



INDIRA GANDHI NATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE ARTS  
11 Mansingh Road, New Delhi - 110 001

Atiśa Śrī Dipaṅkara-jñāna and  
Cultural Renaissance



IGNCA

Atiśa Śrī Dipaṅkara-jñāna and  
Cultural Renaissance

Proceedings of the International Conference  
16<sup>th</sup> - 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2013



INDIRA GANDHI NATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE ARTS  
NEW DELHI



# **Atiśa Śrī Dīpaṅkara-jñāna and Cultural Renaissance**

**Proceedings of the International Conference  
16<sup>th</sup> - 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2013**

Edited by  
**Shashibala**



INDIRA GANDHI NATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE ARTS  
New Delhi

*Editor*  
Prof. Shashibala

© **Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts**

All right reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, Recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission of the Copyright owner, indicated above, and the publishers.

First Edition : November, 2018  
Price:

*Typeset by*  
Smt. Anupama Dhawan  
Kalakosa Division  
Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts

*Published by*  
Director (Publication)  
on behalf of  
Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts  
11 Mansingh Road, New Delhi  
Website: [ignca.nic.in](http://ignca.nic.in)

Printed in

## Contents

<b>Foreword</b> by Dr. Sachchidanand Joshi	vi
<b>Preface</b> by Prof. Shashibala	viii
1. <b>Jowo Je Paldhen Atiśa</b> Chamgon Kenting Tai Situpa	1
2. <b>Atiśa Śrī Dīpaṅkara-jñāna and the Buddhist Cosmopolis</b> Lokesh Chandra	3
3. <b>Some Problems in Studying Atiśa</b> Kaie Mochizuki	11
4. <b>The Ideals of Atiśa and Universal Peace</b> Prem Shankar Shrivastava	17
5. <b>Atiśa - Born with a mission</b> Christel Pilz	33
6. <b>Wouldn't You Rather be Practicing the Dharma? Atiśa and the Heart Advice of the Kadampa Masters</b> Bhikkhu Sumati Sasana (Kabir Saxena)	45
7. <b>Gyantse and Borobudur</b> Garrey Foulkes	53
8. <b>Tibetan Study Material at the Asiatic Society with Special Reference to Atiśa</b> Bandana Mukhopadhyay	69
9. <b>Śrī Dīpaṅkarajñāna at Vikramaśīla Monastery</b> Kaie Mochizuki	81

10. **Some Aspects of Atiśa and Archaeology of Vikramaśīla** 93  
C. P. Sinha
11. **The Depiction of Atiśa in Tibetan Art** 99  
Andrea Loseries
12. **Atiśa : Voice of the Ashes** 109  
Elizabeth D. Inandiak
13. **Atiśa's Ritual Methods for Making Buddhist Art Holy** 123  
Dan Martin
14. **Tārā Rituals Written or Translated by Atiśa** 139  
Kuo-wei Liu
15. **A Comparative Study of the Buddhist Theory of Atiśa in Tibet and the Han Nationality Region** 153  
Zhangzong
16. **Mādhyamika Aspects of Atiśa's Philosophy** 163  
Karunesh Shukla
17. **An Analysis of Various Tantric Lineages of Atiśa Based on his Biographies** 175  
Yen Hui ju
18. **Atiśa and Tholing Monastery : The Archaeological Discoveries** 187  
Zhang Jian Lin

## Atiśa's Ritual Methods for Making Buddhist Art Holy

Dan Martin

Some may be surprised to find the subject of consecration featured in a volume honouring Śrī Dīpaṅkarajñāna or Atiśa as we will go on to call him<sup>1</sup>. This reaction would depend on how we imagine him spending his days. One may think he was constantly absorbed in solitary contemplation, pondering deep philosophical questions, or dispensing words of wisdom to his followers. Of course he did do all those things and more. Yet I think I can say with confidence that one of the things he did was performing consecration rituals, both long and short, and on a regular basis. During his stay in Tibet in particular, it was precisely on account of his high stature as an Indian Buddhist leader that consecrations were requested of him.

Let me give just two recorded examples. The first is in a fascinating book that I came to know about only recently. It may be the earliest significant example of an 'explanatory text' about consecration. It is by a Tibetan author of the Kagyu School, well-known but not among the *most* famous. He signs his name as Sgom-rin. This Sgom-rin, born in 1202, included a curious collection of stories about consecration events. Here is one that involves Atiśa, called by his Tibetan epithet Jowo Je:

'On one of his journeys Jowo Je was asked to consecrate a metal-cast image of Tārā. He placed it upon the palm of his hand and said, 'Ma-ta-ra-ma, I request that you come into this.' Repeating the words three times he then said to the owner of the image, 'Now,

offer good offerings to it.' Of all the icons in the northern parts of U-ru, this one is the greater in its blessings<sup>2</sup>.'

