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Within this year the first millennium since the birth of Atiśa1 will come to an end. This may be the opportunity to consider the biographical tradition about Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna. In India proper no literary sources relating to the life of this learned monk from Bengal have survived; we have only Tibetan source material on which to depend. There are few Tibetan historiographical works not containing at least a short note on Atiśa’s life.2 We may mention here the comprehensive histories of the growth of Buddhism in Tibet with their passages on Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, e.g. the Šba ḏed3, Bu ston Rin po che’s Bde bar gsigs pa’i bsian pa’i gsal byed chos kyi ’byun gnas gsum rab rin po che’i mdzad4, the Rgyal rabs gsal ba’i me loṅ5, the Deb ther shon po6 and the ’Phags yul rgya nag chen po bo dkar lugs yul du dam pa’i chos ’byun dpag bsam ljon bszi7 (hereafter Dpag bsam ljon bszi by Sum pa mkhan po Ye sras dpal byor. It is obvious that the older of the commonly known chos ’byun or rgyal rabs give only the main facts of the biography8; from the end of the 15th century onward there appear in general historical works more detailed descriptions of Atiśa’s life9. The two extensive biographies of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna are not dated, namely the Jo bo rje dpal ldan mar me mdzad ye sras kyi rnam thar rgyas pa10 (hereafter Rnam thar rgyas pa) and the Jo bo rin po che rje dpal ldan a ti sa’i rnam thar rgyas pa yongs grags11 (hereafter Rnam thar yongs grags).

It may be asked if there was an autobiography of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna or a biography written by one of his direct disciples. From the Rnam thar rgyas pa we learn that Atiśa did not like to be praised by ’Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byun gnas in a hymn of praise12. Another episode in the same biographical work tells us that some of Atiśa’s pupils asked the master to write about his former and later existences and about his way to salvation—this would have become an autobiography—but on this occasion too Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna refused to do so13. In the biographical tradition dealing with Atiśa there is a book that claims in its title to have been composed by ’Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byun gnas (1005-1064 A.D.), namely the Jo bo rje’i rnam thar lam yig chos kyi ’byun gnas sras bya ba ’Brom ston pa Rgyal ba’i ’byun gnas kyis mdzad pa14 (hereafter Rnam thar lam yig). In the colophon to this work15 the name of the author is given as ’Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byun gnas and in the body of the book we read that the upāsaka—i.e. one of the often used names for ’Brom ston pa16—bears the name ’Brom and not ’Brom17. We cannot solve here the problems arising from these different names, but we find proof that the book was not
written by the mentioned disciple of Atiśa in another passage of the Rnam thar lam yig referring to the conquest of Eastern India by Muslim armies—an event which happened about 1200 A.D., i.e. about 140 years after the death of 'Brom ston Rgyal ba'i 'byun gnas.

Since there exists neither an autobiography nor a biography written by a direct disciple of Atiśa we may pose the question: what are the sources for the biography of Dipamkaraśrijñāna? An answer could be deduced from a detailed episode which appears in the Deb ther shon po, the Bka' gdams rin po che'i chos 'byun rnam thar nin more byed pa'i 'od ston (hereafter Bka' gdams chos 'byun rnam thar), the Bka' gdams kyi rnam par thar pa bka' gdams chos 'byun gsal ba'i sgron me (hereafter Bka' gdams chos 'byun sgron me), the Rnam thar rgyas pa and the Rnam thar yoons grags. We quote here, translated from the Bka' gdams chos 'byun sgron me, the two main parts of the episode relating the beginning of the biographical tradition:

