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Summary

The traditional accounts of the early history of Tibetan Buddhism are far from unbiased. They do not portray accurately the history of Buddhism as it first moved into that country. The political/social context was far more complex than traditional accounts would lead one to believe.

Ch’an Buddhism was introduced into Tibet in three main currents. These are: from Kim Ho-shang’s teachings, from Wu Chu’s teachings and from Mo ho yen’s teachings. The various forms of Ch’an gained wide popularity. So much so that the first Tibetan born abbot of the most important monastic center, bSam yas, was a Ch’an master. At the same time the rDzogs pa Chen po teachings from India were being introduced by Vimalamitra and Vairocana. Doctrinally there are considerable similarities between these two teachings. The teachings of Vimalamitra became very popular in the central district of Tibet. The teachings of Vairocana became popular in the areas of Tibet near the Chinese border.

The rNyinma master Rong Zom lived at the time of Atisa. Two generations before him the Ch’an teachings that survived after the suppression of Ch’an (in Tibet), were unified with the rDzogs pa Chen po teachings of Vairocana. Rong Zom received the entire teachings of both Vimalamitra and Vairocana. He was the first person to do so. After the time of these two masters. Because the Ch’an teachings were already preserved in the system of Vairocana, with Rong Zom the whole of the rDzogs pa Chen po and Tibetan Ch’an were united.

This information is well documented in early rDzogs pa Chen po texts and histories. Further references are to be found in The Blue Annals. as well as material from Tun Huang.
In the past few years, there has been some attention paid to the topic of rDzogs pa Chen po and its connections with Ch’an.[1] Although the material that has been published has exhibited excellent scholarship, it has not been very extensive. There remains considerable work to be undertaken in developing this area of research.

In the following paper, I hope to build on my other published papers on this topic and add to our knowledge in two ways.[2] First, I would like to show how the important figure of Rong Zom played a key role in bringing the two traditions together. Second, I would also like to show how Ch’an thought was preserved and incorporated into the structure of Tibetan Buddhism with its strong Indian based gradualistic path approach. It will be shown that Rong Zom was indeed instrumental in the uniting of these traditions and that Ch’an, although having to go underground for a period, emerged at the very pinnacle of one school of Tibetan Buddhism.

The Early Spiritual Arena In Tibet

As is well known, Buddhism first started filtering into Tibet at the time of Srong Sum Gam po who married both a Chinese princess and a Nepalese princess. As legend has it, both brought with them a statue of the Buddha. These statues were duly enshrined and proceeded to become important religious treasures of lasting inspiration.

Previous to this event, there were undoubtedly some contact between central Tibet and Buddhism. Legend holds that a copy of the Karandavyuha Sutra fell from the sky. While the validity this story may have is undetermined, yet it was used repeatedly to show the close connection of Tibetan rulers with Buddhism and notably with Avasokitesvarra. There is also a report of some Khotanese monks having gone to Tibet. It seems reasonable to assume that wandering monks and yogis were not altogether unknown on Tibetan soil. Yet, at best these minor incidents, perhaps only set the stage for the more official introduction of Buddhism in the late 8th and 9th century A.D. However,

it is logical these minor incidents developed among the population and, more importantly, among the various chieftains, a base for Buddhism to grow. Although Tibetan history prefers to portray the great kings of Tibet as enlightened Bodhisattvas, who intrinsically knew the value of Buddhism and were thus willing to risk all in order to establish it in Tibet, the reality of such a portrayal is very different.

The Kings of Tibet most likely saw in Buddhism several advantages. The first and foremost was probably the belief that by adopting it, the important religious base of the "Kings right to rule," could be completely under the kings control. Politically, this had further ramifications. Some of the more remote chieftains living in areas that bordered Buddhist countries were already coming under the influence of Buddhism. This allowed the kings in central Tibet to have some critical alliances in their continuing problems with neighboring regions such as Zhan Zhung. Also, it allowed
for better relationships with the surrounding Buddhist countries such as China and Nepal. Mention must be made of the fact that some Tibetans considered that Buddhist magic was by far more powerful than their native shamanistic magic. Finally, the primitive Tibetans could not but be impressed by the sophistication of thought, religious practices, and other cultural dimensions, such as education, that Buddhism brought with it. Thus, it was to the kings every advantage to foster Buddhism and promote its wide diffusional. The larger the base of Buddhism in the country, the more secure was the kings base of power.