I will give one more example in the hope this will suffice to convince skeptical readers that consecration was one of his occupations. It is from Alaka Chattopadhyaya's classic 1967 book on Atiśa, where it simply states, 'He was invited there to perform the *pratiṣṭhāna* ceremony in the newly built temple of Gra-phyi in the market place<sup>3</sup>.' Notice, too, on the pages that follow in the same book, instances of Atiśa making a number of places holy after they were blessed by his mere presence. So, in these examples we get a feeling that consecrations can be effected by anything from the mere physical presence of a ritual master, or a few moments of saying a couple of words or *mantras*, or what is likely in the case of the temple, a much more elaborate full-length ritual lasting from one to seven days. In Atiśa's consecration text itself, he describes rituals of three different lengths- long, short, and extremely short, and this accords very nicely with the examples just given.

How are we to define consecration, especially if, as is often the case in such matters, the words used in the definition are themselves very difficult, perhaps even impossible, to define? It may seem presumptuous to go on to write about something I do not know Well, that I do not know in the sense of being able to make a clear definition, one likely to satisfy a critical audience. In my defense, I would say that I am not alone in this, that in fact, nobody can really capture holiness in a definition any more than they can capture beauty, harmony or goodness, although we all know what those things are; we have experience of them, and have clear ideas about where they may be found. Their absence can be especially glaring in places we expect to find them. But as soon as we try to define them, we just foist the problem on other words with definability issues of their own.

Since I do not have a definition of my own, I hope you will allow me to quote someone else's. This one comes from the Chicago school, and in its opening phrase reflects the view of Mircea Eliade, inspired by Rudolph Otto before him. According to this, the sacred is a particular structure of human consciousness that



corresponds to a palpable presence, energy or power encountered in the environment<sup>4</sup>.

For now, I will not argue with the Lévi-Straussian structuralist guise that Eliade used to gain Religious Studies entry into the secular academy. In some ways this definition has to be dissatisfying, given its use of the weasel words structure and presence that are somehow joined through a mysterious and unclarified idea of correspondence. The experiential or responsive aspect of it is concealed in the words 'palpable' and 'encountered'. We may just as well say that the sacred is something we experience when we come in contact with persons or objects we have traditionally regarded with veneration; that, when this happens we know it.

Our definition like the one from Chicago might seem to deemphasize the objective existence of holiness 'out there.' I leave that part of the question up to you, the reader, to decide. However, there can be no doubt that Atiśa does see the consecration (particularly its *mantras*) as having objective effectiveness even without the presence of a subjective witness. He says:

'The merit of a ritual correctly performed will arise  
both in those who saw and those who did not see it done.  
As for an image, it is by the perfect characteristics of the *mantra*  
that blessings enter into the receptacle<sup>5</sup>.'

We have two common words in English pointing to the same phenomenon, the words 'holy' and 'sacred'. They have differences in terms of the contexts in which we use them. For example, we never speak of the 'holy and the profane,' but of the 'sacred and the profane.' We say 'holy man,' never 'sacred man.' Although the viability of the sacred-profane dichotomy has often been questioned, in a general way I believe we do need to think of the sacred as applying to those things made use of for religious cult (which is to say religious worship), while those things that are not so used are profane. Even this may not be all that clear in Atiśa's text, as we will see a little later. So really, I am not sure if this distinction - a distinction that probably owes more to Durkheim than to Eliade - is one we ought to be insisting upon from the very start.

Such oppositional categories like [1] sacred and profane, or [2] popular and official religion, or [3] natural and historical religions, while they might seem to

assist us in understanding temporarily, inevitably run into problems or even contradictions. More germane to our topic, I believe that the so-called 'Mosaic distinction' between religions that make much use of divine representations and those that do not, has been over-determined<sup>6</sup>. Even if we were to admit that it *is* significant, yet it does not have an over-riding significance. What I mean is, every religious culture has come to its own long-term or enduring conclusions about the manner or degree of divine representation. We have to see, to begin with, that the so-called Abrahamic faiths all look back to the temple cult of Jerusalem. The temple, particularly the Holy-of-Holies, was regarded as a dwelling for the divine presence with the divine footstool in the form of the Ark of the Covenant. The invisible throne was uplifted by two visible winged beings that may be described quite accurately with a Sanskrit word as the *vāhana* of the divinity. We have to see, too, that practically every aspect of ancient Middle Eastern temple cult, the offerings and rituals, were carried out in Jerusalem in (almost every respect) identical ways, as if they were done in the presence of a sculptural divine representation<sup>7</sup>. And, although I may not have time to go much into my ideas along those lines in this essay, I believe that the non-representation of divinity is analogous to the non-performance of consecration. What I mean is, degrees of representation and styles of consecration may be co-variables within the life of a given religious culture. Now a few words on consecration are in order.

