptions and miracle stories,” *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*, *ibid.*, pp. 136–139.

25. The note on this story, found at 409b1, gives the source as the “*Tang gaoseng zhuan*,” but this is clearly a mistake for “*Liang gaoseng zhuan*.”

26. The two texts are identical except for one section toward the end of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biography (408a17–21). This passage is missing in the version in the 28th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*.

27. The Tan Wujie passage is found in *juan* 65, Dao’an and Sengsheng passages in *juan* 18, Daojiong and Puming passages in *juan* 17, Huiguo and Hongming passages in *juan* 94, Huijing passage in *juan* 95, and Daolin passage in *juan* 42.

28. This applies to the case of the story about Daolin. We noted above that the story about Daolin appears to have been added later to the original list of the *Gaoseng zhuan* stories in the *Ruijing lu*. For this reason the relationship among the three sources compared here, the *Ruijing lu*, the *Fayuan zhulin* parallel, and the *Gaoseng zhuan* original might have been somewhat different in the case of this story.

29. In the *Gaoseng zhuan* the biographies of Dao’an and Sengsheng are found separately in the 5th and 12th fascicles (“exegetes” and “reciters” sections). Those of Daojiong, Puming Huiguo, and Hongming are all found in the 12th fascicle (“reciters” section) in the *Gaoseng zhuan* following the same order, though in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, other biographies are found between each of these four biographies.

30. We have seen earlier that the first story in the *Ruijing lu*, the story of Tan Wujie, is said in the *Ruijing lu* to be based on the *Gaoseng zhuan* and yet the identical story in the *Fayuan zhulin* is said to be based on the *Mingxiang ji*. Perhaps in Daoxuan's time, the *Gaoseng zhuan*'s dependence on the *Mingxiang ji* was widely known, and the parallel versions of the biographies/miracle stories that are found in these two works were not clearly distinguished by Daoxuan and his contemporaries. Consequently, Daoxuan might have considered these stories about Tan Wujie and Huijin as *Gaoseng zhuan* stories, rather than as *Mingxiang ji* stories, as indicated in the *Fayuan zhulin*, and used these shorter versions of the stories as suitable summaries of the *Gaoseng zhuan* biographies when he compiled the *Ruijing lu*.

31. The *Ruijing lu* stories about Zhizhan (no. 11), the anonymous monk of the Wuhousi (no. 12), the lips dug out from the ground at Mt. Dongkan (no. 13), and the eunuch who grew a beard (no. 14) are found in the biography of Zhizhan that appears first in the "reciters of scripture" section. The *Ruijing lu* story about Daoji (no. 17) is based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of the same monk that appears as the seventh biography in the same section. The story about Baogui (no. 18) is based on the biography of Baogui that appears as the eighth in the section. The story of Kongzang (no. 19) is based on the eleventh biography. The stories about Yisu and Shi Heshi (nos. 20 and 21) are based on the biography of Yisu that appears as the 13th biography of this same section in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*.

32. A brief comment on this work appears in Gjertson, "The Early Chinese Buddhist Miracle Tale: A Preliminary Survey," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 101, no. 3 (July–September, 1981), p. 294.

33. The story about Sun Jingde (no. 9) is accompanied by a note stating that it was taken from a work called *Qi shu*; sources are not mentioned for the four stories after that (stories nos. 10, 11, 12, 13); the story about the eunuch (no. 14) is accompanied by the *Jingyi ji* note. The story no. 10 is about Daolin, which had been taken from the *Gaoseng zhuan*.

34. Daoxuan gives this date in his preface as the latest point of the period covered in the collection (425b22).

35. Daoxuan's additions to the 645 version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* are discussed in Maekawa Takashi, "*Dōsen no kōshū kōsōden ni tsuite: zoku kōsōden tonō kanren*," *Ryūkoku shidan*, 46 (1960), pp. 20–37.

36. The Taishō text of the *Fayuan zhulin* is based on the Korean edition, and notes variant readings in other editions at the bottom of each page. Thus, we learn from the Taishō edition in the note giving the *Jingyi ji* as the source of the Zhizhan stories in the 85th fascicle that the character for "two" is missing in the Song, Yuan, and Kunaicho editions. The note reads: "The above story appears (*jian*) in Hou Junsu's collection." This would imply that we do not know the source of the first item in the miracle stories section of the 85th fascicle, and that Daoshi probably copied the note on the source for the second item, i.e., the Zhizhan biography stories, from the corresponding passage in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography. It appears quite possible that, since the source for the first item is not specified by an independent note, someone assumed that the source for the first item was also the *Jingyi ji*, and changed the note for the item



accordingly, by inserting the character for “two” at the appropriate place. The notes in the miracle stories sections in the *Fayuan zhulin* typically follow the format of attaching a note at the end of last story in the series of miracle stories taken from a given source, saying that “The above such and such number of stories come from such and such source.”

The first item in the miracle stories section of the 85th fascicle is a story about the Tinghu lake deity in Yangzhou. It is also possible, however, that this story had in fact been based on the *Jingyi ji* and when Daoshi prepared this section of the *Fayuan zhulin*, fascicle 85, he simply chose to indicate this fact by modifying Daoxuan’s original note on the second story slightly. In that case, we must assume that the character for “two” was dropped at some relatively early stage in the transmission of the text.

