



汉藏佛学研究丛书

中国人民大学国学院 主办
北美汉藏佛学研究会

敦煌遗书研究论集

林世田 著





汉藏佛学研究丛书

中国人民大学国学院 主办
北美汉藏佛学研究会

敦煌遗书研究论集

林世田 著

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

敦煌遗书研究论集/林世田著. —北京: 中国藏学出版社, 2010. 3
(汉藏佛学研究丛书)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 80253 - 249 - 6

I. ①敦… II. ①林… III. ①敦煌学 - 文集 IV. ①K870.6 - 53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 035992 号

敦煌遗书研究论集

林世田著

出版发行: 中国藏学出版社

责任编辑: 黄维忠 南加才让

封面设计: 翟跃飞

印 刷: 北京牛山世兴印刷厂

开 本: 640 × 965 毫米 1/16

印 张: 25

印 数: 1500 册

字 数: 334 千字

印 次: 2010 年 3 月第 1 版第 1 次

书 号: ISBN 978 - 7 - 80253 - 249 - 6/K. 240

定 价: 40.00 元

《汉藏佛学研究丛书》编辑缘起

众所周知，佛教按其流传的区域可分北传和南传佛教。北传佛教主要为汉传佛教（包括韩国、日本佛教）和藏传佛教（包括蒙古佛教），宗大乘教法；南传佛教流行于斯里兰卡、缅甸、泰国、柬埔寨和老挝等地，宗小乘教法。北传大乘佛教两大支中的汉传佛教，乃公元一世纪时经由中亚传到中国，复从中亚传到韩国和日本，西方学术界现称之为“东亚佛教”（East Asian Buddhism）；而北传大乘佛教的另一支藏传佛教则是分别于公元八世纪和公元十一世纪后（即西藏佛教史上的前弘期和后弘期）先后两次传入西藏的佛教。由于藏传佛教与印度佛教关系紧密，对它的研究常常与对印度佛教的研究结合在一起，形成所谓“印藏佛学研究”（Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Studies），是当代佛学研究领域内最为引人瞩目、且最有成就的一个分支。这一局面的形成自然有其充足的理由。佛教源于印度，对印度佛教的研究当然是理解佛教的基础。可是，用梵文纪录的大乘佛教原典大部分并没有在印度被保存下来，印度佛教早在公元十三世纪初就已经消亡，印度佛教及其历史的重构很大程度上依赖的是《藏文大藏经》和其他藏文宗教、历史文献。《藏文大藏经》收录了4569部佛典，包含了绝大部分印度佛典，特别是后期大乘佛典的完整翻译。藏文本身又是参照梵文人工制定的书面语言，在语法和构词法方面明显有贴近梵文的倾向。早在公元九世纪初，为了规范佛经翻译，吐蕃赞普就命令译经的高僧专门编制了正字法字典

《语合二章》(*sGra sbyor bam gnyis*) 和解释语源的语汇手册《翻译名义大集》(*Bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen po*), 确保了藏语书面语言的规范化。藏文佛经翻译工程每每有因遭伊斯兰入侵而流亡西藏的印度学问僧的加入和合作, 使藏文佛典翻译的质量得到了可靠的保证。是故, 藏文成了今天研究印度佛教者必须掌握的语言工具, 人们只有通过藏文的翻译来想象梵文原文的语言风貌, 重构梵文原典, 并正确理解佛教原典的微言大义。藏传佛教作为大乘佛教的直接继承者, 印度佛教大义在西藏持续不断地被阐释, 印度佛教所讨论的哲学问题在西藏得到了更深入的探讨和论辩。西藏历史上出现了一大批杰出的佛教学者如俄译师罗丹喜饶 (*rNgog lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab*, 1059-1109)、萨迦班智达 (*Sa skya pandita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan*, 1182-1251)、布敦 (*Bu ston Rin chen grub*, 1290-1364)、龙青绕绛巴 (*Klong chen rab 'byams pa*, 1308-1364/69)、宗喀巴 (*bTsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa*, 1357-1419) 等, 他们对佛教义理的阐释都有独特的创见, 极大地丰富了佛教的哲学思想。对他们的著作研究显然有助于我们更深入地理解印度佛学原理。此外, 除了具有很深的理论色彩以外, 西藏佛教的另一个最显著的特征就是密乘观修的盛行。西藏佛教对印度密教传统的接受、继承和发展, 不仅使西藏的文化和社会深深地打上了被人类学家称为“萨满”的烙印, 而且亦使密教成为藏传佛教本身的一个标志特征; 有人甚至认为密教是西藏人为丰富世界文明做出的最大贡献。现存藏传佛教文献所记载的五花八门的藏传佛教密修仪轨是重构印度古老的密教传统的最重要的资源。只有对藏传密教作深入的研究, 才有可能将古老的印度密教传统的真面目揭示出来。所有这些构成了西方“印藏佛学研究”形成和发展的基础。于西方学术界, 特别是欧洲的东方学界, 藏学最初每每被当成印度学、佛学的附庸。即使西藏学被当成一门独立的学科而渐渐被人接受的今天, 它亦依然没有完全摆脱其传统的角色。不管是在欧美, 还是在日本, 藏学研究最重要的内容就是置于“印藏佛学研究”框架下的藏传佛

