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The cult of the Tsan dan Jo bo has not received much attention from the people of Tibet, even though its popularity is ancient and widespread in Central Asia and China, for it was diffused in many of the latter lands already during a time that corresponds to the proto–history of the Tibetan plateau. Despite a conspicuous number of shifts in location, the sandalwood statue of Buddha Shakyamuni never found a home in Tibet, unlike other wondrous statues that were brought to the plateau during its imperial period and thereafter.

Knowledge of the Tsan dan Jo bo in Tibet has remained rather marginal. The Tibetan literature talks about it cursorily; most authors who dealt with the image and its worship belonged to the late periods, bar one earlier case which, however, is only apparently an exception to this state of affairs (see below). Indeed the sources associate the statue’s worship with India and China, and there are few traces of its cult on Tibetan soil, where awareness of this statue was mainly confined to literary accounts.

The study of this image is intriguing, then, because it gives a researcher the opportunity to see how Tibetan culture handles a topic extraneous to its direct domain.

In the few literary cases in which it appears, the image has been relegated to brief references in encyclopaedic works, such as sde srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho’s *Bai du rya g.ya ’sel* or Kong sprul’s *Shes bya kun khyab mdzod*. The only major monographic work on the Tsan dan Jo bo is that of lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje, which is published here.

Most of what these few Tibetan texts talk about concerns the statue’s legendary origin. They somewhat accept as beyond dispute that the sculpture is a likeness of the Buddha executed during his lifetime and describe the legendary circumstances of its making in heaven while the master was there to impart teachings to his mother.

This is hardly tenable in the light of the archaeological evidence documenting the creation of the Buddha image at Mathura and in Gandhara after centuries of symbolical representations of Shakyamuni. Therefore, one cannot but consider the hypothesis that the tradition of depicting of the Buddha had developed anthropomorphically already during his lifetime as pure fancy.
Also in consideration of the fact that the Tsan dan Jo bo has nothing to do with the creation of the Buddha image, the physionomic traits of the Tsan dan Jo bo seem to me to betray a post–Gandharan origin (see fig.1), perhaps not much predating the period in which the sandalwood statue is said to have been transferred to Central Asia from the Indian North–West.

The tradition holds that the statue, after remaining over 1,000 years in India, was taken to the Silk Route oasis of Kucha by the Kashmiri master Kumārajīva, the father of the great Kumārajīva (344–409), hence sometime before 344, when the latter was born at this locality chosen by his father as the family residence.

The Tsan dan Jo bo was then transferred to metropolitan China after Kumārajīva was taken prisoner in Kucha in 384, in a war that another legend says was waged by the Chinese in order to acquire Kumārajīva’s teachings and to take possession of the statue (see Terentiev, *The Sandalwood Buddha of the King Udayana* p.20).

mGon po skyabs favours another account of the Tsan dan Jo bo’s transfer to Central Asia, similar to the other legends in spirit but not in letter. He summarises his version of those events in *rGya nag chos ’byung* urging the reader to consult his monograph dedicated to the sandalwood statue (*Tsandan Jo bo’i lo rgyus*), which remains untraced. He says that the ruler H phu ki yan waged a war against India in pursuit of three objectives: to win rig ’dzin Ku ma ra shri (i.e. Kumārajīva’s father) and the Tsan dan Jo bo for his kingdom and to conquer Indian territories. Hence it is not question here of taking Kumārajīva captive in Kucha and of seizing the statue in the process.

mGon po skyabs’s *rGya nag chos ’byung* (p.73 lines 4–11) reads:

“Rig ’dzin Ku ma ra shri zhes pa rig pa ’i gnas lnga mthar son cing mngon shes dang rdzu ’phrul thogs med mnga’ ba de’i grags pa Hor rigs kyi rGya rgyal H phu ki yan gis thos pas mi ring ba zhig na blon po ltas mkhan gys bkra shis pa’i skar ma shar ba’i rgyu mtshan zhu bar mtha’ khob pa chen po zhig phan grogs su ’byung bar lung bstan pas/ zhor la rGya gar gyi yul khams ’ga’ zhig ’thob tu ’dod pas dmag dpon Lu’i kwang dpung chen po dang bcas btang bas pandi ta dang Tsandan Jo bo gdan drangs pa sogs (line 11) phal cher bdag gis Tsandan Jo bo’i lo rgyus su bshad zin’?”,

“Rig ’dzin Ku ma ra shri brought his knowledge of the five sciences to the ultimate stage (*mthar son* sic for *mthar song*). H phu ki yan, ruler of China of Hor extraction, heard the fame of his clairvoyance and miracles, and not long thereafter, owing to [the advice of] a discerning minister, while wondering about a cause that could make his lucky star shine, ordered to avail of the help of that one great barbarian. Since he wished to conquer some regions of the land of rGya gar, he sent the great general Lu’i kwang off with a huge army. The latter indeed drew the pandi ta and
the Tsandan (spelled so) Jo bo [to China], [events] that are mentioned in the *Tsan dan Jo bo’i lo rgyus* penned by me”.

Kong sprul records another version of the legend, one which makes a marvelous claim for the Tsan dan Jo bo as belonging to the category of flying statues, for it says that it crossed the sky in order to reach China.¹ There are several stories in Tibetan literature of flying objects which went from India to the plateau. To mention here a couple of instances I have cited in my past work, Rin chen bzang po’s flying mask depicting Gur mGon crossed the sky, from Kha che to mNga’ ris skor gsum, following Lo chen on his way back to his lands (see my “Sa skya and the mNga’ ri skor gsum legacy: the case of Rin chen bzang po’s flying mask”). A Thugs rje chen po, the image destined to become the principal statue at Zhwa lu, flew behind the monastery’s founder lCe btsun Shes rab ‘byung gnas while he was returning to gTsang from rgya gar (*Early Temples of Central Tibet*, see the work entitled “Zhwa lu and the Newar Style of the Yuan Court”).

It should be noted that the Tibetan tradition obviously tends to focus on the objects that flew to the plateau. It is interesting then that, among the many that concern magical flights in the traditions of India and China, at least one case of a religious object that flew from the Noble Land to Central Asia and China is mentioned in the Tibetan literature.

The belief that the statue was carved during the lifetime of the Buddha found again its way into the most important work on the sandalwood statue preserved in the Tibetan canon. This work, mentioned above, is much older than, for instance, those of the *sde srid* and Kong sprul consequently—an indication that a remarkable gap occurred on the plateau within the literary interest shown for the statue. This short work on the history of the Jo bo, bearing the title *Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul* (*bsTan ’gyur, rGyud lxxxv*) is included in the 1681 Peking edition of the Canon (see Suzuki’s catalogue).

Its colophon says that it was translated from the Chinese to Yu gur by one Am chang in fire pig 1227 (the year of the definitive capitulation of Byang Mi nyag to Jing gir rgyal po (Gengis Khan)), and from the latter language into Tibetan by one Da na si (seemingly not a Tibetan, perhaps an Indian?) in water pig 1263.

---

¹ Kong sprul Yon tan rgya mtsho, *Shes bya kun khyab mdzod* (stod cha) (p.572 lines 15–18): “rGya nag dge phyir bzhud ces bcom ldan ’das kyis bskul bas mkha las gshogs te lta da’ang rGya nag du bzhugs pa Tsan dan Jo bo zhes ’dra bshus kyis Si thang yang mang du ’byung ba ’bur sku’i thog ma ni ’di dag go’?/”; “Owing to the exhortation of the Buddha that [the statue] should go to China to promote virtue, it crossed the sky and even now is kept in China. The depiction of the Tsan dan Jo bo having been copied, there are many Si thang of the first tridimensional image [of Buddha Shakyamuni]”.
The text is an enumeration of the whereabouts of the statue, as it was transferred from place to place over many centuries, giving the length of stay in each place. It was kept at a good number of localities in Central Asia and China, and received remarkable royal reverence. The history of the Tsan dan Jo bo documents that, in the regions of Central Asia and China through which it was moved throughout the centuries after its transfer from India, the role of the statue was to sanctify royal power by its very presence.

*Cung*, the Chinese original translated from the Yu gur language into Tibetan under the title *Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul*, tells the history of the Tsan dan Jo bo in rather different terms from the legend mentioned above. It says that the statue was transferred from India to Khotan (Li yul), and from there to the Ordos region (Byang ngos) before ending in China. It adds that it was taken to eleven different countries in this land.

*Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul* (f.154a line 1–f.155a line 4) reads:

“Om Swasti Siddham. bCom ldans ’das sku bltam sa nas Sangs rgyas kyi bar dang/ Tsan dan sku’i ’byung tshul rGya’i lugs kyi mDo rabs bs dus pa la/ rgyal rabs Tshe’u zh es bya ba’i ring la rgyal bu bzhi pa Ce’ung bang zh es bya ba rgyal sar bton nas lo nyi zhu rtsa bzhi lon pa’i dus su/ shing stag lo kyi nyi nang/ zla ba bzhi pa’i tshes brgyad nyi nang/ rab bltams nas zhag bdun lon pa’i dus yum sKyum chen mo ’das nas lha’i yul du skyas/ rgyal po Ce’u dbang gyal sar bton nas lo bzhi bcu zhe gnyis lon pa’i dus su/ rgyal bu Donn grub lo bcu dgu lon nas khyim dor nas grong khyer gyi phyi rol tu gshegs nas gangs kyi ri la dka’ ba mdzad nas/ Ce’u dbang gi rgyal rabs Inga pa Mu dbang zhes bya ba rgyal sar bton nas lo gsum lon pa’i chu lug lo la rgyal bu Don grub lo sum cu lon pa’i dus su Sangs rgyas nas lo brgyad lon pa’i tshe yum gyi drin dgongs nas gSum bcu rtsa sum lha’i yul du gshegs te yum la chos bshad nas lha’i yul du dbyar zla ba gsum bzhugs pa la/ rgyal po U tra ya nas bcom ldan ’das dran nas Mou dgal gyi bu la zhus pas/ Mou dgal gyi bus rdzu ’phrul gyi zo bo sum cu gnyis dang/ tsan dan dmar po smug po dang bcas pa bhangs nas lha’i yul du khyer te/ bcom ldan ’das sku bltan tshig mi zhes pa mtshan sum cu rtsa gnyis yongs su rdzogs par bzod nas mi’i yul gdan drangs te/ rGya’i yul gyi Ce’u mub dang zhes bya ba rgyal sar bton nas lo bcu gcig lon pa’i dus su lcags yos lo la bcom ldan ’das lha’i yul du dbyar zla ba gsum mi’i yul du byon pa’i dus su tsan dan gyi sku mchog ’di (f.154b) bcom ldan ’das la dbu bkug nas sku kham s ’ dri ba’i tshul du bzhangs te/ de nas bcom ldan ’das phyag brkyang te sku mchog de nyid lha mi’i don rgya chen po mdzad par gyur ro zhes bka’ stsal te/ de nas zung nas tsan
As for a brief treatment of the Chinese version concerning how the Tsan dan Jo bo statue came to exist [during the period] between the birth of the Buddha and his enlightenment, during the time of the Tshe’u dynasty, in the twenty-fourth regnal year after the fourth prince Ce’u dbang took over the throne, [Shakyamuni] was born on the eighth day of the fourth month of the year of the wood tiger. His mother, sGyum chen po, died seven days after [delivering] and passed to the land of the gods. Forty-two years after King Ce’u dbang’s took over the throne, Prince Don grub, having reached nineteen years of age, abandoned his household and went to practise penance in the snow mountains. In water sheep, three years after Mu dbang, the fifth generation in the Ce’u dynasty, took over the throne, rgyal bu Don grub attained enlightenment at thirty years of age. Eight years later, thinking of his mother’s kindness, he went to the paradise of the Thirty-three Gods and preached the religion to his mother. He stayed in the paradise for three months. King U tra ya na [of Wa ra na se] asked Mou gal bu about making an image of the Buddha.
Mou gal bu gathered thirty–two miraculous artists along with dark red sandalwood, and brought them to the paradise. They made a statue of the Buddha complete with his thirty–two distinctive marks, which was brought to the world of the humans. Eleven years after Mun dbang, [ruler of] the Ce’u of China, took over the throne, in the year of the iron hare, having completed his three month summer retreat, [the Buddha] returned to the world of the humans. This extraordinary Tsan dan statue

2 The dark red variety of sandalwood used for the statue of Buddha Shakyamuni is named tsan dan gor shi sa by the Tibetan tradition (spelled go shirsha in Dung dkar Blo bzang ‘phrin las, Tshig mdzod chen mo p.1652b lines 16–17).

On the issue of the various kinds of sandalwood, the most precious or perhaps the one with the most legendary properties is the tsan dan sbrul gyi snying po, apparently called so because snakes seem to be attracted by its scent. It seemingly is found in South India and a piece of it, together with the statue of sPyan ras gzigs bCu gcig zhal with eight arms in the same species of tree, the yi dam of Srong btsan sgam po, was collected by the miraculous dge slong Shri la a ka ra ma ti and placed as consecrational object inside the clay statue of bCu gcig zhal of Licchavi manufacture, made for installation in Ra sa ’Phrul snang during the time of Srong btsan sgam po (Nyi ma’i rgyal rabs p.359,5–p.360,3): “The miraculous monk Shri la A ka ra ma ti, who had been sent to rGya gar, came back carrying with him a sPyan ras gzigs bCu gcig zhal with eight arms, one khru in size, made of tsan dan sbrul gyi snying po which spontaneously came from a great sandalwood tree in South India; one piece of tsan dan sbrul gyi snying po; one piece of tsan dan gor shi sha from the Po ta la; one bundle of grass from rGya mtsho Glo; a mchod rten with a bum pa coming from grong khyer Ke ru; (p.360) a relic from the Sangs rgyas gsum; [a piece of] the Bodhi tree and sand from the gnas chen brgyad as much as one bre; the sand from the bank of the Ne ra dza ra (spelled so for Na ra dza ra), wetted by the water from bCom ldan ’das’s bowl; and jewels, as much as one bre. These were used to fill the interior of the bCu gcig zhal statue that was made”.

Among the several sources dealing with these miraculous findings, the earlier Bla ma dam pa bSod nams rgyal mtshan’s rGyal rabs gsal ba’i me long (completed in 1368) tells a slightly dissimilar story (ibid. p.79 lines 5–16). It says that this self–originated yi dam statue of Srong btsan sgam po, made of tsan dan sbrul gyi rnying po, was found in South India on the shore of the ocean deviding it from Singh la, but does not talk about the piece of the same material used as consecrational object inside the Ra sa ’Phrul snang image and the other findings.

The Ra sa ’Phrul snang’s bCu gcig zhal statue survived until the Cultural Revolution when the temple was desecrated. My friend Tamdin Dorje Tuladhahr, who was a young man in those days in IHa sa trying to do what he could to help his fellow Tibetans, has told me in one of our conversations that, when the statue was torn to pieces, the heroics of the rGyud smad monk Byams pa rgyal mtshan saved the main head, a secondary head and the piece of tsan dan sbrul gyi sning po. They were eventually taken to Dharamshala for safe keeping.
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(f.154b) was made in the act of bending one’s head to the Buddha and enquiring about his health (bcom ldan ’das la dbu bkug nas sku khaps ’dri ba’i tshul du bzhengs). Then the bcom ldan ’das, after prostrating to the extraordinary statue in sheer delight, uttered the following prophecy: “1,000 years after my nirvana, [my statue] will go to the great realm of China and will render a great service to both the lha–s and the humans”. The extraordinary statue stayed in India for 1,285 years starting from that point. It remained in the land of Li yul, known as Ku sen, for eighty–six years. Then it remained at Byang ngos in Mi nyag for forty years. Then it remained in Kyin cha ja zur for seventeen years. Then it remained in Byang gNam for 173 years. Then it remained in the region of Ha nam for 367 years. [The statue] then went back to Byang gNam and remained there for twenty–one years. After it had been at Thin ho for nine years, it went to the north in iron pig year**. It stayed with the community known as Sang shi in Cung do. The Zhang si community of the Su is nowadays the Shing ngan. [The statue] remained twenty years in the castle of the Cung kyin si, known as Sang. Then while it was for the third year at the capital of rgyal po Thing of the bCung ci dynasty, it was taken to Cung in water sheep 1163 and remained in its royal palace for fifty–five years. Then during the time of the king known as Da’ cha’u, the Hor came and destroyed the royal palace on the ninth of the third month of fire ox 1217. Since it remained with the Shing ngan si community at a place where it had been previously received by the Cang shus ja ’kun gyi tsi even at present, veneration (f.155a) is paid [to the statue]. Forty–seven years elapsed from me glang (fire ox 1217) up to [the present] chu phag (water pig 1263); 2,055 years elapsed from the making of this excellent Tsan dan Jo bo statue up to this chu phag (water pig 1263) (i.e. made in 791 BCE). On the basis of this system, 2,013 years elapsed from the parinirvana up to this chu phag (749 BCE). [This account] in the historiographical text known as Cung ends [here]. In brief, on the thirteenth [day] of the second month of fire female pig (1227) [this work] was translated from Chinese by the Yo gur translator Am chang, and [then in 1263] from the Yo gur language into the Tibetan language by Da na si, two [translators] in all”.

Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul is essentially a bstan rtsis (or “chronological table”) of the sandalwood statue’s presence in various localities within a widespread stretch of lands of Central Asia and China after it was moved there from India. It can be subdivided into two spans of time of remarkably uneven duration. The first one covers a very long period (seemingly some one millennium and a half). The second one concerns events happening
during the 100 years or so preceding the writing of the Chinese chronicle, namely Cung, from which *Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul* draws information.

The first chronology covering centuries and centuries is questionable, for it does not match the shorter and successive chronology which seems to be reliable. One and a half extra *rab byung* or sexagenary cycle seems to have been added to it. There is a further small discrepancy of five years, which does not help again to harmonise the two chronologies with one another. These five years should be discounted from the calculations possibly because calendrical peculiarities must have occurred in that long span of time.

I wonder whether the number of years during which the Tsan dan Jo bo remained in India is at the basis of the excess in the computation. This would bring the date of the transfer of the Tsan dan Jo bo from India to Central Asia—to Li yul according to *Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul*, to Kucha according to the legends mentioned by Terentiev—closer to the life time of Kumārajīva (344–409). However, a substantial difference in time remains between the two sets of accounts, for *Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul* would fix the transfer of the statue from India to the beginning of the 5th century even after the amendment that deduces one and a half sexagenary cycle, while the above mentioned legends place it during the 4th.