37. As we noted in passing above, a note at the end of a group of miracle stories attached to Zhizhan’s biography, in a collection of monks’ biographies, which says “All (*bing*) these stories are found in Hou Junsu’s *Jingyi ji*,” may be read to mean either that both Zhizhan’s biography and the groups of stories attached to it are found in the *Jingyi ji*, or that only the stories and not Zhizhan’s biography itself are found in that work. Since the *Jingyi ji* has now been lost, we cannot determine which of these readings is in fact correct, though I am inclined to believe that it was only the group of stories that was found in the *Jingyi ji* and not Zhizhan’s biography itself. The *Jingyi ji* was not a biographical collection, and the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* generally does not mention the sources of the biographies included in it explicitly.

The section in the 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* where the biography of Zhizhan and the attached group of miracle stories are found is itself not a biographical collection, but a collection of miracle stories. In this context, a reader might naturally assume that the note that is found at the end of this material, saying that “All these stories are found in Hou Junsu’s *Jingyi ji*,” was meant to include all the stories, including Zhizhan’s biography itself, as coming from the *Jingyi ji*. Medieval Chinese miracle stories were frequently told in the form of biographies, and Zhizhan’s story does mention several miraculous events.

38. The *Ruijing lu* passage also uses the conjunction *you* at the beginning of the story about the monk in Yongzhou (427b18). This word is also found in the corresponding 85th fascicle passage in the *Fayuan zhulin* (910a4), but does not appear at the corresponding place either in the corresponding passage in the 18th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (418b21), or in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zhizhan (686a15). Daoxuan used the conjunction *you* frequently in listing stories one after another, and since we are reasonably certain that the 85th fascicle passage was independently and directly based on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* passage, we cannot dismiss the possibility that this word *you* might have existed in some earlier version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, which was copied by Daoshi when he prepared the 85th fascicle passage. The word could then have been dropped at some point in the course of the textual transmission of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*.

If we follow the analysis presented here that the passage in the 18th fascicle was prepared on the basis of the corresponding passage in the *Ruijing lu*, we would have to assume that Daoshi must have simply dropped the *you* that followed closely the earlier occurrence of the same word, rather than changing it again into *hou*.

The significance of these differences regarding the conjunction *you* in front of the story about the monk in Yongzhou remains rather obscure.

39. These *Gaoseng zhuan* stories correspond to *Ruijing lu* stories no. 2 (Dao'an) and no. 3 (Sengsheng) and *Shenseng gantong lu* story no. 2 (Zhu Shixing).

40. This fact again suggests that the main body of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* and the *Ruijing lu* may have been originally prepared on two separate occasions and the *Ruijing lu* may have been appended to the main body of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* either at the time the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* was compiled or later. As suggested earlier, the *Ruijing lu* might have been first prepared as a part of the *Datang neidian lu*.

41. If this was the case, it would probably mean that the collection of miracle stories attached to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Sengming existed by the time the *Shijia fangzhi* was compiled, in the first year of Yonghui (650–51).

42. The version in the 17th fascicle is given in the middle of a set of three stories which are said to come from (*chu*) the *Tang gaoseng zhuan*, using the standard formula used in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The *Shijia fangzhi* version lacks the note that gives the source of this story using the verb *jian*, and therefore if Daoshi copied this version of the story from the *Shijia fangzhi*, it is natural that the verb *jian* does not appear in the note on the source of this story in the 17th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin*.

43. In the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* Daoxuan appears to have used the character *ru* ("as") as well as *jian* in referring to the sources where the story in question appears. Thus the character *ru* appears in 404a22 (no *Fayuan zhulin* parallel), 413c11 (The *Fayuan zhulin* parallel also gives *ru*, 383b13), 419b5 (source note dropped in the *Fayuan zhulin* passage), 423a6 (no *Fayuan zhulin* parallel). In addition to the passages discussed in detail above, the character *jian* appears in 414a12 (The *Fayuan zhulin* also gives *jian*, 383a16), 432a (The *Fayuan zhulin* uses the word *chu* in a note that in a typical manner gives the sources for the group of five miracle stories taken from the *Mingxiang ji*, 617a7). Thus, in one case the verb *jian* is preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin* version, and in another replaced by a more typical formula for referring to sources used in that encyclopedia.

One notable exception to the pattern described here is the case of the source note for the story about the Buddha's footsteps in the Xiangsisi in Yuzhou: the source for this story is given with the verb *chu* in the second fascicle of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* (422a6,7) and with the verb *jian* in the note in small characters in the 14th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* (391b12). Thus the usage of *chu* and *jian* is reversed in this example. The same story also appears in the *Luelie datang yuwang guta li* in the *Guang hongming ji*, compiled by Daoxuan (203ab), but the source is not indicated here. In spite of this one contrary example, I am still inclined to believe that it was Daoxuan who preferred to use the verb *jian* in the context we are interested in here.

A brief survey of the references to bibliographical references in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* collected in the *Kōsōden sakuin* (ed., Makita Tairyō and Suwa Gijun, Kyoto, 1975) reveals that both the verb *ru* and *jian* are used frequently in mentioning biographical and historical sources. For example, references to independent biographies of monks, described by such titles as *Bieji* and *Biezhuān*, use the