Given this environment, wondering monks were permitted, religious teachers were invited and the financing of Dharma projects of various sorts were undertaken. We know from Chinese sources that China was very much aware of Tibetans for many years before the 8th century A.D. These encounters were probably beneficial and some were reportedly military in nature. The Tibetan have no source of comparable information. Tibetans seem to have had only vague information about India proper. There had been some contact with parts of India that bordered Tibet such as Kashmir.[3] Further, it is safe to assume that Tibet had some knowledge of what is now Nepal.[4] But accurate information of the Gangatic Plane and the heart-land of Buddhism seems to have been lacking. Therefore, it was not at all surprising to find that

the Tibetans first looked to China, including Khotan and Tun Huang, for its importation of Buddhism.[5]

The earliest translations made, the earliest training in Buddhism undertaken by Tibetans, and the largest contingent of masters all were Chinese in origin. Of important consideration was the Tibetan occupation of Tun Huang in 780 A.D. At this famous site, many manuscripts were translated from the Chinese originals into Tibetan. Thanks to the large find of such preserved material made in the beginning of this century, we now have become aware of these manuscripts. However, a detailed study of the translation system used for translating Chinese into Tibetan has not come to light so far. Be this as it may, the available information indicates that at the earliest stages, the Tibetans were spending far more time in trying to understand and to transmit Chinese Buddhism to their native soil, than they were Indian Buddhism per se. This of course would change.

As is now well known, Ch’an monks and Ch’an teachings gained popularity in Tibet early in their adaption of Buddhism. Of course, the various states of Tibet that were closest to China and Central Asia (where Ch’an had also become popular) were the most influenced, such as Kham. But this popularity had affected the whole of the Tibetan world. In China at this time, Ch’an was coming into its own and many different schools were developing. However, at Tun Huang various Ch’an schools were represented.[6] This assortment of Ch’an teachings allowed for some unique mixes of schools as is represented by Mo Ho Yen 和尚摩訶衍 (Tb. Hwa shang Mahayana). Mo Ho Yen seems to have blended some teachings of the Northern school of Ch’an with the Pao T’ang school. It was this hybrid form of Ch’an that was being propagated in Tibet.[7]
There were three transmission lines of Ch’an into Tibet. These lines of transmission were supported by several powerful families. The first line of transmission was fromIchou 益州 - 成都 and came from the master Kim (Chin ho shang) 金和尚. This lineage was brought to Tibet by the son of a Chinese commissioner named Sang Shi in Tibetan sources. The second line of transmission was probably from master Wu Chu 無住 of the Pao T’ang school. This lineage was brought to Tibet by the Tibetan minister Ye shes dbang po. The third was introduced by the famous master Mo ho yen, who traveled to Tibet from his residency at Tun Huang.\[8\]

The first of the above mentioned transmissions took place in circa 750 A.D. Upon Sang Shi’s return from China to a politically unstable situation, the texts were hidden for two years before he could translate them. Although these teachings were to be quickly superseded by the second line of transmission, Sang shi’s teachings were of considerable importance. Also of importance is the fact that Sang shi became abbot of bSam Yas Monastery. This monastery was the central stage for the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet.

The line of teachings stemming from Wu Chu took on far greater importance than that introduced by Sang Shi. First, Wu chu or his students claimed that he had received the transmission from master Kim. Although this is highly questionable, in the Tibetan eyes, this must have added to his prestige. Second, the radical teachings of the Pao T’ang school in someways parallels the more radical approach taken in the Mahasiddha’s teachings which were being introduced from India.\[9\]

The third line of transmission developed as much influence as that of the Pao T’ang line, if not more. This was introduced to Tibet by Mo ho yen of Tun Huang. However, the actual historical events of his life as well as the teachings he passed on, are still a subject of study.\[10\] According to legend, Mo ho yen was the Chinese representative at the debate of Lhasa.\[11\] According to late Tibetan sources, his teachings seem to be a mixture of both late Northern Ch’an and the Pao T’ang Ch’an. However, as noted by other scholars, the historicity of the Lhasa debate is highly questionable.\[12\] Also, more study is needed to determine first, if Mo ho yen was influenced by Pao T’ang teachings or other Ch’an schools besides the Northern school. Second, if the Tibetans had inadvertently assigned teachings to Mo ho yen that were not representative of his position. Third, to what extent was Mo ho yen influenced by the other Ch’an teachings available at Tun Huang. Finally, if Mo ho yen was actually influenced by the Mahasiddha teachings.\[13\]

