

# Liu Yan's 劉晏 (716-780) Essay on "The Inequality of the Three Teachings" 三教不齊論: Problems Concerning its Manuscript Found in Dunhuang

T. H. Barrett

The Dunhuang document 三教不齊論 at the centre of this study, an essay included on the Stein manuscript S 5645, has seen a radical re-evaluation due to developments in scholarship during the past decade. The connections formerly posited between it and references preserved in the Japanese medieval and early modern tradition of commentary on the 'Three Teachings' have been shown to be mistaken, the result of the same title being assigned to two different Tang period compositions. Here we look briefly at the surprising new evidence that has prompted this re-evaluation before turning to a tentative fresh approach to the Dunhuang document itself. I hope also in future to use the newly discovered material as an opportunity to characterize the development and especially the emergence in printed form of the rich Japanese tradition of commentary concerned, but in order to abbreviate my presentation will do so in another publication.

The work on the 'Three Teachings' found at Dunhuang on S. 5645 and there named as a composition or compilation by Liu Yan 劉晏 (716-780) was first introduced to a modern academic readership in 1962 by the Japanese scholar Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮, and it was he who noted that a work with the same title was listed, though without any named author, among the bibliographical acquisitions of the two earliest Japanese Buddhist leaders to visit China in the ninth century, namely Saichō 最澄 (767-822) and Kūkai 空海 (774-835); it was, too, he further observed, mentioned several times also in later commentary on the essay on the Three Teachings 三教指歸

composed by the latter figure.<sup>1</sup> Liu Yan was a major participant in government in eighth century China, so any writing by him is of interest.<sup>2</sup> But In the late twentieth century the work brought back by the two Buddhists, thanks to the progress in cataloguing pre-modern library holdings throughout Japan, turned up as still in existence, and eventually it was realised that one manuscript copy derived from Saichō's original import and two deriving from Kūkai's had been located.

The chief credit for pushing forward research into these new discoveries currently lies with Fujii Jun 藤井淳 of Komazawa University, Tokyo, who in 2016 published a thorough study both of the materials in Japan, and indeed of the essay by Liu Yan, that drew on not only on his own work but also on studies by his fellow researchers Ikeda Masanori 池田將則, Kuramoto Shōtoku 倉本尚徳, Murata Mio 村田みお, and Yanagi Mikiyasu 柳幹康; the volume includes a full edition of the text, plus annotation and translation, as well as the contributors' research essays.<sup>3</sup> The chief results of this outstanding collective research add to our knowledge in a variety of ways, which for present purposes may be limited to the following points.

First, the newly discovered (or rediscovered) work is not by Liu Yan, but by a much more obscure figure, one Yao Bian 姚璿, who describes himself as a *canjun* 參軍 or administrator in Luzhou 廬州, in present-day Anhui. That there were two different works with the same title is not surprising, for as Makita remarked in 1962, the insistence that the three

<sup>1</sup> Makita Tairyō, "Ryū En no "Sankyō fusei ron" ni tsuite" 劉晏の三教不齊論について, in Tsukamoto hakushi shōju kinen kai 塚本博士頌壽記念會, ed., *Bukkyō shigaku ronshū: Tsukamoto hakushi shōju kinen kai* 佛教史學論集: 塚本博士頌壽記念 (Kyoto: Tsukamoto hakushi shōju kinen kai, 1961), pp. 694-715.

<sup>2</sup> We return to Liu Yan below. His chief fame was as a financial administrator: cf. D.C. Twitchett, *Financial Administration under the T'ang*, second edition (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1970), pp. 52-53, 92-94, 111-113.

<sup>3</sup> Fujii Jun, ed., *Saichō, Kūkai shōrai "Sankyō fusei ron" no kenkyū* 最澄・空海将来『三教不齊論』の研究, (Tokyo: Kokusho kankokai, 2016), pp. 59-71 provides the text.

teachings are not the same can be seen as a response to an influential assertion to the contrary by the late sixth century critic of monastic Buddhism, Wei Yuansong 衛元嵩.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, since the author mentions a date equivalent to 724, and a colophon in the manuscript copied by Saichō bore the date 774, the composition of his work must have fallen into the half century in between. Thirdly, Yao's work was later revised and expanded by someone who, as may be gathered from the citations of new material in it, lived under the Song dynasty – as Makita had already noted, not before the 1110s, to judge by an official title mentioned – and this somewhat different work also circulated in Japan under Yao's name but under the new title "Sanjiao youlie zhuan" 三教優劣傳, where it was eventually printed in 1650.<sup>5</sup> The new information brought forward by this group of researchers, and also by a certain amount of research in Chinese that has been stimulated by the retrieval of this hitherto unexamined eighth century source on interreligious debate, provides an ideal opportunity to reconsider the original Dunhuang text, in that it may still help us in understanding the context of Liu Yan's work on the Three Teachings, if only by providing something of the broader intellectual context within which the work under Liu's name was created.