教研究。

将印度佛教和西藏佛教作为一个整体来研究，追溯其根源、观察其流变，无疑是佛学研究应当采取的正确方向。“印藏佛学研究”的传统历久不衰，至今新人辈出、成果卓著，表明这一学科依然具有极强的学术潜力。毋庸讳言的是，“印藏佛学研究”于佛学研究领域内占据的绝对强势，显然导致了人们对另一个本该受到重视的学科，即“汉藏佛学研究”（Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies）的忽略。汉藏两个民族间的文化交流源远流长，汉藏佛教之间你中有我、我中有你。西藏佛教的来源并不只是印度佛教，汉传佛教对于藏传佛教传统的形成同样有过巨大的影响。按照西藏人自己的历史传统，佛教是在吐蕃赞普松赞干布时期分别通过其迎娶的尼婆罗公主和大唐公主两位妃子传入吐蕃的。文成公主居藏时期，既有大唐派往印度求法途经吐蕃的汉僧往还，亦有常住吐蕃传法、译经的汉族和尚。公元八世纪下半叶是吐蕃王国的全盛时期，亦是汉藏佛教交流的黄金时期。为数不少的汉文佛经于此时被翻译成了藏文，亦有一些佛经从藏文译成了汉文，当时曾出现过像法成这样兼通藏、汉的大译师。尤其值得称道的是，汉地的禅宗佛教曾于此时传到了吐蕃，且深受吐蕃信众的喜爱，几乎所有重要的早期禅宗经典都曾被译成藏文。不幸的是，随着八世纪末“吐蕃僧诤”的发生、九世纪中朗达磨的灭佛，以及后弘期藏族史家对“吐蕃僧诤”这一事件之历史传统的建构，汉藏佛教之间的交流趋于停顿，尽管“和尚”的影子事实上从没有在藏传佛教中消失。不管是宁玛派的大圆满法，还是噶举派的大手印法中，汉地禅宗教法的影响从没有被彻底排除。而自十一世纪初，藏传密教就已经开始通过中央欧亚的西夏、回鹘等民族在汉人中间传播，到了蒙元王朝，藏传密教更进一步深入到中原腹地，汉、藏高僧亦曾合作进行过勘同汉、藏法宝（佛经）这样的大工程。此后明、清两代的皇帝亦多半对藏传密教情有独钟，直到近代，藏传佛教一直是汉传佛教中一个醒目的外来成分。总而言之，汉、藏两种佛教传统间有千丝万缕

