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To my Peter!
PREFACE

This book is the result of many years of work on Tibetan, Chinese and Nepali texts. It would not, however, have been complete, as far as events and persons of the last generations are concerned, without the unselfish help of Tibetan friends scattered all over the world. I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Zur-k’aň Žabs-pad, to P’a-lha Žabs-pad T’Uub-bstan’-od-lidan and to Mrs. P’reñ-riñ Rin-c’en-sgrol-ma (”Mary-la” Taring), who generously opened to me their amazing stores of personal knowledge about people and institutions in the Tibetan government and upper classes. Also bKras-k’aň T’Uub-bstan-ts’e-dpal helped me with information. Lha-rams-pa ’Jam-dpal-señ-ge (Jampel Sanghe Ati) helped me to decipher the difficult smaller hand in the Šin-byi roll.

Particular thanks are due to Mr Hugh Richardson, the last British Agent in Lhasa, who went over the galley proofs and supplied a large amount of information; the years from ca. 1935 to 1945 would have been almost a blank without the sure and copious data supplied by Mr Richardson, to whom I owe a debt of sincere gratitude.

To Professor T. V. Wylie of the University of Washington, Seattle, I am indebted for digesting and conveying to me the information supplied by Zur-k’aň Žabs-pad. Herr Peter Lindegger-Stauffer of Rikon, Switzerland, performed the same office for additional information supplied later by Mr P’a-lha. Professor K. Enoki, Tokyo, had some Chinese texts microfilmed for me. Professor G. Tucci allowed me the use of his rich fund of Tibetan woodprints long before they were donated to the library of the Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (IsMEO). Professor H. Harrer kindly sent me photographic copies of the Šiň-byi roll, and the Ethnological Museum of the Zurich University, in whose possession the roll passed in January 1973, generously authorized its publication. To all these scholars and institutions goes the expression of my sincere thanks.

Rome, July 1973

Luciano Petech
INTRODUCTION

§ 1. – Scope of the work

The aim of the present book is to collect and analyse materials concerning the prominent families of the Tibetan aristocracy, with particular regard to the role they played in Tibetan politics since the establishment of Chinese suzerainty till the end of the traditional Tibetan polity (1959). The book is definitely not intended to be a history of Tibet. Nor it is a biographical dictionary; in order to compile one, a pre-requisite would be a prosopography of the upper clergy, a task which must be left to other scholars.

The subject of my study are the families of the upper aristocracy and, secondarily, some of their individual members, but not the class to which they belonged; I have deliberately excluded any study of the social and economic structure of the nobility. The sources would be exceedingly meagre for the 18th and 19th centuries. For the present century, they are limited to the accounts of Western travellers and to field work among the Tibetan refugees in India and elsewhere; an extrapolation toward the past would be a risky undertaking, which I feel unwarranted at the present state of research.

A word of explanation about dates. As the Tibetan calendar has not yet been worked out, I avoid giving the European equivalents for months and days. Tibetan (and Chinese) dates will be indicated by numbers only; e.g. 23.X means 23rd day of the 10th Tibetan (or Chinese) month. Western dates are written out in full, e.g. 13th November.

§ 2. Sources

A few words about the general character of the texts utilized will not be amiss.

Our main source of information is represented by the Tibetan and Chinese texts and documents. The Western (mainly British-
Indian) documents and accounts play a secondary role and are limited to the last ninety years or so.

Tibetan texts are rather unsatisfactory as historical material, this being due to their very nature. The most important and bulky among them, the biographies of the Dalai-Lamas and of the Pan-c'en, are at their best mere court agenda, listing the audiences granted, the ceremonies performed, the journeys undertaken and (luckily) the official appointments made. However, they are no chronicles in the Western sense and are concerned only marginally with political events; generally speaking, they also pay scant attention to the aristocracy. Some biographies of great churchmen (such as KSGT and Samati) follow more or less the same pattern. Slightly better are the biographies of secular noblemen; these, however, are but few and I could consult only two works of this kind: MBTJ and sTag-lwis. Politics too sometimes conspire to lower the historical value of these biographies. Thus for instance the dramatic events of the Gorkha war of 1792, in which the Eighth Dalai-Lama cut a rather sorry figure, are glossed over in DL8.

The Chinese documents are copious and afford considerable help for periods of internal or external stress, e.g. for the years down to 1751, the two Nepalese wars (1788-1792 and 1854-1856), the Dogra war (1841-1842), the upheaval of 1862 and the Ñag-roñ campaign of 1863-1865, the friction on the Sikkim border (1887-1893), the Ñag-roñ affair of 1896-1898 and the negotiations with the British in the years 1905-1908. Curiously, they are very meagre for the coup of 1871 and for the British expedition of 1903-1904. For the years between these outstanding events they bring but little; thus the years 1752-1787 and 1793-1840 are almost a blank as far as the Chinese documents are concerned.

Parallel utilization of the two sets of sources (Tibetan and Chinese) is beset by a galling difficulty. As a rule, a Tibetan official is mentioned in Tibetan texts by his title and family name only (e.g. bka'-blon Ts'a-roñ-pa); on the contrary, the Chinese documents normally list him by title and personal name (e.g. bka'-blon dBañ-p'yug-rgyal-po). Unless we have a Tibetan text supplying both family and personal names, research is laborious and sometimes the result is more a reasonable guess than a certainty. On a level lower than bka'-blon identification is quite often impossible.
§ 3. The historical frame

The internal history of Tibet under Manchu suzerainty (1720–1912) and during the brief period of de-facto independence (1912–1951) has not yet been adequately treated as a whole. Worst off is the central period, about 1751–1904, for which we have practically only the book of Shakabpa, *Tibet, a political history*, New Haven 1967. It is unscholarly in its handling of the Tibetan texts, and Chinese sources are not utilized at all; nevertheless it supplies a large amount of new information, including some texts not yet accessible to Western scholars, and can render good service as a first introduction to Tibetan history of the period under consideration. There are adequate studies for the periods 1720–1751 (Petech 1972) and 1904–1959 (Lamb 1966; Richardson); and the Chinese angle has been set forth by Li Tieh-tseng. As it is not my aim to give here a complete account of Tibetan modern history, I shall limit myself to pointing out some landmarks.

The Manchu suzerain power, finally established in Tibet in 1720, tried in succession several ways of controlling the country and its peculiar aristocratic-theocratic society; the most prolonged experiment consisted in a sort of resurrection of the old monarchy under the house of P'o-lha (1728–1750). It collapsed in 1750 with the murder of the "king" by the imperial representatives, and the ensuing changes were final; henceforward wavering ceased and Tibet received on that occasion her final political set-up, which was to last with few modifications till 1912. Its main feature was the restoration of the temporal power of the Dalai-Lama, in abeyance since 1682; he was to act through a council of four ministers (*bka'-blon*). The Tibetan government was supervised by two imperial residents (Manchu *amban*; Chinese *chu-Tsang pan-shih ta-ch'en* 駐藏辦事大臣), who down to the end were always Manchu and never Chinese.

The Nepalese wars of 1788 and 1791–1792 ¹ ended with the intervention of an imperial army, which dictated peace at the gates of Kath-

¹ By far the best account of this conflict is that by L. E. Rose, *Nepal, strategy for survival*, Berkeley 1971, pp. 50–67, based mainly on Chinese texts and unpublished Nepalese documents. The other recent study by B. D. Sanwal, *Nepal and the East India Com-
mandu. They also gave occasion for some administrative reforms, the most important being the enhancement of the ambans' powers of intervention, and the new procedure for selecting the re-incarnations of the Dalai-Lama, the Pān-c'ēn and other high churchmen; this was to take place through the presentation by the ecclesiastical authorities of three candidates, the final choice to be made by drawing lots from a golden bowl in the presence of the ambans. Formally, there were no further changes until 1912. Of course the practical working of the institutions and the actual measure of imperial influence and control depended on the local political situation, and even more on the efficiency of the Manchu supervising agencies; the latter declined sharply after the Opium War (1839-1842).

The 19th century was a period of stagnation, with little apparent change. There were three major events which broke the somnolent peace prevailing in the country.

The first was the outbreak in 1844 of very strong and vocal protest of the clergy against the long rule of the regent, the mTs'o-smon-gлин sprul-sku Ňag-dbañ-jam-dpal-ts'ul-k'irms, in office since 1819. At that time Manchu supervision was still fairly efficient; the government sent to Tibet a special commissioner (Ch'i-shan 翡善), who had the regent tried by a judicial committee of the highest dignitaries of the church and sentenced him to deposition and exile. The ensuing troubles were quelled with adroitness not devoid of firmness 1. Imperial authority was still unchallenged and everybody bowed to it. But it was to be for the last time.

In 1862 there was a sharp conflict between the regent, the Rvasgren sprul-sku Ňag-dbañ-ye-šes-ts'ul-k'irms-rgyal-mts'an (in office 1845-1855 and since 1856), and the monks of 'Bras-spuns. This time the inefficient and corrupt amban Man-ch'ing 諏 慶 let events grow over his head. The regent fled to China, where he died almost at once, and power passed in the hands of the former bka'-blon and duke bSad-pa, Bombay 1965, pp. 74-84, brings nothing new, except for some sidelights from British-Indian documents.

1 See Petech 1959, 388-389. The relevant Chinese documents are summarized by Suzuki Chūsei, A study of a coup d'état at Lhasa in 1844, in Oriental Studies presented to Sei Wada, Tokyo 1960, 553-564 (in Japanese). The Tibetan point of view, ignoring the role of Ch'i-shan, is expressed by Shakabpa, 180. The deposed regent was at first sent to Manchuria, then was allowed to settle on the Kansu border, where he died in 1854; Mayers, 116.
The Peking government could only recognize the fait accompli. The reappearance of a lay regent might have portended a new trend in Tibetan history; but bSAD-sgra's death, after only two years as regent, allowed power to return to the high clergy as a matter of course.

Lastly in 1871 there was the reaction of a part of the clergy against dPal-ladan-don-grub, an ambitious monk of dGa'-ldan, who was aiming at gathering all power in his hands. He tried to forestall the mounting opposition by a coup d'état, which cost their life to some ministers and other officials; but in the end dPal-ladan-don-grub failed, fled to dGa'-ldan, had to quit this haven of refuge, and on the point of being overtaken by the soldiers of the government committed suicide. The Chinese ambans had successfully intervened in the last stages of the coup, and their action, coupled with the general revival of Manchu power in the seventies of the 19th century, brought about a temporary increase of imperial authority in Tibet at least as far as external relations are concerned.

On a different plane was the 13th Dalai-Lama's assertion of power in 1895, when he compelled the regent to resign. This resulted in the permanent direct rule of a Dalai-Lama, for the first time in that century: all his predecessors since 1804 had died either before or immediately after reaching the full age of eighteen. His assumption of ruling powers went off without serious friction, at least outwardly; and yet it led to consequences much more far-reaching than the dramatic convulsions of 1844, 1862 and 1871. These had concerned only a small circle of the higher clergy, as well as some of the foremost noble families, and had no lasting effects either upon or within the prevailing system. On the other hand the action of the young Dalai-Lama in 1895 created, or rather revived, a centre of power which increasingly overshadowed Manchu suzerainty and eventually inherited its position in Tibet. On the immediate plane, coupled with the disastrous result of the Sino-

---

1 See below, 174–177.
2 The sources for this event are particularly meagre. The account of Shakabpa, 189–190, is the best. The Chinese documents (mainly MTSL, 313.14.b–16a) give few details, but supply the names of the six officials killed by the order of dPal-ladan-don-grub. On the manner of his death (suicide pact with a jasak bla-ma) see also Bell 1931, 158.
3 Rose, 123.
Japanese war of 1894–1895, it led to a strong decrease of the influence of the ambans.

As for external wars, the first years of the 19th century saw almost complete peace till the Dogra invasion of 1841. It failed disastrously; but also the Tibetan counterstroke and the attempt of the Lhasa government to oust Gulab Singh from Ladakh met with an equally dismal failure. The treaty then concluded recognized the annexation of the purely Tibetan kingdom of Ladakh to the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir. No Chinese troops had taken part in the war, and the amban Meng-pao played a passive role, merely reporting to the emperor the facts as if the victories in the first campaign were due to his orders and leadership 1.

The war with Nepal (1854–1856) is a subject that has been grossly neglected till very recently and is still insufficiently known 2, as the Chinese documents are scarce, the Tibetan texts give almost no information, and most of the Nepalese documents still await publication. It ended with Tibet paying an indemnity, promising a small annual tribute and allowing a Nepalese representative in Lhasa, with jurisdiction over the Nepalese subjects residing in Tibet. In this case too the paramount power took no action and could only secure a platonic assurance of "respect to the emperor" in the final draft of the peace treaty.

By then the Lhasa government had come to realize that Chinese military power in the Himalaya was a thing of the past and that there was no possibility of a renewal of the campaign of 1792. This led them to take a mild interest in military matters; but its only practical result was seen in 1863–1864, when the Szechwan provincial authorities signally failed to stamp out the "rebellion" (i.e. the national resistance) of the chief of Nag-rön. It was a Central Tibetan expeditionary force who succeeded in bringing the war to an end; the Nag-rön chief mGon-po-rnam-rgyal perished in the flames of his castle besieged by the Lhasa troops. The emperor recognized the fact by granting to the

---

1 A serious study of this conflict is a desideratum. For the moment, two one-sided accounts can be utilized. Shakabpa, pp. 177–180, gives the Tibetan angle; and FRH, pp. 49–59, reflects mostly the Chinese point of view, giving in the Appendix a translation of the relevant passages of MP.

2 Recent accounts are those by B. D. Sanwal, op. cit., 284–286, and Ramakant, Indo-Nepalese relations 1816–1877, New Delhi 1968, 257–261; they bring no fresh information. The first serious study of the subject is due to Rose, 108–118.
Dalai-Lama the government of that region, a situation which lasted until 1908 in spite of an abortive attempt to reintroduce direct Chinese rule in 1896–1897.

Small local affairs, such as the periodical trouble with the semi-independent principality of sPo-bo, were of no great consequence.

The border frictions with British India, which started in earnest in 1887 and climaxed in the entry of Colonel Younghusband and his force in Lhasa in 1904, ushered in a hectic period. It saw in turn the flight of the Dalai-Lama to Mongolia, his short-lived return at the end of 1909, the attempt of the dying Manchu regime to gain cheap laurels by energetic action in Tibet, the flight of the Dalai-Lama to India and his final return to Lhasa upon the collapse of the Chinese empire, to maintain himself as absolute ruler of Tibet down to his death in 1933. These events are well known and we need not expatiate upon them here.

§ 4. The Tibetan government

The political institutions of Tibet during the last two centuries have been described several times. For our purpose a short sketch may suffice, supplemented by the glossary of administrative terms at the end.

The government of Tibet was basically divided into a secular and an ecclesiastical branch. The latter lies outside the scope of my study. Suffice it to know that there were 175 ecclesiastic officials (rtse-drui) and that the highest among them was the Chief Abbot (spyi-k'yab mk'an-po; the Chinese called him simply mk'an-po); the office was

---

1 Sometimes these frictions, usually due to the Lhasa government attempting to annex the country or to the ruler (the Ka-nam sde-pa) refusing to pay tribute, degenerated into full-fledged war. Such was the case in 1835–1838 (see under bSād-sgra and Zur-k'aṅ, pp. 163–164 and 146), in 1910 when sPo-bo utterly wearied out a Chinese expeditionary force (see Shakabpa, 238–239; Lamb 1966, 276–277), and in 1927–1931, when the principality was finally extinguished and its territory annexed (see under mTS'o-sgo, p. 140).

2 The last and perhaps the most complete account is that in Rahul 1969, 22–50. A dry list of offices classified according to rank is found in Tharchin, 164–166; another, of course in Chinese transcription, is given by Mayers, *The Chinese government*, 111–112. An account of the Tibetan government, rather muddled and incomplete, but important because of its early date is that by Das, 230–256. Another, quite good but not detailed, is that by D. Macdonald, *The Land of the Lamas*, London 1929, 55–62 and 116–120. Also Richardson, 18–27, is helpful.
created at the time of the Gorkha wars of 1788-1792. He was the head of the ecclesiastic establishment and acted as a link between the Dalai-Lama, to whom he had always direct access, and the yig-ts‘an. The latter, composed of four Lama officials (mk’an-druñ or sde-druñ, popularly called druñ-yig c’en-mo), was a sort of ecclesiastic counterpart to the council of ministers. Its chairman was the senior member (mk’an-druñ c’e-ba, sometimes shortened into mk’an-c’e), who usually held the half-Chinese title of ta bla-ma. Their main task was the control of the numerous and wealthy monasteries. Only the three great convents of ’Bras-spuns, Se-ra and dGa’-ldan in the neighbourhood of Lhasa were directly subordinate to the Dalai-Lama.

The cadre of the lay officials (sod-druñ, usually called druñ-'k'or) consisted of 175 members, all of them belonging to the aristocracy; they alone filled the government posts reserved to the secular element. Their rank was determined according to the Chinese system, introduced in 1792. However, only five of the nine Chinese ranks were in normal use, viz. those from the third to the seventh inclusive. The Dalai-Lama and the Pan-c’en were outside and above official rank. Only the ministers and the holders of Chinese titles (kung, taiji, jasak) were entitled to the third rank. Most of the higher officials belonged to the fourth, and the title rim-bži (fourth rank) was a sort of general style for most of the upper bureaucracy. Sometimes the emperor granted to an official a personal rank higher than the one normally belonging to his post; e.g. a bka’-blon could be promoted to the second rank.

The highest office in the state was after 1907 that of the Grand Ministers (blon-c’en), whom the Dalai-Lama, then at Hsi-an, appointed to help the regent in conducting the government. At first they were three, but vacancies were not filled again after the death of the original incumbents. After 1926 there was only one, now styled Minister of State (srid-blon). In 1939 the post practically fell into abeyance. It was revived in 1950, when two Ministers of State were appointed; but in 1952 it was abolished altogether. The Grand (or State)

---

1 In the thirties and forties of the present century it was the practice for the spyi-k’ yab mk’an-po to be treated as an additional member of the bka’-šag, or at least called in frequently to their discussions. He therefore became a link between the bka’-šag and the regent (HR).
Ministers are sometimes said to have enjoyed the second rank; but it
seems that this was never officially settled. Their task was to act as
connecting link between the Dalai–Lama and the council of ministers.
They did not, however, take part in the deliberations of that body,
but merely forwarded its proposals to the ruler together with their own
opinion. Their actual influence on affairs was always much less than
the name would indicate.

Before 1907, and in practice even after that date, the lay branch
of the Tibetan government was topped by the Council of Ministers,
called bka’-blon šag lhan-rgyas, usually shortened into bka’-ṣag; this
was actually the name of their office rooms near the 'P'rul-snañ, the
cathedral of Lhasa. As the highest administrative agency in Tibet,
during most of this period it enjoyed the right of direct access to the
Dalai–Lama; this privilege was withdrawn in 1907. The bka’-ṣag
was one of the two really significant offices open to the nobility, and often
contributed decisively to the shaping of Tibetan policy. The history
of the bka’-ṣag is therefore of great relevance for the study of the prac-
tical functioning of Tibetan institutions. After the reforms introduced
by the Chinese in 1792–1793 it was placed under the control of the
ambans, but otherwise left paramount in current administration.

The bka’-ṣag was formed by four officials of the third rank, whose
full title was bka’i-guñ-blon, usually shortened into bka’-blon; the
literary style was mdun-na-’don, sometimes also sa-ḥban. At the
beginning of the 19th century they came to be called in common parlance
Ŝabs-pad (lotus-feet) 1. As shown by the ŠBR, the bka’-blon in charge,
as well as the blon-c’en and srid-blon, were not included in the official
list of the 175 șod-drünü; evidently they were considered as outside and
above the professional government service. The bka’-blon were on an
equal footing and there was no chairman of the council; seniority con-
ferred merely a gradation of prestige and of ceremonial precedence.
However, during the last years the bka’-blon bla-ma took seniority
regardless of the date of appointment (HR). They acted as a com-
mittee, without departmental specialization. Quite often one of them
was sent out on a special task (as spyi-k’yab), consisting in a mission

---

1 Some instances are found already in DL8 (e.g. 193a, 196a, 197b, 199a, 204b). The
title Žabs-pad grows more common in DL9, at least in its first pages. The PC4 does not
use it.
(don-spyod, don-gcod) to outlying districts, or accompanying the amban in his tours of inspection. After 1750 three of them were laymen and one an ecclesiastic, with the title of bka’-blon bla-ma; but during the period 1804–1878 no seat was reserved for the clergy and all the four ministers were laymen. In 1878 a supernumerary ecclesiastical member was added, increasing thus to five the number of the ministers; but in 1894 the scheme of 1751 was restored, and henceforward the bka’-ṣag consisted of three laymen and one bla-ma. This number was never exceeded, except that sometimes joint or deputy members of the council were appointed, but with a lower standing. Only during the last six or seven years of its existence a beginning with departmental specialization was made.

The bka’-ṣag had a considerable staff at its disposal. It consisted of five secretaries (bka’-ṣag druñ-yig), usually shortened into bka’-druñ), who were responsible for its clerical work. Of these, the two Grand Secretaries (bka’-druñ c’e-ba) were of the sixth rank, and the three Lesser Secretaries (bka’-druñ c’uñ-ba) were of the seventh rank. Other members of the staff were the three bka’-ṣag mgron-gñer, shortened into bka’-mgron (sixth rank); they presented to the council the petitions and reports of the lower officials and generally maintained the liaison with the bureaucracy. There was also a subordinate secretarial section called bka’-ṣod, concerned mainly with ecclesiastical affairs and manned by several druñ-yig of the seventh rank.

The revenue and expenses of the state were controlled by the account department (rtsis-k’ari), headed by three lay officials of the fourth rank called rtsis-dpon; at some date in the late twenties of the present century a fourth rtsis-dpon was added. They were assisted by three or four accountants (rtsis-pa; sixth rank). Although in theory subordinate to the bka’-ṣag, theirs was the other significant office open to laymen alone, because the rtsis-dpon, together with the mk’an-druñ, were the spokesmen or leaders of discussion in the National Assembly (ts’ogs-’du), at which the bka’-blon were not allowed to be present, and they reported the opinion of the Assembly to the bka’-ṣag. Another source of influence was their control of the school of finance (rtsis-bslab), which entailed a considerable say in the new appointments to government service (HR).

---

1 See below, p. 220.
There were three treasuries. The main one was the bla-bran p'yang-mdzod, in the premises adjoining the 'P'rul-snañ. It was controlled by three treasurers (bla-bran p'yang-mdzod-pa, usually shortened into bla-p'yang; fourth rank), one lay and two ecclesiastic. Then there was the private treasury of the Dalai-Lama ('p'ral-bde p'yang-mdzod), housed in the Potala palace (rtse); it was headed by three treasurers (rtse-p'ral p'yang-mdzod-pa, usually shortened into rtse-p'yang; fourth rank), one lay and two ecclesiastic; however, the lay rtse-p'yang was regarded during his term of office as a rtse-druni and sat with the monks at the ceremonies, audiences with the Dalai-Lama etc. (HR). Lastly there was the reserve treasury (rnam-sras gan-mdzod) in the Potala, seldom mentioned in the texts; it was under the direct responsibility of the bka'-šag and was drawn upon only in a national emergency.

The financial administration of the army was in the charge of two paymasters (p'ogs-dpon; fourth rank), one lay and one ecclesiastic.

There was no well-graded judiciary. Outside the capital the district governors acted also as judges in civil and criminal cases. Special judicial officers were found in Lhasa only (all of them of the fifth rank). They were: the city magistrates of Lhasa (mi-dpon; two laymen); the magistrates of the walled dependency of the Potala (žol-sde-pa or žol-gñer; two laymen, one monk), in charge of the state dungeons there and having jurisdiction for some twenty-six miles up the sKyid-c'u valley and nineteen down it; and the bšer-dpañ (two laymen), who acted as law advisers to the bka'-šag when the latter, sitting as court of appeal, decided serious cases brought before it from Lhasa and Central Tibet. Indirectly their jurisdiction extended to most of the country. They were also responsible for the care of the 'P'rul-snañ cathedral.

Military organization, based upon the local militia (yul-dma) and in later times upon a small standing army, normally lacked a central command. When it was necessary to send out a considerable body of troops on an expedition, one of the bka’-blon took its command. Only in 1913 the Dalai-Lama created the permanent post of Commander-in-Chief, with the title of spyi-k’yah mda’-dpon (abridged in spyi-mda’), changed almost at once into dma’-gi spyi-k’yah (abridged

———

1 Bell 1946, 266.
in *dmag-spyi*). After 1934 there were permanently two *dmag-spyi*, one monk and one lay. Otherwise the highest officers of the army were the provincial generals (*mda’-dpon*; fourth rank), at first three in gTsan ¹ and one in dBu. In 1751 one was added in dBu and after the middle of the 19th century another was appointed in gTsan, but permanently detached to Diñ-ri. After 1913 other *mda’-dpon* were created, such as the commander of the Dalai-Lama’s bodyguard and one or two to command large units in Eastern Tibet. Other officers were the twelve Wing Commanders (*ru-dpon*; fifth rank), the twenty-four Commanders of Hundred (*brgya-dpon*; sixth rank) and the 120 captains (*ldin-dpon*; seventh rank); but numbers and ranks of these officers are found in the Chinese texts only, and they were outside the cadre of the 175 *sod-druñ*.

The structure of the central government sketched above was in existence already in the twenties of the 18th century. Almost all the relevant titles of office can be met with in the Tibetan texts of the time and in the letters and reports of the Italian missionaries ². There was no substantial modification during the whole of the following two hundred years. And this is another instance of the innate conservatism of Tibetan traditional society.

For the purposes of provincial administration, most of the regions under the direct control of the Lhasa government were divided into districts (*k’ul*; but they are now called *rdzoñ*, which is properly the castle serving as headquarters), the great majority of which were situated in the two provinces of dBu and gTsan. At the time of the 13th Dalai-Lama there were 52 *rdzoñ*, to which the small independent principality of the Sa-skya abbots should be added. Each *rdzoñ* was in charge of one or two governors (*rdzoñ-sdod*, more usually *rdzoñ-dpon*; the Chinese and Nepalese continued to use the earlier title *sde-pa*), appointed

---

¹ There is some evidence going to show that in the first quarter of the 18th century there were two *mda’-dpon* in gTsan (*gTsañ-jiñs kyi k’a-lo-pa zuñ*; *MBTJ, 57b, 127a, 190a*) and one in Kohn-po, the latter post being hereditary in the O-roñ family.
² The documents issued to the missionaries by the Tibetan governments between 1714 and 1741 (*MITN, III, 183–214*) are particularly interesting in this connection. They show that control over taxation, building activity etc. in and near Lhasa was already in the hands of the lha-gñer, *sol-gñer* and *mi-dpon*, while the bla-brañ *p’yag-mdzod* acted as public register of land. On the other side some offices mentioned there vanished soon after; such were the *lcän-srun-ba* (forestry officer; probably replaced by the *šin-gñer*) and the *darogha*, a Mongol term which at least in some instances seems to be equivalent to the Tibetan ’go-pa* (see the six *darogha* of Nag-c’u in *DL6, 438b*).
for a term of three years; in the case of two governors (rdzoṅ-sbrel), either both laymen, or more commonly one lay and one monk. The governors of the outlying rdzoṅ of Nag-ts’aṅ, Nag-c’u and Sa-dga’ bore the title of ’go-pa; those of Roṅ-śar and gNa’-naṅ the title of ṣo-pa. The heads of twenty–three important districts (8 single rdzoṅ dpon, 11 double rdzoṅ-dpon, 2 ’go-pa, 2 ṣo-pa) were of the fifth rank; twenty–seven governors (18 single, 8 double, 1 ’go-pa) were of the sixth rank; two rdzoṅ-dpon (single) were of the seventh ¹. They were responsible for the collection of revenue, for law and order and for the hearing of civil and criminal cases arising in their districts ². Often a rdzoṅ-dpon, especially when young and belonging to a family of the higher nobility, was an absentee; he stayed on in Lhasa and his duties were performed by a steward (gñer-pa).