Slightly after the first introduction of Ch’an in Tibet, there was the introduction of Indian forms of Buddhism. Although we read of a natural encounter between Tibetans interested in Buddhism and Buddhist teachers at Tun Huang and of wondering Ch’an monks, the introduction of Indian Buddhism seems to have been totally under the control and by invitation only of the ruling house. However, it seems extremely
unlikely that this was the case and I would assume that wondering Indian monks and yogis were not completely unknown in Tibet. However, Tibetan historians have left us little information of the earliest contacts between Tibet and Indian Buddhism except the above picture.

The four people who are of most important for the introduction of Indian Buddhism on Tibetan soil are: Sangha Raksita, Padmasambhava, Vairocana and Vimalamitra. Sangha Raksita is only remembered for his introduction of the monastic tradition (vinaya rules & ordination). He was probably involved in more activities than just that. The famous Padmasambhava has had his name associated with absolutely everything in Tibetan Buddhism. This is more myth than fact. Vairocana, a Tibetan monk, and Vimalamitra[14] both studied under the same master in India.

Because the connection between Ch’an and Tibetan Buddhism is found in the rDzogs pa Chen po tradition, only those mentioned above who had a solid connection with this tradition will be discussed. That would be Vairocana and Vimalamitra. Padmasambhava is said to have had a major role in the introduction of this tradition into Tibet but, as noted by other scholars, this is probably a myth.[15] From my own research, I have found no solid evidence to support Padmasambhava being claimed as one of the initial transmitters.

Vimalamitra was an Indian who lived circa 800 A.D. His main teacher was Sri Simha. From him he had learned a tradition known as Ati-yoga or Mahasandhi (Tb. rDzogs pa Chen po). He later transmitted this tradition to Tibet and perhaps China.[16] Vairocana was one of the first Tibetans to become a monk. He lived at the same time as Vimalamitra and also studied with Sri Simha. He studied with Sri Simha in India at Dhyanakantaka, located on the Krishna river.[17] He later brought the tradition of Ati-yoga back to Tibet and also some of the outlining areas, were Tibet meets Central Asia/China. Although it is reported that Vairocana only transmitted a portion of the tradition and that Vimalamitra was responsible for the section left out, upon scrutiny of the resources, it has been determined that Vairocana taught the entire tradition.[18]

The Ati-yoga is more concerned with meditational techniques than philosophy. In its philosophy, it has combined components of both
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Yogacara and Madhyamaka. One often finds lengthy discussions of the eight consciousness (Sk. vijnana), Buddha-nature (Sk. tathagatagarbha) and other such topics. It is also not uncommon to find typically, that the Madhyamaka positions are expanded and claimed to be the highest view. This hybrid of Yogacara-Madhyamaka was the philosophical vogue in India during this same time period.[19] Every possible combination of the various sub-branches of the Yogacara with the sub-branches of the Madhyamaka was developed. Although claimed otherwise, present day Tibetan Buddhism is still strongly influenced by these hybrids in one way or another. Further, unlike most of the other traditions in India the Ati-yoga accepted the idea of sudden enlightenment. Meditatively it put forth the idea of seeing the mind in its nakedness. Finally, it promoted a non conventional approach to life as a Buddhist.
One can see from the above paragraph that there is considerable common ground between the Ati-yoga and Ch’an. Ch’an also had developed a hybrid of Yogacara and Madhyamaka. This is based on the Lankavatara Sutra and the Diamond Sutra (Sk. Vajracchedaka). Although at present this hybrid appears to have formed solely due to the internal dynamics of Chinese Buddhism, particularly in Ch’an, it seems that no research has been undertaken to investigate the connection of the hybrid movements in India and China where they occurred at about the same time. Further, Ch’an also teaches sudden enlightenment, non-conventionality and original face (roughly equivalent to naked mind).