When I use the word 'consecration' as my translation for the Sanskrit *pratiṣṭhā* (or the Tibetan words, particularly *rab-gnas*, used to translate that Sanskrit), I am conscious of following American English conventions, not the English of the English. In England they always speak of church and altar dedications. In English church usage, the word consecration is reserved for the rite of making a person into a bishop. If you are accustomed to the English-English uses of these terms, I would just ask you to forget them temporarily to avoid unnecessary confusion.

In the Tibetan contexts that are our main concern here, but in Indian Buddhist contexts as well, we must include temples among objects that require consecration. Yet, when in some parts and in some ways quite similar rituals are done on people rather than things, I will call it empowerment or initiation ù in

the Sanskrit *abhiṣeka*. The explanatory text by Sgom-rin we mentioned before states this distinction quite simply:

'What is done for divinities is consecration,  
and what is done for persons is empowerment<sup>8</sup>.

Atiśa's text does include an empowerment sequence, toward the end, immediately before the enthronement offerings.

The same ritual of consecration is performed, with slight adjustments only, for three categories of Buddhist icons representing the Buddha's Body, Speech and Mind, as well as temples housing those same three categories of icons. The three icons are primarily images, written scriptures and the *chorten* or *stūpa* (but sometimes ritual implements are also included in the Mind category).

We must also distinguish the consecration proper, the *pratiṣṭhā*, from two rituals that I will call pre-consecration rituals. The first is the Earth Rite (*sa-chog*) that is itself made up of several sub-rituals. It includes checking the surrounding area for signs and doing a soil and water test. The second pre-consecration ritual I will call the Relic Deposition, although the Tibetan term means Dhāraṇī Insertion (*gzungs-gzhug*)<sup>9</sup>. These two pre-consecration rituals may lend themselves even more easily to cross-cultural comparisons than the consecration itself. The Earth Rite includes elements that resemble not only Indian Vāstu traditions, but also the practices of the Roman Auguri, for example. And Relic Deposition is a practice with close analogues in the ancient Middle East, among Hittites, Assyrians and Egyptians, and in Catholic altar consecration rites<sup>10</sup>.

No special apologies are needed for finding consecration a subject of interest in religious studies nowadays. It could be seen as part of a general trend to turn attention away from learned distinctions that mean little to the followers of the religion and instead look at things that do make a difference for the practices of believers. Ritual is one of those things, like prayer, that are likely to occupy the religious person's time. For although the consecrating of icons may be an activity involving mainly the religious elites, the ordinary believers will then go on to make those icons objects for offerings and other lay people's practices, like circumambulation, prostration and so on. Consecration in clear ways bridges the academic categories of official and popular religion. Or, another way to put it, it

serves various purposes for both sides, some of those purposes at least being held in common.

By far the most famous 'House of God' that was ever consecrated in the city I have made my home is the temple of King Solomon, built a little less than 3,000 years ago<sup>11</sup>. It is not my intention to go into a huge study of Eurasian traditions of consecration, or even to do a serious comparison. I just want to point to one rather striking idea they have in common. When the temple was consecrated, King Solomon knelt on top of a specially built platform in the courtyard, lifted his hands to the sky, and made a very long speech that contained these especially memorable words (II Chronicles 6:18):

'But will God in very deed dwell with men on the earth?  
Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee ;  
How much less this house which I have built?'

Atiśa's text reads, in what is traditionally its most-quoted passage:

The consecration is both necessary and unnecessary. When examined ultimately [i.e. in ultimate truth], who blesses what how? From the beginning [it was there] without birth and cessation; how could it be established/consecrated? For those who possess the realization of all *dharmas* as clear light, consecrations of objects for worship are unnecessary. Neither is it for those who may not have realized emptiness, yet have realized that *stūpas*, scriptures, images and so forth arise from blessed emanations of the Buddhas, and do not arise otherwise. If they have strong faith, a consecration is not necessary. For the beginners, the untrained, in relative truth, in worldly labels, for beings who do not know the real essence, the Buddha taught consecration<sup>12</sup>.

These kinds of statements on consecration's impossibility or non-necessity are hardly unique. In fact Atiśa's passage echoes a classic one from the *Pratiṣṭhā Tantra* quoted in practically every Tibetan work about consecration. What is especially interesting about Atiśa's formulation is the way he brings together the perspectives of the ritual master and the ritual consumer. For the master the

ritual elaboration is unnecessary if emptiness has been realized. For the faithful it is unnecessary if they are fully cognizant of the icon as divine manifestation.