的联系，对这两种佛教传统的研究同样不能割裂开来。遗憾的是，当今从事“东亚佛教”研究的学者很少注意到汉传佛教与藏传佛教间的关系，而从事“印藏佛学研究”的学者中兼通汉语文者寥寥可数，遂使“汉藏佛学研究”成了一门备受冷落的学问。值得提醒的是，由于敦煌古汉、藏文文献，特别是其中有关汉传禅宗佛教的古汉、藏文文献的发现，“汉藏佛学研究”于上个世纪的下半叶一度曾相当的活跃。法国汉学家戴密微（Paul Demiéville）先生于1952年出版的大作《吐蕃僧诤记》被人称为“当代欧洲佛学、汉学的最高权威”，曾激发了世界各国汉、藏、佛教学者对汉传禅宗教法于吐蕃传播的历史的浓厚兴趣。以上山大峻为首的一批日本佛教学者于上个世纪七、八十年代曾对见于敦煌古藏文文献中的大量的禅宗文献作了仔细的勘定和研究，使得禅宗于西藏传播的历史终于变得清晰起来。著名的西藏学家、印藏佛学家 G. Tucci, D. S. Ruegg 和 Samten G. Karmay 等人亦曾下功夫对“吐蕃僧诤”的历史和藏传佛教传统中的禅宗成分作过认真的梳理。可是这样的研究自上个世纪九十年代以来已不复多见，汉传佛教和藏传佛教的研究又重归井水不犯河水的局面。事实上，对敦煌古汉、藏文禅宗文献的研究远没有达到该了结的地步，不但尚有大量的敦煌古文献还没有得到系统的整理和研究，而且还有许多敦煌以外发现的对这一课题的研究同样具有重要价值的古藏文文献有待人们去研究、整理。例如世界各国学者正联合对 Tabo 所发现的古藏文文献进行整理，其中就发现有与敦煌古藏文禅宗文献类似，但更为完整的文本。还有像《禅定目炬》（*bSam gtan mig sgron*）这样系统判定渐门、顿门、大瑜伽、大圆满等教法之见、行、道、果的古藏文文献，亦待人们去整理和研究。不仅如此，对于藏传密教于西域、汉地传播历史的研究事实上还没有真正开始。我们于晚近才真正公之于世的俄藏黑水城西夏、汉文文书，以及最近于宁夏地区陆续出土的西夏时代的西夏文、汉文文书中见到了大量有关藏传密教的文献，这些资料的发现终于使得重构十一至十四世纪藏传佛教于西域和汉地传播

的历史成为可能。“汉藏佛学研究”不但方兴未艾，而且与“印藏佛学研究”一样极具潜力。

当然，作“汉藏佛学研究”的意义远不止于对汉、藏佛教史的梳理，其中一项极为重要的内容应当是汉、藏文大藏经的比较研究。汉、藏文大藏经是佛学世界公认的宝库，佛经之大部分唯以其汉文或藏文之翻译而保存至今。虽然汉文大藏经从数量上远少于藏文大藏经，《大正藏》中仅录 2920 种佛典，且多有重复翻译者，但汉、藏文大藏经有互补的作用，汉文佛典中有较多的早期资料，而藏文佛典含有更多的晚期资料，故对汉、藏文大藏经进行比较既可发现其异同，亦可互相补充其不足。由于汉、藏文佛典的译文质量差别甚大，对二者进行对勘有助于汉、藏文译本的厘定，特别是有助于改正汉译文中的种种纰漏。与藏文大藏经形成鲜明对比的是，汉文大藏经的翻译可以说是问题百出。虽然于中国的译经史上出现过像鸠摩罗什、玄奘这样杰出的大师，然而亦出现过许多名不副实的译师，他们所翻译的佛经不但文字佶屈聱牙，而且语义多妄自分别，令人不知所云，无法卒读。由于汉语文与梵文间的差距太大，以至即使是备受推崇的玄奘的翻译实际上亦常常与梵本有较大的距离，更不用提那些滥竽充数的译师们所翻译的作品了。汉文佛经翻译的不正确，严重影响了汉传佛教徒对佛法之微言大义的理解，引起了佛教史上一次次的争论。例如作为大乘佛教根本思想之如来藏学说，亦正由于汉译佛典的种种纰漏，近数十年不断受到歪曲，甚至批判。事实上，受到批判的佛家宗派，包括汉传佛教的天台宗、华严宗、净土宗、禅宗等，及藏传佛教的宁玛派、萨迦派、噶举派、觉囊派等，无一不以如来藏为根本。批判如来藏的人，实在对如来藏的涵义不甚了了，他们将如来藏自立定义，然后去批判这自立的定义。他们由“中观”去否定，却不理解龙树的缘起学说；他们由“唯识”去否定，却不知弥勒瑜伽行以如来藏为证果。对于此误解或错解，除了因为于中观与瑜伽行这大乘二宗河的教法蒙昧以外，亦由于受了拙劣的译文所误导。要使汉传佛教研究更上