After he (namely Roṇa pa Lag sor pa) had asked seven direct pupils of the master, [namely] Dge bīṣes Ston pa', Rnal 'byor pa chen po, Dgon pa ba, the former Mkha' ru ba, Žaṅ btsun Yer pa [ba]. Sgom pa dad pa from Yer pa rtsibs sgan [and] Jo bo legs, and two indirect pupils. [namely] the later Mkha' ru ba and Yūn ba pa, about the precepts for meditation and about the reports about the master, the direct pupils agreed in their words. Since the words of the two indirect pupils disagreed, [Lag sor pa] thought, "Since the Dge bīṣes Lo tstdha ba", who was a direct follower of the master for 19 years, is now living at Khab Guṅ thon, it is necessary to meet him personally." [Thinking this] he went to Maṅ [yul]. He met him (i.e. the Dge bīṣes Lo tstdha ba) residing in the temple of Yāṅ thog. He asked first for extensive [instruction on] the precepts of the mantras and stayed for three years. In the last year he requested to be told the stages of the way of the pāramitās, the [special] virtues of the greatness of the physical [existence] of this great master and the report of how [the master] had been invited to Tibet. To this the Dge bīṣes Lo tstdha ba answered, "I followed the master for 19 years: since I invited him to Tibet too, I know the report on the master very [well]. Except for you, nobody has come to pose these questions." After saying this he (i.e. the Dge bīṣes Lo tstdha ba) gave this extensive report.

At this [time] four religious [adepts] from the retinue of Rma tsho went over to him (i.e. Roṇa pa Lag sor pa) and became known as the four [spiritual] sons of Roṇa pa [later on]. These were the four: Bya 'Dul ba 'dzin pa', Rgo Mc'iṅ phu ba, Gnam par ba and Dge bīṣes Žu len pa. Since Rgya ra Ston brjod was an upāsaka, he was not counted as one of the spiritual sons. Gnam par ba founded Gnam par and Ram pa lha sders. He acted as an abbot of Gsān phu for eight years too. Regarding the notes the four [spiritual] sons made of the words of Lag sor pa—it is said—Bya 'Dul ba 'dzin pa condensed the precepts and the report. Rgo condensed the report but gave a great deal of the precepts, Gnam par ba, in not writing the report, wrote down the precepts only, Dge bīṣes Žu len pa [made] extensive [notes
of both the precepts and the report, but he especially made the report accurate. Rgya ra Ston bskri had [notes on] the precepts for the mantras, but apparently no [notes] at all on the precepts for the pāramitās. After all these written notes had come into the hands of Zul phu ba Bya-'Dul chen po—since he himself put this extensive report on the master into letters, it filled all quarters.

This episode could be considered a later invention, since it is given in books composed at the end of the 15th century or later—if we disregard the two undated rnam thar27. But the Hu lan deb ther, composed by Tshul pa Kun dga' rdo rje in 1346 A.D., already gives the frame of the above quoted report in a very short form38. By this it is proved that the report of the beginning of the biographical tradition concerning Atiśa existed already in the first half of the 14th century39.

There are four main points in the quoted report of special interest for our considerations: 1. Up to the time he came to Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba40 the student Roṅ pa Lag sor pa looked in vain for a biography of Atiśa. This shows that a biographical work on Dipamkaraśriñāna did not exist at that time41. 2. The teachings of Atiśa, his special virtues and the report of his life were taught to Roṅ pa Lag sor pa by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba. 3. The oral tradition on Dipamkaraśriñāna extends from Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba to Dge bses Zul phu ba Bya-'Dul chen po, and the latter prepared the first written biography. 4. The old reports on Atiśa are referred to under the title of lo rgyus, i.e. "report."

The dates of the lives of the persons who participated in the oral tradition on Dipamkaraśriñāna are only partially known: Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba was born 1011 A.D.42, but the year of his death is not given. We may deduce that Roṅ pa Lag sor pa, who had been a disciple of 'Brom ston Rgyal ba'i byuṅ gnas, was born not much later than 1044 A.D.43; he had not seen Atiśa personally, i.e. he was presumably not an adult at the time of the master's death in 1054 A.D. For Bya-'Dul ba 'dzin pa chen po, alias Zul phu ba, we have different dates, according to the Bka' gdambs chos 'byuṅ sgrom me 1100-1174 A.D.44 and according to the Deb ther sion po 1091-1166 A.D.45 His fellow student Gnam par ba was abbot of Gsaṅ phu in the years 1143-1151 A.D. It seems possible that after the death of Mchig phu ba, Gnam par ba and Dge bses Zu len pa, their notes were given to Zul phu ba; in this case the first written biography was composed after 1150 A.D. We may exclude the possibility that this form of the biography originated much earlier than 1120 A.D., at the time when Zul phu ba reached the age of 20 years or, according to the Deb ther sion po, 29 years.