Besides, there was a certain number of government estates (gţis–ka), their stewards (gţis-sdod) ranking on the average below the rdzoṅ-dpon; three were of the sixth rank, the rest of the seventh. Districts and estates together were usually called rdzoṅ-gţis, a collective name for the administrative units outside Lhasa.

Some outlying regions were under a special administration. In mNa’-ris sKor-gsum, or Western Tibet, two commissioners called sTod sgar-dpon (fifth rank, but locally fourth) supervised the four rdzoṅ and the numerous nomad clans of the region. In A–mdo (North-Eastern Tibet) there was till about the middle of the 19th century a commissioner called mDo sgar-dpon, whose functions concerned above all trade and the control of local monasteries. K’ams (Eastern Tibet) was subject to a sort of general supervision by the rdzoṅ-dpon of sMar-k’ams (fifth rank, but locally fourth). When the administration of Ṇag-roṅ was entrusted to the Dalai-Lama in 1865, his representative (spyi-k‘yab) supervised in some form the various chieftains of K’ams down to 1911 ³. In 1918 the Dalai-Lama created the post of

¹ This list is based on Tharchin, 164–166, with slight modifications from ŠBR.
² For the relations between central and local government see the discerning remarks of M. C. Goldstein, The balance between centralization and decentralization in the traditional Tibetan political system, in CAJ 15 (1971), 170–182.
³ Except for an abortive attempt to reintroduce direct Chinese rule in 1896–1897, which ended with the retrocession of Ṇag-roṅ to the Dalai-Lama; see Li Tieh-tseng, 64. The Tibetan officials were expelled from Ṇag-roṅ by Chao Erh-fēng in the summer of 1911; Lamb 1966, 274.
governor-general of Eastern Tibet (mDo-smad spyi-k'yar, usually abridged into mdo-spyi), held concurrently by one of the bka'-blon. A parallel post of governor-general of the South (Lho-k'a spyi-k'yar, abridged as lho-spyi) was established in 1927 with authority over the several rdzoṅ and estates of Dvags-po and Koṅ-po; but its importance and prestige were not high. Another special officer (Gro-mo spyi-k'yar, in short gro-spyi) was in charge of the Chumbi valley.

For some other offices of secondary or nominal importance we may refer to the Glossary.

There were at first no fixed rules for appointment and advancement in officialdom. Between 1751 and 1788 membership of the bka'-sag was practically by direct inheritance from father to son. This custom was abolished by the Chinese, and in later times a young nobleman had to follow a sort of administrative career, starting with his first official appointment (žabs-gsar-ba) usually on New Year's day and following either the financial branch up to rtsis-dpon or the treasury service up to bla-p'yang or the military career up to mda'-dpon. These three offices were the usual stepping stones from which the judgment and trust of the Dalai-Lama (or of the regent) raised him to a seat in the bka'-sag. A kind of intermediate stage was represented by the joint ministers (bka'-blon las-'par) and by the deputy ministers (bka'-ts'ab). The office of bka'-blon could be held only once. There is not a single instance of a bka'-blon being reinstated after dismissal or retirement. When the 13th Dalai-Lama wanted to redress the injustice done on the three ministers he had abruptly dismissed in 1903 for giving him advice which the events proved sound, he did not appoint them to the bka'-sag again, but created for them the new post of Grand Minister.

According to Chinese regulations, a vacancy in the council and among the mda'-dpon was to be filled upon the presentation by the amban (acting upon the advice of the Dalai-Lama or of the regent) of two names in order of preference; the final choice was reserved to the emperor. But mostly it was a mere formality, as Peking constantly appointed the man presented as first choice, thus ratifying the proposal of the Tibetan government.

---

1 There are many instances of this procedure in MP and CCCTTT.
§ 5. Aristocracy and theocracy

After 1751 Tibet was under the temporal rule of the Dalai-Lama. In this theocratical state the nobility held a sort of subordinate partnership, the forms of which have now to be studied.

It is usually said that Tibet was a feudal country down to 1951, with the qualification that the nobility was flanked and up to a certain point dominated by the Yellow Church and its great monasteries. On the whole this picture is correct, but remains somewhat vague; the composition of the aristocracy and the measure of their participation in the central government have yet to be worked out.

The Tibetan nobility, like every other aristocracy, underwent radical changes during the ages. The great noble families of the time of the monarchy (c. 600–841), such as sTag-sgra, Cog-ro, mC’ims etc., vanished after the end of that period and the victory of Buddhism, to be replaced by new ones; in recent times very few houses (Lha-rgya-ri, mDo-mk’ar, T’on-pa) could claim an ancestry going back to monarchical times. In the same way the nobility of Sa-skya-pa times was largely superseded by new families in the course of the P’ag-mo-gru period (14th century). The topmost layer of Tibetan aristocracy, as it existed in the time of the 13th Dalai-Lama, came into being in the first half of the 18th century and was the most lasting result of P’o-lha-nas’s rule. We could even say that the high peerage of today (the sde-dpon) is formed by the descendants of P’o-lha-nas’s council of ministers; but this would be an over-simplification. This, however, was the last change of great import. The vested interests then created were consolidated under the dyarchy of the Dalai-Lamas and of the Manchu emperors and were crystallized down to the end of traditional Tibet after 1951.

The first enlargement of this hard core came in 1792 as a result of the Gorkha war. A second was due to the 13th Dalai-Lama, who included in the upper nobility some of his favourites (Ts’a-roñ is a typical instance); at the same time a few of the oldest families laded in the background (e.g. the T’on-pa). All this enlarged the circle of the ruling

---

1 But see the discerning remarks of Carrasco, pp. 207–208.
families, but did not substantially alter its composition. Regeneration within the nobility was a comparatively slow affair; its most active factor was the institution of the *mag-pa*, on which see below, p. 17. This system resulted in changing the lineage proper of most of the noble families.

Political influence within the central government was restricted to the nobility of dBus and gTsaṅ. The latter region prevailed in the 18th century, because of the privileged position given to it by P'o-lha-nas. Predominance passed soon to dBus (chiefly after 1792); but gTsaṅ always preserved a substantial share of power. This regional rivalry lost its meaning when after the flight of the 6th Paṅ-c‘en to China in 1923 most of the great families of gTsaṅ gradually shifted their residence to Lhasa and its district.

The clearest evidence of political influence of a family was membership of the *bka’-ṣag*. That body was always a stronghold of the aristocracy, and even more so during the long span of time (1804–1878) when no seat was reserved for an ecclesiastical member. The interplay of clerical supremacy, Manchu suzerainty and aristocratic power during the 19th century influenced to some extent the inner balance of the *bka’-ṣag*, giving preponderance in turn to the upper nobility, to the old lower nobility and to new families; however, it is difficult to get a clear picture on this point. As for the great feudal lords of the south-east (e.g. Lha-rgya-ri and sPo-bo), their influence remained restricted to the local plane and they never participated in the central government.

The administrative machinery functioned as a partnership between clergy and nobility; no commoner was normally admitted to middle or high office. If such a thing happened, his ennoblement was a necessary preliminary step (Ts'a-roň is again the typical instance) ¹. The economic position of the aristocracy was firm and secure, except for possible confiscations for crimes or misdemeanour. Therefore, the noble class was not exposed to any appreciable pressure from below. On the other hand, the apportionment of offices between clergy and aristocracy was rigidly determined by law and custom, and no direct clash between the two components of Tibetan polity was possible. Thus

¹ As M. C. Goldstein rightly remarks, "although it was possible for the ruler to ennable commoners ..., such events were extremely rare"; *J. As. Stud.*, 30, 523.
the social and political status of the nobility as a whole could oscillate only between very narrow limits. Substantially, the power and wealth of the aristocracy in 1950 was not much different from what it had been in 1750.

This pattern shows some striking similarities with the only possible parallel within European polity of about the same period: the nobility of the Papal State in its last stages. There too we notice the same stable social frame, the same partnership with the clergy (but only on the administrative, not on the policy-making level) and, on the whole, the same stagnation and lack of real renovation.

As to the economic and social aspects of the aristocracy, the basic fact is that the power of the nobility rested on their landed estates and serfs, and thus on agriculture; there were no nobles among the cattle-raisers and the nomads, although some families had herds of cattle in addition to land. But, as said above, I deliberately exclude this subject from my account and refer the reader to P. Carrasco's *Land and Polity in Tibet* and to the recent studies by M. C. Goldstein.

The family based on the estate shows some peculiarities which makes it something very different from an European noble family. Polyandry is not perhaps the main factor, mainly because the fathership of a son is attributed by convention to the chief or first husband. Much more relevant is the institution of *mag-pa*, the son-in-law who enters the family of his wife to all effects and takes its name. This is not simply a means for ensuring the continuation of a family in the case of absence of male heirs. Not seldom the lineage by *mag-pa* is parallel to the survival of the direct male descendance; sometimes *mag-pa* lineage overshadows the direct one, i.e. becomes the main branch of the family. Typical examples are found chiefly in the house of bSad-sgra.

There are some instances of the continuance of a family being suddenly cut off because of a sentence of death upon its head or on the whole of its male members. An instance of total extirpation and

---

1 However, some of its new members, such as Ts'a-roh and sPo-mdâ'-ts'añ, grew very rich; and increasing contact with India after about 1934 tended to increase also the successful trading ventures of several noble families (*HR*).

of absolute severance, without any appreciable connection between old and new family, seems to be that of the Na-p'od family, wholesale executed by order of the Chinese representatives in 1728; however, the documents on the case are not sufficiently clear. A less radical instance is that of the foundation of a new Ts'a-roñ family after its head and heir had been killed in 1912. In this case government gave to the transfer of the estate the formal shape (of course a forced one) of a succession by mag-pa, although male members of the original house were still alive. In any case, the basic element of continuity seems to be the landed estate, not descent by blood.

On the other side the original estate (p'a-gžis) has not such a paramount importance as to supply the family with its only and unchangeable name; fairly often the name of the estate is flanked by the name of the family mansions in Lhasa. Official documents, such as the ŠBR, prefer the estate name and their example will be followed here.

Coming now to the actual composition of the ruling class, the distribution of political influence as reflected in membership of the bka'-ṣag is shown by the following table. It lists the seats held by various families during the first and the second halves of the period under consideration (1728-1844 and 1844-1959). The date of 1844 is that of the deposition of the mTs'o-smon-glin regent; it has no particular meaning in this context, but simply affords a convenient division into two equal portions for a period of about 230 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Seats 1728-1844</th>
<th>Seats 1844-1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mDo-mk'ar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dGa'-bži</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'a-lha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bŚad-sgra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zur-k'añ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bSam-grub P'o-brañ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'on</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gSar-byuñ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'ri-smon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na-p'od</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'a-roñ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-Yu-t'og</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor-k'añ-gsar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can legitimately draw some conclusions. First, the circle to which real power was limited was much smaller in the first period (eleven families) than in the later period (thirty-four families). Secondly, the noble houses that held a seat twice or more times, i.e. those who at one time or the other were politically very important, are only fourteen, out of the more than two hundred listed in Pr. P. 1954. And this shows that social differences within the aristocracy were much more marked than it appeared on the surface.

§ 6. Titles and subdivisions of the aristocracy

The Tibetans distinguish three classes within their aristocracy:

1) yab-gûs, i.e. the families of former Dalai-Lamas; they are now six, including that of the present Dalai-Lama;

2) sde-dpon, the highest peerage, including five families;

3) the rest of the aristocracy (sku-drag; in their capacity as landholders called sger-pa), about two hundred families, most of whom never played a political role.

Of course the first two classes monopolized most of the power received by the aristocracy, the sde-dpon (except the Lha-rgya-ri house) more so than the yab-gûs; the latter were handicapped by the unwritten rule that during the lifetime of a Dalai-Lama his relatives were debarred from the bka'-šag. The 13th Dalai-Lama was the first to circumvent it by creating for his nephew the new post of Minister of State (srid-blon).

The Tibetan aristocracy could receive Chinese titles from the emperor. In 1751 the Ch'ien-lung emperor had laid down that henceforward no Tibetan could hold the title of prince (wang), nor that of duke of the first degree (chên-kuo kung 錦國公). Thus the highest title available was that of duke of the second degree (fu-kuo kung 輔國公), followed by that of taiji 台吉 (in four degrees). The additional distinction of jasak 扎薩克 could be granted to a
first-class taiji. Heredity was by decreasing degrees; thus the son of a kung became a first-class taiji, the son of the latter a second-class taiji and so on. The rule did not apply to those houses to whom the emperor granted the privilege of "heredity forever".

At the end of the empire the houses officially holding rank in "heredity forever" were the following: the P'o-lha or lCañ-can house (kung); Hor-k'añ-gsar (jasak first-class taiji); bSam-grub P'o-brañ (first-class taiji); dGa'-bži (first-class taiji). The kung title belonging to the three yab-gžis houses of Glañ-mdun, P'un-k'añ and Lha-klu seems to have been inherited by courtesy only, without imperial sanction.

In 1912 the emperor ceased to be the fons honorum. Only once, in 1919, the 13th Dalai-Lama tried to exercise this privilege, as the de facto successor to the vanished imperial authority, by confirming the kung title to lCañ-can, P'un-k'añ and Lha-klu. Then the matter remained in abeyance and the kung title seems to have become a matter of custom, reserved to the houses who had enjoyed it under Manchu rule.

Occasionally the emperor granted the kung title for life only, as a very special distinction; the father of the 4th Pan-c'en and bSadsgra dBañ-p'yuğ-rgyal-po are instances in case. Much more common was the grant of the personal title of taiji, an usage which was continued by the Dalai-Lama after 1912.

Lastly, I point out once more, at some risk of repeating myself, that my enquiry regards a strictly limited field, i.e. that portion of the Tibetan aristocracy which was in contact with, and participated in, the actual functioning of central power. The exclusion of notables and landowners of purely regional importance practically reduces the field of research to the nobility of dBus and gTsañ, with the addition of the premier families of Koñ-po and Dvags-po. Within this field a narrower selection has been effected by including only those families which had access to power at its highest level, that of the bka'-šag. But if I had adhered strictly to these principles, I would have left out some houses of such prestige and influence as to render their exclusion wholly unjustifiable. Therefore, the last section includes some families who, although they never held a seat in the bka'-šag, have at one time or another occupied an outstanding place, because of their social position and their traditional connexion with the military career.

Summing up, in the present work I shall deal with the aristocracy
in the following order: a) yab-gtis; b) sde-dpon; c) those sku-drag families who occupied at least once a seat in the bka’-sag or a post of srid-blon; d) some sku-drag families particularly connected with the territorial military organisation; e) the lCañ-can (P’o-lha) family. Within each group, the order is that of the Tibetan alphabet. Short biographical sketches of the ecclesiastic ministers (bka’-blon bla-ma) are given as an appendix. As a rule, I give the personalia (as far as they can be ascertained) only of those members of the aristocracy who held office before 1959. The present-day generation, whether in Tibet or in the emigration, is excluded.
The grant of high rank and large estates to the father or to the brother of a Dalai-Lama was not an old tradition in Tibet, as nothing of the sort happened (as far as we know) in the case of the first six Dalai-Lamas. Apparently the custom was started by the Chinese, who in 1729 granted the title of *fu-kuo kung* to the father of the 7th Dalai-Lama. It is usually said that the *kung* title continued to be granted as a matter of routine to each subsequent *yab-gzis* 1. This is only partly true, because the title was not always hereditary and because two families never got it: that of the 9th Dalai-Lama received no title at all and that of the 10th was given the lesser title of first-class *taiji*.

Apart from the question of the title, seven families (from the 7th to the 13th Dalai-Lama) 2 ought to fall under this heading. Actually they are only five, because the families of the 8th and of the 12th were merged into one (Lha-klu), and that of the 9th died out at once 3.

---

1 Bell 1924, 54.
2 The relatives of the present Dalai-Lama (house of sTag-lha, formerly sTag-'ts'er) are omitted, because they did not (and chronologically could not) hold posts in the Tibetan administration.
3 bsTan-'dzin-c'os-skyon, the father of the 9th Dalai-Lama, died immediately after his conception. The child was brought up with loving care by his paternal uncle, whom he called father (a-p'a), and who accordingly is given the respectful title of father in the biography (DL9, 17a-b). On New Year's day of 1808 the regent gave to this man the honorific name Mi-'gyur-rdo-rje-ts'e-rgyal (DL9, 26b). Early in the 8th month of 1808 he received the first-rank coral button, granted him by the emperor (DL9, 56a-b, 58a). And indeed CSK, 1641b, registers the grant of the first-rank button to the Dalai-Lama's uncle Blo-bzañ-sñan-grags-rnam-rgyal; but the name, being identical with that of the father of the 10th Dalai-Lama, must be due to a mistake. The "father" of the 9th Dalai-Lama is mentioned rather often during the lifetime of his nephew and foster-son, down to 1815. After that he appears for the last time in 1822, as the uncle of the former Dalai-Lama (DL10, 101b). According to ZK he was a monk; anyhow, he left no children.
The house of GLAŇ-MDUN

This is the family of the 13th Dalai-Lama. Its founder was the Dalai-Lama’s father Kun-dga’-rin-c’en, a farmer from Glani-mdun, a village at the foot of the Dvags-lha-sgam-po mountain in Dvags-po. On 12th April 1879 the emperor granted him the title of kung, to which on 10th August 1879 the jewel button and the peacock feathers were added. His name is not much to the fore during the following years; but he was a man of great common sense, and in the ts’ogs-’du his advice was usually followed. Thus when about 1884 a case was brought against the P’a-lha family, who had protected Sarat Chandra Das and had allowed him to come to Lhasa in their train, Kun-dga’-rin-c’en voted against the wholesale confiscation of their landed property, which would have benefited the clergy only, and succeeded in limiting the fine to the escheat of their largest estate; it was then let out to the P’a-lha at a high rental, much to the advantage of the state treasury. He died in 1887, leaving five sons.

The eldest was Don-grub-rdo-rje, who in 1888 was granted the title of kung with the jewel button and the peacock feathers. He played no conspicuous role, except for the hostile position he took in 1901 toward the Japanese monk Kawaguchi. Still, his influence behind the scenes must have been considerable. A tradition current in Lhasa attributes to him, in conjunction with the gNas-c’uñ c’os-skyon, the dismissal of the whole bka’-šag in 1903. He arranged first for a meeting of officials, at which some of them were put up to criticize the bka’-blon and then putting about a story that the Dalai-Lama wanted to go into retirement because of the incapacity of his ministers. The solution which the ’Bras-spuṅs abbots put forward was that all the four bka’-blon should resign. At least this story

---

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 2.
2 TTSL, 90.7a, 97.10b; DL13, Ka, 52b.
3 He is mentioned late in 1879 and then in 1882, when he was recovering from smallpox; DL13, Ka, 64a, 108b.
4 Bell 1946, 50–51.
5 DL13, Ka, 161a.
6 CSK, 1642b; DL13, Ka, 183b.
7 He is mentioned in passing only once (1900); DL13, Ka, 340b.
8 Kawaguchi, 576–578.
seems to embody a tradition that the kung was more than a nonentity (HR). In 1904 he fled from Lhasa along with the Dalai-Lama and in 1905 he was in Urga¹. He is said to have died in Tsaidam in 1909 (ZK).

The second brother B l o - b z a n - b k r a - s i s entered the official career in the monastic branch, but then left it to become a mag-pa in the Bhrum-pa family (q.v.).

The third brother B y a m s - p a - r n a m - r g y a l - d p a l - d a n appears for for the first time in 1900 and was appointed gzims-dpon mk'an-po on 10.XII of that year, i.e. in January 1901². He came out to meet the Dalai-Lama returning to Lhasa late in 1909 ³. At the beginning of 1912 he paid him a visit at Darjeeling and then returned to the capital⁴. He appears to have died soon after (ZK).

The fourth brother was the 13th Dalai-Lama.

The fifth brother J a m - d p a l - d b a n - p ' y u g was recognized as the embodiment of the Šar-pa c'os-rje Nag-dbañ-ts'ul-k'rim some time before 1886, and as such was enrolled in the Se-ra sMad college⁵. His name occurs again in 1892 and 1893⁶. He is said to have died about 1906 (ZK).

Don-grub-rdo-rje's son K u n - d g a - d b a n - p ' y u g (b. 1906) is apparently the yab-giis Glañ-mdun who at the beginning of 1913 greeted the Dalai-Lama returning to Lhasa from his Indian exile; he is mentioned also in 1923⁷. In 1924 he was appointed joint srid-blon and at the beginning of 1926 received the appointment as full srid-blon⁸. But his influence in politics was always slight and decreased after the death of his august uncle, whose biography he sponsored⁹. At that time he was described as a rather stiff and uncommunicative young

¹ CCCTTT, Yu-t'ai, 2.6.
² DL13, Ka, 333a, 358a.
³ DL13, K'a, 76b.
⁴ DL13, K'a, 108a, 109a.
⁵ DL13, Ka, 146a. The Šar-pa bla-brañ, attached to Se-ra sMad, was very wealthy. The next incarnation came from the bŠad-zur family, and the present one from Ram-pa. Such links between noble houses and great monasteries, though outside any formal system, had an important bearing on Lhasa politics (HR).
⁶ DL13, Ka, 221a, 230b.
⁷ DL13, K'a, 118b, 232b.
⁸ DL13, K'a, 248a, 258b–259a.
⁹ DL13, K'a, 326a.
In April 1939 he ceased to fulfil the duties of his office and retired from political activity, although maintaining the title and the salary attached thereto (TR).

After the Tibetan-Chinese agreement of 1951, Kun-dga'-dbaṅ-p'yuṅ, adapting himself to the changed circumstances, started on a fresh career. In 1956 he became a member of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibetan Autonomous Region. After the flight of the Dalai-Lama, he maintained and even enhanced his position: in 1959 he was elected Deputy Chairman of the First Committee for Tibet of the CPPCC and in the following year he became a member of the Standing Committee of the Preparatory Commission. In 1962 he entered the Election Committee for the Tibetan Autonomous Region; and when in 1965 the Autonomous Region was inaugurated, he was elected member of its first People's Congress. He was also one of the deputy chairmen of the Government (People's Council) of the Tibetan Autonomous Region until its supersession in September 1968; but he was excluded from the Regional Revolutionary Committee which took its place. Thus it seems that, whatever his real political influence was, he always managed to stay in, or to re-enter, the topmost layer of the Tibetan government of the day. No information later than 1968 is available.

The house of P'UN-K'AN

Full name: P'un-ts'ogs-k'aṅ-gsar. The P'un-k'an estate is situated in the neighbourhood of K'ra-'brug at the mouth of the Yar-kluṅs valley. This is the family of the 11th Dalai-Lama.

Its founder was dKon-rts'e Ts'e-dbaṅ-don-grub (b. 1809). On 10th October, 1841, he received the title of fu-kuo kung;
the coral button and the peacock feather were added in 1848\(^1\). In 1845 the government had granted him a family estate (yab-g\(\ddot{\text{g}}\)is)\(^2\). He took a lively part in official life, at least in its ceremonial aspects\(^3\); but we never read of him wielding any political influence. Apparently he survived his son and was alive as late as 1860\(^4\).

He had three sons. The eldest is mentioned in 1847, when he performed the Tsari pilgrimage with his parents, and in 1852\(^5\); possibly also in 1860 along with his father.

The second son was the 11th Dalai-Lama.

The youngest son, N\(\text{a}\) g\(-\text{d}\) b\(\text{a}\) n\(-\text{r}\) g\(\text{y}\) a\(\text{l}\)\(-\text{m}\) t\(\text{s}\)\(\text{a}\) n, first mentioned in 1845\(^6\), was recognized in 1848 as the new incarnate of Grib Ts'e-c'o\(\text{g}\)-gli\(\text{n}\), one of the four “royal monasteries” of Lhasa\(^7\). As such, he is mentioned in 1852, 1853 and 1855\(^8\). Elsewhere he is called simply the ge\(\text{cu}\)n sku-\(\text{\ddot{z}}\)abs, Lord Younger Brother; thus in 1852\(^9\) and along with his father in 1860.

No personal names are found in the following years, except for a rgyab-’ded (“follower”) P'un-k'a\(\text{n}\) sr\(\text{a}\)s, who in 1888 was in charge of 1000 men of Brag-g\(\text{yab}\) marching to the Sikkim border\(^10\). Only the yab-g\(\ddot{\text{g}}\)is P'un-k'a\(\text{n}\)-pa occurs on formal occasions in 1860, 1862, 1871, 1874, 1879, 1888, 1898, 1901, 1902\(^11\). The Chinese texts register no further grant of the kung title; and yet the title was renewed at an unknown date, because the P'un-k'a\(\text{n}\) gu\(\text{n}\) is mentioned in 1877, 1878 and 1882\(^12\). Also the “duke Tapshi” (a misprint for Yapshi, yab-g\(\ddot{\text{g}}\)is), whom the British found in 1904 as rdzo\(\text{n}\)-dpon of Gyantse\(^13\), must have been a P'un-k'a\(\text{n}\) kung.

---

1 CSK, 1642a; DL11, 109b, 111b.
2 PC4, 239a.
3 Mentions of the rgyal-yab gu\(\text{n}\) in the DL11 on formal occasions are so frequent, that it is not worthwhile to list them.
4 In that year the yab-g\(\ddot{\text{g}}\)is P'un-k'a\(\text{n}\)-pa is mentioned along with his wife and with the elder and younger brothers [of the late Dalai-Lama] (yab-yum jo-lags da\(\text{n}\) ge\(\text{cu}\)n be\(\text{a}\)s) DL12, 67b.
5 DL11, 93b, 210a.
6 DL11, 63a-b.
7 DL11, 112a; LZTK, 72a.
8 DL11, 214b, 228b, 235a-b, 256a.
9 DL11, 209a-b.
10 DL13, Ka, 183a.
11 DL12, 66a, 97b, 182a, 223a; DL13, Ka, 66b, 182b, 295a, 360a, 376b.
12 PC5, 253b; DL13, Ka, 45b, 96a.
13 Waddell, 203.
According to the rules, the head of the family in the following generation bore the lesser title of taiji. This was P’un-k’añ b K r a–ś i s–r d o–r j e (b. 1888). He entered civil service as early as 1902 and in 1909 he went from Lhasa to gŠor-sgo to greet the Dalai–Lama upon his return to Tibet. In 1910 he was in charge of the smon-lam festival, when the Chinese troops, arriving in Lhasa on the 3rd day of the year (12th February), met P’un-k’añ on the road and fired upon him; his servant and his horse were killed and he himself was was beaten and placed under arrest in the Chinese camp. Not surprisingly, he supported the national rising; contributions of money and men came forth from yab-gžis P’un-k’añ in 1912 and 1913. In 1914 he was a rim-bži. In 1919 P’un-k’añ taiji bKra-sis-rdo-rje was appointed kung, the only attempt by the Dalai–Lama to succeed the defunct Chinese Ch’ing dynasty as fons honorum. In 1924 he was collector of the corn-tax (’bru-bskyel do-dam-pa) in gTsañ. In 1926 he became the lay head of the Foreign Office, with the additional title of jasak, and kept this charge till 1938. In that year he was appointed bka’-blon, although his sight was utterly bad and was getting worse (TR) and a few months later was implicated in the conspiracy of the former regent sTag-brag (TR). He was imprisoned for about a month and eventually went off with a fine, the title of kung being given back to him. He retired to private life and died in Lhasa some years ago (HR).

His eldest son mGon-po-ts’e-rin (b. 1918) was bka’-drun in 1938, Gyantse rdzoṅ-dpon in 1939, and married the eldest daughter of the Maharaja of Sikkim in 1940. When his father was arrested, the son was also held for a short time. He lives now in Kalimpong (HR).