This remains true even though the conclusion of the collective research edited by Fujii, and indeed of earlier research, is that the reverse does not hold good, and that Liu Yan's piece cannot throw any light on Yao's, because it is not – at least in the form in which we have it – a discussion of the Three Teachings, but rather a justification of Buddhist practice within Chinese culture that makes no specific reference to the Daoist tradition whatsoever, even if it may perhaps represent an excerpt from a larger work that did exercise that function.<sup>6</sup> At present all remarks about this source

<sup>4</sup> Makita, "Ryū En", p.701. The importance of Wei Yuansong's thought has been pointed out by Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄, *Chūgoku Bukkyō shisōshi kenkyū* 中国仏教思想史研究 (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1969), pp. 264-297.

<sup>5</sup> Makita Tairyō, "Sanjiao yūretsū den ni tsuite" 三教優劣傳について, *Bukkyō bunka kenkyū* 仏教文化研究 11 (1962), pp. 87-98.

<sup>6</sup> Note already the conclusion concerning this essay on p. 44 of of Zhang Wenliang 張文良, "Yao Bian 'Sanjiao buqi lun' kao" 姚瞿三教不齊論考, *Furen zongjiao yanjiu* 輔仁宗教

must remain somewhat tentative, in that it plainly demands careful consideration from three different perspectives, none of which has yet been explored in full.

The most basic of these is the perspective of codicology – in other words, the analysis of every aspect of the unique physical manuscript of which the piece forms a part, since without an appreciation of the whole no assessment can be made of its particular individual significance. Though Makita did devote some space to a brief description of most of the other items that go to make up Stein 5645, we now possess in the work of Sam van Schaik and Imre Galambos at least one model demonstrating the benefits of a more complete approach to a composite document from the Dunhuang archive.<sup>7</sup> There is furthermore one formal feature of the manuscript that gives an immediate clue both as to its earliest possible date and to its function. Stein 5645 has rounded edges at each corner of the page, and according to a personal communication in April 2019 to me of his forthcoming research findings Dr. Galambos is certain that such manuscripts in China cannot be earlier than the 880s, though earlier antecedents exist in Western Asia. We look forward to his forthcoming study documenting this important point, but meanwhile it is worth reporting his conclusion that this innovation was designed to improve the portability of manuscripts. Stein 5645 would seem therefore to be a small portable personalised reference work or selection of useful notices and memoranda, probably put together by a member of the sangha and kept handy as a personal possession rather than borrowed from a library.

One point that must be made immediately, however, is that the transcribed body of text that we have so far denominated as the *Sanjiao buqi lun* does not in fact bear that title, since it begins in mid-phrase without any form of heading; the characters *Sanjiao buqi lun* 三教不齊論 and 'Liu Yan

---

研究 25 (2012), pp. 33-49.

<sup>7</sup> Sam van Schaik and Imre Galambos, *Manuscripts and Travellers: The Sino-Tibetan Documents of a Tenth-century Buddhist Pilgrim*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.

shu' 劉晏述, 'narrated by Liu Yan', only occur at the end of the piece as an apparent indication of its source. This would seem to suggest that what we have was excerpted from a larger source under the title given, though given the verb used, the relationship of Liu to the text we possess and to the source whence it came is not precisely clear, at least to me, since I do not know whether or not the usage of the verb could cover not only the composition of the text but also the compilation of a more extensive dossier of texts taken from various sources. Perhaps it means no more than that the piece was initially prepared for the benefit of the emperor rather than put forth for a public readership.