verb *jian* in a number of cases: 618c23 (Huiman's biography), 634b29,c1 (Huisheng's biography) and 701c11 (Facheng's biography) use the verb *jian* referring to the respective *Bieji* biographies; 489c25 (Tanyan's biography), 544a14 (concerning Shensu in Zhikuan's biography), 558c13 (Tanxiang's biography), 575b16 (Huizan's biography), 647a23 (Sengyi's biography) and 658a26 (Faxing's biography) used the same verb in referring to *Biezhuan* biographies. Elsewhere the verb *jian* is used in referring to a work called *Ganying zhuan* (668c10, Shetisina's biography); to a work described as *Baochang deng lu* and the *Fashang lu* (429a16,17 and 29 in Bodhiruci's biography); to Fei Changfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* (as *Suidai sanbao lu*, 431a in Gounaluotuo's biography; as *Fei Changfang sanbao lu*, 434c8 in Shenajueduo [Jnanagupta]'s biography; as *Feijie sanbao lu*, 560b9 in Xinxing's biography); to the *Jingyi ji* (686b14 in Zhizhan's biography [a discussed above]); to the *Suidai jing lu* (i.e., the *Zhongjing mulu* compiled by Yancong [also known as *Renshou lu*], 434c22 in Shenajueduo's biography); to Daoxuan's *Neidian lu* (434c13 in Shenajueduo's biography); to a work called *Leiwen* (650b27 in the section on Fu Hong in Huiyun's biography). The verb *chu* is frequently used in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* in a different sense, to indicate the works that the subject in question had produced: e.g., 530a19 (Shensu's biography), 434b4 (Shenajueduo's biography), 455a22 (Xuanzang's biography), 443a18 (Huijing's biography), 596a13 (Sengche's biography), 428a11 (Tanyao's biography), 434b4,5 (Shenajueduo's biography). In one passage (632a13), the verb *chu* is used in a statement made by the subject of the biography Zhixuan as the verb preceding the source of information being discussed between the Emperor of the Northern Zhou dynasty and Zhixuan.

In the light of this evidence concerning Daoxuan's usage, I am inclined to believe that the use of *chu* in the story of Xiangsisi mentioned above is truly an exception, and possibly a corruption of the original *jian*, which Daoshi copied into the *Fayuan zhulin*.

In an earlier article, I suggested that the story of the two floating images in the Wu Commandary found in *Fayuan zhulin*, 13th fascicle, may have been the original which Daoxuan copied into the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*: story no.3, second fascicle (413c–414a; especially, 414a12). See "Two sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: *stūpa* inscriptions and miracle stories," *ibid.*, footnote 132, p. 222. This story is also accompanied by a note which gives the *Jingyi ji* as one of the two sources mentioned and begins with the verb *jian*. The analysis given here in connection with two other notes on the *Jingyi ji* suggests that it was probably again Daoxuan who composed the note on this same source for the story of the two floating images in the Wu Commandary, and that the *Fayuan zhulin* version of this story might have been copied from the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*. My earlier observation in the above mentioned note needs to be modified accordingly.

44. Makita Tairyō, "Kōōkanzenonkyō no shutsugen," Makita Tairyō, *Gikyō kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1976), pp. 272–287. The comment on Daoxuan's role is found on pp. 281–282. The following background to this story is particularly interesting to us. The name of the *Gaowang guanshiyin jing* appears for the first time in the biography of Lu Jingyu in the *Wei shu*, compiled by Wei Shou in 554, and in the *Bei shi*, compiled by Li Yanshou in 659. Makita notes that the original *Wei shu*

biography of Lu Jingyu has been lost, and the current edition of the *Wei shu* reproduces the *Bei shu* biography in its place. Makita believes, nevertheless, that the original *Wei shu* story must have been very similar to the present version based on the *Bei shu* (*Ibid.*, 274). In this biography, the core of the story associated with Sun Jingde in Daoxuan's accounts is told briefly in connection with another figure, Lu Jingyu; the name of the scripture is given as *Gaowang guanshiyin jing*, in exactly the same manner as in Daoxuan's Sun Jingde story. Thus, there is little doubt that the story in Lu Jingyu's biography represents an earlier form of the same story. Falin's *Bianzheng lun* (written in response to Fu Yi's memorial in the fourth year of the Wude period [621]) mentions the same story briefly as a event that occurred under the Qi dynasty (*qishi youyin*) (*juan 7*, 537bc). The reference to the *Qi zhi* and *Qi shu* in the notes in the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* may have some relationship to the reference to the Qi dynasty in the *Bianzheng lu*.

The name Xiao Xun appears in the *Zhou shu* in the account describing the end of the Later Liang dynasty. After a brief description of the end of Xiao Cong's reign, this passage lists the titles given to the sons of the first ruler of the Later Liang, Xiao Cha, and then those of the second ruler, Xiao Kui (the names of the successors to the throne whose lives are described in detail earlier are not mentioned here—thus Xiao Cong is not mentioned in the list of Xiao Kui's sons). Among several others, the list of Xiao Kui's sons mentions Xiao Xun, who is said to have been appointed as the Prince of Nanhai, and Xiao Yu, who is said to have been as the Prince of Xin'an (p.866). The appointment of Xiao Yu as Prince of Xin'an was also mentioned in the two biographies of Xiao Yu reviewed above.

The biography of Xiao Cong appears in the *Sui shu*, *juan 79*, pp. 1793–94, and the *Bei shi*, *juan 81*, pp. 3092–3093. Xiao Cong succeed his father, Xiao Kui, Emperor Ming, as the last ruler of the Liang dynasty (or Later Liang, 555–587). When the Sui emperor Wen abolished the state of Liang, Cong was given the title of Duke of Ju. Later, Xiao Cong was favoured by the second Sui ruler, Emperor Yang, and was appointed as Duke of Liang. In the end, he lost the emperor's favour, and partly because he was close to Heruo Pi, and partly because of a popular children's song that hinted at the resurgence of the Xiao family, the Emperor ordered that Xiao Cong's family be exterminated (*fei yu jia*, p. 1794, l. 8). Xiao Cong ended his life shortly after that. The *Sui shu*, *juan 79* (p. 1794) and the *Bei shi*, *juan 81* (p. 3093) state that he had a son called Xuan, who had served as the Vice-Governor of Xiangcheng. But he must have been killed when the Emperor ordered Xiao Cong's family exterminated, and the title of Duke of Liang was passed on to Xiao Ju, who was a son of Xiao Cong's younger brother.