---

1 ŠBR, 10.
2 DL13, K’a, 72a. According to Shakabpa, 223, 228, on this occasion he was appointed head of the new Foreign Bureau. But this is apparently a mistake for the appointment of 1926. The correct situation is described by Rahul 1969, 67–68.
4 DL13, K’a, 118b, 121a, 135a.
5 DL13, K’a, 173a.
6 Rahul 1962, 180–181; Rahul 1969, 68.
7 For some information from Western observers about him and his son see Chapman, 79; Harrer, 127–128.
The second son Ṫam-dpal-ṃṇaṃ-ṅid (b.c. 1920) was a favourite of the Rva-sgreṅ regent. He became a bka'-mgron in 1939 and a gñer-ts'ani in 1943; he died quite young, perhaps c. 1945 (HR).

The house of G:YU-TʻOG

This is the family of the 10th Dalai-Lama, founded by his father Blo-bzan-sņan-grags. In 1822 the emperor conferred upon him the rank and button of a first-class taiji 2. But already in the 8th month of 1822 he applied for and obtained leave from the emperor to quit Lhasa, whose climate did not agree with him, and to return to his home in order to recover his health 3. He died on 22.IX, 1824 4.

He was succeeded by the Dalai-Lama’s younger brother bsKal-bzan-p’un-ts’ogs, who had come to Lhasa in 1822 5. In the 11th month of 1824 he was granted the title and estates of his father, the grant being made public in Lhasa during the New Year’s festival of 1825 6. In the same year 1825 he was given the estate of g-Yu-tʼog, which had been confiscated from the ’Bum-t’aṅ family in 1792 7; it takes its name from the mansion near the Turquoise Bridge (g-Yu-tʼog zam-pa) at Lhasa 8. His name is often mentioned (but only on formal occasions) even after the decease of his brother, for the last time in 1848 9. It seems that the title of taiji was not maintained to his descendants.

Another member of the family was rDo-rje-rab-brtan, who first appears in 1826 as son (sras) in connection with the mother of the Dalai-Lama 10. He cannot possibly be a son of bsKal-bzan-p’un-ts’ogs, because the latter was born in 1817 at the earliest 11 and in

---

1 Pr.P. 1954, n. 6.
2 HTSL, 37.35a-b; DLIO, 93b–94a.
3 HTSL, 40.17a-b.
4 DLIO, 148a.
5 DLIO, 94a.
6 HTSL, 75.31a-b; DLIO, 150b, 151b.
7 DLIO, 146a.
8 Waddell, man opposite n. 331, n. 6.
9 DLII, 108a.
10 DLIO, 164a. Mentioned in similar circumstances in 1828, this time also with the maternal uncle (sku-žan) of the Dalai-Lama; DLIO, 195a.
11 He was junior to the Dalai-Lama, who was born in 1816.
1826 was still a little boy. He was apparently a half-brother of the Dalai-Lama. He could be the same as the g·Yu-t'og sras who appears in 1848, 1850, and 1852. Afterwards the style changes, perhaps because he (or another) succeeded to the estates of the family; and in 1860, 1862 and 1868 we find a yab-gëis g·Yu-t'og-pa.

Other members of the family took up official careers in the ecclesiastical branch. Thus we find a mk'an-drüni g·Yu-t'og Blo-bzañ-bs tan-\'dzin, who in 1848 was assistant director of the works at bSam-yas (under bka'-blon gSar-byun) and is mentioned also in 1852. Another was g·Yu-t'og Blo-bzañ-dbañ-ladan, "nephew of the preceeding Dalai-Lama", who got his first appointment to office in 1854. He is probably the g·Yu-t'og ta bla-ma, who was appointed mk'an-c'uni in 1859 and is mentioned again in 1860.

A less shadowy figure is the g·Yu-t'og sras who appears in 1860 and was appointed bšer-dpañ in 1862. He seems to be identical with the g·Yu-t'og p'yang-mdzod of 1867. In any case, he was promoted to bka'-blon on 7.X, 1873. In 1877 bka'-blon g·Yu-t'og was one of the officials who conveyed the 13th Dalai-Lama to Lhasa. In 1878 he was still alive, but it appears that he died shortly afterwards (ZK); and indeed he is not mentioned by S.Ch.Das at the time of his visit (1881).

His son g·Yu-t'og-pa P'un-ts'ogs-dpal-dan (b. 1860), held various offices, then was a rtse-p'yang before he was appointed bka'-blon at the end of 1903. He played a conspicuous role when the British armed mission entered Tibet. First he was sent to persuade the mission not to advance farther, and he had fruitless conferences with Colonel

---

1 DLII, 95a, 134a, 160b; bSam-yas, 232.
2 DLII, 69b, 97b, 158a.
3 bSam-yas, 74; DLII, 203a.
4 DLII, 236b.
5 DLII, 50b, 72b-73a.
6 DLII, 72a, 97a.
7 PCS, 181b.
8 DLII, 194a.
9 DLII, Ka, 44b-45a.
10 PCS, 253b.
11 The imperial confirmation was granted much later, on 2nd November 1904; CCCTTT, Yu-t'ai, 1.25. Cf. Landon, 11, 12; Shakabpa, 209.
12 CCWCSL, 182.6a-7a; Waddell, 270.
Younghusband at sNaṅ-dkar-rtse on and after 20th July 1904 1. Two months later he was one of the chief negotiators of the Lhasa treaty 2. He was thus particularly indicated for the delicate task of enforcing its terms; for this purpose, after the British troops had withdrawn, the Tibetan government sent him to open the trade mart at Gyantse, as a sort of special commissioner 3. As a consequence, he became a persona non grata with the Chinese. The junior amban Chang Yin-t'ang 張蔭棠 accused him, rightly or wrongly, of corruption, grasping and oppression, upon which he was removed from office and subjected to an enquiry (January 1907) 4. It seems that in 1910 he fled to India in the company of the Dalai-Lama and died there soon after (ZK).

His brother was the monk official bla-p'yang g-Yu-t'og mk'an-c'uṅ 'Jam-dbyangs-bstan-'dzin, who in 1894 accepted the post of deputy (ts'ab) for bka'-blon mDo-mk'ar-ba, who had applied for leave 5. In 1900, being still a bla-p'yang mk'an-c'uṅ, he was in charge of some work in the 'P'rul-snaṅ 6; in the same year he was appointed spyi-k'yaṅ mk'an-po 7. When the British entered Lhasa, he fled with the Dalai-Lama to Urga; but in 1906 he was dismissed and sent back to Tibet 8. He died about 1912–1913 (ZK).

The eldest son of P'un-ts'ogs-dpal-ladan was Ts'e-riṅ-dban-'dus's (?), who entered government service in 1899 9. He must be the bšer-dpaṅ g-Yu-t'og sras who visited the Dalai-Lama at Darjeeling early in 1912 10, and the g-Yu-t'og yab-gţis of 1912, 1923 and 1925 11. In 1924 he was rtse-p'yang.

A brother of his (?) was given in 1892 the name P'un-tṣogs-rnam-rgyal 12; but nothing else is known about him.

Ts'e-riṅ-dbaṅ-'dus's (?), son of b Kṛa-siṣ-don-grub (b.

---

1 Younghusband, 225–228; Waddell, 290–292.
2 Younghusband, 282–288; Landon, 11, 64, 102.
3 Younghusband, 367.
4 CCCTTT, Chang Ying-t'ang, 2.20, 2.22, 3.27.
5 DL13, Ka, 241a.
6 DL13, K’a, 188a.
8 Rahul 1962, 177n. According to ZK he was dismissed in 1909.
9 SBR, 6.
10 DL13, K’a, 109a.
11 DL13, K’a, 118b, 233b, 254b.
12 DL13, Ka, 221b.
1906) entered government service in 1924 and was trained as a gunner at Quetta (1925–1926). Upon his return to Tibet he was appointed bka’-druṅ (1926). Only in 1931 he returned to the army; in that year he was given further training as machine-gunner at Gyantse 2, after which he became mda’-dpon (1931–1935) of the “noble regiment” (groṅ-drag dmag-sgar) 3. Later he was mda’-dpon of the bodyguard (1935–1938) and in 1938 was given the title of taiji 4 and was put in charge of the Salt and Tea tax department (HR). The Chinese heard a rumour that in 1939 he tried to overthrow the Rva-sgren regent in agreement with the srid-blon 5, but the story is certainly without a real foundation (TR, HR). He was given the title of jasak in 1942 and was appointed mdo-spyi in November of the same year; he left for K’ams in April 1943 and came back to Lhasa only in the late autumn of 1947 (HR). In 1950, when the Chinese troops attacked C’ab-mdo, the Lhasa government appointed him to lead a mission to Britain, which, however, never materialized 6. In 1955 he became director of the Judicial Office of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region 7. In 1956 he was appointed bka’-ts’ab with full ministerial powers (PL, TK, TR, ZK) 8, and in the same year he preceded the Dalai-Lama, who was going to India for the celebrations of the Buddha Jayanti (TR, ZK). In January 1957 he severed every connection with the Communist regime, refused to return to Tibet and settled at Kalimpong 9. He is now (1973) residing in Taiwan.

His brother b s K a l-b za n-r i n-c ‘ e n (c. 1907–1972) separated from the g’Yu-t’og family and was known as mDa’-t’aṅ-pa, from the name of an estate in the P’o-braṅ district. He entered service in 1928.

---

1 SBR, 44.
3 Rahul 1962, 189. The regiment was created by Kun-’p’el-lags as a prop to his own power; the men, serving against their will, nearly mutinied after the death of the Dalai-Lama and the exile of Kun-’p’el-lags, and the regiment was gradually disbanded; Taring, 115–116.
4 Taring, 110; Rahul 1962, 189.
5 Li Tieh-tseng, 186.
6 Tibet, 750; Richardson, 181.
7 Tibet, 750.
8 According to HR, his appointment to the bka’-sag goes back to 1951, which seems less likely.
9 Tibet, 350, 782.
In 1937 he visited India to pay for ammunition supplied to the Tibetan government. In 1938 he became a žol-gñer and in 1944 was sne-šan to Mr Richardson, the Political Officer in Sikkim (HR). He settled in India before 1959 and died there in 1972 (PL).

A member of the family who is difficult to fit in the frame is Don-grub-rnam-rgyal (1890-1951), who entered service in 1913 and was a lha-gñer in 1924. He was officially called Sras-nañ sras and passed as an elder brother of bKra-sis-don-grub, which of course is chronologically impossible. Later he came to be known as the yab-gzęs p’ogs-dpon, owing to his marriage to a sister of srid-blon Glañ-mdun. In that capacity he was put in charge of the property of the 13th Dalai-Lama at Nor-bu-glin-k’a. In 1942 he was sent to investigate losses caused to people in Western Tibet by wandering Kazaks (HR). He died in Lhasa about 1951 or 1952 (PL).

The house of BSAM-GRUB P’O-BRAN

The name is commonly abridged as bSam-p’o. This is the family of the 7th Dalai-Lama.

Its founder bSod-nams-dar-rgyas is a figure of some note in Tibetan history of the early 18th century. Although born at Gyantse, he belonged to a ’P’yoñs-rgyas family. At first he became a monk at ’Bras-spuñs. Later the administrator of that monastery sent him to Li-t’añ in Eastern Tibet, where he turned layman and married. His first-born was soon rumoured to be the incarnation of the 6th Dalai-Lama. Lajang Khan twice sent some officers of his to make enquiries, but bSod-nams-dar-rgyas brought his child into safety first to sDe-dge, then to Kukunor, where the Qoñot princes recognized and protected him. The emperor interned them both in the sKu-’bum monastery; but the Dsungar invasion of Tibet induced him to grant recognition and support to the new incarnation. Father and son were brought to Lhasa by the imperial army on 16th October, 1720.  

1 SBR, 23.  
2 Pr. P. 1954, n. 4.  
3 DL7, 13a-15a; FPYL, 17.13b.  
4 On these events see Petech 1972, 20-24, 68-73.
bSod-nams-dar-rgyas developed a particular attachment to the royal shrine of bSam-yas, where he started restoration work and the building of new chapels in 1722 \(^1\), and where he received in state his son in 1724 and 1725 \(^2\). He was still there in 1726, when he erected a statue of Dipamkara \(^3\); and at the end of the same year or early in 1727 P'o-lha-nas paid him a visit \(^4\). From the very beginning he acquired a position of great influence in Tibetan politics \(^5\). But in the civil war of 1727–1728 he backed the wrong horse, fell into disgrace and was banished with his son to Eastern Tibet. Early in 1729 he was summoned to Peking to stand an enquiry. However, the emperor did not wish to hurt the feelings of the Yellow Church; so he pardoned the miscreant and even granted him the title of fu-kuo kung (29th June 1729) \(^6\). After some years of exile at mGar-t'ar, the Dalai-Lama and his father were allowed to return to Lhasa (1735). However, the new kung had to give an assurance never again to meddle with politics; and to ensure his compliance, he was debarred from staying permanently in Lhasa \(^7\). He took up his residence in the Zaňs-ri valley, a northern tributary of the gTsaň-po; but not even there was he master in his own house, because the estate was granted not to him, but to his younger son Kun-dga'-bstan-'dzin. Father and son built near the village of Zaňs-ri K'aň-dmar the palace of bSam-grub P'o-bran, which gave the name to the family \(^8\). From his new abode he did not move, except for his trips to Lhasa on the occasion of the smon-lam

---

\(^1\) DL7, 89b; bSam-yas, 65. In the gsuň-'bum of the 7th Dalai-Lama there are a dkar-c'ag and a small poem in praise of the buildings he erected at bSam-yas; Taube, nn. 2870, 2872.

\(^2\) DL7, 104b–106a, 114b.

\(^3\) dKar-c'ag included in the gsuň-'bum of the 7th Dalai-Lama; Taube, n. 2871.

\(^4\) MBTJ, 227a.

\(^5\) For the role played by the father of the 7th Dalai-Lama see Petech 1972, 74–115.

\(^6\) STSL, 82.4a; DL7, 132a.

\(^7\) According to F. Costantino da Loro (letter of 15th October 1741), "the father is permitted to come to the capital only once in a year"; MITN, II, 69. The Giornale of F. Cassiano da Macerata adds that "the king (P'o-lha-nas) refused him the residence in the town; but by order of the emperor he was obliged to allow him the choice of a dwelling place, and he chose a beautiful valley to the east, at a distance of only three days, with the permission to go to Lhasa once in a year and to stay there one month"; MITN, IV, 122.

\(^8\) Tucci 1956, 129. In 1737 the Dalai-Lama visited there his father and brother; DL7, 225b, 227a.
and for a visit to bSam-yas (1736) 1. And in this humiliating position of half-exile he remained until his death in March 1744 2.

His younger son Kun-dga’-bstan-dzin was enfeoffed in 1735 with the estates of Zaṅs-ri, bSam-grub P'o-brañ and bSam-yas, and was given title and seal of Acitu Darhan 3. On 23rd August 1744 the emperor granted him the continuance of the title of kung 4. The name of the new duke occurs fairly frequently in the DL7, but always in connection with ceremonies, travels and the like; the Chinese texts have little to add, and it appears that he played no political role. His normal residence continued to be Zaṅs-ri, where in 1754 he entertained his brother 5. In any case, his prestige was such, that in 1763 he was appointed bka’-blon in the vacancy caused by the demise of mDo-mk`ar Ts'e-riñ-dbañ-rgyal 6. But even in his new position he continued to be a rather un conspicuous figure. He died early in 1773 7.

His son bKrás-rnam rgyaI succeeded to the title 8. He maintained the usual formal contacts with the Dalai-Lama, the Panç-c'en and the regent 9. In 1783 the emperor promised him the expectancy of the first vacant seat in the bka’-sag, but not the continuance of the title to his descendants; after his death it was to be reduced to a first-class taiji, hereditary forever 10. He continued to be in fairly close and cordial relations with the regent 11, and in 1787 he and his son founded in Lhasa a new chapel, the gNas-bcu'i-lha-k'an 12. At last during the New Year's festival of 1788 he received the appointment to the seat in the bka’-sag left vacant by the death of T'on-pa Srid-ži-

---

1 DL7, 200a.  
2 DL7, 307a.  
3 DL7, 188a.  
4 KTSL, 221.1a–b; DL7, 311a–312a.  
5 DL7, 455b.  
6 FPYL, 18.15a; see also TWC, 24.7b. An isolated mention of him as bka’-blon at the beginning of 1761 (DL8, 18b) seems to be due to a mistaken anticipation.  
7 Funeral rites were performed on 23.III, 1773; PC3, 326b. The news was received in Peking on 8th May, 1773; KTSL, 931.15a.  
8 KTSL, 931.15a; FPYL, 18.17b.  
9 Mentions in 1774, 1777, 1778, 1779; PC3, 355a; Samati, 16b, 51a; PC3b, 70a.  
10 FPYL, 18.20a–b; WTTC, pref. 37a–b; KCCHLC, 104.5b.  
11 Instances in 1785 and 1786; Samati, 187a, 217b.  
12 DL8, 165b.
In the 2nd month of the same year he was sent to bKra-sis-lhun-po to wait upon the Pan-c'en, in the company of the amban Yamantai 雅滿泰; shortly afterwards, in the 7th month, he inspected Naṅ-gnon, i.e. the district of bKra-sis-lhun-po. But then something happened of which no trace is preserved in the sources, and he retired or was dismissed from his seat, because he was not included in the bka'-šag at the time of Samati Pakṣi's return to Tibet (12th month of 1790). The Chinese texts (KEKCL) too, although mentioning him occasionally, never give him the title of bka'-blon. Thus he had gone out of the bka'-šag in 1789 or 1790. In 1791 he was commanding some 'Dam Mongol troops sent to gNa'-lam, and on 16.VIII (13th September) he fell in battle against the Gorkhalis.

His brother bsKal-bzaṅ-bstan-'dzin-rnam-rgyal became a monk and ultimately rose to the post of bka'-blon bla-ma (v.).

Another member of the family was the nephew (sku-ts'a), or rather grand-nephew of the 7th Dalai-Lama called Blo-bzaṅ-bka'-sis-sis, who was initiated in 1786 and was a dge-bskos c'en-mo in 1788.

As already laid down by the emperor, bKra-sis-rnam-rgyal's son P'yang-rdor-dban-p'yug (d. 1817) inherited the rank of first-class taiji, and by this title, often abridged as bSam-p'o taiji, he is repeatedly mentioned in the first years of the 19th century, although his personal name never appears in the Tibetan texts. The same applies to his son bSod-lhun-p'un-ts'ogs (d. 1831), who was a second-class taiji. Neither father nor son entered government service.

On the contrary, bSod-lhun-p'un-ts'ogs's son rGyal-mtš'an-dnö-sgrub appears repeatedly in the Tibetan texts. His personal name is in CSK only.

---

1 DL8, 167b.  
2 DL8, 168b; L4PC, 52b.  
3 DL8, 173b.  
4 KEKCL, 1.14b.  
5 KTSL, 1394.12a; KEKCL, 2.1b, 2.16a; also 8.10b, 16.9b, 16.16a-b. Cf. FPYL, piao 3.17a; WTTC, 13a–13a; KCCHLC, 24.2b.  
6 PC4, 48a, 51b.  
7 WTTC, pref. 37a.  
8 DL9, 60a, 75a, 107a, 145a, 1731. He and his father (bSam-grub-p'o-braṅ-pa guṅ taiji) are listed among the danapati (shyin-bdag) of Klo-'rdol Bla-ma; KDTT, 183a.  
9 Mentioned in DL10, 85b, 144b, 154a, 165b, 186a, 195b, 213b, 238b. His personal name is in CSK only.  
10 For the first time in 1838; DL10, 268a. And then often in DL10 and DL11.
although they as usual are silent about his personal name, known only from the Chinese sources. In 1841 he was sent to Mongolia to obtain information on the illness of the Jebtsundamba Qutuqtu; at that time he was already a 1st class taiji ¹. In 1844 he accompanied as far as sMar-k‘ams the amban Mêng-pao, returning to Peking ². In 1847–1848 he went with the bka’-blon bŠad-sgra to Brag-gyab ³, and his activity there earned him from the emperor an unspecified promotion ⁴. He first appears as bka’-blon when on 29.VI, 1852, he came from Lhasa to join the Dalai-Lama, then travelling in Southern dBus; on 8–9.VII he entertained him lavishly at Zaňs-ri K‘an-dmar ⁵. He is again mentioned in passing in that year and in the following ⁶. In 1854 he was contributing to the expenses of the restoration of bSat-zas ⁷ and in 1856 he signed, along with the other bka’-blon, the peace treaty with Nepal ⁸.

Another member of the family was bSam-p‘o D a m-c ‘ o s – p ‘ e l – r g y a s , who made his career among the monk officials. He was rtse-drüh in 1849–1850 and was appointed rtse-mgon in 1854 ⁹.

The name of rGyal-mts’an-dnos-grub’s successor to the taiji title and to the family estates is found nowhere. We can only say that he was the bSam-p’o taiji who in 1873 was in partial charge of the travel arrangements for the Dalai-Lama (with base at gDan-sa-mt’il) and who in 1874 entertained him at Zaňs-ri ¹⁰. The yab-gžis bSam-p’o occurs in 1879 and in 1886 ¹¹.

In 1900 the descendant (rigs-sras) of this family, by name P ‘ y a g-r dol, received the imperial edict conferring upon him the taiji title, just about the time when the Dalai-Lama was visiting that region;

¹ MP, 2.4a–b.
² DL11, 51a.
³ DL11, 83a, 104b, 105b. For the Brag-gyab question see under bŠad-sgra.
⁴ X. 1847; HTSL, 448.31a–32b.
⁵ DL11, 198a, 205a–206b.
⁶ DL11, 224b, 238b.
⁷ bSat-zas, 218.
⁸ Tharchin, 124; SPS, 118.
⁹ bSat-zas, 218; DL11, 248a, 249a.
¹⁰ DL12, 193a, 219b, 220a. The bSam-p’o gun mentioned as bka’-blon in 1879 (DL13, Ka, 64a) must be a textual error for Lha-klu gun.
¹¹ DL13, Ka, 66b, 151a.
the ruler was received with great honours at the bSam-grub P’o-brañ palace in Zañs-ri mK’ar-dmar ¹. In spite of the difference of name, P’yag-rdor must be the same as the “first-class taiji of Tibet” Sung-tsan-chi-to 松壇奇樫, who in 1900 was given that title as the successor of his brother Nor-bu-dgra’dul deceased ². Anyhow, this is the yab-gžis bSam-grub-p’o-brañ-pa mentioned in 1901 ³ and perhaps also in 1912 and 1923 ⁴.

P’yag-rdor’s son taiji T s‘e-d b añ-r i g’-d z i n (b. 1905) entered government service in 1919; in 1924 he was tog’-dzin of Gur-pa (?) ⁵. Later he became a žol-sde-pa and then a rtsis-dpon. His title of taiji was taken away in 1931 and restored in 1937 (HR). He attended the Inter-Asia Conference held at Delhi in March 1947 ⁶. In 1957 he was appointed bka’-blon (PL, TR, ZK). He was one of the foremost supporters of the new regime. In March 1959 he became Deputy Commander of the Tibet Area Command. When on the 10th the situation grew very tense, he drove in a Chinese staff car to the Nor-bu-gliṅ-k’a; the Tibetan crowd stoned the car and he was seriously wounded ⁷. On 28th March he put his signature to the proclamation of the Tibet Area Command against the rebels ⁸. Shortly afterward he became a member of the National Defense Council ⁹ and of the Standing Committee of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region, and in 1962 he was appointed member of the Election Committee for the Autonomous Region ¹⁰. In February 1967 he was accused of being head of a renegade clique, whereupon he was deprived of all his posts ¹¹. No information after that date is forthcoming.

bSam-p’o sras d Pa1-l d a n-c’os-d b añ (b. 1902) entered the service in 1920, and in 1924 was chief of the police (’go’-doms bka’-

---

¹ DL13, Ka, 345a–346a.
² TTSL, 462.9b.
³ DL13, Ka, 361b.
⁴ DL13, K’a, 118b, 233b.
⁵ SBR, 35.
⁶ Shakabpa, 291.
⁷ Dalai-Lama, 156; Tibet, 349, 355, 749–750; TR.
⁸ Tibet, 355–356.
⁹ Tibet, 750.
¹⁰ Tibet, 404, 426.
¹¹ Who’s Who, 554.
ts'ab) in Lhasa; nothing else is known about him. He may have been a brother of the above.

Ts‘e-dbañ-rigs-‘dzin’s eldest son bSam-p‘o sras b s T a n -’ d z i n - d o n - g r u b (b. 1924) was a bka’- druñ c‘uñ- ba in 1942 (HR). Then he became a rim-bži and in February 1951 was sent from Lhasa to Peking via C‘ab-mdo, as a member of the Tibetan delegation who negotiated and signed the Sino-Tibetan agreement. In 1952 he was a mda’-dpon. In March 1959 he was among the Tibetans who tried to defend the Potala; he was imprisoned by the Chinese and was freed after a couple of years in bad conditions of health. He died soon after (PL, TR).

The elder sister of P‘yag-rdor married Zur-k‘añ N o r - b u - t s ‘ e - r iñ, who as mag-pa took the family name bSam-grub P‘o-brañ (ZK, TR). In 1909 he was rtse-p‘yag and early in 1910 the Dalai-Lama appointed him acting bka’-blon on or shortly before his flight to India. He died in India in 1910 (ZK).

Family tree of bSam-grub P‘o-brañ

bSod-nams-dar-rgyas (d. 1744)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seventh Dalai-Lama (d. 1757)</th>
<th>kung Kun-dga’-bs tan-’dzin (d. 1773)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kung bKra-sis-rnam-rgyal (d. 1791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taiji P‘yag-rdor-dbañ-p’yug (d. 1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taiji bSod-lhun-p’un-ts’ogs (d. 1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taiji rGyal-mts’an-dhos-grub (d. after 1856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taiji N N N N N (alive 1873–1874)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sister

married Nor-bu-ts‘e-riñ (d. 1911) (d. 1900) (d. after 1923)

Padma-rdo-rje

taiji P‘yag-rdor
taiji Nor-bu-dgra-’dul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P‘yag-rdor-dbafi-p‘yug (d. 1817)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rGyal-mts’an-dhos-grub (d. after 1856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor-bu-dgra-’dul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor-bu-ts‘e-riñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 ŠBR, 38.
2 Li Tieh-tseng, 206; Richardson, 278; Shakabpa, 304; Taring, 174; Tibet, 766.
3 Taring, 187.
4 DL13, K’a, 78a.
5 Shakabpa, 228.
6 The genealogy after 1791 is based upon CSK, 929a–b.
During the First World War his son Padma-rdo-rje was sent to Quetta for military training; he was dismissed from the army with other officers in 1924.

The [earlier] house of LHA-KLU

Full name: Lha-klu-dga’-ts’al. It is the name of their stately mansion near Lhasa. This is the family of the 8th Dalai-Lama. This house supplied a disproportionate number of princes of the Yellow Church; and the well-known decree of 1793, by which the emperor prescribed the drawing of lots from a golden bowl for the selection of higher incarnate Lamas, was mainly aimed at preventing in the future such a monopoly by a single family.

The unnamed forefather of this house had at least three sons. The eldest was bSod-nams-dar-rgyas; according to a Chinese text, who calls him by the name A-’bum (A-mu-pu-mu), he died early. Indeed he is not mentioned in the biography at the time of the recognition of the 8th Dalai-Lama, nor ever afterward. There is a tradition to the effect that he had been a servant in the household of an official described as Roñ-dpon c’en-po (HR).

bSod-nams-dar-rgyas in his turn had three sons: bSod-nams-bkra-śís, Blo-bzan-rdo-rje and the future 8th Dalai-Lama. bSod-nams-bkra-śís visited the Pañ-c’en in 1771. In 1781 he obtained from the emperor the title of fu-kuo kung, but died at Urga on 9th April, 1782.