In addition to the hybrid philosophical position held by the Ati-yoga tradition, its metaphysical base is firmly in the Tantras. Thus, explanations of meditational mechanics, modus operandi, metaphors and the such are all drawn from tantric literature. In contrast to this, Ch’an is firmly based in the Sutras.

Both Vimalamitra and Vairocana transmitted the teachings of Sri Simha in Tibet and set up separate lineages. However, there must have been some crossing over of the two lines even during their life time, as they stem from the same cycle of teachings and the same teacher. If we follow Tibetan history, these two lines seem to have remained separate until the time of Rong Zom.

In summary then, the picture of Buddhism in Tibet at the time of Rong Zom was far more complex than later Tibetan sources would have us believe. Ch’an in three different forms had been introduced and had gained considerable popularity. This is exemplified by the fact that a number of Ch’an works were translated into Tibetan, one of its representatives was selected as abbot of the most famous monastery in Tibet at the time and that the various representatives (either Chinese or Tibetan) of Ch’an had gained royal support in Tibet. The rDzogs pa chen po (or Ati-yoga) of the Mahasiddha Sri Simha, which has considerable elements in common with Ch’an had also been introduced.

By the time of Rong Zom, these sudden teachings of Ch’an and rDzogs pa Chen po were receiving less emphasis and the gradualistic approach of Indian Buddhism was beginning to make itself felt.

**Hagiography Of Rong Zom**

The most important thing to note here is that Rong Zom brought together within himself both lines of Ati-yoga originating from Vimalamitra and Vairocana. Vairocana was instrumental in the establishing of these teachings in the Kham area. Though he had worked in central Tibet, his line of transmission was much stronger in Kham. Vimalamitra, however, had spent his time mostly teaching in central Tibet and therefore, his line was stronger there. That these two lines of Ati-yoga would come together is not at all surprising. Once Buddhism had grown to be national in Tibet, various small groups were no longer isolated from one another. Whatever traditions
and practices they were following could be easily known by others. This would allow for someone like Rong Zom to collect various traditions.

What is of considerable interest to us here is the connection of the Ch’an teachings with the rDzogs pa chen po lineage.

Rong Zom

Rong Zom was the son of Rong ban Rin chen Tshul khrims. He was famous as a great Tibetan Pandita. He was born at Khungs rong on the border of Lower gTsang. Shortly before this a scholar called Acarya Smritijnanakirti came to Khams, and translated several tantras.

After his death, he was reborn as Rong Zom. Others say, that a pandita named Acarya Phra la Ring mo came to Khams. He also translated a commentary on the gSang sning rGyud (sk. Guhya garbha Tantra), he further taught this tantra. After his death, he was reborn as Rong Zom. When lord Atisa had met Rong Zom he said: "This Lord is the incarnation of the Indian Acarya Krisnapada the Great. How shall I be able to discuss the Doctrine with him."

Rong Zom studied the sutras at the age of seven. From thirteen onwards, he became a great scholar, who had completed his studies and became known as the "one unobscured in all branches of knowledge." Endowed with the faculty of prescience, knowing the proper time and measures (to be adopted) in the disciplining of living beings, with the view of establishing in Bliss in this and future lives ordinary living beings, and those who had entered religion, he produced well-written treatises. All the treatises composed by him did not contradict scriptures, reason and the explanations given to him by his teacher. They were free from blemishes in words and meaning, and they were known to be unrefutable by other famous scholars. In addition, he also was a great translator. He translated the: Sri Vajramahabhairava nama Tantra, the Sarvatathagatakayavakcittakrsnayamari nama Tantra, the 'Jam dpal sNgags don, the Abhidhana uttaratantra and other texts. His commentaries and translations covered the entire range of Buddhist learning. Of considerable importance was his work on the rDzogs pa Chen po entitled: rDzogs pa Chen po’i lTa sgom Man ngag... Precepts on the Theory and Meditative Practice of the Great Achievement.

During this period there took place a religious debate attended by all of the scholars from the four districts of Tibet. They intended to debate with him, holding the opinion that it was improper for persons born in Tibet to compose treatises. After they had gone over one of his treatises and after debating the subject matter with him, they all felt amazed, and each of them honoured him and then listened to his exposition of the Doctrine.