A short biography of Xiao Cong's younger brother, Xiao Huan, is appended to Xiao Cong's biography: this biography states Xiao Huan called himself the third son of Xiao Kui, and also mentions his other younger brothers, Jing, Chang, and Yu. This list is a little shorter than that in the *Zhou shu* mentioned above, and most notably, the name Xiao Xun does not appear in this passage in the *Sui shu*. We must also note that the title Duke of Liang is mentioned in connection with other figures in the *Sui shu* passage.

The discrepancies between the *Sui shu* and *Tang shu* passages on the Xiao family may reflect the different orientations of the two dynastic histories. The last ruler of the Later Liang dynasty, Xiao Cong, and his nephew, Xiao Ju, were favoured by Emperor Yang of the Sui dynasty, and this special relationship may explain why the *Sui shu* passage describes Xiao Cong's life in some detail. Xiao Yu, who also had been close to Emperor Yang, responded to the invitation of the founding Emperor of the Tang dynasty, and served Emperor Taizong closely. This would explain why the *Jiu tang shu* devotes a long biography to him. Perhaps the *Jiu tang shu* chose not to mention Xiao Cong because of his close relationship with the Sui Emperor Yang.

We noted above that the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* describes Huiquan's father as the man who served the Sui dynasty as the Lord of Liang. This description appears to fit the life of Xiao Cong as it is described in the *Sui shu*, rather than that of the obscure Xiao Xun (the *Fayuan zhulin*, 911a9, states that the biographies of both the Duke of Song, i.e., Xiao Yu, and his elder brother, the *taifusi daqing* are found in dynastic histories [*guoshi*], but Xiao Xun's biography is not found in any of the existing dynastic histories). In describing Huiquan's father as the Duke of Liang, Daoxuan may have confused Xiao Xun with Xiao Cong who served the Sui dynasty. Or, there might have been other complex stories behind these divergent accounts of the Xiao family in the *Sui shu* and the *Tang shu*. The identity of the father of Huiquan and Zhizheng still remains somewhat obscure. Biographies of later members of the Xiao family are found in the 99th fascicle of the *Jiu tang shu* and the 101st fascicle of the *Xin tang shu*.

45. The phrase is the description of Kongzang's death: *zhong yu huichang*, *Fayuan zhulin*, 766a19; *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 689c14,15; the corresponding passage in the *Ruijing lu* reads as *mo yu jingsi*, (428a9).

46. There may have been a complex relationship between the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* section on the biographies of Kongzang, Shi Huiquan, and Yisu (which includes the section on Shi Heshi) (689b–690b) and the *Fayuan zhulin* passage on Kongzang, which contains in the 85th fascicle (910c–912a) a long appendix reproducing the stories about Yisu, Shi Heshi, Duke of Song (911a8, 13) and his older brother, “Chief Minister of the Court of the Imperial Treasury” (*taifusi taqing*, 911a8,9, 16). This section in the 85th fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* is followed by a long story about Cui Yiqi and his wife, who was the daughter of Xiao Keng, a nephew of the Duke of Song mentioned above. The same story appears in a shorter form at the end of the *Ruijing lu* (430ab). The relationship between these two versions of the story will be discussed below. What is of particular interest to us here is the fact that the stories about the Xiao family appear to have been carefully collected in this section of the *Fayuan zhulin*. Since the Xiao family traces its background to Emperor Wu\* of the Liang dynasty, who in later legendary traditions appears to have become a paradigmatic pro-Buddhist ruler in China, comparable in some regards to King Aśoka in India, the interest that Daoxuan and Daoshi showed in stories associated with this family is worthy of some attention.

The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huiquan is, in fact, an extended account of eminent members of the Xiao family. Stories about the Duke of Song, Lord Specially Advanced (689c20), i.e., Xiao Yu, and about his older brother “Chief

Minister of the Court of the Imperial Treasury" (690a3) constitute a large part of the second half of this biography (690a7–11 and 690a11–14 respectively).

There are obvious parallels between the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* account of the Xiao family and the passage about the Duke of Song and his older brother in the *Fayuan zhulin*, suggesting that these two passages were intimately related to each other. The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* account is more extensive than that of the *Fayuan zhulin*, but the *Fayuan zhulin* account also contains information not found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* account. This suggests that the two accounts might have been based on a common source, from which Daoxuan and Daoshi excerpted materials independently and rather freely. The material on the Xiao family is placed in different places in the two sets of stories about the same subjects in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and the *Fayuan zhulin*: it is found before the biography of Yisu in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and after that biography in the *Fayuan zhulin*. The reason for this difference is unclear.

Members of the Xiao family occupied important positions during the Sui and Tang period, and their biographies are found in several dynastic histories. Xiao Yu's biographies are found in the two histories of Tang dynasty: the *Xin tang shu*, *juan* 101, pp. 3949–3952; the *Jiu tang shu*, *juan* 63, pp. 2398–2404. Xiao Yu's father was the Emperor Ming, and at the age of nine Yu was appointed as the Prince of the Xin'an Commandary. The *Jiu tang shu* gives a short biography of a man called Xiao Jun, who is said to have been a son of Xiao Yu's older brother Xiao Xun, the Duke of the state of Liang (p. 2405).