Atiśa's text is not an explanatory treatise<sup>13</sup>. There is not very much there that could be described as doctrinal or theoretical. Like the great majority of texts on this subject, it is a ritual handbook, intended for the practical guidance of ritual officiants. Still, it has some interesting pointers for understanding the most general structures and purposes of the ritual. It is naturally possible to get confused about what is going on at a particular point in the ritual. So Atiśa's most general outline of the ritual is both simple and revealing and worthwhile to remember. He reduces all the complications down to three phases: expelling, igniting and spreading. He says:

'In the preparation rites, expelling the obstructions is key.  
In the main part of the ritual igniting the blessings is key.  
In the concluding rites the spreading of the Teaching is key<sup>14</sup>.'

Before looking into the more specific subject matter, it would be good to say a few words about Atiśa's work in general and its place in the history of Buddhist consecration ritual. I believe we have to trust the colophon information when it plainly states it was first composed by Śrī Dīpaṅkarajñāna, and subsequently translated by him with the cooperation of Gya Lotsawa at Vikramaśilā Vihāra. So we know that it was composed and translated before 1040 CE when the two of them departed from Vikramaśilā. Although there is nothing explicit to that effect, it would have been composed in Sanskrit even if no Sanskrit version survives to the best of my knowledge. We basically are forced to be satisfied with this much information. Scarcely any historical information may be gleaned from the rest of the text, except to say that it does make use of some earlier works.

He rarely refers to any of those earlier writings by title, but he surely knew the 'Consecration Tantra', a few consecration chapters contained in tantras, and may be two or three texts on the subject written by Indian authors. There were not very many of these and, except for the Tantra, each one was only a few pages long. If we look for Tibetan authors of consecration treatises, there were none at all prior to the time Atiśa lived. One of the two texts from the early 11th century is but a bare outline of the ritual proceedings, done by the Great Translator

Rinchen-tsang-po. It was widely used in the later Tibetan literature, but as a separate text it was made available in reprint only a few years ago. The other early text is an equally small one-page text by Rong-zom-pa, with a few brief appended texts<sup>15</sup>.

So, starting from Atiśa's time we see a great development of consecration literature both in India and in Tibet. In Tibet, there are numerous works by early Kadam and Kagyu teachers. Most prominent among the 12th-century ritual treatises are those of the Kagyu master Phag-mo-gru-pa, and in the following century the already-mentioned explanatory treatise by Sgom-rin. In general, my point would be that Atiśa's work, at a length of twelve pages in the Derge version, gave a much fuller and lengthier treatment of the subject than had been available before him.

Yet there is one huge exception to this pattern of gradual evolution in size. The Tibetan Bon religion's most celebrated treasure-text revealer, ShenchenLuga (Gshen-chenKlu-dga'), found his texts in 1017 and died in 1035 CE, so his time on earth overlapped with Atiśa's life, but he lived out his entire life before Atiśa entered Tibet. I will not say more about him because he was the subject of my doctoral dissertation over twenty years ago, but just to say that among the texts he excavated was a set of three about consecrations of Body, Speech and Mind receptacles<sup>16</sup>. In total length it amounts to 116 folios - 19 times longer than Atiśa's. I find this puzzling, although I have no explanation for it. I had hoped one day to do a thorough study of the Bon consecration texts. Many other matters have gotten in the way meanwhile. We will spare a few more words on the Bon text in a minute.

I should have liked to discuss and find an explanation for the fact that the earliest Tibetan epigraphic evidence for consecration, the word *rab-gnas* is not used, but rather *zhal-[b]sro*, with the literal meaning 'face-warming'. I have not arrived at any clearly defensible explanation for this. At the least we can say that the word *rab-gnas* is a direct calque translation of the Sanskrit, while *zhal-sro* is not, so it is possible *zhal-sro* in this work of translation represents a æconceptual matching with a pre-existing local Tibetan ritual term<sup>17</sup>.

For the moment I will just make a few brief philological comments about two Tibetan words found in Atiśa's work, one associated with the biography of Shenchen, the other found in Shenchen's consecration works. They are the 'expanded chest' (*'brang-rgyas*) and the 'bird horns' (*bya-ru*). The 'expanded chest' is one of the ritual items used by Shenchen to propitiate the treasure protectors before removing the hidden texts.

I've written a long paper on this very word, so for now I will just say that it is a ritual offering item, a packed dome of flour dotted with dabs of butter that was rejected by Sakya Paṇḍita as having no Indian background, and as such should not be used in Buddhist rituals<sup>18</sup>. Atiśa's text does very plainly make use of it without the least hint of an apology.