Before we can try to establish a connection between the facts in the passage quoted above and the extant biographical tradition we have to investigate the available texts concerning the life of Atiśa. The analytical considerations46 begin with the two extensive biographies, the Rnam thar rgyas pa and the Rnam thar yoins grags, because it can be assumed that the
greatest amount of material for comparison can be found there. We may mention the fact that the Rnam thar yoins grags is contained in the official collection of the Bka' gdoms pa School, the Bka' gdoms legs bsm'i; therefore it can be concluded that the Tibetans regarded this form of the biography as being authoritative. A comparison of the two extensive biographies shows that they are closely related. This relationship can be seen not only in the agreement of the contents, but also in extensive identical passages. In view of this great similarity it is especially conspicuous that these two biographies differ in structure and in the arrangement of single episodes. This can serve as an argument for the determination of the relationship between the two works. The clear structure of the extensive Atisā-biography in the Bka' gdoms legs bsm'i shows this presentation to be the more modern. A further argument for this is the well-standardized form of the language in this biography, while in the Rnam thar rgyas pa we find remnants of colloquial or dialect forms. However, the Rnam thar yoins grags is not derived from the Rnam thar rgyas pa; both works are descended from a common ancestor.

When comparison of the other available sources for the life of Atisā is brought into consideration, we find a great deal of agreement between the reports. These points of agreement—depending upon the completeness of the sources in question—are of different kinds. Works with a very detailed presentation show passages with identical formulations, while the shorter biographical sketches on Atisā have descriptions of the main facts which are identical in contents only. It is certain that there is an established tradition about Atisā's life. This tradition can be seen as an example of a biographical tradition in Tibet, and we could use it to investigate how the transmitted material has changed in the course of time. In Sum pa mikhān po’s Dpa‘ ba’ bstan bzad we read e.g. that Atisā in taking refuge left five wives and nine sons. The older tradition reports that Atisā’s elder brother, being the heir of his father’s realm, had five wives and nine sons. Sum pa mikhān po combines the portraits of the two persons, thereby enlarging the scale of renunciation: Atisā, like Śākyamuni, left both wife and child in order to become a monk. This changing of the materials handed down classifies the Dpa‘ ba’ bstan bzad: it is a source of secondary rank, in spite of its remarks regarding the reliability of some older sources. An example of literary transformation is to be found in the Chos ‘byin bstan pa’i padma rgyas pa’i nīn byed (hereafter Padma rgyas pa’i nīn byed) by Padma dkar po: the author, in depicting the imprisonment and the death of the monk Ye śes ’od, the former king of Western Tibet, uses passages from four different books, namely the Deb ther snyon po, the Rnam thar yoins grags, the Rnam thar lam yig and the Rgyal rabs gsal ba’i me lon. Padma dkar po joins fragments which have the same function in their own context from the four texts and thereby achieves an integrated treatment with a correspondingly dramatic result. This shows that the Padma rgyas pa’i nīn byed also cannot be regarded as a primary source for the life of Atisā. We have to take into account that during the course of time the
tradition about Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna's life may have changed and that the
most recent biographies do not preserve all the facts of the original version
unaltered.