一个台阶，且令如来藏教法从一片批判的声音中回复其“本来面目”，实在有必要大张旗鼓地号召汉、藏佛学研究者同心协力，将汉、藏佛经对勘作为一项伟大的事业来进行。

有鉴于以上所说原因，我们竭力倡导打破汉、藏佛学研究间的此疆彼界，使“汉藏佛学研究”与“印藏佛学研究”并重，成为当代佛学研究的主流。为此，中国人民大学国学院和北美汉藏佛教研究协会合力主办这套《汉藏佛学研究丛书》，借此团结海内外有志于汉、藏佛学研究诸同好，来共同营造“汉藏佛学研究”的繁荣。

沈卫荣 邵颂雄

2006年10月1日

Editors' Preface

The geographical terms “Northern Buddhism” and “Southern Buddhism” are used to refer to the Buddhist traditions transmitted outside of India. “Northern Buddhism” refers primarily to Buddhism practiced in China, Korea, Japan, Tibet and Mongolia, where the Mahāyāna tradition is followed. “Southern Buddhism” is practiced in Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos, and follows the Theravāda tradition. Chinese Buddhism, being one of the two main branches of “Northern Buddhism,” is a result of the encounter between Buddhism in Central Asia and the Chinese civilization during the first century C. E. This highly evolved form of Buddhist practice was later transmitted to Japan and Korea, where it is known to Western academics as “East Asian Buddhism.”

The other main branch of “Northern Buddhism” was transmitted from India to Tibet in the 8th century and again in the 10th century. These are known as the first dissemination (snga dar) and the second dissemination (phyi dar) respectively. Because of the close relationship of the practice of Buddhism in India and Tibet, the study of Tibetan Buddhism has often been linked to Indian Buddhism. This has given rise to the academic practice known as Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Studies, which has become one of the most well-developed and successful areas in modern academic Buddhist studies.

There are many reasons that contribute to the success of this discipline. Buddhism originates in India and, needless to say, the

study of Indian Buddhism is the foundation of understanding Buddhism. However, the majority of the Sanskrit Mahāyāna scriptures are not preserved in India because after the 13th century, Buddhism became extinct on Indian soil.

The understanding of Indian Buddhism and its history is reliant to a large extent on the Tibetan Canon and other related Tibetan texts which deal with Buddhist doctrines and history. There are 4,569 Buddhist texts found in the Tibetan Canon, including a major portion of the Indian Buddhist works, most particularly the translation of late Mahāyāna scriptures.

The Tibetans developed a literary language that evolved into a tool for precisely translation Buddhist Sanskrit texts. Reflecting the motivation for which this language was developed, this literary language has clear echoes of Sanskrit in terms of grammar and syntax. As early as the 9th century, the Tibetan kings had ordered the monks who were translating Buddhist texts into Tibetan to compile dictionaries and glossaries such as the *sGra sbyor barn gnyis* and the *Bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen po*, in order to systematize the translation of Buddhist texts and ensure the accuracy of the translation. Many Indian Buddhist monks also collaborated in these translations when they fled from the Muslim invasions. This further contributes to the quality of the Tibetan translation. As a result, Tibetan has become an essential language for the scholars specializing in Indian Buddhism. Using this language the scholars have attempted to reconstruct the original Sanskrit and helped to interpret the philosophical meaning of the texts. Throughout the history of Tibet, an impressive number of scholars have been produced, such as *rNgog lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab* (1059-1109), *Sa skya paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan* (1182-1251), *Bu ston Rin chen grub* (1290-1364), *Klong chen rab 'byams pa* (1308-1364/69), and *Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa* (1357-1419). Their interpretations of Buddhism exhibit original insights, and the study of their works also helps us in

approaching the Indian Buddhist works with fresh vision.

In addition to the rich and profound doctrinal views, a further characteristic of Tibetan Buddhism is the tantric practice. The reception, continuity and development of Indian tantrism in Tibetan Buddhism grant the Tibetan culture and society an image of “shamanism” as understood by anthropologists. As well, the tantric practice has also become a landmark of Tibetan Buddhism. Some scholars even suggest that tantric practice is the greatest contribution which the dedicated Tibetan people have given to world civilization. All these qualities provide a firm basis for the need and development of the unique discipline of Indo-Tibetan Buddhist studies in the West. In Western Academe, especially the Oriental Studies in Europe, Tibetan studies was initially treated as a minor area related to Indology and Buddhist studies. Even today, when Tibetan studies has been gradually accepted as an independent discipline, in Europe, America or in Japan, the majority of Tibetan studies are still considered within the framework of Indo-Tibetan Buddhist studies.