On the 'bird horns', Roberto Vitali has written a long paper<sup>19</sup>. The most famous usage of the term is in the names of the 18 Bya-ru-can kings (*bya-ru-can* means 'having bird horns') said to have ruled ancient kingdom of Zhangzhung in western Tibet. Other usages of the term have been found, but in general it points to a headgear topped by a disk framed on either side by rather ox-like horns. It is found on the heads of Zhang-zhung kings and Bon divine figures. By the early 13th century we may know of it as a name for a kind of fool's hat worn by wandering actors, acrobats and bards. But also more particularly relevant, until this day it is used as a finial at the top of Bon chortens. The parallel between the consecration texts of Shenchen and Atiśa is quite striking, since both view the pair of 'bird horns' at the top of the *chorten* as symbolic of wisdom and means.

I think some are imagining my thinking may be headed toward the conclusion that Atiśa did not really write his consecration text, that it might have been composed by a Tibetan and only then attributed to his hand. If so, I would ask you please not to be so fast, as I have no such conclusion to offer. In my view this would be just another example of what I like to call 'the standard yak test'. According to the standard yak test, if a text contains the word *yak* in it, it must have been a Tibetan composition. I have seen this type of argument used many times, by both Tibetan and non-Tibetan writers, particularly in arguments about the authenticity of the Tibetan medical scriptures and of the tantras of the Nyingma school. Even people with my rather low-level knowledge of Indian

literature could know that Kālidāsa makes reference to yaks, and yaks occur in an undoubted translation from Sanskrit, the *Rosary of Jātaka Stories* by Āryaśūra<sup>20</sup>. Another reason why the standard yak test does not work is the fact that some translators believed in making culturally appropriate translations. This should not be surprising. All translators into Chinese believed in this method. I think particularly when the Indian author is cooperating with a Tibetan translator, the two of them are conscious of creating a new text, not just a translation but a new or renewed text that will be useful and accessible to a Tibetan audience. Therefore less easily transferred cultural idioms are not so likely to be preserved. They may favor meaningful equivalents of metaphors over slavishly literal versions of the same. So my answer is no, I do not think the Tibetanness of these two words is any proof or indication of Tibetan authorship.

What I do think they prove is just that both the Shenchen and Atiśa texts are from the same pre-Mongol period of Tibetan history, reflecting cultural conditions of that time before the use of the 'expanded chest' was placed in doubt by Sakya Paṅḍita and before the 'bird horns' were reduced to traveling minstrels' caps. In effect, and at the very least, these things help us to argue in a general way for the age of the texts, if not for their actual authorship.

I would like to end by considering one final issue, which is this: How influential has Atiśa's text been on the later consecration traditions of Tibetan Buddhism? To judge from frequent citations in the later literature alone, it would seem that it had a wide impact. We would need to cover a great deal of the literature to be able to gauge the types and degrees of influence. Yet there are two areas I can think of, in which the content of the text came to clash somewhat with later Tibetan ideas about consecration<sup>21</sup>. One of these areas is the so-called '*Sūtra* consecration,' an issue that was made into an issue by Sakya Paṅḍita at the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Yael Bentor has written the major study on this topic<sup>22</sup>. Atiśa and his Kadam followers (including some early Kagyu writers) held that *Sūtra* consecration was a possibility but after Sakya Paṅḍita cast doubts on it, the idea fell into disrepute in some circles.

Another area of problem: Atiśa followed the time-hallowed Indian tradition of using Buddhist divinities in rites of consecration for such things as wells and



groves. Later Tibetan authors, although here we do find some sectarian differences, tend to dismiss the possibility that secular objects could have consecration rituals performed for them, limiting these to the icons of Body, Speech and Mind: images, scriptures and *chortens*. Yael Bentor has devoted some pages to this issue<sup>23</sup>. In both cases the problem would seem to be that over time Tibetan scholars tended to develop complex systems of their own, accepting certain principles as being basic ones and defining other things accordingly. For Sakya Paṇḍita, there is no such thing as a ritual of any kind in Buddhist *sūtras*. All rituals are in the *tantra* category. In consequence of his definition, even to speak of a consecration ritual done according to a *sūtra* method is rendered unacceptable.

So, with the few samples we have looked at, I think we can see how Atiśa's consecration text is interesting for a number of reasons, from perspectives of religious studies, cultural history and philological or 'word history' studies. Still more to the point, it is interesting for what it can tell us about the world Atiśa inhabited. It informs us about the uses Buddhists in his day had for images, consecrations and blessings, and their ideas about the same, and these are words students of religions most especially need to find ways to hear.