The English translation of 述 *shu* as 'narrate' is based upon earlier efforts on my part in trying to pin down the meaning of this term in relation to the title of another document of the early ninth century.<sup>8</sup> Those efforts did not entirely reassure me that I had grasped the usage of the word. I am therefore grateful that more recently Max Deeg has commented on its meaning in the context of an immensely famous late eighth century document where its function in the ascription of the piece has hitherto not attracted sufficient attention. That document is the 'Nestorian Stele', 大秦景教流行中国碑 *Da Qin Jingjiao liuxing Zhongguo bei*, in his study and translation of which Max Deeg draws attention to the use of the character in the terminology of Chinese historiography.<sup>9</sup> This usage is indeed discussed in the *Shitong* 史通 of Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661-721), but in context the meaning seems somewhat specialised; here in English 'Recapitulation' might be the best interpretation.<sup>10</sup> The *locus classicus* for the word is even so undoubtedly the opening of the seventh chapter of the *Analecst* 論語, where Confucius affirms that he 述而不作, he 'transmits but does not create', and all

<sup>8</sup> T H. Barrett, *From Religious Ideology to Political Expediency in Early Printing: An Aspect of Buddhist-Daoist Rivalry* (London: Minnow Press, 2012), pp. 50-51.

<sup>9</sup> Max Deeg, *Die Strahlende Lehre: Die Stele von Xi'an* (Wien: Lit Verlag, 2018), p. 72, n. 174.

<sup>10</sup> For the relevant passage in a bilingual edition with French translation, see Liu Zhiji, trans. Damien Chaussende, *Traité de l'historien parfait* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2014), pp. 70-71, though the French translation of 述 as 'Propos' does not clarify matters much for me.

commentaries here agree that the word indicates receiving information and passing it on unaltered. 'Recounted by Liu Yan' would seem as likely a translation of the usage on Stein 5645 as any that I have been able to devise, but room for debate certainly remains.

As Makita informs us, Liu's material is contained in a small notebook, measuring only 12x8.5 cm, consisting of seventy pages composed of leaves of paper sewn together at the right hand side with thread, into which several different texts have been written in 'memo' fashion. It is preceded by seven other works, of which the first six are liturgical - that is, hymns, prayers and formulae for practical use. The seventh piece is a small compilation of materials useful for explaining the history of Buddhism in China that includes the date 869: Makita points out that a similar small collection from Dunhuang, P. 2722, carries the date 880.<sup>11</sup> After the essay by Liu another incomplete piece of seventeen pages follows, upon which Makita does not comment beyond giving the title, *Sima toutuo Dimai jue* 司馬頭陀地脉訣, on the grounds that it is of a different type from what precedes it.<sup>12</sup> This is true in a sense, in that it is a work of prognostication, but such reference materials on what today is called *fengshui* 風水 certainly have to be recognised as part of the lives of the Buddhist clergy of Dunhuang, in the light of more recent research.<sup>13</sup> Marc Kalinowski, who translates part of it and calls this category of writing 'domestic topomancy', shows that its author lived in South China in the middle of the ninth century, and seems to have had a particular interest in including information useful to the Buddhist clergy.<sup>14</sup>

Unfortunately, the notebook is not in perfect condition, and not simply

<sup>11</sup> Makita, "Ryū En", p. 700.

<sup>12</sup> Makita, "Ryū En", p. 701.

<sup>13</sup> This manuscript is included in the description of other works of the same type in Yu Xin 余欣, *Shendao renxin: Tang-Song zhi ji Dunhuang minsheng zongjiao shehuishi yanjiu* 神道人心唐宋之際敦煌民生宗教社會史研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006), pp. 179-182.

<sup>14</sup> Marc Kalinowski, *Divination et société dans la Chine médiévale* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2003), pp. 563-564.

because the final pages are damaged, but because at least two pages (i.e. at least one sheet of paper) preceding Liu's essay must be missing, since the text begins in mid-sentence. I have yet to see this notebook in the British Library, but the photographs that have been published allow one or two tentative deductions to be made.<sup>15</sup> First, the presence of corrections (on sheets 23a, 24b and 33a) suggests that the notebook was put together quite carefully: it was not just used for rough notes, but deliberately compiled as a small reference work for the use of the owner. Secondly, the omission of the one or more sheets containing the beginning of Liu's essay may have been accidental, or may alternatively have been a decision made at the time that the sheets were sewn together, but the owner of the notebook evidently did not think it important to take it apart again and insert either the sheet or sheets that had been omitted, or (if that material had been lost) one or more freshly copied sheets. In short, what we have now is probably as much as the owner felt necessary to preserve.