1 Shakabpa, 259. His personal name was indicated to me by TR. Perhaps he can be identified with Lha-pa Padma-rdo-rje (b. 1891), who entered the service in 1914, and in 1924 was E Ñin-mk’ar gžis-sdod; ŠBR, 26.
2 Taring, 71.
3 Pr. P. 1954, n. 1.
4 L. A. Waddell, Chinese imperial edict of 1808 on the origin and transmigrations of the Grand Lamas of Tibet, in JRAS 1910, 75–86.
5 The name is found only once, in DL8, 14a.
6 FPYL, 18.19b (= KCCHLC, 103.33a).
7 PC3, 307a.
8 FPYL, 18.19b–20a; WTTC, pref. 35a–b; KCCHLC, 103.33a; DL8, 120b; KDTT, 57a.
9 KTSL, 1153.1a–b.
Of his two sons, the elder became the 4th Jebtsun Damba Qutuqtu Blo-bzañ-t'ub-ldan-dbañ-p'yug (1775-1813). The younger, R a b-brtan-rnam-rgyal, succeeded his father as kung in 1782. At first he resided with his brother in the Khalkha territory; then he came back to Tibet. In 1784 he was granted the peacock feather. He died childless in 1803, and in vain the Dalai-Lama begged the emperor to appoint as successor his own maternal cousin. The title lapsed, as the emperor had laid down in 1783.

bSod-nams-dar-rgyas's second son Blo-bzañ-rdo-rje entered the ecclesiastic career. He appears for the first time in 1781. Two years later he went to bKra-sis-lhun-po to represent the Dalai-Lama at the installation of the Pañ-c'en, after which he is not mentioned until 1788. In the following years (1789-1790) he was known as the abbot of Mañ-ra. However, he was persona non grata with the Manchu residents, and in October 1790 he and his half-brother Blo-bzañ-dge-'dun-grags-pa were arrested and sent to Peking. Early in 1791 he was received in audience by the emperor, who confirmed his title of mk'an-po. But on 3.III, 1791, the news of his death (probably at Peking) reached Lhasa; the funeral rites were performed three days later.

The third son of bSod-nams-dar-rgyas was, as already said, the 8th Dalai-Lama.

A younger brother of bSod-nams-dar-rgyas, called Blo-bzañ-p'un-t's os, was certainly the most active and influential...
member of the family. His relations with the 3rd Pan-č’-en were particularly close; he visited him in 1765, 1769, 1777 and 1778, and in 1781 he sent an envoy to Ts’a-č’-u-k’a in the gDañ-la region to receive with due honour the corpse of the pontiff, who had died in Peking. In the same year he was honoured by the grant of an imperial seal. He too was present at the enthronement of the Pan-č’-en in 1783–1784, and in 1786 he went again to bKra-sis-lhun-po to bring some presents to the young incarnation. In 1785 he had discussed with the regent the arrangements for the impending assumption of full powers by the Dalai-Lama. Probably he played an influential role during the two years (1786–1788) in which the Dalai-Lama tried (and failed) to govern personally; but no trace of such a role is found in the texts. In 1788 he was among the officials who received the Pan-č’-en, fleeing from bKra-sis-lhun-po to Lhasa before the Gorkha invaders. In 1789 he was sent to bKra-sis-lhun-po to take part in the funerals of the Pan-č’-en’s father and in the next year he visited again that monastery; the died later in that same year 1790.

He had a son of his own, by name Blo-bzān-dge-rnam-grags-pa. This half-brother of the Dalai-Lama was present at the funerals of the 3rd Pan-č’-en in 1781. On 10th August, 1789, the imperial commissioner Bajung memorialized the throne proposing him for an appointment as mk’an-po; without waiting for a reply, the Dalai-Lama invested him as abbot of gNal sDe-drug (8th month).

---

1 PC3, 235a, 287a; PC3b, 41, 32b, 33a.
2 PC3b, 281b; PC3c, 56b.
3 Samati, 123b.
4 PC4, 20b, 27b, 39b. This text calls him at first k’u-bo (uncle) Ačitu mk’an-č’-en, and later mes-po (grandfather) Ačitu mk’an-po.
5 PC4, 46a–b.
6 Samati, 181b.
7 PC4, 55a, 56a. Further contacts with the Pan-č’-en: PC4, 60b.
8 PC4, 62b.
9 PC4, 63a, 64a.
10 Samati, 355b; PC4, 65a.
11 PC3b, 282a–b, 290b.
12 KTSL, 1333.12a–b.
13 DL8, 180a. He is mentioned as such also in 1790; PC4, 66a. gNal is the valley of the Nye-chu in Lho-k’a; Ferrari, 126. gNal sde-drug is a comprehensive name for six monasteries (sde-drug) in that region, viz. Gra’-or, Zaňs-po-c’e, Ri-steň, Ňaň-skyal, Te’u-ra, gSer-p’yi-k’a. "They are very famous in dGe-lugs-pa history, and it was traditional
Soon after he and Blo-bzañ-rdo-rje fell into disgrace with the imperial representatives, and already at the end of 1789 the emperor was seriously thinking of summoning them to Peking. Things came to a head in the following year, when the amban charged them both with unlawful extortion of money, unruly behaviour and strong rNîn-ma-pa leanings; as a consequence, the emperor passed strict orders to send them to Peking (28th September, 1790); they left Tibet on the 28th October. Their exile, however, was not very hard, and on 21.II, 1791, the news reached Lhasa that the emperor had granted to the brothers an audience, during which he had confirmed at last their titles of mk'anz-po. Blo-bzañ-rdo-rje died in China; but on 17th October 1791, following the entreaties of the Dalai-Lama, the emperor allowed Blo-bzañ-dge-`dun-grags-pa to return to Tibet, where he arrived in December. In the first month of 1792 he was appointed, along with bka'-blon dGa'-bzi and g·Yu-t'og, to negotiate with the Žva-dmar sprul-sku and the Nepalese commissioners. But before his mission could materialize, he died in February 1792.

Another member of the family was d Pal ldan-don-grub, of whom we are told that he was a nephew (sku-ts'a) of the Dalai-Lama's uncle Blo-bzañ-p'un-ts'ogs; the latter sent him to visit the Pañ-c'en in 1767 and both together went on the same journey in 1769. dPal-lidan-don-grub went again to gTsani in 1778 and finally settled there, as it appears from other mentions in 1779 and 1781.

that all six should be administered by a single mk'anz-po, to be appointed by the Lhasa authorities; Smith, 182. See also the list in Ferrari, 126-127.

1 Samati, 319b.
2 KTSL, 1361.11a-13b, where a much abridged version of the document quoted in the following footnote can be found. Cf. also Samati, 333b-334a.
3 On the whole affair see the memorial by O-hui and the imperial rescript in answer thereto, in MCSL, 841b-842a.
4 Samati, 364a; DL8, 188b (where the date is 27.II).
5 KTSL, 1387.12a-13b.
6 KEKCL, 10.4a.
7 KEKCL, 18.11a-b, 18.15b. Cf. Rose, 48.
8 KEKCL, 20.11a (where he is wrongly called "A-ku-la, the younger brother of the Dalai-Lama"); cf. 30.161.
9 PC3, 265a.
10 PC3, 287a.
11 PC3b, 47b.
12 PC3b, 54b, 63b (where he is called not quite correctly, a nephew of the Dalai-Lama); PC3c, 56b. Incidentally, the statement of S. Turner, An account of an embassy to the court...
After the recognition of his son as the 4th Pan-c'en Blo-bzañ-bstan-pa'i-ni-ma (1781–1853) he received in 1787 the title of fu-kuo kung ¹, as well as the coral button and the peacock feather ². He died in 1789 ³.

Family tree of [early] Lha-klu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.N.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bSod-nams-dar-rgyas, d. c. 1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blo-bzañ-p'un-ts'ogs, d. 1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blo-bzañ-dge-'dun-grags-pa d. 1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bSod-nams-bkra-sis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blo-bzañ-rdo-rje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Dalai d. 1782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dPal-idan-don-grub d. 1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Jebsun Damba Qutuqtu d. 1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rab-brtan-rnam-rgyal d. 1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Pan-c'en d. 1853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to tell how the family was continued. There was a Lha-klu sras, who in the 5th month of 1808 returned from gTsan ⁴ and in the same year received a rank button from the emperor ⁵; we do not know in which way he was related to the family of the 8th Dalai-Lama. In 1813 he accompanied the Pan-c'en upon the latter's return to gTsan ⁶. He is mentioned, always without a personal name, in 1814, 1822, 1825, 1827, 1829, 1832 ⁷. Then there is utter silence.

The [later] house of LHA-KLU ⁸

Full name: Lha-klu-dga-ts'al. This is the family of the 12th Dalai-Lama and was founded by his father P'un-t'sogs-t'se of the Teshoo Lama in Tibet, London 1800, 230 and 249, that the Dalai-Lama and the Pan-c'en were first cousins, is another case of over-semplification. They belonged to two different generations.

---

¹ KTSL, 1277.17a-b; PC4, 50a-b.
² PC4, 60a. In his last years he was closely connected with the Ẓva-dmar sprul-sku; KEKCL, 38.9b-10a.
³ PC4, 62b. Cf. KTSL, 1351.38a.
⁴ DL9, 46b. Also mentioned as Lha-sras in DL9, 37b, 39a.
⁵ DL9, 58a.
⁶ DL9, 146b.
⁷ DL9, 159b; DL10, 85b, 154a, 155b, 186a, 212b–213a, 268a.
In order to save government estates from being allotted to the new yab-gžis family (ZK), in 1858 the government ordered the father and relatives of the 12th Dalai-Lama to live with the family of the 8th; the two houses were merged into one by matrimonial ties. In 1859 the emperor granted to P'un-ts'ogs-ts'e-dbañ the title of kung. His name occurs pretty often in the DL12 during the following years, always on the usual formal occasions. He died in the 3rd month of 1865.

P'un-ts'ogs-ts'e-dbañ had three sons, of whom the Dalai-Lama was the youngest. The eldest, Ye-ses-nor-bu-dbañ-p'yu-g, is occasionally mentioned in 1856, 1860 and 1865. The emperor sanctioned his succession to the title of his father; the decree was dated 2nd August 1865 and, not having been received in Tibet on account of the troubles in Nag-roñ, was renewed on 20th January 1866. This second document was received in Lhasa on 25.I (early March), 1866. About that time he collaborated in the case against mT'u-stobs-luñ-pa and fought against the Nag-roñ rebels, for which in 1868 he was granted the third rank and the peacock feather. He is often mentioned in the lifetime of his brother; later, on account of his prestige and connections, he became the foremost figure of the Tibetan government during the late seventies and the eighties of the 19th century. In 1875-1876 he was entrusted with the supervision of the building of the Dalai-Lama's tomb on the roof of the Potala. As the Lha-klu guñ he is mentioned in 1877 and 1878. About 1880 he was appointed bka'-blon, appearing as such at the end of 1881 when

---

1 Name found in DL12, 20a.
2 rgyal mc'og bryad pa'i yab gžis Lha klu dga' ts'al ba dañ | goñ sa mc'og gi yab yum sku rñe rnams t'ugs 'dod geig 'dres la gžuñ gnas sñar lam legs skyes stsal bar yab gžis p'an ts'un gyi sku no rnams t'ugs rje c'e žus kyi mjal p'yag tu bcar; DL12, 44b.
3 WTLSL, 303.13b-14a; CSK, 1642a; DL12, 49b.
5 DL12, 24a. 59a, 62a-b, 128a.
6 MTSL, 162.23b; CSK, 1642b.
7 DL12, 133b.
8 See under bṢad-sgra und P'u-luñ, pp. 177-178 and 120-121.
9 MTSL, 222.13a; DL12, 156b.
10 DL12, 280a, 281a, 285b.
11 DL13, Ka, 45b; PC5, 253b.
he was sent along with bka’-blon Ram-pa-ba to settle a trouble which had arisen in gTsarî. Late in October 1881 the junior amban Wei-ch’ing 維慶 had been sent to inspect the garrison of gTiṅ-skyes. Both on the journey and during his prolonged stay at Shigatse he demanded travel allowances which were far in excess of the customary ones. The rtsis-dpon lCan-can, who accompanied him as sne-šan, was unable to extort such vast sums from the peasantry, and the result was a riot, in which the mob, led by the two rdzoṅ-dpon of Shigatse, stoned the Chinese soldiers. The infuriated amban had the rtsis-dpon arrested and flogged, but was attacked by the people and his life was saved only by the timely arrival of mda’-dpon P’a-lha. Some days later the senior amban Sê-léng-ê 色楞額 and the bka’-blon Lha-klu and Ram-pa arrived at Shigatse and investigated the matter, judgment being delivered on 12th December. The two rdzoṅ-dpon were degraded both in rank and post; the village headmen were punished by flogging and imprisoning. As to Wei-ch’ing, his case was referred to Peking; but although the Chinese government recognized that his dealings were both corrupt and high-handed, they threw the blame on his underlings and on the Tibetan officials 1. After having settled this question, Lha-klu visited the Pan-c’en and on the 23rd December left for Lhasa 2.

Some time later he was entrusted with a much more difficult case. On 8th April 1883, at the end of the smon-lam festival in Lhasa, a petty dispute between a Newari trader and two Tibetan women resulted in a serious riot, during which 85 Nepalese shops were looted and some of the owners were beaten 3. There was considerable loss of property, for which the Nepalese government requested compensation, to the amount of Rs. 1,700,000. The bka’-šag accepted the principle, but offered a much smaller sum. The situation grew so tense, that war seemed inevitable; the Nepalese collected an expeditionary force, which was intended to invade Tibet by the Wallung pass in eastern

---

1 Das, 64, 67–69; TTSL, 139.11b, 140.12b–13a.
2 Das, 87; PC5, 272b.
3 On the facts see CCCTTT, Ting Pao-chên, 36–37 (19th March 1884) and 38–39 (16th July 1884); TTSL, 163.7b (15th June 1883); Rose, 124. It also appears that some Nepalese traders sustained loss of merchandise on the frontier at sKyid-gron; TTSL, 170.4a (6th October 1883).
Nepal and was to be commanded by general Padma Shamsher Jang Bahadur\(^2\). The imperial government was duly informed about the tense situation, but the only measure taken was the despatch of a minor official called Ting Shih-pin \(^1\) whom the governor-general of Szechwan Ting Pao-chên \(^3\) sent to Lhasa to collaborate with the amban Sê-lêng-ê \(^4\). In November 1883 the amban appointed a commission composed of the Chinese official Chao Hsien-chung \(^5\), of the bka'-blon Lha-klu and Ram-pa and of the Nepalese representative ("Captain") in Lhasa, to conduct negotiation with a Nepalese delegation at sKyid-groṅ \(^6\). After a long haggling, the two delegations signed an agreement on 26th May 1884, by which Tibet agreed to pay Rs. 942.098 as compensation, in annual instalments over a seven-years period. For this purpose the Szechwan treasury advanced 80,000 taels (= c. Rs. 400,000) to the Lhasa government \(^6\). And thus peace was preserved \(^7\). Chao Hsien-chung was duly commended for his part in it \(^7\). Ye-ses-nor-bu-dbaṅ-p'yug, on the contrary, earned little thank; in 1886 he was described by the imperial government as obtuse and inefficient and was considered with some suspicion \(^8\).

About this time another problem was coming to the fore, in the shape of British penetration in Sikkim and subsequent friction on the ill-defined border. The situation gradually grew to a climax, and the Tibetan frontier forces were forcibly expelled from Lűn-t'ur on

---

\(^1\) On the Nepalese measures see Rose, 125.

\(^2\) Ting Pao-chên (1820–1886) was governor-general of Szechwan from 1876 to his death; Hummel, 723–725.

\(^3\) CCCTT, Ting Pao-chên, 42–44 (18th September 1884); TTSL, 186.13b–14a (17th July 1884), 190.9b–10a (9th September 1884), 193.1b–2a (19th October 1884).

\(^4\) CCWCSL, 36.32b–34a (25th November 1883); TTSL, 170.4a (6th October 1883), 172.1a–b, 183.5a–b.

\(^5\) TTSL, 187.9a–b, 187.12b; DLJ3, Ka, 121a; Rose, 126. According to Shakabpa, 194, most of the money was advanced by the Caghan Nomin Han, a Mongol incarnate who had come to Lhasa about that time (DLJ3, Ka, 115a). For the balance of the payment, which was again supplied by the Szechwan treasury, see TTSL, 216.12b, 216.12b–13a. The last instalment of 67,579 taels was received in Lhasa on 6.XI, 1886 (DLJ3, Ka, 150b).

\(^6\) On this serious crise see Lamb 1960, 153–154; Shakabpa, 193–194; Kawaguchi, 280–281; and above all Rose, 123–126.

\(^7\) TTSL, 216.12b (2nd November 1885). He published a diary of these negotiations with the title T'ang-Kuo hsi-huo chi-lüeh, 1888.

\(^8\) TTSL, 229.2b–3a (7th July, 1886).
21st March 1888 1. When the news of the defeat reached Lhasa, Ye-ses-nor-bu-dbañ-p'jug was appointed overall commander of the Tibetan forces on the Sikkim frontier, with headquarters at Gyantse; he set out from Lhasa on the 28.II (c. 9th April) 2. His activity in his new assignment receives a flood of light from the Chinese documents 3, but was not particularly successful. On 22nd May he launched an attack on the British camp at sNa-gdoñ (Gnatong), where he narrowly missed capturing the lieutenant-governor of Bengal, but was driven back with some loss 4; thereupon he returned to P'ag-ri 5. On 24th September General Graham attacked and dispersed a Tibetan concentration at sNa-gdoñ, and Lha-klu fled to Rin-c'en-sgañ in the Chumbi valley; the Chinese complained peevishly of his indecision 6. In July 1889 he was still commander-in-chief on the Sikkim border 7. In the following year a proceeding was instituted against him, but was quashed on account of the good work he had done at Lhasa after his return there 8. He died on 6th December 1891 9.

His younger brother mK'yen-rab-blo-gros-'jigs-med was žabs-gsar-pa in 1861 10. He is mentioned again in 1867 and at the time of the demise of the Dalai-Lama in 1875 11.

It is difficult to say who was the Lha-klu'i mgon-gñer Ts'e-brtan-p'un-ts'ogs mentioned in 1875 12.

---

1 Lamb, 186; Shakabpa, 199-200. The story of the British activity on the Tibet-Sikkim border 1887-1890 is too well known for me to give references.
2 DL13, Ka, 169b; CCCTTT, Wen-shih, 6.21, 6.25.
3 CCCTTT, Wen-shih, 7.21, 7.23, 7.27, 8.1; CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 1.5, 1.8-11, 1.13, 1.16, 2.4; CCWCSL, 76.9b, 77.18a-20b, 77.22b-25b, 78.2b, 78.18a-b. TTSL has several documents on these events, but the name of Lha-klu appears nowhere.
4 Lamb 1960, 186; V. G. Kiernan, India, China and Sikkim: 1886-1890, in IHQ 31 (1955), 38.
5 CCCTTT, Wen-shih, 8.20.
6 Lamb 1960, 187; V. G. Kiernan, loc. cit.; CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 1.8. Another Chinese document refers to a fight on the Jelep-la under the date of the 3rd October, in which the Tibetans lost nearly 100 men; TTSL, 259.7b-8a.
7 CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 2.12.
8 Document of July 1890; CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 3.22.
9 CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 4.19.
10 DL12, 82a.
11 DL12, 138a, 253b, 272b.
12 PC5, 239a.
The son of yab-gžis Lha-klu received the title of kung in 1892. He was about 20 years old in 1904, when his house in Lhasa became the headquarters of the British mission. He died in 1918 (TR); in the 9th month of 1919 his widow caused a gilt pinnacle to be made for the 'P'ril-snañ, as an offering for the deceased.

A young brother of his (?) was given in 1891 the name 'Jig s-med-rnam-rgyal. He died ca. 1912 (ZK).

The Lha-klu sras P'un-ts'ogs-rgyal-po (b. 1883), who entered the service in 1906, was given the title of jasak in 1923 and was žol-gñer in 1924, is something of a mystery, being difficult to fit in the family tree; perhaps he was yet another brother of the duke.

The kung who died in 1918 had divorced his first wife and married a lady from the T'on family; as he had no male offspring of his own, he took into the Lha-klu house the son of his second wife, who was an illegitimate child of kung Glañ-mdun and thus a half-brother of srid-blon Glañ-mdun (ZK, TR). This boy, by name P'un-ts'o-gs-rab-rgya-s, was given the title of kung at the beginning of 1919; but he died at the age of 16 shortly before the arrival of Sir Charles Bell in 1920.

The Lha-klu lha-leam, i.e. the widow of the old duke, remained unmarried for some years. She had fallen in love with rtsis-dpon Luñ-śar, one of the most influential men in Tibet. A marriage was out of question, as it would have meant the extinction of one of the two houses. Thus in about 1924 in order to ensure the survival of the Lha-klu family, she adopted Luñ-śar's younger son, aged 14, by name T's'e-d bań-rdo-rje (b.c. 1910). He entered service in 1927 and was dismissed in 1934, when Luñ-śar was imprisoned and blinded.

---

1 DL13, Ka, 221a.
2 Waddell, 355.
3 Bell 1928, 78, says: "recently" (in relation with his arrival in Lhasa late in 1920).
4 DL13, K'a, 176b; cf. Bell 1928, 85.
5 DL13, Ka, 217a.
6 ŠBR, 13; DL13, K'a, 233a.
7 He might be identical with the yab-gžis Lha-klu, who was in charge of the smon-lam of 1921 and is mentioned again in 1923; DL13, K'a, 207b, 233b.
8 DL13, K'a, 173a.
9 Bell 1928, 78.
however, the Lha–klu lha–lcam saved him from heavier punishment. He was re-admitted into service and in 1937 was appointed bka’-mgon. In 1940 he married a lady of the T’on–pa family. In 1941 he was promoted to the fourth rank and appointed rtsis-dpon (HR). This was still his rank in November 1946, when he escaped an attempt on his life by some attendants of the former regent Rva–sgreñ. In December of the same year he became a bka’-blon and shortly after was concurrently appointed mdo-spyi. However, he stayed on in Lhasa for some time, and in April 1947 he helped Zur–k’añ žabs-pad to arrest the former regent. Not before the summer of 1947 did he leave for K’ams. In July 1950 he was recalled from C’ab–mdo and left for Lhasa in September. In 1952 (TR, ZK) or 1957 (PL) he was dismissed from the bka’-šag. In 1959 he was prominent among the Tibetan officials who advised resistance against the Chinese and took active part in it. After the collapse of the revolt he was arrested and subjected to a public trial, after which he was held for five years in a labour camp. He seems now (1972) to be living in Lhasa (PL, ZK).

As to the old Lha–klu lha–lcam, the real mainstay of the family, she died in Lhasa a few years after 1959.

---

1 This account is based on Taring, 118; cf. Chapman, 319. In Pr. P. 1963, 419, the story is told in a rather different way.
2 Shakabpa, 292–293; Ford, 35.
3 Taring, 168.
4 Ford, 74; Richardson, 183. For a lively sketch of him see Ford, 12–15.
5 Taring, 270.
This section of the aristocracy consists of five houses: dGa’-bži, T’on, mDo-mk’ar, P’a-lha, Lha-rgya-ri.

The last of the five will be omitted. The chiefs of Lha-rgya-ri claimed descent from the ancient kings of Tibet, and as such enjoyed much prestige and several privileges. Their estate in south-eastern Central Tibet was autonomous to such an extent, that some Western authors speak of the “king” of Lha-rgya-ri. But the political importance and the interests of this ancient family were purely local, and they never held office in the central government. Accordingly, they are mentioned only incidentally in the Tibetan texts and never in the Chinese ones. It must be remarked that they seldom if ever gave trouble to the Lhasa government and they accepted passively all the political changes of the first half of the 18th century.

The house of DGA’-BŽI

Another name is rDo-riñ, which is perhaps the more common today; it is derived from the Lhasa mansion of the family, near the P’rul-snañ and in front of the pillar (rdo-riñ) which bears the text of the treaty of 822. The dGa’-bži estate lies to the north of Gyantse.

---

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 4.
2 Their early history and genealogy are set forth in the Chronicle of the Fifth Dalai-Lama, ff. 105b-106a (= Tucci 1949, 649).
3 Lha-rgya-ri is the headquarters of the E-yul district; Ferrari, p. 126 n. 254. On the little town and its rulers in 1913 see Bailey, 176-178.
4 Pr. P. 1954, n. 8.
5 It occurs for the first time in DPDG, 127a-b; and in L8DL it alternates freely with dGa’-bži.
7 It is described by Bell 1928, 98-102.
A dGa’-bži-ba without name or title occurs already in 1699; but the foundations for the greatness on the family were laid by b S o d - n a m s - r g y a l - p o of K’aň-c’en in Šaňs, usually called K’aň-c’en -nas. We know nothing of his beginnings. At the end of 1715 or at the beginning of 1716 Lajang Khan appointed him governor (sgar-dpon) of mNä’-ris sKor-gsum (Western Tibet). It was due to his vigilance that late in 1717 the Qošot ruler got the first news of the approach of the Dsungar army. After the fall of Lhasa and Lajang’s death he maintained his post in mNä’-ris; we do not know whether he recognized the authority of the new puppet regime. We hear next that he intercepted and annihilated a party of Dsungars who was carrying into exile to Dsungaria some old Qošot officials. By this action he started the Tibetan revolt against the Dsungars. I have shown elsewhere that, although we cannot identify him with Desideri’s “Targum-treê-sciij”, the Jesuit missionary built up his highly coloured tale around a historical kernel, represented by the deeds of K’aň-c’-en-nas. In 1721 sgar-dpon K’aň-c’-en-nas received the title of Daicing Båtur and the estate of Yar-brog-glin. After that year, his life identifies itself with the history of Tibet. He was murdered by his colleagues on 5th August 1727.

In 1725 K’aň-c’-en-nas had asked the imperial government to

---

1 *DL6*, 361b.
2 It is odd that he is never given the name dGa’-bži-ba.
3 This date can be inferred from Desideri’s travel account. When on the 7th September 1715 he arrived at Gartok, the headquarters of mNä’-ris, “the commander of those regions and of the troops had been a Tartar prince, and when he died the princess his widow had remained in command for two years (i.e. 1713-1715). Now she had obtained permission to leave with her retainers, and other troops with another commandant were to be sent from Lhasa to replace her”; *MITN*, V, 173. Desideri made his journey to Lhasa in the company of this lady, whom Freyre calls Caçal (*MITN*, VII, 199). Her unnamed successor must have been none else but K’aň-c’-en-nas.
4 *TWC*, 24.3b. Two later texts make him the son-in-law of Lajang; *DL10*, 70a, and the Jen-fu ēi-i biêig of Sung-yün (amban 1794-1799), quoted by W. Heissig in *OE*, 9 (1962), 88; but all the contemporary sources are silent about it.
5 *MBTJ*, 117a.
6 *MBTJ*, 166a-b. This must be the same party mentioned in the Mongol document translated by W. Heissig in *ZDMG* 1954, 408.
7 See Petech 1972, 62-63.
8 *DL7*, 74b.
9 Petech 1972, 78-115.
appoint, as his deputy in the government of mNa’-ris, his elder brother dGa’-bži-ba. The proposal was accepted, and on 25.V, 1725, we find already mention of sTod sgar-dpon dGa’-bži-nas. After the murder of K’aň-c’en-nas, P’o-lha-nas left for mNa’-ris to assemble an army there. He appealed to Ts’e-brtan-bkra-śis, who had to avenge the death of his brother and willingly joined him; it was probably his influence which obtained some auxiliary troops from the king of Ladakh as well. dGa’-bži-ba joined the gTsan army at the head of 2000 men from mNa’-ris, and took part in the first part of the campaign. He was killed with a score of his men at the end of 1727 in a skirmish near rGya-mk’ar, an affair of little military significance but of unforeseen political import, because in its course T’ön-pa Sri-gcod-ts’e-brtan went over to P’o-lha-nas, and mDo-mk’ar Ts’e-riñ-dbañ-rgyal was taken prisoner, both to become later the first appointments to P’o-lha-nas’s council of ministers. The death of dGa’-bži-ba gave to P’o-lha-nas control of mNa’-ris, and that large region remained firmly in his hands to the end of his life.

This death seemed to mean an irreparable setback for the dGa’-bži family. But the Peking government had not forgotten its staunch fidelity in 1720. At the beginning of 1729 the emperor bestowed upon the dead dGa’-bži-ba the posthumous rank of a first-class t’aijí and granted to his elder son rNam-rgyal-t’s’e-brtan the inheritance of this title. Of course, these Chinese honours implied no feudal tenure; and mNa’-ris remained lost to the dGa’-bži house, since P’o-lha-nas appointed his own elder son Ye-šes-ts’e-brtan to its vacant governorship.