The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huiquan states that Huiquan's father was an older brother of Yu, Duke of Song, Lord Specially Advanced, and served the Sui dynasty as the Duke of Liang (689c21); it also mentions that Xiao Jun was Huiquan's older brother (689c29). If we follow the *Jiu tang shu* passage about Xiao Xun mentioned above, Huiquan's father, who is said to have been a Duke of Liang, appears to have been Xiao Xun. The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography notes further that Huiquan had a younger brother, a monk named Zhizheng who lived in the same place as Huiquan. The father of the monk Zhizheng is described separately as the older brother of the Duke of Song, the Chief Minister of the Court of the Imperial Treasury (*taifuqing*) (690a3). We have noted above that this title is also mentioned in the *Fayuan zhulin* passage as that of Xiao Yu's brother, who was also a pious lay Buddhist.

The name Xiao Xun appears in the *Zhou shu* in the account describing the end of the Later Liang dynasty. After a brief description of the end of Xiao Cong's reign, this passage lists the titles given to the sons of the first ruler of the Later Liang, Xiao Cha, and then those of the second ruler, Xiao Kui (the names of the successors to the throne whose lives are described in detail earlier are not mentioned here—thus Xiao Cong is not mentioned in the list of Xiao Kui's sons). Among several others, the list of Xiao Kui's sons mentions Xiao Xun, who is said to have been appointed as the Prince of Nanhai, and Xiao Yu, who is said to have been as the Prince of Xin'an (p.866). The appointment of Xiao Yu as Prince of Xin'an was also mentioned in the two biographies of Xiao Yu reviewed above.

The biography of Xiao Cong appears in the *Sui shu*, *juan* 79, pp. 1793–94, and the *Bei shi*, *juan* 81, pp. 3092–3093. Xiao Cong succeed his father, Xiao Kui,

Emperor Ming, as the last ruler of the Liang dynasty (or Later Liang, 555–587). When the Sui emperor Wen abolished the state of Liang, Cong was given the title of Duke of Ju. Later, Xiao Cong was favoured by the second Sui ruler, Emperor Yang, and was appointed as Duke of Liang. In the end, he lost the emperor's favour, and partly because he was close to Heruo Pi, and partly because of a popular children's song that hinted at the resurgence of the Xiao family, the Emperor ordered that Xiao Cong's family be exterminated (*fei yu jia*, p. 1794, l. 8). Xiao Cong ended his life shortly after that. The *Sui shu*, *juan* 79 (p. 1794) and the *Bei shi*, *juan* 81 (p. 3093) state that he had a son called Xuan, who had served as the Vice-Governor of Xiangcheng. But he must have been killed when the Emperor ordered Xiao Cong's family exterminated, and the title of Duke of Liang was passed on to Xiao Ju, who was a son of Xiao Cong's younger brother.

A short biography of Xiao Cong's younger brother, Xiao Huan, is appended to Xiao Cong's biography: this biography states Xiao Huan called himself the third son of Xiao Kui, and also mentions his other younger brothers, Jing, Chang, and Yu. This list is a little shorter than that in the *Zhou shu* mentioned above, and most notably, the name Xiao Xun does not appear in this passage in the *Sui shu*. We must also note that the title Duke of Liang is mentioned in connection with other figures in the *Sui shu* passage.

The discrepancies between the *Sui shu* and *Tang shu* passages on the Xiao family may reflect the different orientations of the two dynastic histories. The last ruler of the Later Liang dynasty, Xiao Cong, and his nephew, Xiao Ju, were favoured by Emperor Yang of the Sui dynasty, and this special relationship may explain why the *Sui shu* passage describes Xiao Cong's life in some detail. Xiao Yu, who also had been close to Emperor Yang, responded to the invitation of the founding Emperor of the Tang dynasty, and served Emperor Taizong closely. This would explain why the *Jiu tang shu* devotes a long biography to him. Perhaps the *Jiu tang shu* chose not to mention Xiao Cong because of his close relationship with the Sui Emperor Yang.

We noted above that the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* describes Huiquan's father as the man who served the Sui dynasty as the Lord of Liang. This description appears to fit the life of Xiao Cong as it is described in the *Sui shu*, rather than that of the obscure Xiao Xun (the *Fayuan zhulin*, 911a9, states that the biographies of both the Duke of Song, i.e., Xiao Yu, and his elder brother, the *taifusi daqing* are found in dynastic histories [*guoshi*], but Xiao Xun's biography is not found in any of the existing dynastic histories). In describing Huiquan's father as the Duke of Liang, Daoxuan may have confused Xiao Xun with Xiao Cong who served the Sui dynasty. Or, there might have been other complex stories behind these divergent accounts of the Xiao family in the *Sui shu* and the *Tang shu*. The identity of the father of Huiquan and Zhizheng still remains somewhat obscure. Biographies of later members of the Xiao family are found in the 99th fascicle of the *Jiu tang shu* and the 101st fascicle of the *Xin tang shu*.

47. Gjertson, *ibid.*, p. 295, n. 54. For a fuller and very informative discussion of the *Mingbao ji*, see Gjertson's Ph.D. dissertation, *A Study and Translation of the "Ming-bao chi": A T'ang Dynasty Collection of Buddhist Tales* (Stanford University, 1975; UMI no. 76–5736).