**Dubious chronology**
(covering the earlier period in the existence of the Tsan dan Jo bo)
- made in 791 BCE, the statue was kept in India for 1285 years;
- $91 - 1285 = 493$ CE, year of its transfer to Li yul;
- $493 + 86 = 578$, year of its transfer to Byang ngos;
- $578 + 49 = 614$, year of its transfer to Kyin cha ja zur;
- $614 + 17 = 630$, year of its transfer to Byang gNam;
- $630 + 173 = 802$, year of its transfer to Ha nam;
- $802 + 367 = 1168$, year in which it went back to Byang gNam;
- $1168 + 21 = 1188$, year of its transfer to Thin;
- $1188 + 9 = 1196$, year of its transfer to the north; it stayed with the Sang shi community in Cung do;
- $1191 + 19 = 1210$, year of its transfer to the capital of rgyal po Thing of the bCung ci dynasty.

**Sounder chronology**
(covering events in the years 1131–1263)
- iron pig 1131, year of its transfer to the north, where it was kept by the Sang shi
community in Cung do; it stayed twenty years in the Sang castle of the Cung kyin si;

- 1131 + 19 = 1150, year of its transfer to the capital of rgyal po Thing of the bCung ci dynasty;
- water sheep 1163, year of its transfer to Cung, at the royal palace;
- 1163 + 55 = 1217, year of its transfer to the Shing ngan si community, at a place where it had been previously kept by the Cang shus ja ’kun gyi tsi (i.e. Cung do?), after the Hor destroyed the royal palace of King Da’ cha’u on the ninth of the third month of this year;
- 1217 + 49 = 1263 it has been kept at the same locality for the last forty–seven years and it was still there at the time of writing.

In approaching the material on the Tsan dan Jo bo I have proceeded chronologically, beginning with the earliest document. I first translated Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul before considering the modern article by Hwang sMin zhin bSod nams rgya mtsho (“Tsan dan Jo bo’i lo rgyus”, sBrang char 1986,2 (originally in Chinese), see Appendix Three) which makes use of both this text and the short monograph on the Tsan dan Jo bo by lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje (1717–1786) (Tsan dan Jo bo’i lo rgyus skor tshad phan von mdom bsdus rin po che’i ’phreng ba, see Appendix Two). Hwang sMin zhin bSod nams rgya mtsho’s article, based on an analysis of the 1263 document, is an excellent compendium of the two texts: it deals with Tsan dan gyi sku rGya nag sa na bzhugs pa’i byon tshul, which ends its treatment in 1263, and with the historical excursus penned by lCang skya for the centuries thereafter. It calculates the length of the Tsan dan statue’s stay at the localities mentioned in both works and attempts geographical identifications. The works of Hwang sMin zhin bSod nams rgya mtsho and lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje have been accordingly appended below for the reader’s perusal. Devoting some attention to them is highly recommended.

TIBETAN CULTIC EVIDENCE:
THE GNAS RNYING SCROLL

Hardly any major evidence is available that the sandalwood image was worshipped in Tibet. Unlike the plethora of replicas of the Po ta la’s ’Phags pa Lokeshvara and sKyid grong’s ’Phags pa Wa ti bzang po, the Tsan dan Jo bo seldom appears in the religious imagery of the plateau, its depiction being confined to scanty and rather insignificant pieces of statuary.³

³ I am indebted to my friend Amy Heller for sending me, besides old and recent pictures of the scroll, the photograph of a small bronze that bears a striking resemblance to the Tsan dan Jo bo (fig.2), enough to be legitimately considered a replica of the sandalwood statue.
The exception to this almost complete neglect is a single but significant religious specimen documenting, besides the above mentioned literary references, that the cult of the Tsan dan Jo bo did reach Tibet. This object is preserved in a monastery of Tibet with steadfast links to Sikkim during the centuries before the loss of Tibetan independence. It is, therefore, fitting that the present article should be published in the Bulletin of Tibetology, a journal that deals with Tibetan culture often from a 'Bras ljong–oriented perspective.

In the early days of my studies of the Tibetan culture I tended to approach the Tsan dan Jo bo in terms of the tenuous historical implications that derive from the phases the statue underwent in the course of centuries owing to Vostrikov’s work, who dedicates a few sentences in his volume (Tibetan Historical Literature) to the Tsan dan Jo bo in connection with the dates of the life of the historical Buddha.

Years ago Andrey Terentiev gave a lecture on great Russian Tibetologists at the LTWA (Dharamshala). This was a good occasion for me to talk with him about Vostrikov, one of the true pioneers in the studies. We ended up briefly speaking about the Tsan dan Jo bo. Terentiev did not spend too many words about it. He only said that the statue would make a perfect topic for another lecture. Knowing that he had dedicated several years to the study of the Tsan dan Jo bo, I asked him if he could teach me something about it. I am obliged to him for spending one afternoon talking to me about it.

There was a follow–up to this in November 2011 in Delhi, when he gifted me a copy of the monograph on the statue (The Sandalwood Buddha of the King Udayana) he had published in 2010.

Just after conceiving the idea of working on a piece dedicated to a great Jo bo statue for the Bulletin of Tibetology, a picture of the famous gNas rnying scroll caught my eye while perusing publications. It took only a few seconds to realise that the painting was a depiction of the Tsan dan Jo bo. This identification was facilitated by the visual documentation published by Terentiev in his book. The features which made me realise that the gNas rnying scroll (cm. 250x130) is a portrait of the sandalwood statue of Buddha Shakyamuni (see fig.3, 4 and 5) are:

- the Buddha’s physiognomy;
- his eyes which are slightly gnam gzigs (or “staring at the sky”, in search of spiritual inspiration) (see fig.6 and 7);
- the mudra–s;

4 The gnam gzigs pictorial solution is an old Buddhist tradition that has found its way in Tibet, too. Proverbial are, for instance, the portraits of the Great Fifth Blo bzang ngag dbang rgya mtsho (1617–1682), whose most accurate depictions are those with his eyes staring at the sky.
the shape and folds of the robe;
- the overall post–Gandharan style of the image; and
- the reddish–white jewel secured to the front of the ushnisha.

There are many depictions of standing Buddha–s in Tibet with the same mudra–s as the Tsan dan Jo bo, but the Tsan dan Jo bo is stylistically different from the Buddha statuary that flourished there. Despite the many layers of restoration applied to it down through the centuries, it has a general Gandharan look that makes it quite recognisable in comparison with other renditions of Shakyamuni.

The silk scroll depicts the Tsan dan Jo bo in a red robe standing on a lotus pedestal against a greyish background. One bla ma is placed in each upper corner. Two inscriptions (one in Chinese on the actual left of the statue, the other in Tibetan on the actual right, as prescribed by bilingual etiquette) are written on either side of the image.

An extremely brief description of the sandalwood statue is found in sde srid Songs rgyas rgya mtsho’s Bai du rya g.ya sel (p.644 line 5). It says that the image has a robe with folds and brocade borders, the ushnisha displays a flaming crystal resplendent with light, and the hands and feet bear the mark of the wheel; and concludes that the statue is endowed with the power to stop the movement of 100 suns in the sky. The term adopted in the text to refer to the jewel (me shel) is rather mysterious and Tibetans, knowledgeable for their command of the language, are hesitant to identify it with any precious stone.

Indeed the gNas rnying scroll translates pictorially the sde srid’s description of the gem in the ushnisha of the Jo bo scroll. The jewel ornamenting the head of the Tsan dan Jo bo has a transparent core that renders well how a crystal (shel) looks like, surrounded by a vibrant red area that aims at reminding one of flames (me). This visual solution shows that there was a tradition about the manner of portraying the Tsan dan Jo bo, which travelled the centuries from the early 15th to the late 17th at least. Elsewhere outside Tibet the jewel was rendered in the artist’s vision in a different way (see below fig.8 for a painting of the Tsan dan Jo bo in the Seryoji, Kyoto, wich has a red jewel in his crown).

Despite my convinction that the gNas rnying scroll depicts the famed sandalwood statue of Buddha Shakyamuni, I was not immediately able to confirm my intuition. My pictures of the scroll, taken way back in 1986 and more importantly my 1986 transcription of the Tibetan inscription were momentarily inaccessible to me, kept as they are inside a container in Europe, while I am living in the Himalaya. I had not paid much attention to the gNas rnying scroll in the past, even during my study of bSwi gung nyams med Rin chen’s gNas rnying skyes bu rnams kyi rnam thar, also known as Gyen tho chen mo (see, for instance,
my article for the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, entitled “The history of the lineages of gNas rnying summarized as its “ten greatesses” (a survey of the period from the second half of the 8th century to the beginning of the Sa skya pa rule”). In the 1980s I considered the scroll a fascinating work but not enough to write an article about it. The fact that I had in the meantime developed interest in the Tsan dan Jo bo lately sent me back to it.

It was the benevolent unfolding of karma that Thomas Laird was in Dharamshala in those days, and we bumped into one another. I found out that he had pictures of the scroll’s inscriptions with him, which he generously put at my disposal. I was also eventually able to get my transcription of the gNas rnying scroll inscription from Europe, and it is that which I am publishing here (see fig.9 for a picture of the Tibetan epigraph on the scroll and the Appendix below for my transcription). That the contents of the Chinese inscription, which I did not transcribe then (I do not read Chinese), are similar to the Tibetan epigraph was confirmed by my friend Elliot Sperling to whom I am grateful (see fig.10).