He heard the secret precepts of the Acarya Padma (sambhava) transmitted through the Spiritual lineage of sNam mKha rDo rje bDud Joms and mKhar chen dPal gyi dBang phyug and so forth till Rong ban Rin chen Tshul khrims. Further, the (Lineage) which originated with Vairocana (was also received). This is one of the Lineages of the
"Mind
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Class (Sems sde)" (of the rDzogs chen teachings). At 1Dan gLong thang sGron ma there appeared an ascetic named A ro Ye shes ’Byung gnas, who possessed the secret precepts of the seventh link in the chain of the Indian Lineage, as well as those of the seventh link of the Chinese lineage of Hwa shang (=ho shang). He preached the system to Cog ro Zangs dKar mDzod khur and to Ta zi Bon ston. These two taught it to Rong Zom. This (Lineage) is called the "(Lineage) of the Great Achievement (rDzogs chen) according to the Kham method." Again, Vimala (mitra) taught the Doctrine to Myang Ting dzin bZang po as well as bestowed the secret precepts on rMa Rin chen mChog and gNyags Jnanakumara. These two transmitted them gradually to Rong Zom.

Though the dates of birth and death of this great man are, as stated above, not to be found, it is said that Atisa, on his arrival to Tibet, met him. Therefore, he should be regarded as being almost a contemporary of (him) and ’Gos Lo tsa ba.[20

The important point to note in the above are that Rong Zom received a hybrid form of the lineage of rDzogs pa chen po that originated with Vairocana as well as the lineage of rDzogs pa chen po that originated with Vimalamitra. The lineage originating with Vimalamitra has been traditionally been associated with the two higher classes of teachings found in rDzogs pa chen po; i.e., the great expanse and instruction classes. the teachings of Vairocana are traditionally held to be only the mind class. Although one will, from a proper historical research, find that both teachers actually taught all three classes of the rDzogs pa chen po, the traditionally ascribed affiliation should not be overlooked in viewing the development of the line of teaching.

Of considerable concern to our investigation are the following lines taking from the hagiography: "Further, the (lineage)which originate with Vairocana (was also received). This is one of the lineages of the "Mind class (sems sde)" (of the rDzogs pa chen po teachings). At 1Dan gLong thang sGron ma there appeared an ascetic named A ro Ye shes ’Byung gnas, who Rosssessed the secret precepts of the seventh link in the chain of the Indian Lineage, as well as those of the seventh link of the Chinese lineage of Hwa shang (=ho shang). He preached the system to Cog ro zangs dKar mDzod khur and to Ta zi Bon ston. These two taught it to Rong Zom."
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Here we see that the lineage of the "Mind class" or the rDzogs pa chen po that was taught in Kham by Variocana (the Indian lineage) had been united with a form originating in China with its teacher identified as Hwa shang. Although it is tempting to associate this Hwa Shang with the famous Mo ho yen Hwa Shang no evidence has come to light for this direct identification. Mo Ho yen was a teacher of Ch’an from Tun Huang. These two lines of teaching were already associated with each other when Rong Zom received the teachings. Thus showing that Ch’an and rDzogs pa chen po were united only two generations before Rong Zom. However, if we accept the traditional view that Vairocana system was only of the Mind class, then, Ch’an had only united with this level. It was not until Rong Zom, himself, had brought the
teachings of Vimalamitra together with the Kham teachings, that the whole of rDzogs pa chen po was united and this would included the Ch’an teachings.
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**Doctrine Of Rdzogs Pa Chen Po**

As with most of the later forms of Mahayana Buddhism the rDzogs pa chen po teachings represent a form of Yogacara-Madhyamaka in their doctrinal position. The Yogacara forms the working models for understanding the mind. The Madhyamaka is used in the formation of statements of truth. In addition to this, a developed theory of Tathagatagarbha emerged as the base for the whole of the doctrinal positions taken.