Therefore we go back again to the Rnam thar rgyas pa as the more
archaic of the two extensive biographies; but since the Rnam thar rgyas pa
does not contain some passages given in the Rnam thar yoins grags\textsuperscript{37}, we
may conclude that it does not comprise all the biographical material given
by its sources. This is clearly shown by an example: the Rnam thar rgyas pa
announces, but does not contain, a passage on the guru-paramparās of the
teachings of the Kriyāyoga and on Yamārī\textsuperscript{38}; the missing passages,
however, do appear in the corresponding context of the Rnam thar yoins grags\textsuperscript{39}. The extant version of the Rnam thar rgyas pa is to be regarded as
detective; it should be used together with the Rnam thar yoins grags in
order to have at hand the full amount of biographical material contained in
the common ancestor of these two texts. But we have to include the
chapters on the life of Atiśa as given in the Deb ther sdon po, the Bka' gdams chos 'byin rnam thar and the Bka' gdams chos 'byin sgron me as
well; these pictures of Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna's life stand next in tradition to
the extensive biographies\textsuperscript{40}. This is already indicated by the fact that these
three books also contain the report of the beginning of the tradition about
Atiśa's life.

The remnants of the spoken language as contained in the Rnam thar
rgyas pa\textsuperscript{41} can be regarded as a first link connecting the report of the
beginning of the biographical tradition concerning Atiśa's life and the
extant biographies. We see the second one in the fact that in the Rnam thar
rgyas pa there appears, in at least five places,\textsuperscript{42} the word io rgyus to denote
a passage or a chapter, as we have found it in the Tibetan text of the
episode quoted above in translation. Since the colloquial forms of language
and the word io rgyus in its special meaning are only met with in
exceptionally few cases in the Rnam thar yoins grags\textsuperscript{43}, the Bka' gdams chos
'byin sgron me and the Bka' gdams chos 'byin rnam thar, these texts rank
in the tradition about Atiśa below the Rnam thar rgyas pa, but far above
all the other works composed in more recent times. In view of these old
biographical pictures of Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna's life belonging to an
established tradition, one could try to reconstruct the original version; this
could be done with the aim of recovering the text written by Zul phu ba.
But this experiment would not be successful, because we do not know to
what extent the original text used the colloquial forms of language. The
second reason lies in the arrangement of the material handed down;
especially the description of Atiśa's special virtues, which could have had
fully another structure than that in the versions now at hand\textsuperscript{44}. The goal to
be reached with the available old forms of the biography is to discern the
picture of Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna as it was seen in an early time; some aspects
could be those of Zul phu ba as well. The basis for such investigations
would be given by a synoptic edition of the archaic texts of this established
tradition\textsuperscript{45}. 
Besides the tradition as given in the biographies and the common histories there are a few hymns of praise to Atiśa containing some facts about his life. In the Rnam thar rgyas pa, the Rnam thar yoins grags, the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun rnam thar and especially in the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun sgron me there are verses quoted from two such hymns, namely the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa by Nag taho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and the bstdod pa written by Pandit Sa’i sṈiṅ po⁷⁴. The full edition of the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa as given in the Legs par bsdad pa bka’ gdams rin po che’i gsun gi gces pas nor bu’i bain mdzod⁷⁵ is based upon a version which had been made after 1496, since the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun sgron me is quoted in a gloss there. The Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa in its available version contains in its beginning 25 lines which the Rnam thar rgyas pa, the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun rnam thar and the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun sgron me attribute to Pandit Sa’i sṈiṅ po. Tsön kha pa Blo bzhann grags pa, in quoting verses from the two hymns of praise⁷⁶, does not distinguish between Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and Sa’i sṈiṅ po: he refers to the lo tṣṭṣha ba only. This could be regarded as a hint that the 25 lines became an integral part of the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa very early⁷⁷. The Bka’ gdams chos ’byun rnam thar and the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun sgron me contain just a few lines from a stotra composed by Rin chen bzhann po, but these verses do not give historical data at all⁷⁸. In the Bka’ gdams chos ’byun sgron me there appear the earliest known quotations from the Bstdod pa sum cu pa attributed to ’Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byun gnas; but since it mentions Po to ba (1031-1105 A.D.),Spyan sha ba (1038-1103 A.D.) and Phu chuṅ ba (1031-1106 A.D.), the extant version cannot have been composed before the end of the 11th century—i.e. after the death of ’Brom ston pa—and we suppose that it is far more recent.