## Reference

1. The correct form of the name Atiśa, spelled without the length-mark over the 'i', has been explained in detail by Lokesh Chandra in his closing address at the conference, with reference to the earlier arguments by Helmut Eimer. To make the case overly simple, the name as such is not found in Indian sources, and the rare Tibetan sources that do explain its meaning gloss it with *phul-byung*, or *phul-du byung-ba*, corresponding to Sanskrit *atiśaya*, with the meaning of *preeminence*. The etymology that sees in it a combination of *ati* and *īśa* (apparently meaning something like *excessive master*) has no good basis. The most frequent Tibetan name for him is Jowo Je (Jo-boRje), an epithet that could be translated as *Reverend Lord*. Preparation of the manuscript for publication was done during my(?) tenure as a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
2. Sgom-rin: 2004, p. 452: *joborje la bshul lam gcig du | sgrolma'i lugs skuzhig la rabgnaszhus pas | phyagmthil du bzhuagnas | ma ta ra maÆdi la byon par mdzad du gsol || langsumsungsnas | da'di la mchod pa bzang du phulzhiggsungnas | u rubyangphyogskyirtenzhig la byinrlabschebazhigbyonskad*. By the way, Sgom-rin is

- the usual pen-name of the figure otherwise known as Spyān-sngaRin-chen-Idan. He was a prominent disciple and biographer of the more famous Yang-dgon-pa Rgyal-mtshan-dpal (1213-1258 CE). I think the *ma-ta-ra-ma* in the quotation may simply represent *mataram*, or *my mother*, although I am not entirely sure of it.
3. Chattopadhyaya: 1967, p. 424. There are other mentions of consecration in the same book, at pp. 244, 245, 266, 305 and 375. The literal translation "in the marketplace" for *tshong-'dus* is misleading, since Grwa-phyiTshong-'dus is the complete proper name of a monastery founded in Grwa-phyi Valley by Klu-mes, one of the first monks to re-enter central Tibet near the end of the 10th century. The name of the monastery was taken from the name of the nearby town, Tshong-'dus, and the entire river valley was called Grwa-phyi. Furthermore, what the original passage, although not presently available to me, surely intended to say here is that a new shrine had been built there ù that shrine being the one that Atiśa consecrated ù given that the temple itself had been founded long before his arrival in Tibet. Compare Eimer's German translation of a passage from Atiśa's biography (1979, vol. 1, p. 251): "In GrvaphyiTsho dusweihte Atiśaeine-Kapelle von der GrN"eeinesBre." I think the expression *bretsam-pa* used in the Tibetan passage Eimer translated (1979, vol. 2, p. 249) just indicates that it was a small temple. There still exist monastic buildings on what may be the same site today. I notice another mention of a consecration in the same work, at vol. 1, p. 255. For even more consecrations performed by Atiśa, see Martin: 2001a, p. 148.
  4. See Urban: 2012, p. 193.
  5. *choga'itshul legs bsodnamsni || nthong dang ni nthongnamissuskye || skugzugssngagskyintshanniyidkyis || rten la byinrlabsÆjug parÆgyur.* Atiśa, *Kāyavākittasupraṭiṣṭhā*, folio 256.
  6. See Assmann: 1996.
  7. Haran: 1985, chapter 13 in particular. About Middle Eastern cult images in general, see the articles collected in Walls: 2005. For the most recommended book specifically devoted to Middle Eastern consecration rituals, see the articles collected in Dick: 1991.
  8. At p. 429 of the previously mentioned text by Sgom-rin. The passage continues: "Both share their ideas with the generation stage / so the purifying agent is in correspondence with the basis of purification, / purifying a Goal that is in correspondence with its Path." In Wylie transcription: *de yang lha la rabgnas mi la dbangbskur | gnyiskaskyed rims dang dgongs pa mthun pas | sbyanggzhi dang mthunpa'isbyongbyed || lan dang mthunba'iÆbras busbyongba yin no.*
  9. Recently several studies of these two rituals have appeared. Just to give two examples, on Earth Rites see Dyke: 1997, pp. 178-227, and on Dhāraṇī Insertion perhaps the simplest introduction is Bentor: 1994, but then see also Bentor: 1995.
  10. On the Auguri, see Rykwert: 1989 For Mesopotamian practices, see Ellis: 1968.