The first line of the Tibetan inscription states that the image on the scroll is indeed a Ta Ming depiction of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue, conceived as a praise to the sandalwood image. It reads:

“Ta’i Ming rgyal pos mdzad pa’i Tsan dan gyi Jo bo’i sku gzugs la bstod pa ni//”;
“This is an encomium of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue, composed by the Ta’i Ming emperor”.

This attribution has significant consequences. Both the 1263 text included in the Peking edition of the bsTan ’gyur (already showing that more attention was paid to the statue outside the borders of Tibet) and the Ta Ming scroll are cultural imports into Tibet rather than autochthonous or spontaneous expressions of a Tsan dan Jo bo cult.

The scroll dates to 1412 (the tenth Yung–lo year) and was painted and donated under the imperial patronage of Cheng–tzu, for the last line of the inscription reads:

“Yung lo bcu pa lo’i zla ba bzhi pa’i bcu bdun gi (sic) nyin//”;
“The seventeenth day of the fourth month of the tenth Yung lo year”.

The scroll’s inscription is a eulogy of the Tsan dan image. Despite the fact that comes from the imperial throne, the genre relates to the religious sphere, so that the typical features of an edict—the expressions of secular authority—are absent altogether. It does not open, then, with the typical official formulae of imperial court pronouncements, only one line attributing patronage of both the painting and the inscriptions to the emperor. The epigraph goes on to describe the legendary circumstances surrounding the creation of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue.
In concentrating on the significance of the sandalwood statue, it says next to nothing about the background to the making of the gNas rnying scroll. There is no indication of the recipient of the scroll, which suggests that the scroll was not painted with a specific future owner in mind. This may mean that more than one scroll of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue was painted and sent out (to Tibet or elsewhere?). The only other historical allusion in the epigraph to the circumstances of its making, besides its imperial origin, is the date of the inscription (and the painting) in its last line.

The epigraph can be subdivided into the following parts:
- the above mentioned opening, which attributes the encomium of the Tsan dan Jo bo and the making of the scroll to the Ta Ming emperor Cheng–tzu;
- verses in honour of the sandalwood image, other eulogistic expressions and religious admonitions;
- dates in the life of the historical Buddha related to the reign of Chinese emperors;
- the circumstances that led to the making of the statue and the identities of the Chinese rulers reigning during the life of the Buddha;
- a reference to its transfer to China;
- succinct (and insignificant) statements on the circumstances surrounding the making of the scroll;
- further eulogies of the teachings and the statue;
- the date of the inscription.

The scroll is an early Tibetan appraisal of the statue. Its making falls after the end of the Yuan dynasty, whose most important emperor, Khubilai Khan, is documented as having been especially devoted to the Tsan dan Jo bo (see ICang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje’s text included in this article). This means that, at least in this case, the Ta Ming did not subvert cultural values established during the rule of the Mongols of China.

Another major point about the gNas rnying scroll is that, apart from the 1263 text in the bsTan ’gyur which is not originally Tibetan, the painting predates the indigenous literature dedicated to the statue by several centuries. This establishes that the cult of the Tsan dan Jo bo in Tibet, although perhaps restricted to some enclaves, was sensibly earlier than most of the local literature which focus on it. However, the gNas rnying scroll must have not been an isolated donation to a Tibetan monastery during the Yung–lo reign, given this emperor’s munificence in favour of Tibetans.

The Tibetan inscription neither records the involvement of Chinese or Tibetan religious masters nor does it mention the name of the artist who painted the image or the person who penned the eulogy.
In the absence of accompanying epigraphs, the two bla ma–s in the top corners of the gNas rnying scroll are difficult to identify. They seem to be Tibetan and this would mean that the scroll was made for a Tibetan destination, but the matter is more complex than at first glance (see the postscript below).

A FEW REMARKS ON THE SI/ZI THANG GENRE
OF THE GNAS RNYING SCROLL

In his work on artistic styles entitled *Kun gsal tshon gyi las rim me tog mdangs ster ’ja ’od ’bum byin*, De’u dmar dge bshes bsTan ’dzin phun tshogs (b.1665?) associates the Tsan dan Jo bo with the Zi/Si thang (also Si’u thang) style of China. He says that the idiom, whose creation he assigns to Zi thun phu sa then, a minister who served under an unspecified Chinese ruler, was originally formulated when he painted a picture of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue.

De’u dmar dge bshes’s description of the style echoes features of Chinese landscape painting in Western understanding but ones with a more articulated colour palette, and adds that the idiom underwent developments after the Tsan dan Jo bo’s basic depiction. This is supported by his description of such stylistic developments in the Si/Zi thang style as do not in fact matching the features of the gNas rnying scroll.

The Tsan dan Jo bo painting at gNas rnying is thus an early 15th century specimen of the Si/Zi thang style, which in turn goes back to remarkable but imprecise antiquity. Hence the “famous gNas rnying si thang” mentioned by David Jackson (*A History of Tibetan Painting* p.111–112) is the Yung–lo scroll of 1412, although he thinks it was a different one. Coming from China and depicting the Tsan dan Jo bo, the gNas rnying scroll is a rare extant specimen of the Si/Zi thang style in Tibet, in a formulation that is close to the original conception of this idiom.

With reference to the adoption of the Si/Zi thang style on the plateau, De’u dmar dge bshes says that it was first diffused in Tibet during the time of Khri srong lde btsan. Although this may be another stereotypical association of religious activities undertaken during the imperial period (in this case a style used to depict images of the deities) with that king, it is possible that the Tibetans relied on an artistic tradition of China during the period of this king’s reign.

However, the little that exists in what literary references say it is the Si/Zi thang style, are works of art which seem to have been executed in China itself. No specimens of the related and derivative Si/Zi thang style from Tibet which allegedly arose during the reign of Khri srong lde btsan are mentioned in the literature, although there may be cases in the sources that have escaped my attention.

In his autobiography, Si tu Pan chen Chos kyi ’byung gnas defines as in the Si/Zi thang tradition a painting of the mdzad pa bcu gnyis/gnas brtan bcu drug,
which was especially inspirational for him when formulating his own unique style (*Dri bral shel gyi me long*, f.78b line 3ff).

The wondrous visionary scroll painting created at the Chinese court and offered in fire pig 1407 to the fifth Karma pa De bzhin gshegs pa (1384–1415) by the the Yung–lo emperor Cheng–tzu (the same ruler who had the gNas rnying scroll painted) belongs to the genre is known as the Si thang ngo mtshar ‘ja’ sa (see *Precious Deposits Volume Three: Yuan Dynasty and Ming Dynasty* p.94–137). *Thang ka*–s donated by this emperor to dGa’ ldan are considered to be Si/ Zi thang–s.5

All this indicates that the physical support of these paintings is not the determinative criterion for qualifying as a Si/Zi thang. Indeed De’u mar says that Si/Zi thang were painted on silk, cotton or paper. The first of the three supports was the most favoured choice, given that Si/Zi thang itself is the Chinese term for this type of material. Neither is the pictorial genre the decisive factor, there being a wide range of subjects. Rather it is the style, applied in different themes and on different supports, although principally on silk.6 The use of the Si/Zi thang pictorial technique and related material support underwent an evolution in the Si/Zi thang style down through the centuries, the assessment of which is a task for Sinologists and art historians.

Structurally the gNas rnying scroll is related to at least one specimen from China published by Terentiev (see fig.11) with lengthy inscriptions occupying the entire space left free by the statue’s image on both sides, and one short epigraph

---

5 In the group of Si’u thang–s donated to dGa’ ldan by the Yung–lo emperor there were works depicting the gNas bRtan bcu drug (Phur bu lcog Ngag dbang byams pa, *Grva sa chen po bzhi* f.15a line 3: “gNas bRtan bcu drug sogs kyi si’u thang ngo mtshar ba nyis shu rtsa drug”), and also the rGyals chen bzhi and gSangs ‘dus. These *thang ka*–s were unveiled in the *gtsug lag khang* for a few days on the sixth month of every year during a festival named the dGa’ ldan Si’u thang, manifestly called so after the type of paintings on display.

6 Do Si/Zi thang–s embody the transfer of the *patra* style from India to China, based on a rendition that has features of a post–Gandhara idiom? Is Si thang corresponding to *patra*? Rather than an original Chinese style, as De’u dmar says, does it represent the adoption of an Indian pictorial genre in China? This possibility cannot be ruled out, however remote. From the little that is known about the ancient Indian painted scrolls, one can say that *patra*–s were eminently religious, whereas Si/Zi thang–s dealt with natural and secular themes. Indeed there was reluctance in the Indian tradition to include details of nature and everyday life in paintings during the periods prior to the advent of the Pala dynasty, during which restrained use of naturalistic details was made to fill limited areas in the background. However, the original Si/Zi thang style, represented by the Tsan dan Jo bo paintings, seems to have been devoid of naturalistic or daily life details.
in Tibetan reading “dGa’ ldan khri ba bzang”. However, the gNas rnying scroll’s is a much more faithful renditon of the statue in that it echoes the Gandharan style distantly and does not display Chinese physiognomic traits, unlike the work published by Terentiev.