The Rnam thar rgyas pa and to some extent the Rnam thar yoins grags as well, present, together with the quotations from the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa and from Sa’i sṈiṅ po’s bstdod pa, a prose version of the verses quoted using the same expressions and formulations. The prose text is somewhat longer and contains more information than the verses⁷⁹. This fact shows us the close relation between the tradition in verse and that in prose; both traditions come to us through Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba, who used the formulations of the verses in teaching the master’s biography to Rohn pa Lag sor pa. The Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa—according to the tradition as preserved in the two extensive biographies⁸⁰—was composed by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba after Atiśa’s death—i.e. in 1054 A.D. or in the following year—in preparing a picture of the master and of the main events of his life; the eighty verses of praise were written on the back of the scroll⁸¹.

The tradition concerning the biography of Atiśa originates from Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and—to a lesser extent⁸²—from Pandit Sa’i sṈiṅ po. The extant verses of the two hymns of praise are the oldest testimony for Dpamkaraṣṭṭīṇa’s life. The extensive tradition would have come to an end if Rohn pa Lag sor pa had not searched for the biography of the
master and had not obtained it by asking Nag tsha Lo tscha ba. About a
century after Atiśa's death the oral reports were gathered by Zul phu ba
and put into the first written version. This literary biography was to
become the main source for all the following descriptions of
Dpamgkarśrijñāṇa's life. There are a few events from the master's life
handed down outside this tradition; we can mention here one attested case:
in the description of Atiśa's studies with Avadhūtipa the Rnam thar rgyas
pa and the Rnam thar yoons grags⁴ distinguishes between the information as
given by Nag tsha Tshul khrims rgyal ba and two other sources⁵⁶.
Probably some material handed down by other traditions was included in
the literary biographies in an early stage as well. The sketch of the life of
Atiśa as presented by Tsoṅ kha pa Blo btsan grags pa contains a more
archaic structure in the arrangement of some points, but it does not
mention Sa'i sūla po as the author of some of the verses quoted; the former
fact being a hint that very old sources were used, the latter point indicating
a great distance from the original tradition. The most archaic of the
extensive biographies at hand, the Rnam thar rgyas pa, together with its
modern version, the Rnam thar yoons grags, seems to comprise almost all
the material about Dpamgkarśrijñāṇa handed down in the first centuries
after the death of the master, including some facts not reported by Nag tsha
Tshul khrims rgyal ba but gathered from other sources. All the portraits of
Atiśa as drawn by later authors—i.e. after 1500 A.D.—are based on the
same tradition, although perhaps somewhat changed or combined with
reports not known to the old biographies.
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66. An Indian pandit in the retinue of Atiśa.
67. Microfilm copy taken from the blockprint in the possession of H.H. Yongdzin Trilok Rinopche.
68. In the sketch of Atiśa’s life as given in the Rim pa thams cad tshāṅ bar ston pa’i byaṅ chub lam gyi rim pa.
69. Probably Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba incorporated these lines into his bstod pa.
70. There are preserved fragments from other old bstod pas, namely of those composed by Gro lü pa Blo gros ‘byuṅ gnas, Phag mo gru pa Rdo rje rgyal po (1110-1170) and Kho phu Lo tsā ba Byams pa’i dpal (1173-1225); see Eimer, *Berichte*, 146-150.
71. Line 282 of the Bstd pa brgyad cu pa runs:
   rab byuṅ dge bṣen lha yaṅ bsad
   “Even of the monks [and] the upāsakas [he] killed five.”
   The corresponding sentence in the Rnam thar yoins grags (fol. 32b1) gives a further detail: four monks and one upāsaka were killed—altogether five persons.
72. See Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 103a4-6 and Rnam thar yoins grags fol. 91a2-6; this is given as well in Bka’ gdams chos ‘byuin sgron me fol. 67b6-68a2.
73. Limited to the report on the family and the home of Atiśa.
74. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 24b3-4 and Rnam thar yoins grags fol. 4b5.
75. One of them is the Be’tu bum shon po; see Eimer, Berichte, 269-270.

ADDITIONAL NOTE


The second of these two books gives a synoptic edition of the biographical texts as announced above in note 65.