Members of the dGa’-bži family found a compensation in brilliant careers within the new Tibetan government. In 1731 rNam-rgyal-ts’e-brtan sent to the emperor a letter of thanks and a gift of local produce. In return he was promoted to the rank of fiu-kuo kung.
once enjoyed by his uncle K'añ-c'en-nas (who apparently had died childless) and was appointed to the office of _bka'-blon_ \(^1\). He married the younger daughter of P'o-lha-nas \(^2\) and died in 1739 \(^3\).

For some reason, about which all our sources are silent, his son P a-s añ s-t s-e-r iñ was excluded from the succession; probably he was still a child when his father died. Anyhow, he obtained only the lesser rank of a third-class _taiji_ \(^4\), and not until 1748 was he promoted to a first-class _taiji_ \(^5\). He was never entrusted with particularly important duties; as late as 1763 he was only 'go-pa of Sa-dga' in Western Tibet \(^6\). In that same year or in the following one, however, he was appointed dBus _mda’-dpon_, as the successor of P'u-luñ Zil-gnon-rdo-rje (q.v.) \(^7\); he appears as such in 1765 and 1771 \(^8\). His last mentions belong to 1778 and 1779 \(^9\) and after these dates we hear nothing more about him and his descendants, if any.

The headship of the dGa'-bži family had devolved upon the younger brother of rNam-rgyal-ts'e-brtan, by name mGon-po dNos-grub-rab-brtan. He too was still young, and in 1737 he had entered the rNiñ-ma–pa monastery of sMin–grol–gliñ for a course of studies \(^10\). In 1739 he showed before the Dalai-Lama his proficiency in grammatical, rhetorical and religious studies, whereupon he was granted the seal and title of Noyan P a n d i t a \(^11\); and by this name he was known henceforward \(^12\). A few weeks later his elder brother died, and Panḍita inherited the title of _fu-kuo kung_ and was also appointed, as a matter of course and in spite of his youth, to the vacant seat of _bka’-blon_ \(^13\).

---

\(^1\) _FPYL_, 17.24b–25a; _Hsi-tsang-chih_, 3.1b.

\(^2\) The marriage had taken place before the New Year's day of 1733; _MBTJ_, 362a.

\(^3\) _DL7_, 263a; _TWC_, 24.10b.

\(^4\) _TWC_, loc. cit. _DL7_, 461a, seems to make him a son of Panḍita; but their correct relationship, found in the Chinese texts, is confirmed by _DPDG_, 120a.

\(^5\) _FPYL_, 18.6b; _KCCHLC_, 105.2b. He is mentioned with this title in 1758 and 1761; _PC3_, 151b, and _DPDG_, 127a.

\(^6\) _PC3_, 215a.

\(^7\) _TWC_, 24.10b.

\(^8\) _PC3_, 238a, 307b.

\(^9\) _PC3b_, 34a, 35b, 66a.

\(^10\) _DL7_, 226b.

\(^11\) _DL7_, 261b.

\(^12\) His personal name is found only once more, in the form Panḍita dNos–grub–rnam–rgyal (1779); _PC3b_, 49b.

\(^13\) _FPYL_, 18.1b; cf. _DL7_, 267a. About 1740 the _Hsi-tsang-chih_, 3.3b, gives him the title of gTsañ _mda’-dpon_; but this is clearly a mistake, because he never held that office.
Although Paṇḍita’s character does not appear as a particularly strong one, he was a very influential nobleman, because of his noble birth and his marriage with bDe-ldan-sgrol-ma, daughter of P'o-lha-nas. He was also very wealthy, and some Chinese texts give valuable information about his income. He played a certain role in the hectic events of 1750. In that year he was already at loggerheads with 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal, who suspected him of conspiring with the unfortunate duke of mNa'-ris. When the Tibetan “king” was murdered and the two Manchu ambans were lynched, he was in Lhasa and the Dalai-Lama entrusted him with the task of re-establishing order. For a moment it seemed that he was going to be the successor of 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal. However, his appointment by the ambans shortly before their violent death was completely unauthorized; and the emperor refused to confirm it. Nevertheless he remained a prominent member of the bka’-sag for more than forty years, and it appears that the Chinese representatives dealt with him in preference to the other bka’-blon. Most of the information about his activity (other than ceremonial) belongs to the later part of his life. In 1777/8 he was one of the most splendid hosts during the Paṇ-c‘en’s stay in Lhasa and he showed the same courteous officiousness once more in 1779. In the same year he with other officials directed some repair work in the 'P'rul-snan. When in that same year the people of San-shan or San-an committed some robberies and intercepted consignments of tea intended for the Dalai-Lama, and the Chinese

---

1 Apparently she was the lady who had married his elder brother rNam-rgyal-ts'e-brtan; according to Tibetan custom, brothers usually shared the same wife. She was a pious patron of the clergy and of the monasteries, and died in 1773; PC3, 334a.
2 WTTC, 14a.45b-46a; 14b.27b-28a. In 1751 he was granted a share of the revenue of the P'o-lha estate; DL7, 401a; KTLS, 385.14b-15b.
3 sTag-lun, 413b.
4 Petech 1972, 21 i–223. The emperor was not impressed by Paṇḍita’s action; KTLS, 378.4a–b.
5 PC3b, 18b, 26b, 34a, 35a–b.
6 Early in 1779 he joined the ambans in presenting to the Paṇ-c‘en the imperial rescript summoning him to Peking; PC3b, 49b. In the 6th month of 1779 he went to receive the Paṇ-c‘en passing through Lhasa; PC3b, 66a.
7 Samati, 217a.
8 This is the 'Ba’ Sa–nān of the Tibetan texts, in the Yang-tze-kiang valley north of Batang; “the people who have their dwellings in that valley make their living solely by acts of robbery”; Wylie, 101 and 183, n. 622.
government sent troops to punish them, Panṣita was ordered to betake himself to sMar-k'ams at the head of 300 Tibetan soldiers, accompanied by some trusted officers; he left Lhasa on the 10th December, 1779. He cooperated wholeheartedly with the imperial commanders in that little, forgotten war, and was still encamped in Sa–ña in the middle of 1780. Soon after he returned to Lhasa, and in the following year he and his son went to the Tengri–nor, to meet the remains of the Pan–c‘en which were travelling in state back to Tibet. By this time age and the weariness of the long Sa–ña campaign had told upon him; and when in 1782 he broke two ribs in a fall from his horse, he asked to be allowed to retire. The amban supported his request, which the emperor granted, together with some precious gifts. At the beginning of 1783 he even took the vows of a dge–bsiñen. Still, the ambans continued to consult him occasionally on affairs of state, and as late as January 1791 he took part in a meeting of the bka’–šag on the occasion of Samati Pakṣi’s arrival. He died in 1792.

His son bSod-nams–bstan–’dzin–dpal–’byor–ts’e–riṅ, usually called by the shorter name of b s Tan – ’ d z i n – d p a l – ’ b y o r, was taught in 1775 by Ye–šes–rgyal–mts’an (1713–1793), the yoṅs–’dzin of the 8th Dalai–Lama; at the same time or slightly later he was also

---

1 Chin. Chiang–k’a; Markham of the maps; Wylie, 182 n. 617.
2 KTSL, 1095.14a–b, 1099.5a–b; DL8, 106b–107a; Samati, 81b, 72b; PC3b, 111b.
3 There are several Chinese documents concerning this campaign. After the sudden death of the amban So-lin on the Lha–ri pass en route to the field of war, the imperial troops were commanded by the amban T’ē–ch’ing–é; it seems, however, that little fighting occurred. See chiefly KTSL, 1100.1a–b, 1100.2b–3a, 1103.19b–21a, 1104.10b–11b, 1108.12b–13b; also Shakabpa, 155. Already in 1770 the people of Sa–ña had made inroads into Tibetan territory; KTSL, 856.16a–b.
4 KTSL, 1108.13a. In the 5th month of 1780 the Lhasa amban on behalf of the Lhasa government transmitted to the Tibetan officers at sMar–k’ams the pay funds; Samati, 90b.
5 PC3b, 282a, 283a, 284b; PC3c, 56a.
6 19th November, 1782; KTSL, 1166.31a–b. The date of 1789 in FPYL, piao 3.17b (repeated of course in KCCHLC, 24.3a and 105.3b, and in CSK) is incorrect.
7 DL8, 134a–b; Samati, 141b.
8 Samati, 349a.
9 The emperor expressed his regrets and sent his condolences on 13th June, 1792; KTSL, 1403.18b–19a.
10 The full name is found e.g. in DL8, 151a. – He wrote his autobiography, to which I have no access; it was extensively utilized by Shakabpa. See Shakabpa, 338.
11 YSGT, 84a.
a pupil of Kloñ-rdol Bla-ma. A concrete relic of this connection with two of the foremost scholars of his time is found in a short instruction on the Lam-rim-c’en-mo dedicated to him by Ye-ses-rgyal-mts’an, and in a commentary on two grammatical works composed by the young nobleman himself. He is otherwise not often mentioned in those years. After his father’s retirement the amban Po-ch’ing-ê, acting upon the recommendation of the Dalai-Lama, proposed bsTan-dzin-dpal-byor’s appointment as bka’-blon and his succession to the rank of fu-kuo kung. At first the emperor demurred; he passed some scathing remarks on the youthful inexperience of the Dalai-Lama, who blindly supported Panñita, and on the rather stupid behaviour of Po-ch’ing-ê; he refused an immediate appointment and asked for further confidential information. It appears, however, that he was immediately satisfied on this score, because in the 3rd month of 1783 the appointment of Panñita’s son as bka’-blon was officially announced in Lhasa. But the title of fu-kuo kung was withheld for the moment.

bsTan-dzin-dpal-byor acted as the sne-san of the amban in his visits to gTsan in 1783 and 1786. About this time he enhanced his position by marrying the younger sister of the Dalai-Lama. In 1786 he accompanied the departing Samati Pakshi as far as the ’Bri-c’u region. Late in 1788 he accompanied the imperial general Ch’eng-te, commanding an advance unit of the Chinese army, who was supposed to drive the Gorkhali invaders out of Tibetan territory. But neither party was eager for a fight, and the Panñ-c’en’s father dPal-lidan-don-grub and the Sa-skya gsol-dpon bla-ma bSod-nams-ye-ses exerted themselves to mediate the conflict. In the spring of 1789 he joined them as representative of the Lhasa government, while the imperial commissioner Bajung 太忠 too went to the border. They discussed

---

1 KDIT, 182b.
2 Tōhoku n. 6142.
3 Tōhoku n. 7068.
4 E.g. in 1778 and 1781; PC3b, 37b, 282a.
5 3rd February, 1783; KTSL, 1172.4a-5a.
6 Samati, 139b; DL8, 134a.
7 Samati, 148b, 180b.
8 Samati, 139b; LBDL, 134a.
9 Samati, 148b, 180b.
the matter with a Gorkhali delegation and the result was a preliminary agreement, signed at sKyid-gron on 12 Šravana badi 1846 (17th August, 1789), by which the Tibetan delegation promised to pay an annual tribute of 50,001 rupees. Immediately after bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor returned to Lhasa, where he received at last the coveted title and seal of fu-kuo kung. The final treaty was signed on 2 Vaisākha sudi 1847 V.S. (16th April 1790). Bajung represented to the emperor this rather shameful surrender as a great success, for which he was rewarded. But later the truth leaked out and Bajung committed suicide (1791), while bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor was the target of deep suspicion.

In the 3rd month of 1791 he was sent to gNä'-lam, the headquarters of the gNä'-nañ district on the Nepalese border, to hand over the balance of the tribute still due and to negotiate with the Gorkhali commanders; he arrived there on 24th July. The events that followed are not clear, as the Tibetan, Chinese and Nepalese accounts differ. So much is sure, on 8 or 9 VII (7th or 8th August) the Gorkhalis attacked the Tibetan delegation at Kuti by surprise, overpowered the escort and seized bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor and bka'-blon g'Yu-t'og, who were carried in chains to Kathmandu. According to the Nepalese version, the Gorkhali officers Damodar Pande and Bam Shah suspected the Tibetans of engineering a plot to kill the Žva-dmar-pa, the Tibetan high incarnate and refugee who was inciting the Nepalese against his home country. According to the Tibetans and the Chinese, this was due to wanton and deliberate treachery of the Nepalese. The coup led to a renewed outbreak of hostilities.

---

1 On the whole affair see Rose, 41–42, and Shakabpa, 158–161. There is a great number of Chinese documents, among which I may quote; KEKCL, 9.22b–26b, 20.7b–8a, 38.9b–15a; KTSL, 1320.5a–7a, 1320.10a–11a, 1325.14b–15a, 1326.2b–3b.  
2 SPS, 53; this document gives the complete name bSod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dpal-'byor-ts'erid. The date in Rose, 42 (2nd June) seems incorrect.  
3 DL8, 179b.  
4 DL8, 180a.  
5 SPS, 20.  
6 KTSL, 1326.9b–10a.  
7 WTTC, 13a.11b; KEKCL, 1.1a–b.  
8 KTSL, 1385.8a–b; KEKCL, 1.1b.  
9 KEKCL, pref. 2.15a, 16.5b; WTTC, 13a.12a.  
10 Rose, 48.  
11 Shakabpa, 163–164.
bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor’s captivity turned into a real disaster for him, as the Manchu authorities suspected him of collusion with the Gorkhalis, the more so as his wife was a niece of the Žva-dmar-pa. Accordingly, he was dismissed from his office of bka’-blon.

In 1792 general Fukangga invaded Nepal, penetrating deep into the country. The Kathmandu government put forward feelers for a truce, but the Manchu generals laid down, as a preliminary condition for any sort of negotiation, that bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor should be delivered into their hands. The Gorkhalis complied, and on the 28th July 1792 bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor and bka’-blon g’Yu-t’og were delivered at the imperial camp. He was escorted to Tibet and Fukangga ordered him to be placed under close guard and not allowed to communicate with his family; he was to be sent to Peking later. Actually he did not leave Tibet and was merely subjected to a judicial interrogation (September–October). In the meantime things cooled down, and the emperor ordered that judgment on him should be deferred to more peaceful times. The final decision came on 15th July, 1793, when he was deprived of the rank of fu-kuo kung and was placed on probation; he was given to understand that, if he repented of his misdeeds and behaved well for two or three years, he would be appointed a sde-pa.

---

1 On this relationship see KTSL, 1402.15b; KEKCL, 28.24a, 28.28a.
2 WTTC, 13b.24v; KEKCL, 31.19a. – On this occasion the imperial representatives in Tibet memorialized the emperor expressing their misgivings lest the dGa’-bži estates (we are told that “the family was very wealthy”) should fall in the hands of the Dalai-Lama’s finance department, thus unduly increasing his power and influence; KTSL, 1405.10a-b; KEKCL, 31.23a-24a.
3 Rose, 55.
4 KEKCL, 37.1a–3b gives 9.VI = 27th July. But this is the date of the letter containing the Nepalese proposals for peace, which bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor brought to the Chinese camp (WTTC, 13b.26a–29a; 2 July in Rose, 61, is a misprint for 27 July). We can get the exact date from a Nepalese letter dated Karttika badi 7, Monday (= 5th November), first published in Nepal Sanskrit Parishad Patrika, III, 3 (1954), 8–9, and then in SPS, 17–20; according to this document it is Śravaṇa 31, Saturday. The number of the day is impossible in Indian chronology, but we may accept the day of the week: Saturday 28th July. Saturday 4th August is impossible, because already on the 2nd August Fu-k’ang-an sent his reply to the letter to Kathmandu (WTTC, 13b.23a–26a). Cf. also KTSL, 1410.32a, 1411.10b, 1414.11a.
5 WTTC, 13b.26a.
6 WTTC, 13c.5b–6a.
7 KTSL, 1417.15b–16a.
After two years of quiet private life, the term expired and in 1795 he was given office (kuan-\text{-}li)\textsuperscript{1}, we do not know in which capacity\textsuperscript{3}. In 1798 he and his son entertained the 8th 'Brug-c'en incarnate as their guest\textsuperscript{4}. After the scandalous events of 1805, which will be told below and by which he succeeded after all in shouldering his son into the bka'-'sag, he continued his life in Lhasa, appearing as former minister on the New Year's festival of 1808 and later in the same year\textsuperscript{5}. At the end of 1808 he (rDo-\text{-}riñ \text{yab}) was received in audience in the Potala after having completed a period of spiritual retreat at Rag-k'a-brag\textsuperscript{6}. Lastly, the bka'-\text{blon} dGa'-bži-ba yab-

bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor's son M i - 'gy r - b s o d - n a m s - d p a l - 'b y o r was born in 1784\textsuperscript{9}. When his father was deprived of the title of kung, the son was granted, as an act of grace and in consideration of the earlier merits of the dGa'-bži family, the lesser rank of first-class taiji\textsuperscript{10}. During the next years he led the usual life of a young aristocrat under the guidance of his father. He too was a pupil of Klön-rdol Bla-ma and in 1798 and 1813 had the 8th 'Brug-c'en as his guest\textsuperscript{11}. In 1805, when he was 21\textsuperscript{12}, father and son acting together se-

\textsuperscript{1} \textsc{Ktsl}, 1430.7b–8b. Cf. \textsc{Wttc}, 5.18a, and \textsc{KeKcl}, 46.26b–29a. The \textsc{fpyl}, piao 3.17b (followed by \textsc{Kcchl}, 24.3a, and \textsc{Csk}) wrongly places the event in 1792.

\textsuperscript{2} At the beginning of 1794 the former minister bsTan-'dzin-dpal-'byor offered a feast to the clergy of Lhasa; \textsc{dl8}, 221b.

\textsuperscript{3} \textsc{Wttc}, 14b.30a.

\textsuperscript{4} \textsc{bc8}, 43b.

\textsuperscript{5} \textsc{dl9}, 26b, 60a.

\textsuperscript{6} \textsc{dl9}, 89a.

\textsuperscript{7} \textsc{dl9}, 93a.

\textsuperscript{8} Tōhoku 6242, Taube 1248; Taube 1284; Tōhoku 5213, Taube 1563. In the colophons he is called dGa'-bži-ba'1 yab bSod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dpal-'byor-ts'e-riñ.

\textsuperscript{9} In 1792 he was nine (suite); \textsc{KeKcl}, 31.17a.

\textsuperscript{10} \textsc{Ktsl}, 1430.7b–8b.

\textsuperscript{11} \textsc{kdtt}, 182b; \textsc{bc8}, 43b, 64a. He sent presents to the 'Brug-c'en in 1818 or 1819; \textsc{bc8b}, 9a.

\textsuperscript{12} And not 13 as in Shakabpa, 171.
cured the entrance of the latter into the bka’-šag by heavily bribing the amban Ts’e-pa-k’ê 策巴克. This unsavoury intrigue caused something of a scandal, and anonymous posters were attached to the walls of Lhasa, denouncing the fraud; as a consequence, the emperor sent two special commissioners to hold a strict investigation, and Ts’e-pa-k’ê, having been found guilty, was dismissed and punished ¹. It seems that Mi-gyur-bsod-nams-dpal-’byor’s appointment was cancelled ²; but even if this is correct, soon after he was finally and lawfully given a seat in the bka’-šag, because we find him often mentioned as bka’-blon in and after 1808 ³. He continued in office for nearly 30 years, but his record is certainly not impressive. In 1809–1810 he made a tour of inspection in the Nag-c’u region ⁴. He took a prominent part in the ceremonies of the Dalai-Lama’s inthronement in 1822 ⁵. In the following year he accompanied the amban to gTsan ⁶, and a few months later he was sent to the Nag-c’u ⁷. In 1824 he was entrusted with the task of installing the new incarnate of Rva-sgreli ⁸. In 1825 he was sent on mission to sPo-bo, from where he went to K’ams and then back to Lhasa ⁹. Similarly in 1828 he left for Kon-po on a mission to sPo-bo; he came back in the next year ¹⁰. As late as the 3rd month of 1834 he accompanied a Chinese general on inspection ¹¹; but he died in that same year 1834 ¹².

The boy “born in the rDo-rin family”, who in 1789 was recognized as the new incarnation of the Lo Sems-dpa’-c’en-po with the name Blo-bzañ-bses-gñen-grags-pa-rgyal-mts’an, was a younger brother of Mi-gyur-bsod-nams-dpal-’byor ¹³.

¹ JTSL, 150.9a–10b, 159.26b–29b.
² Shakabpa, 172.
³ First mention in DL9, 37b, and several other entries in DL9 and DL10.
⁴ DL9, 103b, 107b.
⁵ DL10, 74b, 81b, 86b, 90b–91a. In the same year he was present at the funeral of the 8th ’Brug-c’en; BC8b, 29a, 38b–39a.
⁶ DL10, 133b, 134a.
⁷ DL10, 138a.
⁸ DL10, 146a.
⁹ DL10, 159b, 163a.
¹⁰ DL10, 202a, 208a.
¹¹ DL10, 288b.
¹² DL10, 295a.
¹³ DL8, 178b, 181a; WTTC, 5.2b.
In 1813 *bka'-druṅ dGa'-bdi sras* was sent with a *rtsi-drūi* to *bkra-šis-lhun-po* to invite the Pañ-c'en to Lhasa, in order to impart the vows of *dge-ts'ul* to the Dalai-Lama. This may be the same as *dGa'-bdi sras Don-grub-tse-dbaṅ*, who in 1821 and 1822 was a *rtsi-dpon* in charge of the arrangements for the journey of the newly found Dalai-Lama to Lhasa; in 1828 he was *bla-p'yaṅ*. He too might have been a brother of Mi-'gyur-bsod-nams-dpal-'byor, but we cannot be sure; in any case, he could not be a son because of obvious reasons of age.

*dGa'-bdi Ni-ma-lhun-grub* was possibly a son of Mi-'gyur-bsod-nams-dpal-'byor or of Don-grub-ts'edbaṅ. He appears as *bṣer-dpaṅ* in 1843, when the Chinese government granted him the peacock feather; he may be the rDo-riṅ *dGa'-bdi-ba* mentioned without a title in 1845. On the other hand we are informed that a *dGa'-bdi sras* was appointed *bṣer-dpaṅ* in 1847; so either there is a patent contradiction between Chinese and Tibetan texts, or this *dGa'-bdi-ba* of 1847 is a different person. In 1849 rDo-riṅ *bṣer-dpaṅ* acted as sne-ṣan to the prince-abbot of Sa-skya returning from Lhasa to his see. In 1852 *dGa'-bdi-ba* was in attendance to the ministers. In 1854 rDo-riṅ appears as *rtsi-dpon*, accompanying the coffin of the dead amban Wên-wei on the first stages of the long journey to Peking. In 1856 he acted as Lhasa sne-ṣan during the ceremonies of the selection by lot of the 5th Pañ-c'en. In the following years rDo-riṅ tajji or rDo-riṅ *rtsi-dpon* was sne-ṣan to the amban Man-ch'ing on his visit to bKra-šis-lhun-po. On 25.I, 1858, *rtsi-dpon* *dGa'-bdi-ba Ni-ma-lhun-grub* received the rescript by which

---

2. *DL10*, 53a, 55a, 56b, 62b.
4. *MP*, 1.60a.
10. *PC5*, 42b, 46b.
11. *PC5*, 61a, 62a-b, 63b.
he was appointed *bka’-blon* 1. In this capacity he collaborated late in 1859 with the special commissioner Li Yü-pu 李玉圃 in putting down a serious disturbance in the C’ab-mdo region, caused by one mGon-po-dbañ-p’yug, in which the semi-independent Tibetan chief of sPo-bo had intervened. By a rather unsavoury trick the ringleaders were arrested and five of their followers were executed; after this, the parties agreed to pursue their quarrel by legal means before a judge. The report on this affair was received at Peking on 17th April, 1860 2. Ní-ma-lhun-grub received little thanks for his activity, because the reward went to *bka’-blon* lCañ-rgyab-pa (q.v.), who acted as judge, and to his helpers. It is also curious to note that, when the latter and his suite obtained an audience from the Dalai-Lama upon their return to Lhasa (9.II, 1861), *taiji* dGa’-bži-ba is not given the title of *bka’-blon* 3. Also, when in the 3rd month of 1860 he accompanied the *amban* Man-ch’ing to gTsañ, he is simply called *rDo-rin taiji* 4. So either he had been dismissed, or his post of *bka’-blon* had been a purely temporary one. Nothing further is heard about him.

A *rDo-rin taiji* accompanied the *amban* to gTsañ in 1869 and was received by the Pañ-c’en in 1876 5. He was also in charge of a part of the arrangements for the enthronement of the Dalai-Lama in 1879 6; in the same year he is called *sde-dpon* dGa’-bži-ba 7.

A dGa’-bži *sras* was *bka’-mgon* in 1892, when he was sent to P’ag-ri 8; he was a *bser-dpañ* in 1896, acting as *sne-šan* for the *amban* K’uei-huan 奎焕 returning to China, and in 1897 9. But after 1899 the head of the family (probably this same man) was debarred from holding office, because a lady of his family was the wife of Nor-bu-ts’e-rin, the brother of the former regent De-mo sprul-sku, who was supposed to have engineered the witchcraft attempt against the

---

1 *DL12*, 40a–b.
2 *WTSI*, 310.25b–27a; cf. 335.3b–4a.
3 *DL12*, 79b.
4 *PC5*, 95b.
5 *PC5*, 202b–203a, 224b.
6 *DL13*, Ka, 46a, 53b, 54b–55a.
7 *DL13*, Ka, 67a.
8 *DL13*, Ka, 224b.
9 *DL13*, Ka, 267b, 280a.
Dalai-Lama in that year. He was still alive in 1934, being 73 years old at that time, and died in 1937 (ZK).

Family tree of dGa’-bži

N.N.

Ts’e-brtan-bka’-sis d. 1727                    K’aň-c’ėn-nas d. 1727

rNam-rgyal-ts’e-brtan d. 1739                Pandita d. 1792

Pa-saň-ts’e-rin d. after 1779                bsTan-dzin-dpal-’byor d. after 1808

Mi-’gyur-bsod-nams-dpal-’byor d. 1834        Don-grub-ts’e-dbaň d. after 1828

N. ma-lhun-grub d. after 1860

N. N. d. 1937

bsTan-dzin-nor-bu d. after 1959

His only son rDo-rin bsTan-dzin-nor-bu (b. 1900) was given military training at Gyantse (1915), on which occasion he was also granted the title of taiji. He entered government service in 1917 and was appointed gTsan mda’-dpon in 1919. In 1921 he was in charge of the smon-lam pageant. Two years later he was sent to Shillong for gunnery training. In 1924 he raised the eleventh regiment in gTsan, but in the following year, upon the general stand-down of the army, he left the military career. His title of taiji was taken away in 1930 and he was degraded to the sixth rank because he

---

1 Bell 1928, 91. On the plot see Kawaguchi, 375-382, and Shakabpa, 198-199. The lady was still alive in 1906, being imprisoned at Tuwa-dzong; White, 204-205.
2 Bell 1946, 55-56.
3 ŠBR, 30; Bell 1928, 91, 273.
4 DL13, K’a, 151b; Bell 1946, 252-253; Shakabpa, 259.
5 Rahul 1962, 187.
6 Bell 1928, 273-275.
7 DL13, K’a, 235a.
8 Rahul 1969, 68; ŠBR, 30.
was suspected of intriguing against the government. In 1932 he was appointed gNa-lam rdzoi-dpon and in 1934 he was promoted to the 4th rank and was entrusted with a delicate mission to the Pan-c'en, then living in exile on the Chinese border (HR) 1. He returned in 1938 and was appointed supervisor of the property of the late Dalai-Lama. His title of taiji was restored soon after (HR). Afterwards he led a retired life and in 1956 became completely blind. He died after 1959 at Gyantse (TR).