The rNyingma school, wherein the rDzogs pa chen po teaching is found, in general, has several unique philosophical features. In the area of Yogacara, it puts forth a theory of 9 consciousnesses. It accepts the 6 consciousnesses of mind and 5 senses as well as the manas. The Alayavijnana is divided into two parts. The first is called the Alayavijnana and represents the storing capacity for the karmic seeds. The second, is termed the Alaya and represents the "all ground" which allows the functioning of the whole process beginning with the Alayavijnana. Here we can perhaps understand the Alaya as the unaware aspect (ignorant) of the Tathagatagarbha.

There is also a distinction made between Tathagatagarbha and Sugatagarbha. The first is the phenomena possessed by ordinary unenlightened individuals and the second is the same phenomena but it is possessed by enlightened individuals. A clearly distinction of these two is important in understanding statements made throughout the whole of the rDzogs pa chen po doctrine.

The ultimate truth is understood in usual Madhyamaka terms. The fact that only two possibilities are permitted, i.e., samsara and enlightenment, directly relate to the conventional and ultimate truth. Nirvana almost always is used in a negative sense as the small rest taken by Hinayana followers and not seen as a full and complete enlightenment. Seeing that only two possibilities exist, one is either in samsara or one is not. This view allows for no possibility of a real path to exist. Enlightenment is seen as taking place suddenly. Liberation of mind and forms are all natural. Spontaneous activity is the correct and appropriate response to any situation. When the mind is free, then, all things are of themselves free, so all is naturally and spontaneously self-liberated. The initial by-product of the meditational process is a state of no-thought. Later development allows one to be in a state of no-thought of no-thought. The texts continually use the terms relating to no-thought; eg. motionless, no-thought, no perception, etc. as indicating only the by-product of the process of meditation. The emphasis is given to the idea of "Rig pa." Rig pa means pure pristine awareness. This pure awareness can be a state wherein one does not move from the non-dual. The word can also be used as a verb "to be purely aware" when one is in the state of no-thought of no-thought, this state is also without movement from the non-dual.
Structure Of Rdzogs Pa Chen Po

According to Long chen pa, the rDzogs pa chen po is divided into two main lines. The first is the rDzogs pa chen po in relation with other paths and the Great Explanation.

The rNyingma schools divides the whole of Buddhism as follows:

Path
lowest
1. sravaka
2. pratiyekabuddha
3. bodhisattva (= mahayan sutra teachings)
4. kriya tantra
5. carya tantra
6. yoga tantra
7. mahayoga tantra
8. anuyoga tantra
9. atiyoga tantra (=rDzogs pa chen po)

highest
rDzogs pa chen po in relations with other paths, means to have the general view as explained in rDzogs pa chen po texts, while practicing any of the paths 1 through 8. An individual does not have to begin with the first. Beginning practice is according to the capacities of each individual. The important point is to maintain the rDzogs pa chen po view while doing any practice. The basis of this view is that we are all already Buddhas. We engage in the activity of any path because that is the activity of a Buddha. For example, while Sakyamuni fully realized the rDzogs pa chen po view he followed the Hinayana systems in order to teach. He practiced the tantras in order to worship other buddhas as well as to teach. Therefore, it is important to learn something of the other paths to be able to engage in the activity of Buddhas.

The Great Explanation relates to the three divisions of the rDzogs pa chen po. These are the Mind class the Great Expanse class and the Instructions class. The Mind class teaches the seeing the mind in its nakedness. The Great Expanse class teaches the openness of being (=experiential aspect of sunyata). The Instruction class teaches the techniques for stabilizing and total incorporation of the overall view and experiences of enlightenment.

There are of course many fine points that are not presented here in our brief outline. Basically, the various meditations are aimed at producing a state of no-thought and later no-thought of no-thought. There are visionary techniques used which make for a close contact with other tantra classes. The metaphors used are usually drawn from the tantras. However, even the visionary meditations are considerably simplified when compared with other classes of tantras. The highest levels of practice are that of the direct viewing of the non-dual state.
Rong Zom had inherited, from the teachings of Kham, a system of rDzogs pa chen po that had already mixed the Ch’an of China with the Indian teachings on sudden enlightenment. As noted these teachings were introduced by Vairocana. Also, as noted, Ch’an was associated with the mind class of the rDzogs pa chen po. When Rong Zom had brought these Kham teachings together with the teachings of Vimalamitra, Ch’an maintained its association with the Mind class.

