THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION CONCERNING ATIṢA (DĪPAKARĀṢRĪṆĀNA)

Helmut Eimer

Within this year the first millennium since the birth of Atiṣa¹ will come to an end. This may be the opportunity to consider the biographical tradition about DīpaṁkaraśrīṆāna. 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 Atiṣa’s life.² We may mention here the comprehensive histories of the growth of Buddhism in Tibet with their passages on DīpaṁkaraśrīṆāna, e.g. the Sba bṣad³, Bu ston Rin po che’s Bde bar gags pa’i bstan pa’i gsal byed chos kyi ’byuṅ gnas gsuṅ rab rin po che’i mdoṅ⁴, the Rgyal rabs gsal ba’i me loṅ⁵, the Deb ther sron po⁶ and the ’Phags yul rgya nag chen po bo dān sog yul du dam pa’i chos ’byuṅ dpag bsam ljon bzani⁷ (hereafter Dpag bsam ljon bzani) by Sum pa mkhan po Ye ’ses dpal ’byor. It is obvious that the older of the commonly known chos ’byuṅ 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 Atiṣa’s life⁹. The two extensive biographies of DīpaṁkaraśrīṆāna are not dated, namely the Jo bo rje dpal ldan mar me mdoṅ ye sles kyi nman thar rgyas pa¹⁰ (hereafter Rnam thar rgyas pa) and the Jo bo rin po che rje dpal ldan a ti sā’i nman thar rgyas pa yongs grags¹¹ (hereafter Rnam thar yongs grags).

It may be asked if there was an autobiography of DīpaṁkaraśrīṆāna or a biography written by one of his direct disciples. From the Rnam thar rgyas pa we learn that Atiṣa did not like to be praised by ’Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byuṅ gnas in a hymn of praise¹². Another episode in the same biographical work tells us that some of Atiṣa’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 DīpaṁkaraśrīṆāna refused to do so¹³. In the biographical tradition dealing with Atiṣa there is a book that claims in its title to have been composed by ’Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byuṅ gnas (1005-1064 A.D.), namely the Jo bo rje’i nman thar lam yig chos kyi ’byuṅ gnas sles bya ba ’Brom ston pa Rgyal ba’i ’byuṅ gnas kyis mdoṅ pa’¹⁴ (hereafter Rnam thar lam yig). In the colophon to this work¹⁵ the name of the author is given as ’Brum ston Rgyal ba’i ’byuṅ gnas and in the body of the book we read that the upāsaka—i.e. one of the often used names for ’Brom ston pa’¹⁶—bears the name ’Brum 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 Dipamkaraśrījñāna? 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 rin mo 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 yoids 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 Roṅ pa Lag sor pa) had asked seven direct pupils of the master, [namely] Dge bṣes Ston pa’, Rnal ‘byor pa chen po, Dgon pa ba, the former Mkhā’ ru ba, Žaṅ btsun Yer pa [ba], Sgom pa dad pa from Yer pa rtsibs sgaṅ [and] Jo bo legs, and two indirect pupils, [namely] the later Mkhā’ 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 bṣes Lo tshcha ba’, who was a direct follower of the master for 19 years, is now living at Khab Guṅ thain, it is necessary to meet him personally.” [Thinking this] he went to Maṅ [yul]. He met him (i.e. the Dge bṣes Lo tshcha ba) residing in the temple of Yab 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 bṣes Lo tshcha 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 bṣes Lo tshcha ba) gave this extensive report...

At this [time] four religious [adepts] from the retinue of Rma tsho went over to him (i.e. Roṅ pa Lag sor pa) and became known as the four [spiritual] sons of Roṅ pa [later on]. These were the four: Bya Dul ba’ dzin pa, Rog Mchün phu ba, Gnam par ba [and] Dge bṣes Zū len pa. Since Rgya ra Ston brjid was an upāsaka, he was not counted as [one of the spiritual] sons. Gnam par ba founded Gnam par and Ram pa lha sDNS. He acted as an abbot of Gsaṅ 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. Rog 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 bṣes Zū len pa [made] extensive [notes
of] both the precepts and the report, but he especially made the report accurate. Rgya ra Ston brjod had [notes on] the precepts for the mantras, but apparently no [notes] at all on the precepts for the pàramitás. 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 nam thar⁳⁷. But the Hu lan deb ther, composed by 'Tsül pa Kun du' ro dge rje in 1346 A.D., already gives the frame of the above quoted report in a very short form⁳⁸. 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 century⁰⁹.