The presence of two bla ma–s in the upper corners of the gNas rnying painting directly links the scroll to the world of the plateau given the masters depicted on it, a typical feature of the Tibetan art lexicon. In the absence of comparative works, it is difficult, however, to suggest an artistic paternity of the painting, whether a Chinese Si/Zi thang or the opus of a Tibetan painter in China.

It is a vivid and realistic depiction of the statue and contains Tibetan elements of the type one would expect of a Tibetan adaptation of the Si/Zi thang style of China painted beyond rather than on the plateau, the latter case said by De’u dmar to be rare.

FAINT HISTORICAL SIGNS

The scroll inscription does not devote a single word to the circumstances surrounding the donation of the painting to gNas rnying. This seems to indicate that the painting was not commissioned specifically for its abbot or the monastery.

No reference to the scroll is found in the sources that deal with gNas rnying, including Myangchos 'byung and Si tu Chos kyi rgya mtsho’s dBus gTsang gnas yig, not to mention the gNas rnying gdan rabs monograph dedicated to this monastery, entitled sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar. One would be led to doubt that the scroll was originally meant for gNas rnying, were it not for a passage in Rab brtan kun bzang 'phags kyi rnam thar that links its abbot with activities undertaken by the Yung–lo emperor of benefit to this monastery’s throne holder soon after the completion of the scroll.

Rab brtan kun bzang phags kyi rnam thar (p.49 line 18–p.50 line 18) says:
“In particular, during that year (i.e. 1413), upon the occasion of the emperor Ye wang sending an invitation to chos rje pan chen Sha ri pu tra, [appointments] were announced to many sde dpon of dBus gTsang [note in the text: [what was sanctioned were] offerings to chos rje Theg chen [and] the Karma pa; (p.50) a golden roof cover at mTshur phu; the title of ta’i gu shri to bdag po bZhi thog pa, a ’ja’ sa [granting] the dbang [rank] to bdag po dBang pa and [the title of] gu shri to his younger brother, an order [bestowing the title of] gu shri on the sNar thang mkhan chen pa and the gNas rnying mkhan chen pa, a si tu’u ’ja’ sa for Hor bSod nams dpal ba and IHo pa Grags pa dpal; a whitewashing of the ’Phags pa Shing kun mchod rten; and a ’ja’ sa for the dBus pa to take over the abbotship of lHa khang chen mo]. Five ta bzhin, headed by the ha ho ta bzhin and the
gsung ta bzhin, together with a retinue of 500, left from the great palace on the eighth day of the fifth month of that year [to convey the orders] and reached [their destination] during the twelfth month.

Having received the [imperial] order, the chos kyi rgyal po (i.e. Rab brtan kun bzang 'phags) and his brother (i.e. Rab 'byor bzang po) went to Pho brang rtse (i.e. rGyal mkhar rtse). They escorted [one of the] ta bzhin from Tshong 'dus [gur mo]. On the fifth day, a 'ja`sa was read out. Rab brtan kun bzang 'phags was given the rank of yung lo ho ta si tu and awarded the great distinction of a tham ga (spelled so) with a knob, made of one bre chen of silver. Arrangements were made [for him to use] a red personal seal from that year on. Likewise an order was issued for the benefit of his younger brother Rab 'byor bzang po bestowing upon him [the rank] of nang chen and a tham ga (spelled so). The grants [for the sde dpon–s of dBus gTsang] were sanctioned [by] the various ta bzhin in the presence [of Sha ri pu tra, when he,] the chos rje pan chen, was in [La stod] Byang. Although in a few documents it is stated that the above mentioned orders were announced in the second month of the year of the horse 1414, [the dates mentioned by me] are correct”.

The date 1412 that appears in the inscription of the Tsan dan Jo bo scroll helps to attribute both the making of the painting and its donation to gNas rnying within the abbotship of ’Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan (1364–1422), an important gdan sa of this monastery.

Rin chen rgyal mtshan was born at Byang gi phug pa of gcung mchog dkar gnas ’og;7 was ordained to the rab tu byung vow in 1373, and ten years later, in 1383, to the bsnyen rdzogs vow at mDon rtsa.8 He ascended the abbatial throneof

---

7 sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.41b lines 3–4): “[’Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] was born, amidst extraordinary signs, at Byang gi phug pa of gCung mChog dkar gnas ’og on the eighth of tha skar zla ba of wood male dragon 1364, under the waxing moon. When he was three months old, rnam mkhyen Rin chen bsam gtan named him Chos skyed rgyal mtshan”.

8 sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.42b line 3–6): “Upon reaching twenty years of age (1383), according to the saying: “One cannot receive the next [teachings] without the bsnyen par rdzogs pa vow”, in order to enter into the successive stages of teachings [’Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] was ordained to the bsnyen rdzogs vow at mDo rtsa by gu ru Shes rab byang chub [acting] as mKhan po, mkhas grub IHa dbang as slas slob, Rong pa bSod nams lhun grub as gsang ston, rTogs ldan Grub pa dpal mgon as dus go ba, [and in the presence of] chos rje Ba ri ba, chos rje Chos rgyal etc., in the middle of twenty–five dge slong, on the fourth of dbyug pa zla ba of water male rat (i.e. wood male rat 1384?), with the waxing moon”.
gNas rnying in water female ox 1373,⁹ and held it until his death.¹⁰ He was a master calligrapher of the eighteen forms of Tibetan script, an erudite in the disciplines of palmistry, mathematics, linguistics (sgra’i sa rig), all astrological sciences, medicine and pharmacology. He was a great abbot, a patron of the literature and the arts,¹¹ and had a special knack for assisting the secular elite of his day in the

⁹ skyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.42a lines 2–6): “When he was eight years old (1371), [’Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] received many teachings from rnam mkhen dKa’ bzhi pa, such as bKa’ gdam Lam rim and Chos spyod thar rgyun. He received rTa mgrin yang gsang from mkhan po Rin chen blo gros. When he was aged ten (1373), thinking to go to dGa’ ba gdong to be ordained, dpal ldan bla ma dam pa bSod nams rgyal mtshan said: “Today a noble being will come. I dreamt last night that the bka’ srung—s were surrounding phags pa Don yod shags pa”. After that, this rje arrived. He was ordained by Sa skya pa chos kyi rje dpal ldan bla ma dam pa bSod nams rgyal mtshan [acting] as mkhan po, Brag thog pa gZhon nu tshul khrims as slas slob, rdo rje ’dzin pa bSod nams dpal as grib tshad pa and slob dpon Kun ’byung as dus go ba, in brief, in the midst of many thousands of monks who came from our own gNas rnying—residents and visitors. He was given the other name rin chen rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po. Then, in water female ox (1373), on the occasion of taking dngos grub on the fourteenth of tha skar zla ba at dpal gnas rnying, with ta’i si tu ’Phags pa rin chen as sponsor, the yon mchod (i.e. ’Phags pa rin chen) having been convened (zhal rgyas), the rje rin po che was elevated to the great throne”.

¹⁰ skyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.45b line 5): “In water male tiger (1422) when he was fifty–nine years old, [’Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] died on the tenth of Hor zla [ba], at dawn”.

¹¹ skyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.45a line 2–f.45b line 1): “On one occasion, [’Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] made editions of rare or damaged manuscripts of Tantric texts belonging to sngags rnying ma and gsar ma, rGyud and rGyud sde bzhi, translated both before and after pandi ta sMri ti and lo chen Rin chen bzang po; of the three Vehicles—long, middle length and short—all of them accurately made; as well as authentic works from rIndia and China. [All these collections] were complete editions. They were made for Zha (spelled so) lu, Chos lung, bSam yas and La stod Byang, for sTod and sMad. He offered beautifully decorated wrappers, wood covers [for those books], and rkong rdzes (sic for bskang rdzas?, i.e. substances used to appease the protective deities?). He appointed a keeper [and] an administrator [to look after these items]. These were installed in Zur spe lha khang. Moreover, with dedicated effort, he collected precious materials from far and near, precious brocades from rGya [and] Hor, gold and silver, a beautiful shining image of the ston pa rin po che (i.e. Buddha) with decorations and a robe, and an auspicious banner. He bought them with no thought to the price. Having summoned mtheb dpon (“chief thumb”, i.e. supreme artist) dPal ’byor rin chen and dpon bKra shis dpon, master painters and stitchers, he restored their vows and blessed their instruments. The appliqué masters involved in the work (lag len pa) rendered great service, under the guidance of this rje, concerning the measurements (bso’i chag tshad), the placement of the gods (lha’i gral bkod); the colour combinations (kha rtog gi spel); the cutting (gras) and tailoring
handling of political affairs. Given his skills in the field of religion and politics and his widespread knowledge, I think of him as a second bla ma dam pa. By the way, he did indeed take the rab tu byung vow from the great Sa akya master bSod nams rgyal mtshan himself.