48. Gjertson reports that Tang Lin heard seven of the 53 stories from members of his family (p. 105), four from Cen Wenben, a high government official, and four from Lu Wenli, “a member of a prominent family” (p. 109). Six more stories were heard from monks, and three were told to the compiler by an acupuncture doctor (p. 109). Only two stories in this collection were copied from earlier written works, and some scholars even go so far as to suspect that these stories might not have been part of the original *Mingbao ji*. (p. 112).

49. The text of the preface is found in Taishō, Vol. 51, 787b–788a; it is translated with extensive notes by Gjertson in his dissertation, pp. 200–215.

50. See Gjertson, *ibid.*, p. 295; Dissertation, p. 174.

51. As Gjertson explains carefully, “the text of the *Ming-pao chi* as it exists today is unfortunately not in its original state”; *ibid.*, p. 112. For an explanation of the text reproduced in the Taishō collection, see *ibid.*, pp. 123–124.

52. Dissertation, p. 131; translation, pp. 230–234.

53. Dissertation, pp. 175–177.

54. Cen Zhongmian, “Tang Tang Lin *Mingbao ji zhi fuyuan*” (A Reconstruction of Tang Lin’s *Mingbao ji*), *Lishi yuyan yanjiuso jikan*, no. 17, pp. 192–94. The source of this list of *Mingbao ji* fragments is the *Fayuan zhulin* (and partly the *Tai ping guangji*, which appears to have been dependent on the *Fayuan zhulin*). Cen mentions the Sengche story on p. 194, and states that it should be excluded from the list of *Mingbao shiyi* fragments because it appears in the *Mingbao ji*. Since, as noted above, (i) the *Mingbao shiyi* often recapitulated *Mingbao ji* stories, and (ii) the versions of the Sengche story in the *Fayuan zhulin* story, attributed to the *Mingbao shiyi*, and the Sengche story in the Kōzanji manuscript, reproduced in the Taishō collection, are not identical, Cen might have been somewhat too hasty in his conclusion.

55. Gjertson notes that Daoshi on more than one occasion added new or otherwise relevant details to the passages he copied from the *Mingbao ji*. See his dissertation, pp. 178–179.

56. Dissertation, p. 131; translation, pp. 235–237.

57. Dissertation, p. 132; translation, pp. 238–242.

58. Dissertation, p. 132; translation, pp. 247–251.

59. Dissertation, p. 132–133 (where a large number of variant versions of the stories preserved in a number of sources are listed); translation, pp. 262–267.

60. Dissertation, p. 136; translation, pp. 349–355.

61. Gjertson discusses the four existing manuscripts of the *Mingbao ji* in considerable detail on pp. 115–117 of his dissertation.

62. Dissertation, p. 140; the translation of the four stories that appear only in the Maeda manuscript is not included in Gjertson’s dissertation. Gjertson also notes that a variant version of this *Mingbao ji* story appears in the *Jingang banruo jing jiyanjì*, compiled by Meng Xianzhong, *Xuzangjing*, vol. 149, p. 42b–43a.

63. Dissertation, pp. 178–179.

64. Dissertation, p. 136; translation, pp. 346–348.

65. Dissertation, p. 135; translation, pp. 338–339.

66. Dissertation, p. 135; Translation, 332–337.



67. The *Pumen* chapter here refers to the 25th chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*, which is often called the *Guanyin jing*, or the Avalokiteśvara scripture. Many extraordinary examples of the assistance that this *bodhisattva* provides for those who recite his name are described in this chapter.

68. The name of this official is given as Zhang Jingyi (794c14) in the *Mingbao ji* text in the Taishō collection; it is given as Zhang Shouyi both in the *Ruijing lu* (429c13) and the *Fayuan zhulin* (485b3) versions. This might also suggest that the *Ruijing lu* and *Fayuan zhulin* versions were directly related.

69. This sentence appears to be confused, since in the previous sentence it is said that Dong Xiong first told (Wang) Xin and (Li Jing)xuan (*xin xuan*, 485b6), and thus Li Jingxuan would have known about the second miracle without being told about it again in the morning.

70. The only other story missing in the *Datang neidian lu* is story no. 15, which is about a copy of the 13th fascicle of the Larger *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* that was seen in the sky during the persecution of Buddhism under Emperor Wu\* of the Northern Zhou dynasty.

71. In this passage, the figure which is described as “a descendant of Gao Biaoren” in the *Ruijing lu* (430a6) is identified as Gao Fayan, described as a great-great-grandson (*xuansun*) of Gao Jiong, a Chief Administrator during the Sui dynasty (640b28, 29). In the Taishō edition Gao Jiong’s name is given as Gao Ying, with a note indicating that the character *ying* is given as *lei* in the Kunaicho edition. I inferred that the personal name of this figure must have been “Jiong,” as it is given in the 41st fascicle of the *Sui shu* (p. 1179). The *Sui shu* biography notes that one of his sons was called Gao Biaoren (p. 1184).

72. “*Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*: An Exploratory Note,” pp. 207–210.

73. “Daoxuan’s Collection of Miracle Stories (*Shenseng gantong lu*): An Analysis of Its Sources,” pp. 325–335.