- The Egyptian practices are most clearly documented in the case of the relatively late temple of Horus at Edfu; see especially Finnestad: 1985. For treatment of the Vāstuvidyā traditions as known in Tibet, see the interesting paper Mori: 2004.
11. Rowton: 1950, along with most other sources that give an exact year for its completion and consecration, places this somewhere between 958 or 957, with construction beginning in 959 BCE. Other dates can be found in the literature.
  12. See Bentor: 1996, p. 16, where we may find a footnote supplying the Tibetan text, part of a general discussion of the necessity and non-necessity of consecration. One ought to consult the same work, at pp. 13-18, for a number of quotations with similar ideas.
  13. For a general survey of the Tibetan genre of explanatory texts about consecration, see Bentor's previously mentioned book, pp. 64-66. Of course the work by Sgomrin that I use in this paper was not at all available at the time her book was written, so it is naturally absent from her list.
  14. As the original passage reads at folio 257: *stagonbgegsnibskra- dpa'ignad || dngosgzhibyinyrlabssbarba'ignad || rjesnibstan pa darrgyasgsun.*
  15. A short work with the name of its author given as Rinchen-tsang-po in its colophon has appeared in published form with the title *Rab-tuGnas-par Byed-pa Don-gsal* (see Rinchen-tsang-po: 2006). This is evidently the very same work referred to by authors as early as the twelfth century as his *sdoml-gyi]-tshig*, or *summary* (even sometimes simply as *sdom*). See Bentor: 1996, p. 61, which says it is "no longer extant," quite true at the time her book was written. The work by Rong-zom-pa may be found in Rong-zom-pa: 1999a, as well as the work that follows it in the same volume 1999b, plus the following work in the same volume 1999c.
  16. For bibliographic information on these consecration texts, see Martin: 2001b, p. 244.
  17. For the use of *zhal-bsro[s]* in Old Tibetan texts, it is an easy matter to search for it in the OTDO database (<http://otdo.aa.tufs.ac.jp>), where we find two separate occurrences, both datable to the early decades of the ninth century. One has a date corresponding to 834 CE. At the same time, a search in the OTDO for *rab-gnas* or *rab-tugnas-pa* fails to find even one single occurrence. Not only is the expression *zhal-bsro* not Indic, it also appears not to reflect any Chinese expression, as Imaeda: 2007, p. 94, has remarked.
  18. Martin: 2013.
  19. Vitali: 2008. I also wrote some in my dissertation, although this part remains unpublished. For fresh new ideas on what the *bya-ru* might be, coming from ethnographic sources, see Huber: 2013, pp. 278-279.
  20. I've discussed the standard yak test in a forthcoming work, "Padampa's Animal Metaphors and the Question of Indianness, His and Theirs." A working draft has been made available over the internet.

21. Perhaps a third instance is to be found in his final instructions for the full-scale consecration of images, in which they are taken on a chariot trip around the town with offerings and music. The procession does not seem to play a very evident role in Tibetan consecrations, although it is well known that various sorts of processions did commonly take place in Tibet on other occasions. In fact, an actual example of a procession that took place in 1988 during the three-day annual re-consecration of Bodhanath Stūpa in Nepal, has been described in Bendor: 1996, p. 319.
22. Bendor: 1992. An English-language translation of the most relevant passage may be found in Sakya Pandita: 2002, pp. 125-129.
23. On consecrations of secular objects, see Bendor: 1996, pp. 57-58, where she also discusses which objects Indian Buddhist authors placed within the categories of Body, Speech and Mind receptacles. See also Mori: 2005, especially pp. 224-228.

### Bibliography

- Assmann, Jan: 1996, *The Mosaic Distinction: Israel, Egypt and the Invention of Paganism*, *Æ Representations*, vol. 56, pp. 48-67.
- Atiśa: *Kāyavākcittasupraṭiṣṭhā (Sku dang Gsung dang Thugs Rab-tuGnas-pa)*, translated by the author and RgyaBrtson-'grus-seng-ge, Derge Tanjur, vol. ZI, folios 254-260 (Tōhoku no. 2496).
- Bendor, Yael: 1992, 'Sūtra-Style Consecration in Tibet and its Importance for Understanding the Historical Development of the Indo-Tibetan Consecration Ritual for Stūpas and Images,' *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989*, Naritasan Shinshoji (Narita 1992), vol. 1, pp. 1-12.
- Bendor, Yael: 1994, 'Inside Tibetan Images,' *Arts of Asia*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 102-109.
- Bendor, Yael: 1995, 'On the Indian Origin of the Tibetan Practice of Depositing Relics and Dhāraṇīs in Stūpas and Images,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 115, no. 2, pp. 248-261.
- Bendor, Yael: 1996, *Consecration of Images & Stūpas in Indo-Tibetan Tantric Buddhism*, E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Chattopadhyaya, Alaka, & Lama Chimpa: 1967, *Atiśa and Tibet*, Indian Studies Past & Present, Calcutta.
- Dick, Michael B., ed.: 1999, *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake.
- Dyke, Mary van: 1997, 'Grids and Serpents: A Tibetan Foundation Ritual in Switzerland,' contained in: Frank Korom, ed., *Constructing Tibetan Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, World Heritage Press, St. Hyacinthe.
- Eimer, Helmut: 1979, *Rnamtharrgyas pa: MaterialienzueinerBiographie des Atiśa (Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna)*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