Pending the resolution of these and other codicological questions, however, there are two further perspectives that demand at least a preliminary mention. The first is the matter of content; the second is that of context, meaning here the particular historical context that would best suit the composition of the text as we have it. The content stands out as important first and foremost for the reason already given: that it is very hard to reconcile with what one would normally expect of an essay on the Three Teachings. But it does not simply make no mention of Daoism at all; even more strangely, it would appear to do this while treating a topic that would seem to require some passing mention of Daoism, at the very least. The work is evidently framed as a discussion document submitted to the emperor, since it ends as was customary for these pieces with the phrase *jinyi* 謹議, i.e. '[Such is] my humble opinion', following closely on several

---

<sup>15</sup> The following observations are based on the photographs in Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan lishi yanjiusuo 中國社會科學院歷史研究所 et al., ed., *Ying cang Dunhuang wenxian* : (*Hanwen fojing yi wai bufen*) 英藏敦煌文獻 : (漢文佛經以外部份) 9 (Chengdu :Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 1994), pp. 1-18.

sentences containing a whole sequence of similar phrases such as 'what your foolish minister opines' *yuchen suo yi* 愚臣所議 and so on. What the emperor evidently wanted to know was something along the lines of whether a monk should bow to him or not, and if so how - a matter of extreme delicacy for anyone seeking to avoid possibly fatal imperial anger.

Such a question was in itself by no means a new one. It was also a matter that other inhabitants of Dunhuang at about this time seem to have maintained an interest in, to judge from an excerpt on the same topic – describing the early Tang but apparently not entirely historically accurate – that survives on another manuscript, P. 2954.<sup>16</sup> Extensive debates had been held at court in 662 and subsequently compiled by a Buddhist monk into a comprehensive dossier that also included historical records on earlier arguments stretching back to the fourth century CE.<sup>17</sup> The entire dossier has, furthermore, recently been summarized and put into a much broader context by Eric Reinders, so there seems no need to recapitulate the arguments themselves here.<sup>18</sup> But this compilation of 662 does serve in its contents to provide a clear contrast to the similar material on Stein 5645, even if it is about forty times larger than the sample of only slightly over one thousand characters to which Liu Yan's name is attached. For granted that the Dunhuang material might ideally be more extensive for completely reliable comparisons of vocabulary, some very interesting patterns emerge nonetheless. Thus the discussion on Stein 5645 mentions Confucius either by his family name Kong 孔 or as the 'Master', *fuzi* 夫子, three times each; the 662 dossier mentions him twenty-one times by family name and once as the 'Master'. Laozi, by contrast, is mentioned not at all in the Stein manuscript, and forty-one times in the 662 records. One of the best known

<sup>16</sup> This document has been studied by Chen Zuolong 陈祚龍, *Dunhuang xueyuan lingshi* 敦煌學園零拾 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986), pp. 279-285; Chen dates this composition to after 795, with the manuscript probably of the tenth century.

<sup>17</sup> Yancong 彦棕, comp., *Ji shamen bu ying bai su dengshi* 集沙門不應拜俗等事, in Taisho canon, 52, no.2108.

<sup>18</sup> Eric Reinders, *Buddhist and Christian Responses to the Kowtow Problem in China* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 51-94.



examples of a Daoist figure who was held to have justifiably adopted a superior posture to a Former Han emperor was the early (but probably not that early) commentator Heshang gong 河上公, 'Master of the Riverbank', who is mentioned seven times in the 662 texts, and again not at all in the Dunhuang argument.<sup>19</sup>

Now while there is plainly much more that could be said about the content of the Stein 5645 extract, this does on the face of it pose some difficult questions about the possible environment during Liu Yan's lifetime that could conceivably have nurtured such a distinctive approach to polemical writing. A cursory reading of a chronological survey of relations between the Tang ruling house and Buddhism, such as may be found in Stanley Weinstein's pioneering *Buddhism under the T'ang*, makes it quite plain that though the dynasty generally supported Daoism over Buddhism, after the An Lushan 安祿山 rebellion of 755 it became dependent for a generation at least on troops of foreign origin whose probable lack of interest in Daoist forms of securing imperial legitimacy required a greater demonstration of Tang involvement with a religious tradition with a more pan-Asian reach.<sup>20</sup> Schemes of political legitimacy based on 'blood and soil' types of thought, after all, assume a base of supporters to whom such thought is intelligible. It is true that the emperor under whom Liu Yan eventually succumbed to what was effectively judicial murder at the hands of a jealous political rival did show signs of trying to return to earlier dynastic policies, but by that point at the very end of Liu's life his extensive bureaucratic duties probably precluded much in the way of literary or religious pursuits in any case.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> For some extended remarks arguing that this legend is even so pre-Buddhist, see Kusuyama Haruki 楠山春樹, *Rōshi densetsu no kenkyū* 老子伝説の研究 (Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1979), pp. 171-198; pp. 186-191 specifically covers the role of the legend in the Tang debates.