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 Roñ pa Lag sor pa looked in vain for a biography of Atiśa. This shows that a biographical work on Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna did not exist at that time⁴¹. 2. The teachings of Atiśa, his special virtues and the report of his life were taught to Roñ pa Lag sor pa by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba. 3. The oral tradition on Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna 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 Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna 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 Roñ pa Lag sor pa, who had been a disciple of 'Bromston 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· gdams choś byuṅ sgron 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 Rgo Mch'i 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 yongs 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’ gdamgs pa School, the Bka’ gdamgs legs bams⁴⁷; 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.⁴⁸ 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 Atiśa-biography in the Bka’ gdamgs legs bams 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 forms⁴⁹. 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 Atiśa 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 Atiśa have descriptions of the main facts which are identical in contents only. It is certain that there is an established tradition about Atiśa’s life⁵⁰. 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 mkhan po’s Dpags bsam ljon bzai⁵¹ we read e.g. that Atiśa in taking refuge left five wives and nine sons. The older tradition reports that Atiśa’s elder brother, being the heir of his father’s realm, had five wives and nine sons. Sum pa mkhan po combines the portraits of the two persons, thereby enlarging the scale of renunciation: Atiśa, like Śakyamuni, left both wife and child in order to become a monk. This changing of the materials handed down classifies the Dpags bsam ljon bzai: it is a source of secondary rank, in spite of its remarks regarding the reliability of some older sources⁵². An example of literary transformation is to be found in the Chos byun bstan pa’i padma rgyas pa’i nin byed⁵³ (hereafter Padma rgyas pa’i nin byed) by Padma dkar po: the author, in depicting the imprisonment and the death of the monk Ye šes ’od⁵⁴, the former king of Western Tibet, uses passages from four different books, namely the Deb ther shon po, the Rnam thar yoins grags, the Rnam thar lam yig and the Rgyal rabs gsal ba’i me loṅ⁵⁶. 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 result⁵⁶. This shows that the Padma rgyas pa’i nin byed also cannot be regarded as a primary source for the life of Atiśa. We have to take into account that during the course of time the
tradition about Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna'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 yois grags\textsuperscript{97}, 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{98}; the missing passages, however, do appear in the corresponding context of the Rnam thar yois grags\textsuperscript{99}. The extant version of the Rnam thar rgyas pa is to be regarded as defective; it should be used together with the Rnam thar yois 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 sion po, the Bka' gdam schos 'byun rnam thar and the Bka' gdam schos 'byun sgron me as well; these pictures of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna's life stand next in tradition to the extensive biographies\textsuperscript{100}. 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{101} 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{102} the word lo 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 lo rgyus in its special meaning are only met with in exceptionally few cases in the Rnam thar yois grags\textsuperscript{103}, the Bka' gdam schos 'byun sgron me and the Bka' gdam schos 'byun 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 Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna'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{104}. The goal to be reached with the available old forms of the biography is to discern the picture of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna 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{105}.
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 'byuin nmam thar and especially in the Bka’ gdams chos 'byuin sgron me there are verses quoted from two such hymns, namely the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and the bstod pa written by Pandit Sa'i sñin po**. 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 mdzod*** is based upon a version which had been made after 1496, since the Bka’ gdams chos 'byuin 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 'byuin nmam thar and the Bka’ gdams chos 'byuin sgron me attribute to Pandit Sa'i sñin po. Tson kha pa Blo bzañ grags pa, in quoting verses from the two hymns of praise****, does not distinguish between Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and Sa'i sñin po: he refers to the lo tshsha 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 early*****. The Bka’ gdams chos 'byuin nmam thar and the Bka’ gdams chos 'byuin sgron me contain just a few lines from a stotra composed by Rin chen bzañ po, but these verses do not give historical data at all******. In the Bka’ gdams chos 'byuin sgron me there appear the earliest known quotations from the Bstdod pa sum cu pa attributed to 'Brom ston Rgyal ba'i 'byuñ gnas; but since it mentions Po to ba (1031-1105 A.D.), Spyan sha ba (1038-1103 A.D.) and Phu chuñ 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 sñin po's bstod 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 verses******. 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 Roñ pa Lag sor pa. The Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa—according to the tradition as preserved in the two extensive biographies*******—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 scroll*******.

The tradition concerning the biography of Atiśa originates from Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and—to a lesser extent********—from Pandit Sa'i sñin po. The extant verses of the two hymns of praise are the oldest testimony for Dīpankarāśrīñāna's life. The extensive tradition would have come to an end if Roñ pa Lag sor pa had not searched for the biography of the
master and had not obtained it by asking Nag tsho Lo tstsha 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
Dpamchkarasrījñāna’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 grags⁴⁴ distinguish between the information as
given by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and two other sources⁷⁷.
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 bzaṅ grags pa contains a more
archaic structure in the arrangement of some points, but it does not
mention Sa’i sīṅ 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 Dpamchkarasrījñāna handed down in the first centuries
after the death of the master, including some facts not reported by Nag tsho
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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68. In the sketch of Atiśa’s life as given in the Rim pa thams cad tshang bar ston pa'i byan 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 lhu pa Blo gros 'byin gnas, Phag mo gru pa Rdo rje rgyal po (1110-1170) and Khro phy 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 byin dge bṣaṇe lha yān bsd
   “Even of the monks [and] the upāsakas [he] killed five.”

The corresponding sentence in the Rnam thar yoi's 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’ gdam chos ‘byun 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’u 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.