74. The organization of the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* is somewhat obscure. The first fascicle of this collection contains *stūpa* and relic miracle stories; the second fascicle, image miracles; and third fascicle, stories of “supernatural temples” (*shengsi*), “miraculous teachings” (*lingjiao*), and “supernatural monks” (*shenseng*). The section called “miraculous teachings” in the table of contents at the beginning of the third fascicle is in fact the *Ruijing lu*; the section called “supernatural monks” in the same table of contents is in fact the *Shenseng gantong lu*. The broad parallels with the 13th–19th fascicles of the *Fayuan zhulin* suggest that the *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* was intended, as the title suggests, as a collection of “three treasure” miracles, and that the stories in the first and second fascicles were probably intended as “Buddha” miracle stories, those of the *Ruijing lu* as the “Teaching” miracles, and those of the *Shenseng gantong lu* as the “Monk or Monastic Order” miracles.

75. As noted above, the collection appears also to have been known as *Dongxia sanbao gantong ji*, or simply as *Sanbao gantong lu*.

76. We noted above that the stories about Kongzang (no. 19) and Dong Xiong (no. 35) in the *Ruijing lu* might have been based on the corresponding passage in the *Fayuan zhulin* (63rd and 27th fascicles).

The collection of miracle stories attached at the end of each of the 100 topical sections of the *Fayuan zhulin* are all given under the heading “*Ganying yuan*.”

It is probably significant that the “*Ganying yuan*” section at the end is never mentioned explicitly in the table of contents that is given at the beginning of each of these topical sections, nor is it included in the rather complex numbered headings and subheadings used for each of these sections. Each “*Ganying yuan*” section begins with its own table of contents. The first “*Ganying yuan*” section that appears in the fifth fascicle of the *Fayuan zhulin* at the end of the section on “gods” contains a rather long introductory essay (303bc). My suspicion is that the *Fayuan zhulin* was originally conceived simply as a topical collection of relevant passages from the scriptures and treatises, and that it was only later that the collections of miracle stories were added to this basic framework. If the idea of adding a miracle story collection arose later, then we could naturally assume that this idea, and the work that was required to carry it out, must have been closely related to Daoxuan’s work on gathering miracle stories and producing miracle story collections. Since stories in the main part of each of the topical sections in the *Fayuan zhulin* are generally taken from translated Buddhist literature, they deal with Indian subject matter (one exception to this general pattern is a long passage about Daoxuan’s miraculous experience that is found in the 10th fascicle, 353c–355b). By contrast, with few exceptions, the material in the miracle story collections treats Chinese subjects. This difference in contents might reflect a significant concern on Daoshi’s part. In fact, both Daoxuan and Daoshi might have been interested in miracle stories partly because the stories they collected were stories of miracles in China; they may well have been concerned to show that the Buddhist teachings were just as effective in China as in India. I am hoping to explore this general question further in the near future.

## LIST OF CHARACTERS

Baochang deng lu	寶唱等錄
Baogui	寶瓊
Bei shi	北史
Bianzheng lun	辯正論
Bieji	別集
Biezhuan	別傳
bing	並
Bolu	白鹿
bushizhe zhong	不識者衆
Cen Wenben	岑文本
Cen Zhongmian	岑仲勉
Chang	場
Chang'an	長安
chu	出
Cui Yiqi	崔義起
Dao'an	道安

Daoji	道積
Daojiong	道冏
Daolin	道琳
Daoshi	道世
Daosun	道遜
Daoxuan	道宣
Daoyu	道裕
Daoyuan	道願
Datang neidian lu	大唐內典錄
Dongxia sanbao gantong ji	東夏三寶感通記
Dong Xiong	董雄
Dongkan	東看
Dōsen no kōshū kōsōden ni tsuite: zoku kōsō den tonon kanren	道宣の後集高僧傳について 一續高僧傳との関連
Doulu	豆腐
fa	法
Facheng	法稱
Faduan	法端
Fahua zhuanji	法華傳記
Falin	法琳
Fanyi mingyi ji	翻譯名義集
Fashang lu	法上錄
Faxin	法信
Faxing	法行
Fayuan zhulin	法苑珠林
Fazang	法藏
Fei Changfang sanbao lu	費長房三寶錄
Fei Changfang	費長房
fei yu jia	廢於家

Feijie sanbao lu	費節三寶錄
Fozu tongji	佛祖統紀
Fu Yi	傅奕
Fu Hong	傅弘
gany yuan	感應緣
Ganying zhuan	感應傳
Gao Jiong	高顛
Gao Fayan	高法眼
Gao Biaoren	高表仁
Gao Ying	高顛
Gaoseng zhuan	高僧傳
Gaowang guanshiyin jing	高王觀世音經
Gikyō kenkyū	疑經研究
Gong hu	宮湖
Gongting hu	宮亭湖
Gounaluotuo	拘那羅陀
Guang hongming ji	廣弘明集
Guanshiyin jing	觀世音經
guoshi	國史
Hedong	河東
Heruo Pi	賀恭弼
Hongming	弘明
Hongzan fahua zhuan	弘贊法華傳
hou	後
Hou Junsu	侯君素
Hu Youzhen	胡幽貞
Huaisu	懷素
Huayanjing zhuan ji	華嚴經傳記
Huayanjing ganying zhuan	華嚴經感應傳

Huiguo	慧果
Huijin	慧進
Huijing	慧淨
Huiman	慧滿
Huiquan	慧銓
Huisheng	慧乘
Huixiang	惠詳
Huiying	惠英
Huiyun	慧雲
Huizan	慧璣
Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu	集神州三寶感通錄
jian	見
jian houjunsu ji	見侯君素集
Jiangzhou	蔣州
Jing	璟
jing	敬
Jingang banruo jiyANJI	金剛般若集驗記
jingfa	敬法
jingfo	敬佛
Jingming jing	淨名經
jingseng	敬僧
jingshe	精舍
Jingyi ji	旌異記
Jiu tang shu	舊唐書
Ju	莒
juan	卷
Kongzang	空藏
Kōōkanzenonkyō no shutsugen	高王觀世音經の出現
Kōsōden sakuin	高僧傳索引