Rin chen rgyal mtshan was the catalyst of a gTsang pa alliance for decades, the political sympathies of which leaned towards Sa skya and had ambitions to exercise its rule over the region before the surge to power of the Rin spungs pa princes,12 despite being largely subservient to the Phag mo gru pa of rTsed thang. A passage in sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.44a line 7–f.44b line 6) illustrates the political make–up of this alliance, composed of fifteen members of important families that included three generations of Shar kha pa princes (ta’i si tu ‘Phags pa rin chen, nang chen Kun dga’ ’phags and Rab brtan kun bzang ’phags); rulers of rTse chen (such as ta’i si tu bSod nams dpal yab sras, i.e this ruler and his sons rGya mtsho and Rin chen ’phags pa; see rGya Bod yig tshang p.384 lines 5–7); Hin du lHun grub rgyal mtshan, the lord of Ya ‘brog; the Thar pa mkhan chen (i.e. of the dPyal family from Man lung) and Zhwa lu mkhan chen (i.e. of the lCe family from this locality).13

(tshem) of the images of the ston pa rin po che and the gNas bBrtan bcu drug, bearing mantra–s painted in saffron and the gso sbyong gi mdo (the “mdo to restore vows”), with 102 bundles (yug) of brocade, 60 bundles (yug) of silk, two times four gan chung (?), two times seven ber thul (?), one gsang lam (?), two bundles (yug) of thon ti (?), a number of squares of gros (?) and silk, and uncountable pearls for the robes. This aesthetically pleasing gos sku chen mo, which is worth seeing, hearing of, remembering and venerating by everyone, must be traditionally praised, for it leads people on the great path of virtue. Because of his wide–ranging compassion—a great chariot of the teachings—([‘Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] was enthroned as the chos kyi rgyal po of the three realms”.

12 sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.43a line 2–3): “When [‘Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan] was twenty–two years old, in the ox year (wood female ox 1385), [a disagreement] arose between Shar kha ba snga gsar (the “earlier and later generations” [of the Shar kha pa family]). Despite his being compelled to sit as mediator at their meeting place in mDa’ rdo, they did not listen to him and there was a misconception that he was taking sides. He did not pursue matters further (thugs cung sgyid lug (“lazy, passive”) pas), and confined himself to hermitages”. But he was eventually called back (ibid. f.43a line 3).

13 sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.44a line 7–f.44b line 6): “He was a master of vig rigs bco brgyad (the “eighteen types of scripts”), palmistry, mathematics, sgra’i sa rig (idiomatic expressions?), the whole science of rtsis (“astrological calculations”) and medical science which are important. Through his a great contribution to pharmacology, people were freed from diseases. First of all, in order to benefit sentient beings, he was the abbot of dpal gNas rnying, the gdan sa gong ’og (“upper and lower main seat”) and of its branch monasteries. He [gave assistance to wielders of]
The religious masters with whom he interacted included rje btsun Red mda’ pa, Tsong kha pa, gZhon nu rgyal mchog, rGyal ba bSod seng, IHo rGyam pa, Byamschos pa, mkhas btsun Yon tan grags, the La ston, the Kong ston, the dGas rong dka’ bcu pa, Grangs chen Kun dga’ dpal, mKhas grub rje dGe legs dpal (1385–1438) and the four abbots of the Tshogs sde bzhi.14

He was the last mkhan po of gNas rnying doctrinally affiliated to the Sa skya school. In 1427, a few years after Rin chen rgyal mtshan’s death (1422), mKhas grub rje dGe legs dpal took refuge at gNas rnying after his falling out with Rab brtan kun bzang ’phags at rGyal rtse. He was visited there by rGyal tshab rje Dharma rin chen (1364–1432), the great disciple of Tsong kha pa, and the dGe lugs pa history of the monastery began around that time.

The circumstances surrounding the 1413 grant are another point that is not elucidated in the literature. The gift of the basics of a royal cult (the sandalwood statue itself was kept in the palace of the Yung-lo emperor) to religious practitioners of Tibet in the form of a painting depicting the Tsan dan Jo bo apparently took place without the involvement of any local secular power. The scroll inscription does not say a word in this regard, leaving open the possibility that the donation occurred under the auspices of the Shar kha principality of rGyal rtse, given that its chieftains (Rab brtan kun bzang ’phags and Rab ’byor bzang po) under whom gNas rnying was at the time, were awarded patents. The biography of the rGyal rtse prince does not provide reasons for such entitlements.

All one can surmise is that the present affair was a typical case of the Ming policy to extend recognition to religious masters (e.g. the gu shri title to the gNas
rnying mkhan po and the award of the scroll) and the promotion of a policy of minimal political interference in Tibet. But several of those who received titles on the occasion were lay dignitaries.

As mentioned above, sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar is not profuse on the subject of contacts between the monastery and the Chinese court during the abbotship of 'Jam dbyangs rin chen rgyal mtshan or at any other time in the history of the former, but it does contain one account that links these events to the gNas rnying abbot.15 Following the conferral of the gu shri rank in 1413, Rin chen rgyal mtshan’s emissary dNgos grub rin chen went to gCong rdo, one of the imperial residences in the area of Peking, and met the emperor Cheng–tzu on his master’s behalf.

Although sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar does not refer to the Tsan dan Jo bo scroll specifically, it says that the Yung–lo emperor Cheng–tzu bestowed unidentified lavish gifts upon the gNas rnying abbot. It is possible that the scroll travelled to Tibet with dNgos grub rin chen.

One wonders whether the succinct enumeration of objects awarded to Rin chen rgyal mtshan by the emperor may contain a veiled reference to the Tsan dan Jo bo scroll. The expression gos phyi nang used to refer to some items gifted by Cheng–tzu could speculatively be taken as works in brocade (framed in brocade?) of secular (phyi) and religious (nang) subjects. sKyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar (f.45b lines 1–2) reads:

“Moreover, it is well known that the emperor of China heard of the immaculate fame of this rje (i.e. Rin chen rgyal mtshan). Persuant of an order of the chos kyi rgyal po of China, the great dNgos grub rin chen went to rGya nag gCong rdo. On behalf of the gNas rnying abbot, he was given a crystal seal empowering [Rin chen rgyal mtshan] over the great land [of gNas rnying] and the grant of this kingdom (i.e. gNas rnying)

15 The scroll is not included among the “ten greatesses” of gNas rnying (gNas rnying gi skyes bu dam pa’i rnam thar f.8a lines 5–6) which are:
1) the ‘ja’ sa of the religious king, lord of the earth;
2) the prophecy of the sngags ‘chang grub thob chen po (i.e. rGya ’Jam dpal gsang ba);
3) the prophecy and consecration of Di pam ka ra;
4) the signs of siddhahood [displayed] by the Yol ston brothers;
5) the prophecy of rje btsun spyan ras gzigs;
6) the lineage of transmission of Phyag drug Ye shes mGon po;
7) the abbotship of ’Bre chen po Shes rab ’bar;
8) the promise made by bstan srung Ma ha ka la;
9) the three grub thob who were the best disciples;
10) the Sems can–s who came in succession as [holders] of the excellent lineage.
through [the bestowal of] a ‘ja’sa. [dNgos grub rin chen] received secular and Buddhist (phyi nang) [works in] brocade. This was because of the noble power of the rje’s (i.e. Rin chen rgyal mtshan’s) deeds”.16

The passage is material to the issue of the gift of the Tsan dan Jo bo scroll to gNas rnying because the conferral of the gu shri rank upon Rin chen rgyal mtshan in the last month of water snake 1413 is a terminus post quem for the ensuing mission of dNgos grub rin chen. No details are given concerning the circumstances of the latter’s journey, whether he travelled alone or the length of his sojourn.

He was the only Tibetan mentioned in the sources dealing with the history of the Shar kha pa principality and gNas rnying, who went to the imperial court in connection with the bestowal of the 1413 ranks.17 The probable date of dNgos grub rin chen’s presence in gCong rdo is 1414, sometime after the scroll had been finished in 1412. It is unclear when dNgos grub rin chen reached back to gNas rnying, probably carrying the gifts for the monastery’s abbot. In any case, there seems to be a link between the 1412 painting of the Tsan dan Jo bo, the 1413 granting of ranks and privileges, and the 1414 mission of dNos grub rin chen.

Apart from the many issues surrounding the Tsan dan Jo bo, which impinge on the domain of Sinologists, several questions concerning the gNas rnying scroll need be asked, whose answers are not easily forthcoming. Was the scroll painted in China by a Tibetan or by a Chinese artist? Was the Si/Zi thang style adapted to

16 Tucci (Tibetan Painted Scrolls p.665b and p.703 n.827) and Jackson (A History of Tibetan Painting p.135 n.267) read the passages in Rab brtan kun bzang ‘phags’s biography that report these events in two remarkably different ways. Tucci has it that Rab brtan did not go to China; Jackson believes he indeed did so. I think that Tucci is correct. There is nothing in the 1413 episode mentioned in Rab brtan kun bzang ‘phags kyi rnam thar indicative of a journey on the part of Rab brtan and his younger brother Rab ’byor bzang po to the imperial court. That the two received awards and privileges at their own seat rGyal rtses is evidence against such a journey.

17 It should be stressed that these endowements from Cheng–tzu to Tibetan dignitaries were coeval with the invitation extended by the emperor to Sha ri pu tra. He was the great master of Dus ’khor from rDo rje gdan, who preceded on the plateau Vana ratna, the other great Indian master who visited Tibet in those years. INga pa chen po Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho confirms the association of Sha ri pu tra with La stod Byang, mentioned in the passage of Rab brtan kun bzang ‘phags kyi rnam thar under study. dPyid kyi rgyal mo’i glu dbyangs (p.14 lines 8–12) says that the La stod Byang ruler rNam rgyal grags bzang received teachings from Sha ri pu tra and the great Bo dong pa master Phyogs las rnam rgyal.