To study Indian Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism as a whole is without doubt an important approach to Buddhist studies. Indo-Tibetan Buddhist studies enjoy a long, vital interest to generations of Buddhist scholars, and it is an area of study that still has the potential for many great discoveries. Having said that, however, the strengths and engrossing findings in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist studies has also overshadowed an equally important area of study — Sino-Tibetan Buddhist studies. Both China and Tibet have a long history of cultural exchange. The origin of Tibetan Buddhism is not limited to Indian Buddhism. Chinese Buddhism has also cast a tremendous influence on the development of Tibetan Buddhism.

According to Tibet's own historical tradition, Buddhism was transmitted to Tibet when King Srong brtsan sgam po married two Buddhist wives, a princess from China, and another from Nepal.

During the period when the Chinese princess resided in Tibet, Chinese monks went to India for their Buddhist training by-passing Tibet. The Chinese missionary monks who went to Tibet also helped with the translation of Buddhist texts. The latter half of the 8th century was the golden age of the united Tibetan kingdom, as well as a golden age for the exchange of Sino-Tibetan Buddhism. A number of Chinese Buddhist texts were translated into Tibetan, and Tibetan texts were also translated into Chinese. There were translators such as Chos grub who excelled in both Chinese and Tibetan. Most importantly, Chan Buddhism also reached Tibet at that time, and was well-received by the Tibetan practitioners; as a result, almost all important early Chinese Chan texts have been translated into Tibetan. Unfortunately, the interaction and dialogue between Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism was virtually halted following the “bSam yas debate” in the late eighth century, and the persecution of Buddhism by King Glang dar ma in the 9th century, coupled with the reconstructing and remaking of the historical tradition of the “bSam yas debate” by historians of the second dissemination; indeed, the shadow of the Chinese “he-shang” (monk) has never entirely disappeared from Tibetan Buddhism. No matter whether it is the rNying ma pa’s “Great Perfection” (rdzogs chen) or the bKa’ brgyud pa’s “Great Seal” (phyag chen), one cannot completely deny the influence of the Chinese Chan tradition.

Since the early 11th century, Tibetan Buddhism has been transmitted to the Chinese community in Central Eurasia via Tangut and Uighur. During the reign of the Yuan dynasty when the Mongols ruled China, Tibetan Buddhism reached China Proper. There were instances when the high-ranking monks of both the Chinese and Tibetan traditions collaborated in the project that launched a comparative study of the translations of Buddhist scriptures. During the Ming and Qing dynasties, the emperors were mostly interested in Tibetan Buddhism. Since then until now, to Han Chinese Tibetan Buddhism is still a distinguished tradition foreign to indigenous

Chinese Buddhism.

There are complex and intriguing relationships between the Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist traditions, and their study cannot really be separated. Yet, modern studies of "East Asian Buddhism" have seldom paid attention to these relationships. Most scholars specializing in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Studies do not know Chinese, resulting in the situation that Sino-Tibetan Buddhist studies has become a neglected area of research. It should be noted that during the latter half of the last century Sino-Tibetan Buddhism was for a period quite actively studied. This was due to the discovery of the ancient classical Chinese and Tibetan texts of the Dunhuang cave, especially the Chan texts. Paul Demiéville's 1952 work, *Le Concile de Lhasa*, has been praised by academics both in the East and the West as a work that inspires the study of the transmission of Chan Buddhism to Tibet. During the 1970s and 1980s, a number of Japanese scholars, notably Ueyama Daishun, have conducted careful and detailed comparative studies of a great many Chan texts, written in ancient classical Tibetan, among the Dunhuang manuscripts, giving us a clear picture of the history of the transmission of Chan Buddhism in Tibet. Tibetologists and Buddhologists such as Giuseppe Tucci, David Seyfort Ruegg and Samten G. Karmay, et al., have also paid special attention to and done remarkable studies on the historicity of the "bSam yas debate" and the elements of Chan Buddhism in Tibetan Buddhism. However, this area of study has not received the same degree of interest since the 1990s, and the studies of Chinese Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism have again been seen as isolated disciplines.