The name of this family, one of the most noble in Tibet, was kept alive by the marriage of dgra-’dul-’d baṅ-rgy a l (b.c. 1913), of the sMon-’ts’o-ba family, to bsTan-’dzin-nor-bu’s only sister. He had attended Frank Ludlow’s school at Gyantse. About 1944 he was sent to be trained in wireless work at the British mission at Lhasa (HR).

*The house of T’ON*

Another name is Bla-braṅ-rniṅ-pa, from the name of their house in Lhasa (RI). In common parlance it is more usual than T’on, but is never met with in books or official documents (TR). And yet it is an ancient one, because in a letter of the 30th March, 1733, addressed to Father Francesco Orazio della Penna, the bka’-blon T’on-pa calls himself Bla-braṅ-rniṅ-pa 3.

The T’on estate is at K’a-rag in the lower sNe-mo valley 4, and the family claims to be descended from T’on-mi Sambhoṭa, the minister of king Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po who in second quarter of the 7th century was responsible (according to tradition) for the introduction of the Tibetan alphabet. He is said to have been buried in a funeral mound (baṅ-so) at Pera (dPal-ra?) in that region (HR). Although this is one of the oldest Tibetan families, and although it is mentioned in the times of the 5th and of the 6th Dalai-Lama 5, it came to high office only in the times of P’o-lha-nas.

1 Bell 1946, 56; Rahul 1962, 187.
2 Pr. P. 1954, n. 9.
3 MITN, IV, 200-201.
4 Wylie, 74. On sNe-mo, the valley of a northern affluent of the gTsaṅ-po in gTsaṅ-roṅ, see Ferrari, 161-162, n. 621.
5 sDe-pa T’on-nas as general (dmag-dpon) in 1678; T’on-gyi sde-pa and his brother
T'on Srigod-tse-bhrtan appears in 1721 as sde-pa T'on-pa¹ and in 1723 is given the title of labs-drui², reserved to some families of the highest nobility. In 1724 he was among the collectors of the grain tax (lo-t'ani) and presented to the government 200 lance shafts³. In 1726 he was among the noblemen who received the Pan-c'en on his visit to Lhasa⁴. At the time of the civil war he was serving in the Lhasa army, but in the course of a skirmish at rGyan-mk'ar (end of 1727) he went over to P'o-lha-nas⁵. At the end of the war (1728) he got his reward, being appointed as bka'-blon in the new government and being confirmed as such by the emperor⁶; perhaps on this occasion or shortly afterward he obtained also the title of jasak 1st class taiji⁷. On the whole, however, he was a rather pale figure, appearing in our texts only on unavoidable formal and solemn occasions⁸. 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal maintained him in office, and in 1748 the emperor rewarded him and the other bka'-blon for their correct behaviour during the visit of the Dsungar mission to Lhasa⁹. He played no role in the upheaval of 1750, and was confirmed as bka'-blon in 1751¹⁰. Early in the following year the emperor ordered that, should the Dsungars try to invade Tibet by the Nag-ts'ani and Arig route, he was to gather the local militia and organise the resistance¹¹; but the emergency never arose. Of his activity in the following years we know almost nothing¹². He was still alive when the Dalai-Lama

¹ PC2, 313a.
² DL7, 91a.
³ MBTJ, 214a.
⁴ PC2, 345a.
⁵ MBTJ, 274b, 285b.
⁶ MBTJ, 301a; STSL, 76.4a-b; FPYL, 17.22b.
⁷ TWC, 24.6a-b; KS, 385.16a-b. The date of appointment is unknown and the Tibetan texts never give him this title.
⁸ DL7, 128a, 320b; PC3, 75b, 87b. At first he was rather sympathetic toward the Italian missionaries; MITN, I, 174; II, 6; III, 93; IV, 103, 200–201. But in 1743 he turned against them; MITN, III, 229, 250.
⁹ KS, 9a–10a.
¹⁰ KS, 386.17b–19a; DL7, 386a.
¹¹ KS, 407.15a–b; FPYL, 18.14a; KCCHLC, 103.28b.
¹² Scattered mentions in DL7, 416b, 440b, 485b, 517a, 542b; PC, 169a.
died in 1757 and he may also be the bka'-blon T'on-pa mentioned without a personal name in 1762 and 1765. He was succeeded by his son Srid-zidi-dbañ-'dus, perhaps in 1765 or 1766; and if this date is correct, he is the bka'-blon T'on-pa of 1768. We know that in 1772 he dissuaded Klön-rdol Bla-ma from going to Urga as dbu-bla of the Jebtsun Damba Qutuqtu, as the regent wanted him to do. In 1777 his personal name occurs for the first time, and after that he is mentioned on formal occasions nearly every year, almost always on occasions that show a particularly close and cordial connection with the Pan-c'en. Thus in 1781 he was sent to meet and accompany the train of the remains of the Pan-c'en coming from Peking; in 1784 he was appointed by the Dalai-Lama to represent him at the enthronement of the 4th Pan-c'en; and late in the same year he went with the Dalai-lama to bKra-sis-lhun-po to dedicate the shrine of the 3rd Pan-c'en. He died in the 9th month of 1787.

In the following year the emperor granted the seal of a jasak to the deceased's son Rab-brtan-dbañ-po (T'on sras jasak) accompanied the bka'-blon

---

1 DL7, 557a.
2 PC3, 200a, 204b, 242b. A dkar-c'ag (Taube, n. 2877) included in the gsun-'bum of the 7th Dalai-Lama registers a t'añ-k'a which he caused to be made.
3 The evidence for this surmise is, however, extremely slender. The KCCLHC, 105.8a (a late text, not devoid of mistakes) states that Hor-k'añ dBañ-'dus (d. 1766) was appointed bka'-blon in 1765. At we have no other information about this, we may suppose that the text mistook him for T'on Srid-źi-dbañ-'dus. But even if this supposition is wrong, the only place in the list of the bka'-blon available is between the two T'on-pa; and in this case Sri-gcod-ts'ebrtan would have died in 1765 and Srid-źi-dbañ-'dus would have got his appointment in 1766.
4 L8DL, 50b, 59a.
5 KDJB, 9a. KDTT, 30b-40a, seems to place this event four years later. YSGT, 84a, mention him in 1776 as bka'-blon T'on-pa žabs-druñ.
6 Samati, 16b.
7 PC3b, 13b, 29a, 31a, 70a-b, 73; PC3c, 4a; Samati, 89a, 160b, 176a; KDTT, 55a, 57b; KTSL, 1166.31a. His name in the KTSL is always Ye-šes-dbañ-'dus.
8 PC3b, 280b, 281b, 284b; PC3c, 56a; DL8, 116b; Samati, 118a; KDTT, 58a.
9 PC4, 34b-35b; Samati, 140a.
10 Samati, 166a.
11 DL8, 166b.
12 KTSL, 1300.19a-b; DL8, 172a.
g·Yu·t’og to the Nepalese border, he held no official position 1. As usual, the later texts omit personal names, but I suppose that he is identical with the sde·dpon T‘on·pa mentioned in 1808 and 1813 2.

A different person was the p’ogs·dpon T‘on sras who in 1808 accompanied the Pan·c‘en upon his return from Lhasa to bKra·sis·Ihunpo, in 1809 was in charge of the smon·lam festival and in 1814 accompanied the amban Hsi·ming 明 and bka’·blon P’a·lha to a tour in gTsañ 3. He was appointed rtsis·dpon in 1815 4. Later he became a bka’·blon and appears as such for the first time in 1822; in that year he alternated with the other ministers in attendance to the boy Dalai·Lama, who was waiting at mÑes·t’añ for his formal recognition 5. Some months later he returned to Lhasa, where he witnessed the enthronement of the Dalai·Lama 6. In 1823 he was sent to the Nag·c‘u region 7 and in 1824 on a tour of inspection of the domains (gžis·skor) 8. In 1825 he accompanied the junior amban Pao·ch’ang 保昌 to another inspection 9 and in 1827 the junior amban Kuang·ch’ing 廣慶 to gTsañ 10. In the 5th month of 1829 he was sent again to the Nag·c‘u region with some troops 11. The reasons for this movement are explained as follows: “Mongols, living near Kukunor lake under a leader named Junang jasak, attacked and robbed a neighbouring tribe of Dranag Khasum. Regent Ts‘o·smo·gliñ dispatched troops to the trouble spot, under the command of the council minister bka’·blon T‘on·pa and the general mda’·dpon (sic for bka’·drun) gSar·byuñ. On the way, they recruited more troops from Derge and Dimchi Nyerga. A number of skirmishes took place with the Mongols, and soon the tribe under Junang jasak surrendered. Junang jasak, together with his son and some other leaders, was taken to Lhasa to do homage and submit before the Dalai—

---

1 DL8, 173a; PC4, 55a.
2 DL9, 80b, 142b.
3 DL9, 41b, 92a, 161b.
4 DL9, 177b.
5 DL10, 75a, 81b, 83a, 85b, 88b.
6 DL10, 89b, 110a.
7 DL10, 133a.
8 DL10, 142a.
9 DL10, 160b-161a.
10 DL10, 184b, 185b.
11 DL10, 213a; HTSL, 157.9a.
Lama” 1. At the end of 1829 the emperor rewarded him with the peacock feather, which he received in Lhasa on 24.XII (c. 18th January, 1830) 2. He went again to the Nag-c'u in 1830, but in 1831 and 1832 he was at the capital 3. In 1836 he accompanied the amban Ch'ing-lu 慶祿 to gTsan 4 and in 1837 the newly arrived amban Kuan-shên-pao 閩聖保 to sTod-p'yogs, which in this case means Western gTsan 5. After the death of the 10th Dalai-Lama he was in charge of the funeral rites and of the construction of the tomb; we find him busy with these tasks in the 10th month of 1837 and in the 9th month of 1838 6. Then at last we come to know his personal name, because it is possible to identify him with the bka'-blon b s T a n - ' d z i n - t s ' e - d b a n of the Chinese texts, who in 1840 was sent along with the darhan mk'an-po Blo-bza'n-p'rin-las-rnam-rgyal to deal with some trouble caused by the two incarnates of Brag-g.yab 7; they came back at once without waiting for orders, for which they were deprived of their Chinese honours (2nd-rank button and peacock feather for the one, title for the other) 8. In 1843, having redeemed themselves by accompanying the commissioners (to Brag-g.yab?), both were given back their honours and titles 9. In that year we find bka'-blon T'on-pa mentioned for the last time 10; he resigned soon after, probably in 1844 when the regent was deposed. He was still alive in 1848, when he (bka'-zur T'on-pa) again went on tour (gžis-skor) 11. Inspite of this

1 Shakabpa, 175 (spelling of proper names mine), with the wrong date of 1832. It is a pity that this account finds no confirmation in the Tibetan texts, except for the fact that the jasak Erke Mergen of Kukunor presented himself to the Dalai-Lama in the 9th month of 1829; DL10, 229a.
2 DL10, 230a.
3 DL10, 242a, 258a, 268a.
4 DL10, 308b, 309a.
5 They left on 6.II and came back to Lhasa on 12.III; DL10, 311a-b. This is too short a span of time for a journey to mNyau'-ris and back.
6 DL10, 332b, 334b.
7 The monks of the twin monasteries of Brag-g.yab Ma-dgon and Bu-dgon are headed by the great incarnation (sprul-sku c'e-ts'an) descended from rNog Lotsawa Legs-pa'i-ses-rab (11th century) and by the lesser incarnation (sprul-sku c'uñ-ts'an) descended from rNog Blo-Idan-ses-rab (1059–1110); Wylie, 100–101.
8 HTSL, 341.36b–37a; MP, 4.2a–4b.
9 HTSL, 389.27a; MP, 4.9b–10b.
10 DL11, 35b.
11 DL11, 111a.
long administrative career, he was never entrusted with really important missions and his influence within the government seems to have been small. With his retirement the political position of the family began to deteriorate, slowly but unceasingly.

bsTan-'dzin-ts'e-dbañ's son is met with in 1825 and 1827 as bka'-mgon and in 1836 as bka'-drun, always in the shadow of his father 1. In 1837 he was appointed lha-gñer 2. He may be the same as the T'on-pa sras who was mda'-dpon in 1846 and 1847 3.

A monk official T'on-pa sras was appointed rtse-p'ral-bde-ba in 1843 4.

One generation later, a T'on-pa sras was appointed dBus mda'-dpon in 1861 5 and is apparently the T'on-pa (t'ung-pa) mda'-dpon rNam-rgyal-don-grub who was among the victims of the upheaval of 1871 6.

After that, the house of T'on faded away from active political life. We still find a sde-dpon T'on-pa in 1902 7. A T'on-pa sras Don-grub-rgyal-po (b. 1887) entered the service in 1906 and was a bser-dpañ in 1924 8. And in 1938 the family still played a role in the display of the old-style army which was a part of the smon-lam celebrations 9. Actually the old family seems to have disintegrated. "There were several brothers, and perhaps due to differences among themselves they decided to separate, thereby dividing the family estates. One of the brothers went as mag-pa in the bDe-skyid-glin family, but that marriage produced no male issue. As for the the T'on-pa proper, a mag-pa was brought in from the family of gNas-c'ag. The present-day T'on-pa are the issue of that marriage" (ZK).

1 DL10, 161a, 184b, 308b.
2 DL10, 311b.
3 DL11, 71a, 87b.
4 DL11, 46b.
5 DL12, 81b. He seems to be the T'on mda'-dpon who (probably in the same year) was sent to sÑe-mo to arrest the former bka'-blon bSad-sgra; Shakabpa, 185.
6 MTSL, 313.14b–16a.
7 DL13, Ka, 371b.
8 SBR, 12.
9 Taring, 137.
And this was the premature end of the political influence of one of the noblest families of Tibet.

The house of MDO–MK'AR

Another name is Rag-k'ā-šag or Rag-k'ā-šar, which is the name of their Lhasa mansion near the P'rl-snaṅ. It is found for the first time in 1761 and in the DL8 it alternates freely with mDo-mk'ar; today it is perhaps the more common of the two.

This is the feudal house of the chiefs of sTag-lun, one of the two sde-dpon families (the other is Lha-rgya-ri) descended from the ancient royal dynasty. "Owing to their historical ancestry the head of the family receives both civil and religious honours on state occasions including installation of the Dalai-Lama. Peasants of the estate always greet the head of the family with the obeisance accorded only to high religious dignitaries and monks in memory of their ancestors. Monks of the sTag-lun monastery [which first belonged to the sect of the same name, but now to the dGe-lugs-pa] always bow to the male members of the mDo-mk'ar family, whenever they visit there... Their dead bodies or ashes are always preserved in this monastery. The sTag-lun monastery has three incarnate abbots: 1) Žabs-druṅ Rin-po-c'e, 2) Ma Rin-po-c'e, 3) rTse-sprul Rin-po-c'e; male children of the mDo-mk'ar family taking up robes fill whichever abbotship may happen to be available."

At the beginning of the 18th century their head was Na-ŋ a d b a ŋ a –

1 The ladies of the T'on family were famous for their beauty. In the twenties of the present century the Lha-klu lha-icam and the P'un-k'aṅ lha-icam came both from this house. So also the wife of the Sa-skya K'ri-c'en 'Jam-gliṅ-c'e-dgu-dbaṅ-sdud (in office 1895–1915); C. W. Cassinelli and R. B. Ekvall, A Tibetan principality, the political system of Sa skya, Ithaca 1969, 25.
2 Pr. P. 1954, n. 7.
3 Waddell, map opposite p. 331, n. 76.
4 DPDG, 127a–b.
5 Talung of the maps, north of Lhasa; Ferrari, 81–82.
6 This passage is quoted with some slight changes from Rahul 1962, 189–190n (=Rahul 1969, 45). Cf. Chapman, 88.
ts'aṅs-pa; he played no part in the history of his time and died in 1724.

The political importance of the family began anew with his son Ts'e-rin-dbaṅ-rgyal (1697–1763). He studied first at Se-ra and later with the ill-fated Lo-c'en Dharmaśri, incarnation of sMin-grol-gliṅ, who was executed by the Dzungars in 1718. He entered the service of Lajang Khan and in 1717 he was already rdzoṅ-dpon of Shigatse. Under the regime of the Dzungar puppet sTag-rtse-pa he was relieved from this post on his own request and was appointed rdzoṅ-dpon of Icag-rtse Gri-gu. This early start was ruined by the Chinese invasion and the execution of his protector; the two mDo-mk'ar father and son were dismissed and sent back to sTag-lun. Ts'e-rin-dbaṅ-rgyal had to start his career from the bottom, as simple druṅ-'k'or (1721). But already in 1723 he officiated for some time for rtsis-dpon P'o-lha-nas, who had been sent to the Nag-c'u as a measure of precaution when Lobjang Danjin started his rebellion in Kukunor. In 1726 he became titular rtsis-dpon, and this was his position when the civil war broke out. He took a lukewarm part in it as an officer in the Lhasa army, and after its end attached himself at once to the rising star of P'o-lha-nas. In 1728 the latter appointed him bka'-blon and in the following year, having escorted the exiled Dalai-Lama on the first stages of his journey to Li-t'aṅ, the emperor confirmed his appointment and granted him the title of jasak 1st-class

---

1 Outside the sTag-lun he is mentioned only once, under the date of 1721, in DL7, 78a.
2 sTag-lun, 394a.
3 sTag-lun, 389b. Ts'e-rin-dbaṅ-rgyal was the author of the lexicographic work published by J. Bacot, Dictionnaire Tibétain–Sanskrit par Tshe-ring-ouang-gyal, Paris 1930, and of a commentary on the grammatical work Sum-rtags; Situ, 85b.
4 sTag-lun, 390b–391a.
5 sTag-lun, 392a.
6 sTag-lun, 393a; cf. MBTJ, 186b.
7 sTag-lun, 393b.
8 MBTJ, 207b–208b; sTag-lun, 394a.
9 sTag-lun, 395b.
10 sTag-lun, 395b–398a.
11 As his career is intertwined with that of P'o-lha-nas, the details may be seen in Petech 1972, passim.
12 MBTJ, 301a–303b; sTag-lun, 399a.
taiji 1. In 1730 he was sent to Gyantse to supervise the Tibetan intervention in Bhutan 2 and stayed there during the following three years; and at Gyantse in November 1733 he finished writing the biography of P'o-lha-nas 3. In 1734 the Tibetan ruler, as an acknowledgment and a moral reward, sent him to mGar-t'ar to inform the Dalai-Lama of the successful solution of the Bhutan question 4. The following years were rather uneventful. Then in 1743 he was placed in charge of the arrangements for the Dsungar mission due to visit Lhasa; the emperor sent him some modest presents as a reward for his activity 5. Under the rule of 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal he participated in the reception to the Dsungar mission of 1748 and was again rewarded by the emperor 6. A little later he came under heavy suspicion by 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal who accused him of conspiring with the unfortunate mNa'-ris kung Ye-šes-ts'e-brtan; in a stormy interview he narrowly missed being killed by the angry ruler 7. Immediately after he was sent to the Nag-c'u to meet 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal's bride, the Mongol princess bSam-grub-sgrol-ma. He was encamped there, when he received the news of 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal's murder and of the lynching of the two ambans; at once he returned to Lhasa 8. But as soon as duke Paṇḍita and the Dalai-Lama had brought the situation under control (a matter of a week or so), he went back to the Nag-c'u to complete his mission 9. When the Chinese commission arrived, he was well received by them, explained his position and was confirmed in office (1751) 10. In 1752 he was placed in command of the troops who were to be concentrated in the Tengri-nor zone, to oppose a possible Dsun-gar invasion 11; but the rumor proved unfounded, and as soon as this assignment was at an end, he applied for leave and returned for a spell

1 FPYL, 17.22b.
3 MBTJ, 394b.
4 DL7, 155a.
5 DL7, 302b; sTag-lun, 409a; KTSL, 212.8a–9a; PC3, 48b, 50a.
6 DL7, 342b; sTag-lun, 411a–b; KSTL, 314.9b–10a.
7 sTag-lun, 413b–414a.
8 sTag-lun, 414a–415b.
9 DL7, 383a.
10 sTag-lun, 416a; KTSL, 386.17b–19a.
11 KTSL, 407.14a.
to sTag-lun (1753) 1. In the following year he accompanied the Dalai-Lama in his journey to C‘os-k‘or-rgyal 2. The ruler was so pleased with him, that in 1756 he granted him an additional number of serfs 3. He maintained his position after the death of the Dalai-Lama in 1757 and the appointment of the De-mo sprul-sku as regent, and died in office on 6.X, 1763 4. With him disappeared the ablest of the old lieutenants of P‘o-lha-nas.

His brother bKa-ris-dpal-grags was the incarnate of Ri-bo-c‘e-rtse 5, and in 1763 was still living there 6. Ts‘e-riñ-dbañ-rgyal’s son bKa-ris-dbañ-p‘yug-legs-pa married in 1753 the daughter of mda’-dpon Ram-pa-ba 7. He died before his father.

His son bSod-nams-dbañ-rgyal (1756–1788) 8 inherited from his grandfather the title of first-class taiji 9. In 1768 he (Rag-śag jasak) presented gifts to the rNam-rgyal grva-ts‘aṅ 10. Already in 1773, at the early age of 17, he was appointed a bka‘-blon in the vacancy caused by the death of bSam-grub P‘o-brañ Kun-dga‘-bstan-dzin 11. In 1775 he accompanied the second amban Hêng-hsiu in his tour to gTsañ 12. In 1779 he escorted the Pan-c’en from Nag-c‘u-k‘a to the banks of the ’Bri-c‘u on his journey to China 13, and in the same year he participated in the restoration work at the P‘rul-snan in Lhasa 14. In 1781 he accompanied the second amban Hêng-shui in his visit to gTsañ 15, and later in the same year he went, with several other officials,

1 sTag-lun, 419b; DL7, 423b.
2 sTag-lun, 420b; DL7, 440b. Early in 1755 he visited the Pan-c‘en; PC3, 123a.
3 DL7, 518a-b.
4 sTag-lun, 440a.
5 sTag-lun, 385a, 440b. Ri-bo-c‘e is a large sTag-lun-pa monastery in K‘ams, 45 miles from C‘ab-mdo; Wylie, 100 and 181 (n. 606).
6 sTag-lun, 386a-b, 440b.
7 sTag-lun, 420a.
8 The date of birth is given in sTag-lun, 422b.
9 FPYL, 18.15a, piao 3.17b-18a; KCCHLC, 24.4a, 105.5b. He is the mDo-mk‘ar žabs-drun mentioned in 1764; DL8, 36b.
10 DL8, 56a.
11 FPYL, 18.17b; KCCHL, 105.5b.
12 PC3, 363a-b.
13 PC3b, 72a, 79a-b; Samati, 73b; KCCHLC, 105.5b.
14 Samati, 217a.
15 Samati, 116a.
to meet the remains of the Pañ-č’en coming back to Tibet. In 1783 he was the patron of the *smon-*lam and was again sent with the *amban* to gTsaṅ. He accompanied the former regent Samati Pakṣi traveling to China, as far as sTag-luṅ-mdā’ (1786). He died, reportedly by suicide, in July 1788.

His younger brother, bSo d nam s stobs rgyal, also called mT’u-stobs, became a monk and is mentioned in passing in 1779, 1781 and 1791.

Upon the death of bSod-nams-dbaṅ-rgyal, the *amban* Yamantai proposed to the emperor to grant the continuation of the title to his elder son bSod nam s dbaṅ’ dus. But in the meantime the imperial commissioner had reported that the late bSod-nams-dbaṅ-rgyal had exacted unlawful presents from the Nepalese merchants, with the complicity of their headman Hahu, and that he had not forwarded a communication of the Gorkha ruler to the Chinese authorities, despatched in the previous year through Hahu; so that his corruption and exactions had contributed not a little to start the conflict with the Gorkhalis. The *ambans* Ch’ing-lin and Yamantai had overlooked, perhaps even connived at, his behaviour. Thus the family had to pay for the misdeeds of its dead chief: bSod-nams-dbaṅ’ dus was debarred from the post of *bka’-blon* and was not allowed to inherit the title of *jasak taiji*; and that is the last we hear about him.

The house of mDo-mk’ar stayed out of office for a considerable

---

1 *PC3b*, 282a; *DL8*, 117a, 120b.
2 *Samati*, 136a, 139b.
3 *Samati*, 272b. In the same year he offered presents to the Dalai-Lama; *DL8*, 163b.
4 *KTSL*, 1318.30b–32b.
5 The relationship is attested in *sTag-luṅ*, 441a.
6 *DL8*, 102a–b, 116b; *Samati*, 393b.
7 *KTSL*, 1319.13a–14a; also 1319.23a–b, 1321.15b–16a. *MCSL*, 817a–b (= E. Haenisch, *Dokumente aus dem Jahre 1788 zur Vorgeschichte des Gurkha-Krieges*, Munich 1951, pl. 49; transl. pp. 35-36; on p. 37 the description of bSod-nams-dbaṅ-rgyal as a Mongol imperial officer in Tibet is of course incorrect).
8 *KTSL*, 1323.10a; Tibetan translation of this document, dated 18.11, 1789, in *Samati* 313b–314a.
9 *MCSL*, 819a (= E. Haenisch, *op. cit.*, pl. 55, 56; transl. pp. 39-40). See also *KTSL*, 1320.16a–18a, 1322.28b, 1323.9a–11b, 1323.13a–14a, 1324.3a–b, 1423.17b–18a; *FPYL*, 18.21a; *KEKCL*, 47.20b–21a.
time, though maintaining its high position in the Tibetan nobility.

A bka'-mgon Rag-sag-pa was appointed rdzoṅ-dpon of 'P'yoṅs-rgyas in 1815.

The next figure of some distinction was 'Gyur-med-ts'e-dbañ-dpal-'byor (1804–1842). In 1831, being a rtsis-dpon, he caused the biography of Ts'e-rin-dbana-rgyal to be added to the history of the sTag-lun chiefs. He still held the same office in 1837–1838, when he took part in the campaign against sPo-bo; on 27th January, 1839, the emperor promoted him to the third rank and granted him the peacock feather. On 26th October, 1839, the amban Mêng-pao recommended him to the emperor for appointment to the seat of the bka'-šag vacated by the retirement of bSad-sgra Don-grub-rje; the decree to this effect was received on 6th January, 1840. In the Tibetan texts he appears for the first time as bka'-blon in the spring of 1841. Later in the same year he was appointed to lead, under the command of Zur-k'an, the Tibetan army sent to nNa'-ris to stem the advance of Zoravar Singh and his Dogras; he left Lhasa on 29th August.

According to the official version, "the difficult journey over two consecutive mountain passes exhausted the bka'-blon who, moreover, was greatly anxious over the situation at the front. Spitting out blood, he died instantly." But the Ladakhi sources tell us that he was made priso-

---

1 The sde-dpon mDo-mk'ar-ba or Rag-sag-pa is mentioned in 1808, 1809, 1813 and 1822; DL9, 38a, 91a, 142b; DL10, 116a.
2 DL9, 177b.
3 The birth date is deduced from the fact that in 1839 he was thirty-six (sui); MP, 10.5b.
4 As stated in the last of the five additional leaves at the end of sTag-lun.
5 HTSL, 317.19b. For the campaign see under bSad-sgra.
6 MP, 10.5a–b.
7 MP, 10.6a.
8 DLII, 17a.
9 MP, 1.2b (= FRH, 158).
10 MP, 1.42a–b, 1.47b.
11 MP, 1.56a (= FRH, 175).
ner and committed suicide; the account of an old soldier, Ts'e-brtan, says that he was decapitated; this is, however, less likely. Probably the Ladakhi tale is nearest to the truth, and the Tibetan authorities, in making their report to the ambans in Lhasa, glossed over the unpleasant fact of the defeat.

His son rNam-rgyal-dbañ-dus-rdo-rje was not allowed to succeed in the seat of his father, but was appointed dBus mda'-dpon as the successor of bŠad-sgra promoted bka'-blon (January 1843). We hear nothing further about him, unless he is to be identified with the sde-dpon mDo-mk'ar-ba mentioned in 1843 and in 1849-1850.