Judging from the narrative in Rab brtan kun bzang ‘phags kyi rnam thar one should come to the conclusion that there was no specific relation between the grants to Tibetan dignitaries and the invitation of Sha ri pu tra to China, if not that two different tasks were assigned to the same mission.
a Tibetan audience, as the bla ma–s painted in the upper corners seem to indicate? Was the painting consequently executed with its Tibetan destination in mind? What was the purpose of donating a painting of the Tsan dan Jo bo? Was it to diffuse the popularity of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue in Tibet? Does this imply, as it seems to do, that the cult was popular in China but much less so in Tibet? Why was the portrait of the Tsan dan Jo bo statue meant for gNas rnying in particular? Was there some undescribed reason that gNas rnying would have been especially receptive to the cult of the statue? Answers may be perhaps found in Chinese imperial documents.

POSTSCRIPT

Details of the two monks in the top corners of the scroll reveal that they have been left unfinished. Code letters of the Tibetan alphabet, customarily used as guidelines in order for the artist to apply the selected colour shades, are visible around the faces of the monks and other anatomical details that have been fully painted. Every letter corresponds to a different shade. This lettering, for instance, is found in the halos and the sword and book implements (see fig.12 and 13).

It is somewhat stunning to realise that a painting originating from the Ming imperial court and bearing the name of the emperor in person has not been completed in these minor details. In the absence of any historical clue useful to explain why the painting is in such an awkward state, there is no other alternative than to venturing into the realm of conjectures.

Two contrasting alternatives come to mind. The first, based on the idea of the possibility of a unfinished painting sent out from the imperial court of China by an emperor such as Cheng–tzu who was especially keen in the promotion of the arts as tokens given to religious masters, is that the two monks are a later addition, whose completion was abandoned for unknown reasons. Originally the scroll would have had the top corners empty.

Pursuing this line of thought in historical terms, one could envisage that the two monks were painted at any later time after the scroll came into the possession of the gNas rnying abbot. I dare here to attempt an art historical remark that needs confirmation and approval by experts. Given the kind of hat worn by the two monks, a wide range of school affilliations should be ruled out. One school which seems to remain valid in this exclusion process is the dGe lugs pa. Again in the opinable realm of aesthetics, one could see in the monks the adoption of an art style that is posthumous to 1412. If the history of gNas rnying is taken into consideration, one needs to realise that, as mentioned above, the monastery underwent a sectarian reform after 1427, when mKhas grub rje went to reside in its premises for a few years before becoming the dGa’ ldan khri pa. gNas
rnying, which experienced several changes of religious affiliation throughout its long history, became dGe lugs pa. I wonder whether the scroll, following the monastery’s conversion to the school of Tsong kha pa, betrays visually a dGe lugs pa appropriation of the imperial painting. Especially during the formation period of dGa’ ldan pho brang there have been several cases of fictitious links to a glorious heritage that did not exist originally.

On the other hand, one is led to think that hardly anyone would have dared to alter a scroll depicting a remarkably holy image, and moreover issued by an emperor of China himself. If this hypothesis is credited, one should conclude that the scroll is an unfinished work.

The painting is thus even more interesting, for it carries with itself a piece of unsolved history.

APPENDIX ONE
TEXT IN TRANSLITERATION OF THE TIBETAN INSCRIPTION ON THE GNAS RNYING SCROLL

// //Ta’i ming rgyal pos mdzad pa’i tsan dan gyi bo’i sku gzug la bstod pa ni/ nged kyi bsam pa la/ de bzhin gshegs pa’i lam ni/ ‘jig rten gsum las mam par grol ba’i mgon cig po/ sprul pa sna tshogs yang dag par mdzad nas/ kun la mthun zhing thogs pa med pa/ rmongs pa rnam kyi sgrub pa bsal bar mdzad cing/ gzug la brten nas sgrub pa yang ma yin/ sgra’i brjod par bya ba yang ma yin te/ sems nyid khe na sangs rgyas yin/ sangs rgya kyang sems nyid khe na yin te/ sems laschos ghan gang yang med/chos las kyang ghan du sems nyid gang yang med do/ ‘on kyang gzug la ma brten na/ rmongs pa rnam kyi sangs rgyas ring du spong bas/ de’i don gyi na/ de bzhin gshegs pa’i phrin las sna tshogs kyi brgyan te/ yon tan gyi skur snang ba/ kun gys mchod pa’i brten du gyur zhing/ gzug la brten nas gzugz mang ba byid la ‘jug pa/ gzugz yod pa rnam kyi gzugz med pa nyid du mam par grol ba/ dper na gru la brten nas/ rgya mtsho’i pha rol tu grol nas gnu mi dgos pa lta bu ’am/ gdoor rdo blangz te mtshon chabtar nas ma phyung ba dang gdoor rdo spangs pa bzhin no/ gal te dam pa’i don la yang dag par ma rtogs na/ ci la brten nas don dam pa stong nyid rig/ nges pa’i tshul lugs ni khyad par gang yang med de/ rtag tu de bzhin yin no/ de’i phyir du/ gzugz bryan la brten nas/ sangs rgyas kyi zhal mthong zhing/ sangs rgyas la brten nas sems kyi ngo bo mthong ba/ myu gu btsugs nas ’bras bu skrun pa re ba lta bu/ lam la zhugs nas khyim la bsnyags pa lta bu’o/ mdo’i rnamz la snang ba lta na ni/ rgyal ba shakyab thub pa de ni/ rgya nag gyi rgyal po ji’u ja’u wa rgyal sar bzhugs nas lo nyi shu rtsa bzhil lon pa’i dus/ stag gi lo zla ba bzhil pa’i tshes bryad la rgyal po zas gtsang ma’i sras su ‘khrungs nas/ zhag bdun na yum sgyu ma lha mdzes ’das nas/ thabs bra lgyis lhar skyes/ de nas rgyal po ji’u ja’u wang ces pa rgyal sar bzhugs nas lo
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bzhi bceu gnyis lon pa'i spre'u yis lo la rgyal bu don grub dgung lo bceu dgu bzhes nas/ rgyal pa'i (po'i) khab spangs ste rab tu byung nas sgrub pa mdzad/ de yang rgya nag gyi rgyal po de'i sras ji'u wang ces pa rgyal sar bzhugs nas lo gsum lon pa'i lug gis lo la mgon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas/ de nas ji'i mu wang rgyal sar lo brgyad lon pa'i yos bu'i lo la bcom ldan 'das yum gyi drin bskor ba dgongs te/ thabs bral du byon nas yum la chos gsungs so/ de'i tshe yul dbu rgyan gyi rgyal po sangs rgyas la 'jal bar 'dod na/ de'i thabs gang yang ma byung bas/ tsan dan la sangs rgyas kyi sku brko bar bcams pa na/ de'i tshe mi'u 'gal gyi bus dgongs pa la sangs rgyas kyi sku ci lta ba 'dra ba mi yongs snyam nas/ rang gi rdu' 'phrul gysis bzo bo gsum bceu so gnyis lan gsum du thabs bral du khrid nas sangs rgyas kyi sku bltas nas/ de nas sangs rgyas kyi sku gzugs ci lta ba bzhin du tsan dan la legs par bsgrub ste/ de la rgyal blon 'bangs la scogs pas mchod pa dang bkur ti byas zhing/ de'i lo la bcom ldan 'das kyang thabs bral kyi gnas nas/ 'dzam bu'i gling du bab/ de'i tshe tsan dan gyi sku gzugs de nyid bzhens nas bsu la la byon/ dbu 'dud pa dang bcas pa mdzad cing/ bcom ldan 'das la sku bab zhus pas/ bcom ldan 'das kyi phyag gyi tsan dansku'i spyi bor bzhag ste/ nga yongs su mya nган las 'das nas lo stong lon pa'i rjes su/ khyod shar phyogs rgya nag gyi yul du song la lha mi 'gro ba mang po lo phan pa rgya chen po gyi zhes sog sa'i lung bstan/ da lta nged kyichos kyi don la dpyad nas/ sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das kyi' 'gro ba mams la byams pa sbyin pa dang/ 'dge ba'i lam la bkod pa dang/ byams dang snying rje'i sgo nas kun la byin gyi brlabs pa dang/ thabs kyi'sngos po kun la phan pa rgya chen po mdzad cing/ de la bstod pa na de'i yon tan brjod gyi mi langs/ don dam chos kyi bdag nyid mtshon par byed pa dang/ sems can mams kyi bsod nams bsags pa dang/ skye bo mams kyi zhal 'jal ba tsam gyes/ de dag gi rgyud la phan pa bya ba'i phyir'/ nged kyi tsan dan jo bo'i sku 'dra bzhens nas/ ched du bstod pa ni/ 'di skad du/ bde bar gshegs pa dam pa chos kyi sku' gsum bceu so gnyis mtshan ldan kyi mam par mdzex/ bai dur rya dang gtsos ma'i gser gyi mdog/ zhal ni zla ba rgyas ltar 'od zer 'phro/ spyan gnyis pad ma'i 'dab ltar dkyus ring/ tshems ni kha ba ltar dkar mnyam thag bzang/ phyag zhas 'jam zhing 'khor lo rtsis stong ldan/ sku bstod seng ge rgyal po'i ro stod 'dra/ ye shes dam pa rgyas zhing dpal dang ldan/ yon tan kun ldan 'dran zla mam par bral/ 'gro dang 'ong ba gnas kyang yod min te/ mchod par 'os zhing bsod nams zhing du gyur/ ye shes pha rol phyin dang thams cad mkhyen/ las 'bras snang zhing zhabs su ldan pa dang/ byang chub dam pa bde bar gshegs pa dang/ 'jig rten mkhyen dang don dam mam par rtogs/ bla na med cing skyes bu mchog tu gyur/ skyes bu 'dul ba byams dang ye shes can/ lha mi ston pa rgya chen 'dren par mdzad/ don dam dag pa gzhal nas 'jig rten mgon/ gzi brjod che zhing rdzu 'phrul che ba dang/ zab cing mam par dag pa dang/ sems can kun gyi rgyud bstun mam par 'dul/ bskal pa rdul snyed zhing sgrol chos 'khor bskor/ mi g.yo' (g.yo'i ) rtag tu gnas zhing de bzhin
no/ 'gro 'ong thogs med kun tu khyab pa dang/ don dam stong pa’i chos nyid rnam par bshad/ sna tshogs gsung dbyangs phyogs bcur rgyas pa dang/ chos kyi sprin ni mnyam pa nyid du sprin/ kun tu char ’bab khyad par med pa dang/ byams dang snying rje thabs ni rnam par spyod/ chos kyi bdud rtsis sgo mo rgyas (SEVERAL SYLLABLE LACUNA)/ mun pa’i gling du rtag tu sgron me spar/ nyon mongs rgya mtsho mam par dag pa dang/ sdug bsngal gdung mams bde la rab bkod nas/ mun pa thoms pa mams kyang ’od zer thob/ nyon mongs gdungs pa rams la ’ang bsal bar ’gyur/ dri mas gos pa rams ni dag byed cing/ ’khor ba bying ba rams la boon ldan ’das/ bla med byang chub du ni grol mdzad nas/ sngon tshe thabs bral du ni rnam par gshegs/ nyid kyi yam las sa rmnams legs ston tshe/ dbu rgyan rgyal pos rgyal ba’i sku dran nas/ sprul pa’i (SEVERAL SYLLABLE LACUNA) sku gzugs bzhengs/ ga (SEVERAL SYLLABLE LACUNA) sku gzugs bzhengs dang gnyis su me dang/ sku gzugs dngos dang sgyu ma’i sku gzugs ni/ mi gzugs me long nang du shar ba bzhin/ phan tshun ’dud na khyad par med pa dang/ mi sor me long gzugs brnyan med pa yin/ rdzu ’phrul dam pa bsam gyi m khyab pa/ zla ba gsal ba nam mkhar ’gro ba bzhin/ skad cig tsam na skal bzhang ’das par ’gyur/ sems yod tsam gyi mchod par gyur pa dang/ bdag gi dge ba’i lam chen la bsam nas/ bstan pa dar phyir ’gro la bde ba sbyin/ gtso ma’i gser dang tshon na lha sogsa pa’i/ brygan te tsan du sku ’drar bzhengs nas/ ’gro ba thams cand bde la ’god pa dang/ nyi ma stong ’ong phyogs bcur khyab pa ltar/ phyogs rnam m kun du drin gyi khyab par ’gyur/ ri dang rgya mtsho kun g.yes pa’i/ /lha klu la sogsa kun gyis skyobs pa dang/ mthong ba tsam gyi kun gyis dang ba skye/ rtag tu bden pa’i lam la mi ldog cing/ phan yon rgya chen bsam gyis mi khyab pa’o// yung lo bcu pa’i lo zla ba bzi pa’i bcu bdun gi nyin// //
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fig.1. The Tsan dan Jo bo, the sandalwood statue of Jo bo Shakyamuni (after A. Terentiev, *The Sandalwood Buddha of the King Udayana* pl. 17)
fig.2. A small statue being a replica in metal alloy of the Tsan dan Jo bo (photo courtesy A. Heller)