- Ellis, Richard S.: 1968, *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Finnestad, Ragnhild Bjerre: 1985, *Image of the World and Symbol of the Creator: On the Cosmological and Iconological Values of the Temple of Edfu*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Haran, Menahem: 1985, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake.
- Huber, Toni: 2013, 'The Iconography of gShen Priests in the Ethnographic Context of the Extended Eastern Himalayas, and Reflections on the Development of Bon Religion,' contained in: Franz-Karl Ehrhard & Petra Maurer, eds., *Nepalica-Tibetica: Festgabe for Christoph Cihppers*, International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, Andiast, vol. 1, pp. 263-294.
- Imaeda Yoshiro: 2007, 'T-Shaped Inscription Frames in Mogao (Dunhuang) and Yulin Caves,' *Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies*, no. 53, pp. 89-99.
- Martin, Dan: 2001a, 'Painters, Patrons and Paintings of Patrons in Early Tibetan Art,' contained in: Rob Linrothe & Henrik Sørensen, eds., *Embodying Wisdom: Art, Text and Interpretation in the History of Esoteric Buddhism*, vol. 6 in SBS Monographs series, The Seminar for Buddhist Studies, Copenhagen, pp. 139-184.
- Martin, Dan: 2001b, *Unearthing Bon Treasures: Life and Contested Legacy of a Tibetan Scripture Revealer*, Brill, Leiden.
- Martin, Dan: 2013, 'Ritual Indigenization as a Debated Issue in Tibetan Buddhism (11th to Early 13th Centuries),' contained in: Henk Blezer and Mark Teeuwen, *Challenging Paradigms: Buddhism and Nativism, Framing Identity Discourse in Buddhist Environments*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 159-194.
- Mori Masahide: 2004, 'The Vāstunāga Ritual Described in Tsong-kha-pa's *Sngags-rin Chen-po*,' contained in: Shuon Hino & Toshihiro Wada, eds., *Three Mountains and Seven Rivers: Prof. Musashi Tachikawa's Felicitation Volume*, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, pp. 843-856.
- Mori Masahide: 2005, 'The Installation Ceremony in Tantric Buddhism,' contained in: Shingo Einoo & Jun Takashima, eds., *From Material to Deity: Indian Rituals of Consecration*, Manohar, New Delhi, pp. 199-240.
- OTDO (Old Tibetan Documents Online) database → <http://otdo.aa.tufs.ac.jp>.
- Rin-chen-bzang-po (958-1055): 2006, *Rab-tuGnas-par Byed-pa Don-gsal*, contained in: *Bka'-gdamsGsung-'bum Phyogs-bsgrigsThengs Dang-po*, Dpal-brtsegs Bod-yigDpe-rnyingZhub-'jug-khang, Lhasa, vol. 1, pp. 41-44.
- Rong-zom-pa Chos-kyi-bzang-po (11th century): 1999a, *Rab-gnas-kyiRtsa-ba*, contained in: *Rong-zomChos-bzang-giGsung-'bum*, Si-khronMi-rigs Dpe-skrunkhang, Chengdu, vol. 2, pp. 131-134.
- Rong-zom-pa Chos-kyi-bzang-po (11th century): 1999b, *Bde-bar-gshegs-pa'iSkusung Thugs-kyiRten-la Rab-tuGnas-pa Ji-ltarBya-ba'iGzhung-giBshad-sbyar*,

- contained in: *Rong-zomChos-bzang-giGsung-'bum*, Si-khronMi-rigs Dpe-skrunkhang, Chengdu, vol. 2, pp. 135-169.
- Rong-zom-pa Chos-kyi-bzang-po (11th century): 1999c, *Bde-bar-gshegs-pa'iSkuGsung Thugs-kyiRten-la Rab-tuGnas-pa Ji-ltarBya-ba'iGzlung-giBshad-sbyar*, contained in: *Rong-zomChos-bzang-giGsung-'bum*, Si-khronMi-rigs Dpe-skrunkhang, Chengdu, vol. 2, pp. 171-196.
  - Rowton, M.B.: 1950, 'The Date of the Founding of Solomon's Temple,' *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 119, pp. 20-22.
  - Rykwert, Joseph: 1989, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
  - SakyaPanditaKungaGyaltshe (1182-1251): 2002, *A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes: Essential distinctions among the Individual Liberation, Great Vehicle, and Tantric Systems*, tr. by Jared Douglas Rhoton, State University of New York Press, Albany.
  - Sgom-rin (13th century): 2004, *Rab-gnas-kyi Cho-gaGsal-byedRin-chenSnang-ba*, contained in *Bri-gung Bka'-brgyudChos-mdzod Chen-mo*, Lhasa, vol. 48, pp. 434-496.
  - Urban, Hugh: 2012, 'Review of Jeffrey J. Kripal's book *Authors of the Impossible*,' *History of Religions*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 192-195.
  - Vitali, Roberto: 2008, 'A Tentative Classification of the Byaru can Kings of Zhang zhung,' *Revue d'Etudes Tibetaines*, vol. 15 [Tibetan Studies in Honor of SamtenKarmay], pp. 379-420.
  - Walls, Neal H., ed.: 2005, *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*, American Schools of Oriental Research, Boston.