Indeed, the study of Dunhuang documents concerning Chinese Chan tradition in Tibet is still at its initial stages. Many ancient Chinese texts and Tibetan Chan texts still have not received the attention and systematic study that they deserve. Furthermore, discoveries of ancient Tibetan texts outside the Dunhuang area are

equally important, meriting further examination and scholarly treatment. For example, scholars from different parts of the world are united in their studies of the ancient Tibetan texts found in Tabo. Among these texts are more complete manuscripts of Tibetan Chan texts that are similar to their Dunhuang counterparts. Important ancient Tibetan texts, like the *bSam gtan mig sgron* which systematically outlines the view, meditation, conduct, and fruit of the Gradual School, Instantaneous School, Mahāyoga, and Atiyoga, are also awaiting further research by scholars. Not only that, the study of the history of the transmission of Tibetan Buddhism in Central Eurasia and China has not really begun to be researched seriously. The Khara Khoto collection has only recently become widely available. In this collection we find many Tibetan tantric texts which are crucial for the reconstruction of the history of the transmission of Tibetan Buddhism in Central Eurasia and China during the 11th to 14th centuries. In short, Sino-Tibetan Buddhist studies have only just begun. The rich content make this discipline potentially as important as Indo-Tibetan Buddhist studies.

Needless to say, the contribution of Sino-Tibetan Buddhist studies does not lie simply in the historical studies of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism. One of the other primary areas of focus is the comparative study of the Chinese Canon and the Tibetan Canon. Many Buddhist texts are extant today because their Chinese and Tibetan translations were collected in these two Canons. Although the numbers of Buddhist scriptures found in the Chinese Canon, 2,920 with some texts translated more than once, are far fewer than the texts found in the Tibetan Canon, mutual benefit is to be gained by studying the two Canons together. For example, the Chinese Canon contains more early Buddhist material, whereas the Tibetan Canon contains more latter texts. As a result, the study of their similarities and differences can help us further understand what is lacking in one or the other tradition.

In addition, the quality of translation found in the Chinese and Tibetan traditions differs greatly. A comparative study of the Chinese and Tibetan translations of Buddhist texts can also help us correct the errors found in the Chinese translation. Compared with the Tibetan translations, the Chinese translations of Buddhist texts are often replete with mistakes. Although there are great translators like Kumārajīva and Xuanzang in the history of Chinese Buddhism, there are also many prominent translators whose translations are of inferior quality. Because of the syntax and grammatical differences between Sanskrit and Chinese, even the translations of Xuanzang, when compared with the Sanskrit originals, sometimes deviate greatly from the original writing.

The mistakes and incorrectness of these Chinese translations have greatly influenced the way Chinese Buddhists understand Buddhism, leading throughout the history of Chinese Buddhism to many doctrinal controversies. Moreover, the doctrine of the tathāgatagarbha fundamental to many Buddhist traditions, including Chinese Buddhist traditions such as Tiantai, Huayen, Chan and Pure Land as well as Tibetan schools like rNying ma, bKa' brgyud, Sa skya, and Jo nang, has frequently been distorted and criticized because of the misreading of the doctrine in the Chinese translation. What is being criticized, however, is not the doctrine as it is expressed in the Indian texts, but the commentators' own interpretations of the doctrine, as "dhātuvādā" or "topical philosophy," based on Chinese terms such as "original enlightenment" and "Buddha-nature." The original face of the doctrine of the tathāgatagarbha can only be found amidst the resistant and critical voices through the concerted efforts of scholars engaging themselves in comparative studies of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist texts.

Because of the reasons stated, we advocate and encourage the removal of the invisible boundaries between the study of Chinese Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism. What must be emphasized is the

equal importance of Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies and Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Studies. Therefore, the School of Chinese Classics at the Renmin University of China and the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies Association in North America (Toronto) present this Monograph Series in Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies, to provide a forum for scholars in the East and the West to help revitalize the study of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism.

Shen Weirong and Henry C. H. Shiu, Series Editors

October 1, 2006