Another mDo-mk'ar-ba appears as rtsis-dpon in 1847, when he returned to Lhasa from a mission with bka'-blon dPal-lhun, and in 1848. He was appointed bka'-blon in 1859. He is again mentioned in 1860, and in that year he accompanied the regent to bKra-šis-lhun-po for the enthronement of the new Pañ-c'en. At the time of the rebellion of the monasteries against the regent Rva-sgreñ sprul-sku in 1862, he was prominent among the lay officials who sponsored the grant of nominal authority to the infant Dalai-Lama. He is not mentioned afterwards.

His (?) son mDo-mk'ar sras Ts'e-dbañ-nor-bu was appointed dBus mda'-dpon in 1862. On 11.X, 1866, he was given the third-class button and the peacock feather. On 25.VI, 1871, he was appointed bka'-blon. In 1875 he was in charge of the construc-
tion of the tomb of the 12th Dalai-Lama. In 1877 he took part, as it seems, in the dealings with the Chinese authorities which resulted in the emperor releasing Tibet from the obligation to select the new Dalai-Lama by drawing lots from the golden bowl. In 1878 he met the Pan-c'en who had come to Lhasa. In the winter of 1878-1879 he and the Chinese commissioner Chou Chên were assigned the task of keeping an eye on the affairs of Sikkim, where the British were building a cart road to the Jelep pass; all information coming in from Sikkim was to be handed over to the two officials. Otherwise Ts'e-dbañ-nor-bu was not much in the foreground and is merely mentioned in passing in 1881 and 1886. In 1889 he was on leave of absence, and this appears to have been his position as late as 1894, when bla-p'yang g'Yu-t'og mk'an-c'uñ 'Jam-dbyañs-bstan-'dzin was his deputy (las-ts'ab). He formally retired in 1896 and became a monk, dying in 1902 (ZK). His daughter married in 1870 the king of sDe dge.

His son mDo-mk'ar sras T'se-brtan-dban-p'yug entered the civil service in 1879; on that occasion he, as a representative of the young nobles, have a display of his knowledge of grammatical texts in the presence of the Dalai-Lama. He may be identical with the bser-dpañ Ts'e-brtan-dbañ-p'yug who in 1890 was granted the expectancy of a post of mda'-dpon. He did become a mda'-dpon, but his later career is unknown (ZK). His (?) son mDo-mk'ar sras bs Tan-'dzin-rnam-rgyal (1886–1935) entered the service in 1902; he may be the same as the mDo-mk'ar mentioned without titles in 1902 and 1903. In 1910 he was a senior master of the stable (c'ibs-c'e) and was sent to confer with the Dalai-Lama, then a refugee at Darjeeling. In 1924 he was a p'ogs-dpon, later a p'yang-mdzod. Then
he shifted to the military career and became a *mda’-dpon* (*ZK*). He received the command of the bodyguard (*sku-srur-dmg-sgar*) in 1933 and died in 1935.

His younger brother T’s e-d ba n-r nam-r gya l (b. 1887) entered government service in 1902. He seems to be identical with the *mda’-dpon* Rag-k’a-śar who in 1912 went to P’ag-ri to dissuade the Dalai-Lama from coming back at once to Lhasa, where the Chinese garrison still offered resistance. In the following years he came to be known by the name of Bye-pad. In 1918 he led some fresh units to reinforce the Tibetan army in Eastern Tibet, after which he held a command at sMar-k’ams, guarding the border toward Batang. In 1922 he left the army and became a *rtsis-dpon* (*ZK*); he appears as such in 1924, after which date nothing more is heard of him.

Rag-k’a-śar *sras* P’un-t s ‘ogs-r a b-r gya s (1903–1957), a son of bsTan-’dzin-rnam-rgyal (*ZK*), entered the service in 1921 and was *bka’-druṅ* at the end of 1923. He was a *bka’-mgron* from 1928 to 1932, and became mTs’o-nag *rdzön-dpon* in 1933, *bṣer-dpaṅ* in 1937, *jasak* and *mda’-dpon* in 1938. In September 1940 (*HR*) he was appointed commander-in-chief. In 1949 he was nominated *bka’-blon* (*HR, ZK*). On 10th February, 1952, he became concurrently 2nd deputy commander of the Tibet Military Area and a Chinese Lieutenant-general, with the task of integrating the Tibetan units in the Chinese army; he was also a member of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region. He died on 13th March, 1957.

---

1 Rahul 1962, 190; I am not at all certain of the identity of bsTan-’dzin-rnam-rgyal with the commander of the bodyguard in 1933–1935.
2 *SBR*, 11.
3 *DL13*, K’a, 111b.
4 Teichman, 124, 143.
5 *SBR*, 11.
6 *SBR*, 39; *DL13*, K’a, 234a.
7 He held this post at the time of Tucci’s visit in 1948; Tucci 1956, 146.
8 He already held this post at the end of August; Lowell Thomas, 71.
9 *Tibet*, 769. G. Ginsburg and M. Mathos, Tibet’s administration in the transition period 1951–1954, in *Pacific Affairs* 32 (1959), 173, mistake him for his son bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas, who became a *mda’-dpon* in 1957 (*ZK*), was in Lhasa before the rising of 1959 (Taring, 228) and is now (1971) in Gangtok (*TK, ZK*).
10 *Tibet*, 784; Taring, 228.
Family tree of mDo-mdk'ar

\[ \text{Nag-dbaṅ-ts’aṅs-pa d. 1724} \]

\[ \text{Ts’e-rin-dbaṅ-rgyal d. 1763} \]

\[ \text{bKra-sis-dpal-grags} \]

\[ \text{bKra-sis-dbaṅ-p’yug-legs-pa d. before 1763} \]

\[ \text{bSod-nams-dbaṅ-rgyal d. 1788} \]

\[ \text{bSod-nams-dbaṅ-d’lus} \]

\[ \text{bSod-nams-dbaṅ-rgyal d. 1788} \]

\[ \text{bSod-nams-stobs-rgyal d. after 1791} \]

\[ \text{bSod-nams-dbaṅ-d’lus d. after 1791} \]

\[ \text{'Gyur-med-ts’e-dbaṅ-dpal-’byor d. 1842} \]

\[ \text{N.N. d. after 1862} \]

\[ \text{rNam-rgyal-dbaṅ-d’lus-rdo-rj} \]

\[ \text{Ts’e-dbaṅ-nor-bu d. 1902} \]

\[ \text{Ts’e-brtan-dbaṅ-p’yug} \]

\[ \text{bsTan-dzin-rnam-rgyal d. 1935} \]

\[ \text{Ts’e-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal d. after 1924} \]

\[ \text{P’un-ts’ogs-rab-rgyas d. 1957} \]

\[ \text{bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas} \]

---

The house of P’A-LHA

Full name: P’a-jo-lha-k’aṅ. The P’a-lha village, where the British entrenched themselves in 1904, and the family mansion, which was destroyed on that occasion, are near Gyantse. These last-comers among the sde-dpon are descended, according to their family tradition, from a monk of the P’a-jo Lha-k’aṅ monastery in Western Bhutan. He got involved in trouble with his government in which the Tibetans intervened (this is probably the war of 1644-1647), and having fled from Bhutan he was given an estate that had been taken from the late gTsan ruler (HR). He had no male offspring but only a daughter, who married a member of the Nu-ma-ba family; their children carried on the P’a-lha name.

---

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 5.
2 Landon, I, 313-325; Waddell, 257-258.
3 Dedicated to the ’Brug-pa incarnate P’a-jo ’Brug-sgom-žig-po (13th century).
4 Bell 1928, 65.
They led an obscure life during the first part of the 18th century. An early mention is in 1783, when the Pañ-c’en received in audience a group of petty officials, among whom there was one Wañ P’a-lha-ba. This is the P’a-jo-lha-k’añ-pa who was in the staff of bka’-blon dGa’-bži Paññita during the ’Ba’ Sa-ñan campaign (1779). He stayed for a long time in that region, and in 1783 he was appointed governor (’go-pa) of rMar-k’ams. At an unknown date he came back to Central Tibet, and in the 2nd month of 1791 he was dBus mda’-dpon, entrusted with the task of a settlement of the cultivators and tilled surface in the districts of dBus. Then at last we come to know his personal name: this is mda’-dpon bS t a n d z i n r n a m r g y a l, who in the 8th month of 1791 accompanied bSam-grub P’o-bran kung in his march from Lha-rtse and the Sa-hai(?) river toward Šel-dkar. There they parted, and he led 500 men to the region of... sum-mdo (Sang-chia-sung-to), where he joined mda’-dpon Mi’gyur-rdo-rje. On 25th October, 1791, he was at gTiñ-skyes, where he had a fortunate skirmish with the Gorkhali, killing some fifty of them against a loss of six men. The situation grew tense, and when he reported the wounding and death of bSam-grub-glin-pa, a Chinese officer with 300 soldiers from Qara-usu was sent to gTiñ-skyes to support him. On 5th November he had another brush with the enemy, and on 26th November he marched to the Ri-bo district, where he took eleven prisoners. In the first month of 1792 he was still at gTiñ-skyes, and only in the 3rd month he was summoned to gNa’-lam. In July the bka’-blon dGa’-bži bsTan-dzin-dpal-’byor (q.v.) is said to have been delivered by the Gorkhalis to the mda’-dpon P’a-jo-lha-k’añ at Dhibuñ. Thus he was almost the only Tibetan officer who showed

1 PC3, 327a.
2 DL8, 107a; Samati, 81b. For this little war see under dGa’-bži Paññita.
3 Samati, 141a.
4 At least this seems to be the meaning of dBus k’ul sa mi ldiñ bsgrigs; Samati, 359b.
5 KEKCL, 1.14b.
6 KEKCL, 1.20b–21a.
7 KEKCL, 7.3a, 7.4a, 8.10b, 27.21b.
8 KEKCL, 7.19a–b, 47.30b.
9 KEKCL, 27.21b–22a.
10 KEKCL, 15.6b, 18.18a, 18.20b, 24.8b, 24.9a, 24.10b.
11 KEKCL, 24.7a.
12 Shakabpa, 167.
activity and military skill in the Gorkha war. This earned him a seat in the bka’-ṣag. In the 4th month of 1793 we find bka’-blon P’a-lha bsTan-'dzin-rnam-rgyal charged with the task of quelling a conflict between the people of Byin-pa (?) and of Brag-gsum in Koṅ-po. Many people were killed during the combats in Koṅ-po and the monasteries of Brag-gsum Luṅ-naṅ were destroyed. In 1794 the amban Ho-lin sent him with the Chinese officer Chang Chih-lin to delimit the Southern border toward Eastern Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan; it was an important event, to which the Chinese repeatedly alluded at the end of the 19th century. In the same year he is mentioned in passing by a Tibetan text. bKa’-blon P’a-lha-ba is met with once more in 1801, after which he disappears from the records.

His (?) son, the dBus mda’-dpon P’a-lha-ba or P’a-lha'i sras, is mentioned repeatedly between in 1807 and 1813. He was particularly attached to the 8th 'Brug-c’en, who blessed his house in 1806 and 1808. In 1813 he appears for the first time as  tiếts-abs-pad. In the following year he accompanied the amban Hsi-ming to gTsar. In 1823 he sponsored the publication of the supplement to the life of the 8th 'Brug-c’en. In 1824 he made a short trip to the Nag-ts’aṅ district. In 1827 he went for a spell to 'Ol-dga’ C‘u-ts‘an, perhaps to cure himself in the famous warm springs there. In 1828 he accompanied the amban Hui-hsien to an inspection tour in gTsar. He retired at the end of 1829 when Zur-k’aṅ-pa was ap-

---

1 YSGT, 180a. Brag-gsum was a rdzón in Koṅ-po; Wylie, 96–97. But neither the history nor the geography of this conflict are clear.
2 Report received by the emperor on 11th July 1794; KEKCL, 54.15a. Cf. WTTC, 2.13a–14a. An abstract of the report, without the names of the officers concerned, is in KTSL, 1454.35a–b.
3 CCCTTT, Wên-shih, 4.26, 5.1–5, 5.6–8; CCWCSL, 75.13b.
4 DL8, 223a.
5 DL8, 286a.
6 He was a donor (sbyin-bdag) of Kloṅ-rdol Bla-ma; KDTT, 183a.
7 DL9, 37b, 53a, 60a, 62b, 76b, 95a, 104a, 141b. In 1813 he acted as sne-saṅ to the Pan-c’en on his return from Lhasa to bKra-sis-ilhun-po; PC4, 162b; DL9, 146b.
8 BC8, 56b, 58a.
9 BC8, 64a.
10 DL9, 161b. Another mention in 1815: DL9, 172b.
11 BC8b, 38b–39a.
12 DL10, 140b, 142a.
13 DL10, 180b, 183b.
14 DL10, 198a, 200a.
pointed as *bka’-blon*; the former minister (*bka’-zur*) P’a-lha is mentioned in 1830 and 1832.

Another member of the family held in 1808 the military rank of *brgya-dpon*.

P’a-lha’s *sras bka’-drun* Tse ’e b r t a n was in 1817 among the officials sent to Li-t’año to examine the boy who later was accepted as the 10th Dalai-Lama.

A *rtsis-dpon* P’a-lha was sent in 1828 to the Nag-c’u region to meet the *mk’an-po* and the *na‰-so*, two Tibetan dignitaries who came from Peking as imperial messengers. In 1829 and 1830 he was among the officials charged with effecting a land–tax settlement (*ţib-dpyod*), under the general direction of *bka’-blon* bŠad-sgra. As a reward for his work on this assignment, the emperor granted him the 3rd-rank button, with which he was formally invested on 28.VI, 1831. In 1834 he succeeded the deceased rDo-ri‰ as *bka’-blon*, the imperial letter of appointment being received in Lhasa on 18.III, 1835. In the 7th month of 1837 he was sent as commissioner in K’ams, in connection with the renewal of the difficult campaign in sPo-bo. This is his last mention in the Tibetan texts; we are, however, able to identify him (*PL*) with the *bka’-blon* bSod-nams-rgya-l-po of the Chinese texts, who in 1838 was rewarded for his work in sPo-bo by the grant of the 2nd-class button and of the peacock feather. In the spring of 1842 he took care of the Dogra and Ladakhi prisoners taken in Western Tibet. This was a part of his duties, because during the mNa’-ris campaign he had stayed in Lhasa in charge of the commissariat and transport service; it worked so smoothly and efficiently, that he was rewarded with the personal title of a 2nd-class *taiji*.
retired at an unknown date (probably in 1843 or 1844) and seems to have been still alive in 1851 1.

An ecclesiastic official (sde-drün) by name P'a-lha-ba Blo-bzañ-c'os-'byor occurs only once in 1842 2.

bSod-nams-rgyal-po's son Padma-rgyal-po appears as rtsis-dpon in 1850, when the ambans and the church authorities had to select, by drawing lots from the golden bowl, the new incarnation of the Jebtsun Damba; fate favoured the son of one Mig-dmar, who was a retainer (ţabs-k'ois) of the P'a-lha family. This boy became the seventh Jebtsun Damba. In 1851 Padma-rgyal-po was on duty supervising the smon-lam festival 4. In 1858 he was still a rtsis-dpon 5, but in 1860 he was already a bka'-blon 6 and as such he is mentioned in passing under the dates of 1863 and 1864 7. In the 5th month of 1866 he was at bKra-sis-lhun-po, in charge of the memorial services held by the Pan-c'en for the Hsien-fêng emperor, who had died five years before 8. A more serious task, and the one for which he had actually accompanied the amban Ching-wên to Southern Tibet, was to collaborate with him in taking the proper measures to upheld Chinese neutrality during the Anglo-Bhutanese war 9. This was of course a very belated move, as the war had ended in November 1865. On 11.X, 1866, in the frame of a list of honours which comprised the whole bka'-sag and several other officials, he was granted the peacock feather 10. He was the bka'-blon P'a-lha mentioned in passing in 1873 and 1874 11. It appears that he

---

1 DLII, 147b.
2 DLII, 27a.
3 DLII, 141a-143a. On the selection see WTLS, 19.2b-3a, 27.7a-8a.
4 DLII, 147b.
5 DLII, 42a.
6 DLII, 68a.
7 DLII, 104b, 116a. The Chinese documents show that in 1864 he was the only full bka'-blon, the other three holding acting commissions only; MTSL, 96.35b, 96.36b-37a.
8 PC5, 171a.
9 MTSL, 184.34a-35a. The Chinese government was kept fully informed on the war by the ambans. See MTSL, 138.61a-62a, 155.21b, and above all 175.23b-24b; CPIWSM, T'ung-chih, 32.31a-32a, 36.31a-33a, 37.29a.
10 The imperial decree is preserved in Tibetan translation; DLII, 135b.
11 DLII, 193a, 227b.
always stayed at the capital and hardly ever went on mission to the outlying districts. He may have died c. 1875.

In 1857 a P'a-lha sras was sent to 'Ol-dga', to fetch the boy who was eventually recognized as the 12th Dalai-Lama 1; P'a-lha–ba, mentioned in passing in 1860 2, was appointed rtse–p'yag in 1867 3. He may have been a brother of Padma-rgyal-po.

In 1876 we find a mda’-dpon bKra-sis-dar-rgyas, who was certainly a member of the P'a-lha family (PL) and was perhaps Padma-rgyal-po's son. Early in that year he was sent with the Chinese commissariat officer (t'ung–p'an) Chou Chen to negotiate with the Bhutanese minister dNgs-grub–dbaṅ–p'yuṅ; their task was to stiffen the back of the Bhutan government in refusing permission to the British to build roads through their country. On 22nd August 1876 he was rewarded for his work by the grant of the 3rd–rank button 4, and in 17th February, 1877, the Peking Gazette published his appointment decree as bka’-blon 5. He is the bka’-blon P'a-lha who met the Pan–c'en during the latter's visit to Lhasa in 1878 6. At the time of S.Ch. Das's visit in 1882 he was absent from the capital 7. Late in 1884 civil war broke out in Bhutan between the sde–srī (Deb Raja) and the dpon–slob of bKra-sis-c'os-rdzon (or T'im–p'u) on the one side, and the dpon–slob of sPa–gro (Paro) and K'roṅ–sa (Tongsa) on the other. The ambans and the regent summoned a conference at P'ag–ri, where they sent the commissioner Liu 8 and bka’-blon bKra-sis-dar-rgyas to mediate (1885). As the two dpon–slob remained defiant, a body of Tibetan troops moved into Bhutan. The K'roṅ–sa dpon–slob U–rgyandbaṅ–p'yuṅ, the future first Maharaja of Bhutan, made his peace in time; the sPa–gro dpon–slob resisted until, completely surrounded, he

---

1 DL12, 29a.
2 DL12, 72a.
3 DL12, 140b.
4 CCWC SL, 7.1a–2b; TS SL, 36.12a–b; White, 286. This episode was recalled by the Chinese in 1888; CCWC SL, 77.14a–16a; CCCTT, Sheng–t'ai, 1.7–8, 3.6–7.
5 Rockhill, 1891, 242n.
6 PC5, 253a.
7 Das, 198, 283.
8 This was the t'ung–p'an Liu Chün, whom see CCCTT, Wen-shih, 1.34–35, 1.35–36. He was active also in Nepal; TS SL, 216.12b, 232.17a.
committed suicide. The trouble was settled, at least for the time being, at the Galing conference of 1886. bKra-sis-dar-rgyas was still in office in 1890 and died early in 1891.

Another P'aa-lha-nas, who appears as acting paymaster (p'ogs-dpon las-byu) in 1879, may be the same as the mda'-dpon P'aa-lha-ba who was posted at Shigatse in 1880 and 1881, and in 1882 acted as the sne-san of the Pa-c'en going to the hot springs for curing his ailments. Apparently he was a brother of bKra-sis-dar-rgyas, with whom he shared a wife, the lha-lcam who extended such a generous protection to S.Ch. Das during his journey to Lhasa. Because of this imprudent act of kindness, the lady and the mda'-dpon were exiled for seven years.

P'aa-lha rje-druui Byams-pa-c'os-rgyan (1865-1925), almost certainly a son of Padma-rgyal-po's old age, was one of the most influential monk officials in the time of the 13th Dalai-Lama. Having entered the ecclesiastical branch of the civil service in 1882 at the age of eighteen, he was the rtse-druui Byams-pa-c'os-rgyan who in 1888 was sent to rDo-rje-brag to supervise the installation of the new Rig-dzin. In 1890 he was sent to bSam-yas to build a chapel of gNod-sbyin-c'en-po. In 1896 he was mk'an-c'uui and headmaster of the school in the Potala (rtse-slob dge-rgan). In 1905 he was still a mk'an-druui and his name was put forward as second choice for the post of

---

1 CCCTTT, Chang Yin-t'ang, 4.34; White, 131-133; Lamb 1960, 178; R. Rahul, *Modern Bhutan*, Delhi 1971, 44-45.
2 See under Ram-pa, p. 157.
3 CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 3.21-22.
4 DL13, Ka, 211a.
5 DL13, Ka, 54a.
6 PC5, 286b-269a, 272a.
7 DL13, Ka, 102a; Das, 108-109.
8 The minister as husband of the lady: Das, 198; the mda'-dpon as husband: Das, 161.
9 Waddell, 9; Bell 1928, 106; Bell 1946, 51; White, 31.
10 The date of his birth results from the fact that he was eighteen at the time of his first appointment in 1882 (DL13, Ka, 110a) and was fifty-five in 1920 (Bell 1946, 196, 225).
11 DL13, Ka, 186b.
12 DL13, Ka, 207b.
13 DL13, Ka, 269b.
bka'-blon bla-ma; but he was not appointed\(^1\). In 1920 and 1921 he was a \textit{mk'an-c'en}\(^2\) and in 1922 he became \textit{spyi-k'yab mk'an-po}, keeping that office till his death in 1925\(^3\).

It is difficult to identify the P'a-lha–ba mentioned without a title in 1899\(^4\); he must be the son of the bka'-blon P'a-lha (bKra-sis-dar-rgyas) who in those years befriended Kawaguchi\(^5\).

A son of the \textit{mda'-dpon} P'a-lha who protected S.Ch.Das was the P'a-lha \textit{sku-sog} whose life and official career is sketched by Ch. Bell, without ever mentioning his name\(^6\). At 20 he was appointed \textit{rdzo'n-dpon} of Šel-dkar-rdzo'n; at 23, bšer-dpa'n; at 33, corn-tax collector ('bru-bskyel do-dam-pa)\(^7\); in June 1913 \textit{rtsis-dpon}; three years later he was concurrently sent to K'ams to help the \textit{mdo-spyi}. And there he fell ill and died at the age of forty-nine, in c. 1918.

His brother was P'a-lha \textit{sras} \textit{s}\textit{od-n a m s - d b a n - r g y a l} (born c. 1871)\(^8\), alias Dewan Bahadur Palhese, the friend of Sir Charles Bell, who speaks at length of him in all his books. He was still alive in January 1935\(^9\), but must have died soon after (\textit{HR}).

The \textit{rtsis-dpon} who died in c. 1918 had three male sons, of whom two died of smallpox in 1910\(^10\). The surviving one, by name \textit{P \text{\`u}n-t s ' o g s - r n a m - r g y a l} (b. 1891) entered the service in 1909\(^11\). He was first \textit{bka'-sod}, then \textit{bka'-mgon} and as such was appointed \textit{rdzo'n-dpon} of Gyantse an office which he was holding in 1924; then he was \textit{žol-gner} and \textit{rdzo'n-dpon} of gTin-skyes; afterwards he became a member of the paymaster's office (\textit{p'ogs-k'ari}) of mDo-smad, and lastly \textit{rdzo'n-dpon} of Rin-spuṅs. He died "in the time of the regent Rva-sgreri Rin-po-che", i.e. sometime between 1934 and 1941 (\textit{PL}).

\(^1\) \textit{CCCTTT}, Yu-t'ai, 1.32-33. The age is wrongly given as 39.
\(^2\) Bell 1946, 196; \textit{DL13}, K'a, 214a.
\(^3\) Rahul 1969, 67. Bell 1946, 196, makes him a Lord Chamberlain (\textit{mgon-gner c'en-mo}), mistakenly as it seems.
\(^4\) \textit{DL13}, Ka, 326b.
\(^5\) Kawaguchi, 331.
\(^6\) Bell 1928, 105-108.
\(^7\) He is mentioned as such in 1912; \textit{DL13}, K'a, 112a.
\(^8\) The personal name is found only in a \textit{lam-yig} translated by Bell 1946, 270. His birth year can be inferred from the fact that he was forty-eight when Bell retired in 1919; Bell 1946, 26, 216.
\(^9\) Bell 1946, 189.
\(^10\) Bell 1928, 108.
\(^11\) \textit{SBR}, 17.
His son T'ub-bstan-'od-ldan (b. 1911) became timber steward (šin-ṛgner) 1929, sod-mgon 1932, distributor of grain in gTsaṅ (gTsaṅ-k'ul-'t'u-p'ogs) 1935, rtse-mgon 1939, mk'an-c'ui and governor of the North (byaṅ-spyi) in August 1942. In 1947 he became Lord Chamberlain (mgon-ṛgner c'en-mo)¹, an office which brought him in close contact with the Dalai-Lama, whom he followed in 1950 to Yatung. He quitted this post in 1951, but remained in close attendance to the Dalai-Lama, whom he accompanied to Peking in 1955 ². Later the Chinese authorities accused him of anti-Communist activities, relating chiefly to the years 1952, 1956 and 1957 ³. In 1959 he fled with the Dalai-Lama to India ⁴, was for a time a minister in the Tibetan government in exile, and in 1964 became the personal representative of the Dalai-Lama in Europe, residing in Switzerland (PL).

His younger brother Ṛ Do-rje dbaṅ-p'yuṅ (b.c. 1915) was c'iḥs-dpon c'en-po in 1937, ru-dpon of the bodyguard in 1942, mda'-dpon of the bodyguard in 1943 (HR). He is now in India.

Family tree of P'a-lha

```
bštAn-'dzin-rnam-ṛgyal d. after 1801
  N.N. d. after 1832
    ...
  bSod-nams-ṛgyal-po d. after 1851
    Padma-ṛgyal-po d. c. 1875
```

```
bKra-sis-dar-ṛgyas d. 1891
  N.N. (mda'-dpon) d. after 1890
```

```
N.N. (?) living 1899
  N.N. (ṛtis-dpon) d. c. 1918
```

```
P'un-ts'ogs-rnam-ṛgyal d. c. 1940
```

```
T'ub-bstan-'od-ldan   Ṛ Do-rje dbaṅ-p'yuṅ
```

¹ This was his position in 1948; G. Tucci 1956, 78-79.
² Tibet, 125.
³ Tibet, 751-752.
⁴ Tibet, 358.
This chapter includes all the noble families who held a seat in the bka’-šag (or a post of blon-c’en) at least once between 1728 and 1959, with the exception of course of the yab-gžis and of the sde-dpon, who have been dealt with in the previous chapters.

Families who supplied only deputy bka’-blon (bka’-ts’ab) or joint bka’-blon (bka’-blon las-’p’ar) are excluded.

The house of KA-ŠOD

The Ka-šod estate is in mK‘ar-k’a near Gyantse. This family did not properly belong to the nobility and had no importance whatsoever before the thirties of the present century. It came to the fore with C’os-r g ya l-ñ i-m a (b. 1903), who entered government service in 1919 and was gSañ-rdzon rdzoñ-sdod in 1924. He held the post of hor-spyi in 1927, when he stopped the Filchiner and Roe-rich expeditions at Nag-c’u-k’a. There were many complaints of his rapacity there (HR). In 1934 he was a rim-bži, when he became involved in the plot of Luñ-šar; he betrayed the conspiracy to bka’-blon K’ri-smon and was formally dismissed, to give an appearance of impartiality to the proceedings; but in 1935 he got his reward, being appointed rtsis-dpon. In 1945 he was promoted bka’-blon. In 1947 he was suspected of complicity in the affair of the Rva-sgreñ Rin-po-c’e conspiracy. All Lhasa expected him to be arrested,
but instead he was sent to command the attack on Se-ra monastery, to his great embarrassment. Although he remained bka’-blon, he was suspected of collusion with the Kuomintang Chinese, who backed the former regent Rva-sgreñ; and when the Kuomintang mission was evicted in 1949, Ka-šod-pa was degraded and ordered to be flogged and banished. He bought his way out of the flogging, but was sent out of Lhasa in white clothes as a sign of disgrace and was confined at sNe’u-gdoñ’ 1. The Chinese recalled him to Lhasa in 1951. They did not reinstate him, but made him a Director of Road Works (HR). He was also given the title of taiji. It seems that in 1972 he was still alive in Tibet (PL).