Kōzanji	高峙
Lang Yuling	郎餘令
lei	類
lei shu	類書
Leiwen	類文
Li Shanlong	李小龍
Li Yanshou	李延壽
Li Yan	李儼
Li Jingxuan	李敬玄
Li Siyi	李思一
Liang	梁
Liang gaoseng zhuan	梁高僧傳
Lidai sanbao ji	歷代三寶紀
Lidai zhongjing yinggan xingjing lu	歷代衆經應感興敬錄
Linde	麟德
lingjiao	靈教
Lingu Yuangui	令狐元軌
Lishi yuyan yanjiuso jikan	歷史語言研究所集刊
Liu Ningzhi	劉凝之
Longsu	龍朔
Lu Jingyu	盧景裕
Lü Shuding	呂叔挺
Lu Wenli	盧文勳
Luelie datang yuwang guta li	略列大唐育王古塔歷
Maeda	前田
Maekawa Takashi	前川隆司
Makita Tairyō	牧田諦亮
Meng Xianzhong	孟獻忠
Ming	明

Mingbao ji	冥報記
Mingbao shiyi	冥報拾遺
Mingxiang ji	冥祥記
mo yu jingsi	沒於京寺
Nan shi	南史
Nanhai	南海
Nanqi shu	南齊書
Neidian lu	內典錄
Pumen	普門
Puming	普明
Qi	齊
Qi shu	齊書
Qi zhi	齊志
Qianfeng	乾封
qishi youyin	齊世有因
Renshou lu	仁壽錄
Rentou	人頭
ru	如
Rui	芮
Ruijing lu	瑞經錄
Ryūkoku shidan	竜谷史壇
Sanbao gantong lu	三寶感通錄
Sengche	僧徹
Sengming	僧明
Sengsheng	僧生
Sengxiang	僧詳
Sengyi	僧意
shangzuo	上座
Shenajueduo	闍那崛多



Shencha	神察
Shenji	神祭
shensi	神寺
Shenseng gantong lu	神僧感通錄
Shensu	神素
Shentai	神泰
shenyi	神異
Shetisina	闍提斯那
Shi Heshi	史呵誓
shi bu fu chou	屍不腐臭
shi bu chou huai	屍不臭壞
Shijia fangzhi	釋迦方志
Shoki zenshū shisho no kenyū	初期禪宗史書の研究
Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku	昭和法寶總目錄
sizhu	寺主
Song gaoseng zhuan	宋高僧傳
Song	宋
Su Chang	蘇長
Sui shu	隋書
Suidai jing lu	隋代經錄
Suidai sanbao lu	隋代三寶錄
Sun Jingde	孫敬德
Suwa Gijun	諏訪義純
taifusi taqing	太府寺大卿
Taiping guanji	太平廣記
Taizong	太宗
Tan Wujie	曇無竭
Tang Lin	唐臨
Tang gaoseng zhuan	唐高僧傳

Tang Tang Lin Mingbao ji zhi fuyuan	唐唐臨冥報記之復原
Tanxiang	曇相
Tanyan	曇延
Tanyao	曇曜
Tanyun	曇韻
Tinghu	亭湖
Wang Yan	王琰
Wang Xin	王忻
Wei Shou	魏收
Wei shu	魏書
Weimo jing	維摩經
weina	維那
Wen	文
wu ta fangshu	無他方術
Wu	吳
Wu*	武
Wude	武德
Wuhousi	五侯寺
Xiancaosi	銜草寺
Xiangcheng	襄城
Xiangsisi	相思寺
Xianqing	顯慶
Xiao	蕭
Xiao Cha	蕭嘗
Xiao Cong	蕭琮
Xiao Huan	蕭暉
Xiao Ju	蕭鉅
Xiao Jun	蕭鈞
Xiao Keng	蕭鏗

Xiao Kui	蕭歸
Xiao Xun	蕭珣
Xiao Yu	蕭瑀
Xie	薛
Ximingsi	西明寺
Xin tang shu	新唐書
xin xuan	忻玄
Xin'an	新安
Xinxing	信行
Xu gaoseng zhuan	續高僧傳
Xuan	鉉
xuansun	玄孫
Xuanzang	玄奘
Xun	荀
Xuzangjing	續藏經
Yan Gong	嚴恭
Yanagida Seizan	柳田聖山
Yancong	彥琮
Yang	楊
Yangzhou	揚州
Yisu	遺俗
Yiyu	遺裕
Yizhou	益州
Yonghui	永徽
Yongming	永明
Yongzhou	雍州
you	又
Youzhou	幽州
Yuzhou	渝州

Zhang Jingyi	張敬一
Zhang Shouyi	張守一
Zhendan shenzhou fo sheli gantong xu	振旦神州佛舍利感通序
Zhenguan	貞觀
Zhikuan	志寬
Zhipan	志磐
Zhixuan	智炫
Zhiyuan	智苑
Zhizhan	志湛
Zhizhan zhuan	志湛傳
Zhizheng	智證
Zhongjing mulu	衆經目錄
Zhou	周
Zhou shu	周書
zhong yu huichang	終於會昌
Zongzhang	總章