fig.3. The gNas rnying scroll depicting the Tsan dan Jo bo (Copyright, 2010, Thomas Laird. Photography by T.Laird and C.Clemens)
fig. 4. An old picture of the gNas rnying scroll depicting the Tsan dan Jo bo (after “Silk Painting of the Ming Dynasty in the Naining Qude Temple, Kangma County” pl. 6)

fig. 5. Detail of the gNas rnying scroll (photo courtesy L. Fournier)
fig.6. The face of the Tsan dan Jo bo being slightly gnam gzigs (“staring at the sky”) in the gNas rnying scroll (Copyright, 2010, Thomas Laird. Photography by T.Laird and C.Clemens)

fig.7. The gnam gzigs glance on the face of the sandalwood statue (after A. Terentiev, The Sandalwood Buddha of the King Udayana pl. 9)

fig.8. The Tsan dan Jo bo portrayed in a painting housed at the Seryoji, Kyoto (after Terentiev, The Sandalwood Buddha of the King Udayana pl. 4)
fig. 9. The Tibetan text of the inscription on the gNas ṅying scroll (Copyright, 2010, Thomas Laird. Photography by T. Laird and C. Clemens)

fig. 10. The Chinese text of the inscription (Copyright, 2010, Thomas Laird. Photography by T. Laird and C. Clemens)
fig. 11. A 15th century Chinese rendition in ink of the Tsan dan Jo bo, structurally similar to the gNas rnying scroll (after A. Terentiev, *The Sandalwood Buddha of the King Udayana* (Supplement) p. 86–90 and plate on p. 92)
fig.12. Detail of the monk in the top corner of the gNas rnying scroll (left side)
(Copyright, 2010, Thomas Laird. Photography by T.Laird and C.Clemens)

fig.13. Detail of the monk in the top corner of gNas rnying the scroll (right side)
(Copyright, 2010, Thomas Laird. Photography by T.Laird and C.Clemens)
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རྟ་དབང་དེ་ཐོབ་བྱུང་བ་བཟོ་བསྡུ་བཞི་བཟོ་

མངོན་ཤིག་བརྒྱུད་མོ་ཟོན་མཛད་
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2. རིགས་པར་སྐྱེ་ལེན་གྲོང་ཕྱི་དོན་དོན་གྱི་སྐྱེ་ལེན་གྲོང་ཕྱིའི་གཞུ་གླིང་གུ་(1163) རྟེན།

2. རིགས་པར་སྐྱེ་ལེན་གྲོང་ཕྱི་དོན་དོན་གྱི་སྐྱེ་ལེན་གྲོང་ཕྱིའི་གཞུ་གླིང་གུ་(1206–1227) རྟེན།
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1285</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>173</th>
<th>367</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>四土</td>
<td>绝兹</td>
<td>贞州</td>
<td>长安</td>
<td>江南</td>
<td>江南</td>
<td>甘南</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>江南</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>江南</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>西藏</td>
<td>甘南</td>
<td>西藏</td>
<td>西藏</td>
<td>西藏</td>
<td>西藏</td>
<td>西藏</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上京</td>
<td>大都</td>
<td>内官</td>
<td>大都</td>
<td>内官</td>
<td>大都</td>
<td>内官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འབྲུག་སྲིད།</td>
<td>ཕྲྲ་ཕྲུག་</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ཡོན་ཏན་</td>
<td>ཕྲུག་པ་</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ཡོན་ཏན་</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ་</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ་</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འདི་མི་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>།ཤེས་</td>
<td>རྡོ</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1367 རྒྱུ་དབང་ཕྱིར་ཁྲིར་བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཀྱིས། དུ་གཞི་དྲུག་བརྡ་བྱུང་བ་རྒྱུ་དབང་། བྱུང་གྱིས་ཞབ་བཟོ་ཀྱི་བཞི་རྒྱུ་དབང་། སྣ་གོ་མི་བོ་དུ་ངན། 1589 རྒྱུ་དབང་ཁྲིར་བཀྲིས་གཞི་དད་བཞི་དབང་། སྣ་གོ་མི་བོ་དུ་ངན། 1644 རྒྱུ་དབང་ཁྲིར་བཀྲིས་གཞི་དད་བཞི་དབང་། 1664 རྒྱུ་དབང་ཁྲིར་བཀྲིས་གཞི་དད་བཞི་དབང་། 1770 རྒྱུ་དབང་ཁྲིར་བཀྲིས་གཞི་དད་བཞི་དབང་། 1900 རྒྱུ་དབང་ཁྲིར་བཀྲིས་གཞི་དད་བཞི་དབང་།
བཀྲ་ཤིས 1956 ིེས་བོད་བའི་ཆེན་པོ་བཞི་སྐབས་གནད་དང་སྤྱིན་ཐོབ་བཤད་
འབུམ་བོད་བའི་སྐབས་སོགས་དེ་བོད་བོད་བཤད་སྐབས་སོགས་
དེ་བོད་བོད་བཤད་སྐབས་སོགས་དེ་བོད་བོད་བཤད་སྐབས་སོགས་
དེ་བོད་བོད་བཤད་སྐབས་སོགས་

དེ་ཤིན་ཕལ་ཞིག་མངའ་ཞིག་བློ་མུ་མ་ཞིག་བཤིང་ཐོམ་མི་ཁུངས་

བོད་ཤིས་པའི་ཐོམ་མི་ཁུངས་
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