<sup>20</sup> Stanley Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) pp. 57-59, 77-89.

<sup>21</sup> Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, pp. 89-90. The fiscal retrenchment at this point actually seems to have been aimed at both Buddhism and Daoism.

Even so, the total silence concerning Daoism suggests a very deliberate caution, pointing strongly to something more than a shift in dynastic policy - something more like an unstable and dangerous political situation in which particular care in addressing the emperor was required, and a policy of 'least said, soonest mended' was highly advisable. This type of situation obtained for example not so much in the longer aftermath of the rebellion as in the decade running up to it, when the 'Brilliant Emperor' (*minghuang* 明皇), Xuanzong 玄宗 (685-762; r. 712-756) was pursuing such a vigorous programme of developing Daoism as an imperial ideology that Buddhism suffered a complete eclipse in imperial support, even if it was not directly persecuted.<sup>22</sup> The only problem with this is that there would appear to be no compelling reason why a court debate should have been held on the 'kowtow question' during this period, though as I will note below in the conclusion of this study I may be wrong on this point. Even so, there is no obvious sign known to me at present that any related administrative move was ever made.

A reconsideration of this question was however made immediately after the Brilliant Emperor was usurped by his son as a result of the rebellion, but the father yet remained alive, and when in fact he was in the highly unstable situation caused by the rebellion still a potential political player, despite the total collapse of his prestige. In the late October of 760 the new emperor, Suzong 肅宗 (r. 756-762), as part of his shift in policy in response to the new dangers confronting the dynasty, conceded that monks should not be required to term themselves 'your subject', *chen* 臣, in addressing the emperor, and it would seem conceivable that some court discussion preceded this decision.<sup>23</sup> But the political environment at this

---

<sup>22</sup> Note Weinstein, *Buddhism under the Tang*, pp. 51-57.

<sup>23</sup> The only early source for this concession is Zanning 贊寧 (919-1001) *Da Song Seng shilue* 大宋僧史略, compiled at the end of the tenth century, and Albert Welter, in his meticulous volume on this work, *The Administration of Buddhism in China: A Study and Translation of Zanning and the Topical Compendium of the Buddhist Clergy (Da Song Seng shilue 大宋僧史略)* (Amherst, New York: Cambria Press, 2018), pp. 556, 559 (Chinese text) and p. 565, n. 41, fails to find any earlier text corroborating this information,

time was very uncertain, with much of the country still in rebel hands as well as the ex-emperor still alive and the potential focus of attempts at deposing Suzong. This would have had the effect of making advocacy of anything politically controversial very difficult, as has been cogently pointed out with regard to the writing of history by Denis Twitchett.<sup>24</sup> It was a time when it was probably best, when asked to comment on a measure bearing on the status of the emperor, to avoid saying anything that might have had bad repercussions later.

Would such a date for a proposal in support of Buddhism deliberately avoiding giving offense to Daoists make sense in terms of Liu Yan's biography, assuming that he was either the author or editor of the piece on Stein 5645? Liu had in fact been a child genius who came to the attention of the Brilliant Emperor at a very young age, so he had found a certain place in court circles well before this time. But his initial post, aged eight (sic), had been a minor clerical one in the imperial library, so it is unlikely that his opinion would have been called upon before he was promoted to a higher level post in the central government, and this happened just before the outbreak of the rebellion. His subsequent efforts fighting on the side of the dynasty however won him recognition from the new emperor, and in the early summer of 760 he had been brought into the restored central government and given important responsibilities in the financial administration.<sup>25</sup>

It should perhaps be pointed out that the evidence for Liu's attitude to Buddhism found in other sources has been characterised as negative,

---

but it is intrinsically quite plausible in the circumstances of the time, for which see Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, p.58.