Conclusion

We have seen that it was the famous scholar/yogi Rong Zom who had brought the teachings of Vimalamitra and Vairocana together and thereby forming a comprehensive whole to the teaching of rDzogs pa chen po. Previous to this, the Mind class of teachings had become associated with the Ch’an teachings coming from China.

Seeing that the Ch’an teachings had a very close doctrinal affiliation with the rDzogs pa chen po, the mixing of the two was a natural event. Later Tibetan teachers forgot about this connection and went on to teach Ch’an in association with other teachings of rDzogs pa chen po. This association was so completely forgotten that in later years, when the rNyingma were accused of spreading teachings similar to Chinese thought (a major religious crime in Tibet), they would strongly deny such charges. In defence, they would point to the Indian origin of the rDzogs pa chen po.
西藏大圆满教义与中国禅法的融合

提要

对早期西藏佛教史而言，西藏本身的传统记载距离不偏不倚的要求仍然很远，因为它们未能正确地描绘出佛教是如何传入这一地区的历史。至于那些缘于政治、社会因素而衍生出来的讲法，其混淆的程度较之上述那些传统记载，就更难令人置信了。

中国禅法被介绍进入西藏者有三派，它们是：金和上的禅法、无住禅师的禅法和摩诃衍的禅法。自后，各种不同的中国禅法弘化方式在西藏地区广泛流行。这可以从西藏最重要的佛教中心—bSam yas 寺的第一位土生藏族住持是一位中国禅法的大师这一点看出。

在同一时代，印度的大圆满教义亦通过维摩密多与毘卢遮那二人而传入西藏。在教义上，大圆满跟中国禅法有极多相似的地方。维摩密多所弘扬的大圆满教义在西藏中部非常流行，而毘卢遮那所宣化的大圆满教义则流行于中、藏交界的西藏地区。

Nyingma 派的大师 Rong Zam 是 Atisa 時代的人。虽然西藏禅宗曾遭受过法难，但在他住世的两代之前，逃过法难的禅法已漸跟毘卢遮那氏所傳的大圆满教義融合了。

到了 Rong Zam，他本人接受了维摩密多与毘卢遮那两人所傳的全部大圆满教義，而且是第一个做到兼通两家之學的人。由於毘卢遮那所傳的教理系统中本来就早已有了中國禅法的成分。再通过 Rong Zam 的融汇贯通，这兩派的大圆满之學便跟中国禅學融合了。

以上所陳，其訊息是早期的西藏大圆满文獻和各類史書所提供。而西藏編年史之一的「青史」和中國敦煌石室中的文獻，則提供進一步的資料。


The first official envoy was Thomi Sambhota who went to study language.

Large tracks of what is now Nepal were part of Tibet at various times.

The Tibetan manuscripts found at Tun Huang are an extensive collection.

We find writings from: northern Ch’an, Pao T’ang Ch’an, Southern Ch’an, Ox head Ch’an and more, preserved there.

ibid. Hanson-Barber. "No-Thought in Pao T’ang Ch’an...".

see note l. b & c.

op cit. Hanson-Barber

op cit. Studies in Ch’an & Hua Yen.


Although it is questionable, the symbol of the debate is important. It represents Tibet’s official policy of rejecting Chinese influence on a high level. The political importance of this is unquestionable.

Master Wu Chu may have had some connection with Tantra. He is quoted as talking about a “Dharani Gate (pg.13.op cit. Studies in Ch’an & Hua Yen). Mo ho yen is closely associated with Wu Chu in Tibetan sources. Tucci (op cit.) holds that some of the Ati-yoga masters were on Mo ho yen’s side at the debate.

There were two Vimalamitras. One was a layman and the other a monk. The historical problems have not been sorted yet.

Vimalamitra and other tantric masters are said to have gone through Tibet and on to Tun Huang as well as Wu Tai Shan. Some rDzogs Chen texts were found at Tun Huang. see Norbu & Lipman, op cit, pg. 7 & 137 n. 19

see Hanson-Barber op cit. "The Two Other Homes of Ati-yoga...".

Hanson-Barber, op cit. The Life & Teachings of Vairocana.

Sangharaksita also taught a hybrid form of the two schools. Yet he was not associated with the rDzogs Chen.
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