<sup>24</sup> Denis Twitchett, *The Historian, His Readers, and the Passage of Time* (Nankang, Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, 1997), p. 67.

<sup>25</sup> The best chronological study (*nianpu* 年譜) of Liu's life known to me is in Qi Tao 齊濤 and Ma Xin 馬新, *Liu Yan, Yang Yan pingzhuan* 劉晏楊炎評傳 (Nanjing: Nanjing daxue chubanshe, 1998), pp. 284-301; for his 760 promotion see pp. 291-292.

despite his reported contacts with the monk Daozun 道遵 (714-784).<sup>26</sup> This view, however, apparently depends on two anecdotal sources from the middle of the ninth century. One concerns his criticism of a monk's recommendation that he do no evil but rather should do good (諸惡莫作, 諸善奉行), namely that even a child knows that, which earns the retort even an old man cannot do it. But this dialogue is attributed to at least two other sets of lay persons and monks, one pair earlier and one pair later than him, and in these other instances the lay persons are historically not known as hostile to Buddhism, so this anecdote cannot in my view be used to establish a negative reputation.<sup>27</sup> The second anecdote simply says that in his youth Liu was fond of the arts of the Way (少好道術), and such an interest in the techniques of obtaining long life were not always incompatible with Buddhism.<sup>28</sup> It does however suggest that Liu was believed to have been relatively well informed about the Daoist tradition, which makes his complete failure to say anything about it in the *Sanjiao buqi lun* even stranger.

It goes without saying that 'context', our third heading under which this item has been assessed, also demands further careful research. For the moment therefore this suggestion can only be a working hypothesis, and one of rather restricted value without further investigation of the two other perspectives required to evaluate this source. The *Sanjiao buqi lun* preserved in Japan does, however, throw some light on the hypothesis, in that it clearly dates to before 774 and at the same time it also looks back to the early part of the reign of the Brilliant Emperor in 724 and specifically addresses Daoist preaching that the author recollects hearing at what turns out to be the site of a pro-dynastic Daoist miracle story put about at that

<sup>26</sup> This seems to be the interpretation of Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究 (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1967), pp. 203-204, 211-212.

<sup>27</sup> See Duan Chengshi 段成式, *Youyang zazu* 酉陽雜俎. Supplement, 4 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981), pp. 230-231, and cf. Qian Zhongshu 錢鍾書, *Guanzhui bian* 管錐編 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979), p. 683.

<sup>28</sup> Li Fang 李昉, *Taiping guangji* 太平廣記 39 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981), p. 245, citing the *Yi shi* 逸史 of Lu Zhao 盧肇.

time.<sup>29</sup> Plainly he has no qualms about doing this, even if he passes over the miracle story itself in preference to explicitly contradicting it. This reinforces the impression that the composition of the other *Sanjiao buqi lun* of Liu Yan, which goes much further and passes over each and every matter connected with Daoism in complete and utter silence, must have taken place under exceptional circumstances. Both these sources are, however, comparatively new to scholarship. Time will tell how they come to be seen in future, but one trusts that enough has been said here to indicate one future direction that that research might take.

The suggestions given above are, in any case, obviously no more than tentative, and it is possible that other interpretations of the evidence are possible. I am grateful therefore for the comment made at the memorial symposium for Stanley Weinstein in December 2018 by Professor Fujii that the arrival of Tantric Buddhist masters at the Tang court during the reign of Xuanzong could have prompted some discussion of the relationship between monks and monarchs. Biographical materials on these men, after all, would have us believe that they could treat the emperor with startling informality.<sup>30</sup> That this informality might have caused comment is a possibility that should certainly be explored in future. Meanwhile I am happy to have had the opportunity to draw attention to the work of Denis Twitchett and Stanley Weinstein, two friends who did much to introduce Japanese scholarship on China to the English-speaking world. Long may such academic contacts continue!

---

<sup>29</sup> This story is mentioned on p.61 of the Fujii edition, and the significance of the site is explained by Kuramoto Shōtoku on pp. 233-239 of the accompanying research.

<sup>30</sup> This informality is quite clear in the materials gathered by the pioneering scholar Chou Yi-Liang 周一良 in his study of these men: note that as reprinted in Richard K. Payne, *Tantric Buddhism in East Asia* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2006), p. 59, Amoghavajra calls the emperor 'third master' 三郎, a highly informal mode of address.