The house of BKRAS-MT’OÑ 2

Full name: bKra-sis-mt’oñ-smon. Their home is near Shigatse. The family is listed in 1723 in the gTsañ nobility 3, but otherwise only scattered mentions are met with in the course of the 18th century; they held only minor posts. Thus one bKra-sis-mt’oñ-smon-pa appears as benefactor (sbyin-bdag) of the Pan-c’en in 1726, 1729 and 1732 4. The same or another is mentioned in 1737 5. In 1742 he was gžis-sdod of Šo-pa-mdø 6. A bKras-mt’oñ-ba of gŽis-ka-rtse was appointed bka’-drun in 1751 7 and is mentioned again in 1754 and 1765 8. Another bKra-sis-mt’oñ-smon-pa was rdzoi-dpon of rNam-glin in 1774 9 and is probably the same as the c’ibs-dpon bKras-mt’oñ-pa, who in 1778 acted as sne-šan of the Pan-c’en on his journey from Lhasa back to gTsañ 10 and in 1779 met him again at Yañs-pa-can 11. A different man was the ecclesiastic official bKras-mt’oñ rje-drun Blo-

---

1 HR; Ford, 36; for some information on him see also Harrer, 127.
2 Pr. P. 1954, n. 192.
3 MBTJ, 191a.
4 PC2, 341a, 354a, 385a, 400a.
5 DL7, 227a.
6 DL7, 282b.
7 DL7, 387a; sTag-luri, 418a.
8 DL7, 456b, 458a; PC3, 239b.
9 PC3, 355a.
10 PC3b, 32b, 36b.
11 PC3b, 63b; DL8, 95b.
bzañ-sbyin-pa, gñer-pa of Rin-c'en-rtse, who in 1779 contributed to the travel expenses of the Pañ-c'en to Peking. A member of the family was also mentioned in 1810 and 1815.

In 1847 mda'-dpon bKras-mt'oñ-ba was sent to Diñ-ri, and in 1849-1853 was connected with the restoration work at bSam-yas. In 1857 he was sent again to Diñ-ri and is mentioned also in 1859 and 1861.

A bKra-sis-mt'oñ-smon-pa paid homage to the Dalai-Lama at Yar-klun in 1874; he may be the same as the mda'-dpon bKras-mt'oñ who appears in 1879 and was dismissed from a command at Gartok in 1881.

A ṣod-druñ bKras-mt'oñ-pa in 1907 visited the Dalai-Lama, then somewhere in Kansu.

The foremost member of this family was bKras-mt'oñ 'Gyur-med-rgya-mts'o (1890–1938). He entered government service in 1913 and was appointed at once gTsan mda'-dpon and posted in K'ams. He was in charge de-facto of the government of sDe-dge and was one of the officers who signed the truce agreement of 10th October, 1918. In 1923 he was in Lhasa; then he went back to K'ams as sDe dge spyi-k'yab, being finally recalled in 1928. In 1932 he was appointed joint (las-'p'ar) bka'-blon and went again to K'ams to hold an important command there. Later in the same year he was promoted to full bka'-blon and mdo-spyi in succession to ņa-p'od-pa.

---

1 PC3b, 53a; PC3c, 2b.
2 BC8, 60b, 67b.
3 PC4, 309b.
4 bSam-yas, 277.
5 PC5, 62b–63a.
6 PC5, 90b, 128a.
7 DL12, 223a.
8 PC5, 265a; Das, 94.
9 DL13, K'a, 30b.
10 ŠBR, 23; Rahul 1962, 190; Shakabpa, 250n.
11 Teichman, 159; Shakabpa, 262.
12 DL13, K'a, 234a–b. Cf. ŠBR, 23.
13 Rahul 1962, 190.
14 DL13, K'a, 303b.
15 Shakabpa, 269.
In 1935 he left K'ams and came back to Lhasa, where he remained till his death in 1938.

A brother of the bka'-blon, by name Blo-bza-n-rnam-rgyal (b.c. 1909), became a monk official in 1933 and was śīn-gñer until 1938, when he was appointed gñer-ts'αn (HR). He held this office till about 1950, when he was appointed mk'αn-c'uni. No information after 1959 (PL).

Another brother, dPal-lldan-rgyal-mts'an (c. 1908–c. 1967), established a side-branch, bKras[-mt'o]-zur[-pa]. He attended Frank Ludlow’s school at Gyantse (1919–1923), then was put in charge of the government estates in Bya-yul. Then he was assistant in the Grva-bźi hydro-electric station, became rdzoi-dpon šar-pa of Gyantse in 1935, sBra-c'en rdzoñ-dpon in 1942, assistant master in the telegraph office (tar-k'taŋ) at Lhasa in 1943 (HR), then director of the same office. He died c. 1967 (ZK).

The son of the bka'-blon, called b S o d-nams-stobs-b y o r (b. 1923), became rtsva-gñer in 1942 and ru-dpon of the bodyguard about 1944. He is now in India (HR).

The house of SKYID-STOD

This house, whose ancestral estates were in gTsañ-roñ, first entered the higher circle of the Tibetan administration with sKyid-stod-nas bSod-nams-p'un-ts'ogs, whom the Dalai-Lama in 1751 appointed governor of Western Tibet (sTod sgar-dpon) together with Žol-k'aŋ-pa; after some reluctance the appointment was confirmed by the emperor. He was still in charge at the end of 1754.

A Žol-gñer sKyid-stod-pa accompanied bka'-blon bSad-sgra on his mission to Brag-g'yab in 1847–1848. He is probably not the same as the sKyid-stod rDo-rje-don-grub who sometime between 1851 and 1853 was sent to K'ams to procure the copper necessary for the repairs at bSam-yas. In 1853 he was a p'ogs-dpon and again accompanied

---

1 Rahul 1962, 180; Chapman, 75.
2 Not in Pr. P. 1954.
3 DL7, 384a; KTSL, 382.6b–7b; TWC, 24.13b–14a.
4 DL7, 466a.
5 DLII, 83a, 105b.
6 bSam-yas, 219.
bsad-sgra, this time to rTa-dbañ; the emperor rewarded him with the 3rd-rank button 1. Some years later he entered the bka’-šag; he appears as bka’-blon on 21.II, 1858, when he was sent as commissioner to the rGya-sde region 2. It is difficult to say what was the trouble there, as the Chinese texts seem to be silent about it; it may have been a local affair. Anyhow, in the middle of 1859 the emperor granted him title and seal of tajii on account of the work done as commissioner in K’yuñ-po-dkar and K’yuñ-po-nag 3. And this is the last we hear about him.

It seems that this house died out in the following years and their estates passed to the Ram-pa family; some of the members of the latter bore the name sKyid-stod without, it appears, forming a special branch 4.

The house of K’E-SMAD 5

The name is that of their original estate in the Yar-stod district 6. They are also called Kun-bzañ-rtse 7, which is the name of their house in Lhasa 8 (TR).

The family is a fairly ancient one, its name occurring already in the time of the Fifth Dalai-Lama 9.

K’e-smad Rab-brtan-gliti-pa appears in 1754 and two years later was rdzon-dpon of rTse-sgañ 10. Another man with the same name was appointed to arrange for the journey of the regent in 1778 11. A rtse-druri K’e-smad was rtsam-len in 1788 12.

---

1 DL11, 236a.
3 DL12, 50a. On these two districts, situated in rGya-sde, roughly 95°50’ W and 31°30’ N, see Wylie, 180 n. 602.
4 I am unable to decide whether the sKyid-stod sras who was appointed mda’-dpon in 1902 (DL13, Ka, 373b, 377a) was still a member of the old family or belonged already to the Ram-pa.
5 Not found in Pr. P. 1954.
6 bSam-yas, 262.
7 Pr. P. 1954, n. 92.
8 Waddell, man opposite p. 331, n. 65.
9 Life of the Fifth Dalai-Lama, Ka, 60a.
10 DL7, 456b, 515a.
11 Samati, 32a.
12 DL8, 173a.
bKa’-drun K‘e-smad-pa was appointed rdzoṅ-dpon of Goṅ-dkar in 1815.

Except for these meagre pieces of information, the family led an obscure life during the whole of the 18th and 19th centuries. It came to the limelight only with K‘e-smad Rin-c’en-dbañ-rgyal (1874–1927), who entered service in 1894 and became a rtsis-dpon in the early years of the present century, being mentioned as such in 1909. In the same year he was appointed co-head of the new Foreign Bureau, with the title of jasak. In 1914 he was appointed bka’-blon. On 26th March, 1921, he was abruptly dismissed and degraded to a simple sras-rnam-pa; the reasons for this were not quite clear, but had something to do with the trouble brewing between the monks and the army officers. In 1924 he was a mere official on agricultural duty (so-nam do-dam-pa). Later he was given back the title of jasak, but was never again appointed to high office. He was a scholar deeply versed in history and literature.

His son Ts‘edbañ-don-grub (1902–1967), usually known as Kun-bzan-rtses, was enrolled as a pupil of the finance school (rtsis-p’rug) and in 1920 entered government service. In 1924 he was a bka’-drun. Then he became a c’ibs-dpon c’en-po, then a rtsva-gñer and Jo-mo rdzoṅ-dpon. In 1932 he was sne-sbn to Colonel Weir, Political Officer in Sikkim. In 1935 he was appointed Nag-c’u ‘go-pa and in 1938 bla-p’yag. But then he fell out with the regent and on 22nd August 1939 the same scene as with his father was re-acted; he was abruptly dismissed and his official robe was removed at once, so that he had to send home for a broadcloth dress in which to go away (HR). He was debarred from holding office till 1945, when he was...
appointed a *rim-bzhi* (*ZK*). He seems to have accompanied his brother-in-law bSod-nams-dbaṇ-'dus to Nanking in 1946. Later, perhaps in 1950, he was appointed *rtsis-dpon* (*HR*). In 1959 he tried to organize Tibetan resistance, then fled to India and died at Dharamsala in 1967 (*TR*).

His brother-in-law bSod-nams-dbaṇ-'dus (1901-1972) played a more important role. He came from the Zur-k’aṅ family, being the paternal uncle of bka'-blon Zur-k’aṅ, and came into the Kun-baṇ-rtse family as *mag-pa* (*TR*). He entered the service in 1919, and in 1920 he was a *bka’-sod* entrusted with presenting offerings at bSam-yas and ‘U-šaṅ-rdo. In 1921 he was given military training in India and most of his subsequent career was in the military branch, although as late as 1924 he was a *bka’-mgon*; concurrently (?) he was rTse-bla rdzoṅ-dpon (*HR*). Soon after he was appointed *mda’-dpon*. However, in 1932 he was degraded and dismissed from the army. In 1934 he was appointed a *žol-gnner* and two years later he took part in the search for the reincarnation of the Dalai-Lama in the Nag-c’u region. About 1938 he was again *mda’-dpon* and was sent to inquire about the rebirth of the Paṅ-c’en who was supposed to have taken place at Ts’a-ba spa-Sod-dgon. In 1940 he was the sne-šan of Sir Basil Gould in his visit to Lhasa. In 1942 he was made head of the Salt and Tea Tax department (*HR*). In 1946 he was a *jasak* and a member of the Tibetan delegation who went to Nanking and took a much-discussed part, due apparently to sheer inexperience, in the compilation of the new constitution of the republic of China. In 1948 he was appointed commander-in-chief (*dmag-spyi*) (*ZK*). In 1951 the Dalai-Lama sent him from Yatung via India to Peking as a member of the delegation who was discussing terms with the Communist government; he was one of the signers of the agreement of 23rd
May, 1951. He ceased to be dmag-spyi in 1957 (ZK). After the revolt of 1959 he escaped to India through Bhutan and settled at Dharamsala, where he died on 14th June, 1972.

The house of K'RI-SMON

The estate (Timen of the maps) which gave the name to the family is in the 'On valley.

We find only a solitary mention of the family in 1754. It emerged in the limelight only with rDo-rje-tse-rin, who on 16th June, 1792, was specially deputed by the Dalai-Lama to bring a large sum of money to the imperial army campaigning on the Nepalese border. The Chinese text give him the title of bka'-blon; but this must be a mistake, or else he was given a temporary acting commission, because in 1798, when he had his new house blessed by the 'Brug-c'en, he was merely a mda'-dpon. We also know definitely that he was appointed bka'-blon in a year which seems to be 1801. His next mention is in 1804, when the 8th Dalai-Lama was nearly on his death bed. He was present at the ceremonies of the recognition of the 9th Dalai-Lama in 1808 and did not quit Lhasa during the whole of that year and of 1809. In 1811 he was charged with a mission to K'ams. In 1812 he is included in a list of bka'-blon found in a

---

1 Shakabpa, 304; Richardson, 278; Taring, 174.
2 Taring, 256.
3 Pr. P. 1954, 194.
4 DL8, 88a; DL1I, 213a; DL13, Ka, 149a.
5 DL7, 456b.
6 WTTC, 13b.7a. As usual, the Chinese give the personal name only, and the Tibetans the family name alone. The identity is established by DL8, 364a, which gives both names.
7 BC8, 43b.
8 BC8, 49a.
9 DL8, 348b.
10 DL9, 27b, 38b, 41a, 45b, 56b, 93a; BC8, 57b, 58a. An explication of the mandala he offered to the Dalai-Lama on the occasion of his consecration is included in the gsuni-'bum of the 8th 'Brug-c'en, vol. Ga, n. 6.
11 DL9, 127a. I wonder whether this is connected with the curious story of a letter sent by the king of Burma to the De-mo sprul-sku as reply to a letter received from him. This letter, carried in the first instance by a Burmese married couple, passed from hand to hand till it reached Mien-k'ung in Ts'a-ba-ro (Menkong or Menkung of the maps; Wylie,
Chinese text 1. His last mention belongs to 1813 2; he went out of office at the end of 1814 or at the beginning of 1815.

A K’ri-smom sras was sent in 1808 to collect the revenue in ’P’yoṃs-rgyas 3; in the following year he was appointed bka’-ṣod dge-rgan 4.

After a long eclipse the family came up again with ’C i - m e d - r d o - r je; in 1858 he was dBus mda’-dpon and accompanied bka’-blon sKyid-stod-pa (q.v.) to rGya-sde 5. He occurs again in 1861 6. He was stationed at Gyantse 7 when in 1863 he was appointed commander-in-second (under bka’-blon P’u-lun-ba) of the Tibetan troops in Nag-roṅ; he was in direct command of the division who besieged the Nag-roṅ chief mGon-po-rnam-rgyal in his castle. In the eighth month of 1865 the building was set to fire and mGon-po-rnam-rgyal perished in the flames 8; this was the end of a war which gave to the Dalai-Lama control of a large zone in Eastern Tibet. In 1866 the emperor rewarded him by the grant of the 2nd-rank button and of the personal title of taiji 9. He was one of the victims of the conspiracy of 1871 10.

A K’ri-smom is mentioned without a title in 1874 and 1878 11.

Nor-bu-dban-rgyal (1874–1945?) was the elder son of rtsis-pa Žva-sgab-pa (1852–1925?) and became a mag-pa in the K’ri-smom family. His early career is unknown, but in 1909, when he came out to meet the Dalai-Lama returning to Lhasa, he was already rtsis-dpon and joint (las-’p’ar) bka’-blon 12. In 1911 he helped to organize

179 n. 585). Then somehow it fell into Chinese hands. The Peking government was highly suspicious of this correspondence; it reprimanded the Tibetan governor of gSaṅ-stags-c’os-rdzon (Sanga Chodzong of the maps; Wylie 179, n. 586), to which Mien-k’ung was subordinate, and ordered the bka’-ṣag to send somebody to investigate the matter. Document of 20th May, 1812, in JTSL, 256.29a-30b. K’ri-smom may have been entrusted with this investigation.

1 JTSL, 262.18b.
2 DL9, 136a, 141b; BC8, 64a.
3 DL9, 56b.
4 DL9, 97a.
5 DL12, 41b.
6 DL12, 78b.
7 Document of 3rd May, 1865; CPIWSM, T’ung-chih, 32.31a-32a.
8 KPRPC, 108b.
9 DL12, 135b.
10 MTSL, 313.14b-16a.
11 DL12, 223b; PCS, 253a.
12 DL13, K’a, 72a.
the Tibetan rising against the Chinese 1. Early in 1913 he was appointed deputy commander-in-chief with the title of taiji 2, and later in the same year he accompanied blon-c'en bSod-sgra to the tripartite conference of Simla 3. In 1914 he became a full bka'-blon 4. After the death of the mdo-spyi (the bka'-blon bla-ma) early in 1922, he was appointed as his successor; in August of that year Sir Henry Hayden met him in Koñ-po, where he was slowly travelling to K'ams 5. He was still there in the 6th month of 1926 6, but at the end of that year he came back to Lhasa, where we find him during the smon-lam festival of 1927 7. Early in 1934 he was the target of Luñ-šar’s conspiracy; he was to be killed, but the plot was revealed in time by Ka-šod-pa and he was able to take refuge in the 'Bras-spuñs monastery; Luñ-šar was arrested, imprisoned and blinded 8. In 1934 he handed over his duties preparatory to retirement; formally he went out of office only in 1936 9, after the longest tenure in Tibetan history of the present century. But even after his retirement it was understood that he would be consulted about affairs of state. He was still alive in 1944, but must have died soon after (HR). K'ri-smon was no statesman, but one of the best administrators of Tibet. He left only two daughters, the elder of whom married as mag-pa a member of the sNe-mo mDo-mk'ar family 10. This was bSod-nams-nor-bu (b. 1897), who entered the service in 1915 and was holding the post of lha-gñer in 1924 11.

His son bSod-nams-dpal-'byor (b. 1920) was bka'-šod in 1940 (HR). Later he was appointed mda'-dpon; in 1950 he commanded the C'ab-mdo garrison and was taken prisoner there 12. In 1959 he was out of office and lived in Lhasa (PL).

1 Shakabpa, 249; Taring, 21.
2 Shakabpa, 249; Rahul 1969, 64.
3 DL13, K'a, 128a; Shakabpa, 251-252.
4 DL13, K'a, 141a; Shakabpa, 248.
5 Hayden, 198–200.
6 DL13, K'a, 261a.
7 DL13, K'a, 265a.
8 Chapman, 91–92.
9 Rahul, 64; Chapman, 87. The date of 1935 in Shakabpa, 279, is incorrect.
10 Pr. P. 1963, 418.
11 ŠBR, 28. He had acted as chief of the pageants in the smon-lam of 1921; Bell 1928, 273.
12 Ford, 16, 137.
The house of GLAŃ-MT'OŇ

Another spelling is Glań-gdon, which ought to be the correct one, derived from a cliff like an elephant's head near the family estate in the neighbourhood of Gyantse (HR, TR).

Although a sde-pa Glań-gdon-nas is mentioned in 1786, a rtsis-zur Glań-mt'oň-ba in 1852–1853 and one rGyal-rtse Glań-mt'oň-ba in 1879, this family played no role in Tibetan politics until the beginning of the 20th century. A Glań-mt'oň-ba was bla-p'yag in 1907, when he went to Hsining to visit the Dalai-Lama, and in 1909 when he had an audience with him in Lhasa. When the Dalai-Lama had to flee to India in 1910, the Chinese appointed Glań-mt'oň-ba as bka'-blon; of course he was considered a mere puppet of the occupants, was not recognized by the Tibetan at large, and upon the return of the Dalai-Lama in 1912 he was cast into prison, where he died soon after. Because of this, the members of the family were not allowed to use the title of sras-rnam-pa (TR).

Nevertheless, Glań-mt'oň-pa D o n g r u b r d o r j e (b. 1884), perhaps a brother of the minister, was admitted to government service in 1914 and was sKyid-groň rdzon-sdod in 1924.

His (?) son P a d m a r d o r j e (1913–c. 1958) entered service in 1936 as a clerk in the rtsis-k'aň and was sne-şan to Mr Richardson when acting Political Officer in Sikkim (1937). He was in charge of the fire offerings at bSam-yas in 1938, grain paymaster (bru-p'og) in dBus in 1941, sMar-k'ams 'go-pa in 1943 (HR), then corn-tax collector in gTsan. He died about 1958 (PL).

Actually the house of Glań-mt'oň should not be included in our list, but I thought it better not to quibble on questions of legitimacy.

---

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 98.
2 Life of the 2nd 'Jam-dbyaňs-bţad-pa, 183b; bSam-yas, 274; PC5, 265a.
3 DL13, K'a, 27b, 80a.
4 Shakabpa, 233, 241.
5 SBR, 24.
The house of \( \tilde{N}A-P'OD \)

This is the premier family of Koñ-po, where it owned several large estates; foremost among them was Ngapo-dzong of the maps, on the Ňañ-c'u below rGya-md'a'.

In the 18th century its most famous (or infamous) member was \( r\ D o-\ r\ j e-\ r\ g\ y a\ l-\ p o \). He rebelled against the Dsungars in June 1720 and joined the Chinese army and the Dalai-Lama on the banks of the lake sKya-rinš; he went along with them to Lhasa, where he became a member of the provisional government set up by the imperial commander Yansin. At the end of the year he left on a mission to mDo-k'ams, but came back very soon and early in 1721 he entered the council of government headed by K'añ-c'en-nas; on that occasion the emperor conferred upon him the title of beise and confirmed him in the government of Koñ-po. He practically never left Lhasa and acted as chairman during K'añ-c'en-nas's frequent absences in mNa’-ris. He represented in the council the old aristocratic party, nationalistic and traditionally anti-Chinese. Very soon he came into conflict with K'añ-c'en-nas and headed the conspiracy that carried out the assassination of the head of the state on 5th August, 1727; after the event, he was the leading member of the triumvirate in which power was vested. He took particular charge of civil affairs, and therefore stayed in Lhasa during the whole of the civil war. In July 1728 he surrendered to P'o-lha-nas, was handed over to the Chinese, was tried, sentenced to death and publicly executed by the slicing method (ling-chih) on the 1st November, 1728.

\( \tilde{N}a-p'od\) goñ-pa is mentioned in 1721

---

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 130.
2 DL7, 62a-b.
3 DL7, 72a-b.
4 Hsi-tsang-chih, 2.6b; FPYL, 17.18b; CSK, 35c (pën-chi 8).
5 He was present at the smon-lam festivals of 1722, 1723 and 1725 (DL7, 84a, 90b, 107b) and during the whole of 1726 (DL7, 118b, 119b).
6 Petech 1972, 114.
7 Petech 1972, 115–117.
8 Petech 1972, 144–149.
9 The family was divided in two branches, upper (goñ-pa) and lower (’og-pa); MBTJ, 383b.
and 1722, and was a Lhasa žol-gñer in 1723. In the same year bka'-blon Na-p'od-pa proposed him for appointment as junior bka'-blon, but he was passed over in favour of sByar-ra-nas. Na-p'od goñ-pa is mentioned again during the smon-lam of 1726. On the 1st November, 1727, being still a žol-gñer, he took part in the murder of K'tañ-c'en-nas. Apparently he was among the members of the family executed by the Chinese in 1728.

Three sons of rDo-rje-rgyal-po were put to death along with him; their names are given in a Chinese text as dGa'-ldan-p'un-ts'ogs, dKon-mc'og— (Kun-ch'u-k'o-la-ku-pu) and dñoš darqan bsKal-bzañ-c'os-dar. Another son, called mGon-po (Kun-pu), was in the late summer of 1728 still at rGya-mda' (the capital of Koñ-po) with some troops; the Chinese took military measures against him, but nothing is known of his end.

The family of rDo-rje-rgyal-po was destroyed. Most of the males were executed, other relatives and the women and children were deported to China or given away in slavery. The Lhasa mansion of both branches of the family (Na p'od goñ dañ 'og), being left empty, was destroyed in 1733 to supply the wood necessary for building the Chinese-style Grva-bţi barracks, north of Lhasa. Apparently, the Na-p'od estates were given to some other nobleman, who started a new family of that name. We do not actually know who he was, but we may hazard a reasonable guess. In 1736 we meet one rDo-rje-dgra-'dul, who was a younger brother of P'o-lha-nas; and in 1741 we find a Na-p'od rDo-rje-dgra-'dul being received in audience by the Dalai-Lama. Thus we may legitimately suppose that the new Na-p'od family was an offshoot of the P'o-lha, exactly as the Hor-
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1 DL7, 73a; MBTJ, 193a. It is difficult to say whether he is the same as the p'yag-mdzod-pa Na-p'od-pa of 1721; DL7, 81a.
2 MBTJ, 203b.
3 MBTJ, 205b.
4 DL7, 115a.
5 MBTJ, 239b.
6 MBTJ, 310a.
7 STSL, 73.26a-27a (= Petech 1972, 250).
8 STSL, 71.17a-18b (= Petech 1972, 249).
9 MBTJ, 383b.
10 DL7, 194a.
11 DL7, 271a.
k’añ-gsar were. rDo-rje-dgra’-dul seems to be the Koñ-po mda’-dpon Na-pu-na, who in the thirties of the 18th century was holding a command in the districts to the south of Central Tibet.

A Na-p’od-pa, perhaps a monk, occurs in 1751; his (?) sister (Icam-sriñ-ma) rNam-rgyal-sgrol-ma died in 1754. A monk official, Na-p’od rje-druñ, who was a nephew (sku-ts’a) of the Samati Pakṣi, was sent by the Dalai-Lama to receive his uncle at rGya-mdā in 1777; he died in 1790. Another Na-p’od rje-druñ was sent in 1803 to meet on the Nag-c’u the Jebsun Damba coming to Tibet; in 1808 he held the post of gzims-dpon.

The family re-entered state service in the lay branch with a ru-dpon Na-p’od-pa, who late in 1808 commanded the Tibetan troops in Lhasa and in 1809 was appointed gzis-sdod of Lho Lha-k’añ. In 1811 he accompanied bka’-blon K’ri-smon (q.v.) to K’ams; in 1813 he was back in Lhasa. He was promoted to mda’-dpon in 1814 and was still alive in 1822.

Members of the family without a title (except sometimes that of sde-dpon) are mentioned in 1808, 1809, 1810, 1813, 1815, 1825, 1842.

A Na-p’od sras was appointed mi-dpon in 1849 and appears with that title in 1852 and in 1853, when the emperor granted him the peacock feather; he was appointed lha-gn'er in 1854. The Na-p’od-pa mentioned without a title in 1860 may be a different person.

---

1 Hsi-tsang chi-shu, 36a.
2 DL7, 388a.
3 DL7, 444a.
4 Samati, 16b.
5 Funeral rites on New Year of 1791; Samati, 353a.
6 DL8, 315a.
7 DL9, 31a.
8 DL9, 76a.
9 DL9, 97a.
10 DL9, 127a.
11 DL9, 133b.
12 DL9, 161b.
13 DL10, 112a.
14 DL9, 83b, 90b, 107a, 132a, 146a, 168a; DL10, 151a; DL11, 21a.
15 DL11, 115b.
16 DL11, 190b.
17 DL11, 235b.
18 DL11, 248a.
19 DL12, 61b.
A *mda’-dpon* Na-p’od-pa appears in 1879\(^1\). He served under *bka’-blon* Lha-klu on the Sikkim border and commanded together with *mda’-dpon* Zur-k’an the Tibetan troops who were beaten by the British at Luñ-t’ur on 21st March, 1888\(^2\). Perhaps we should identify him with the *mda’-dpon* T s’e-r i n-d pa l-d a n, who in those days led some troops to the border, behaved rashly and was deprived of his rank button, but was left in command to give him a chance to redeem himself\(^3\). He visited Darjeeling in 1892\(^4\), and that is the last piece of information about him.

Another member of the family was the *lha-gñer* Na-p’od-nas who in 1895 was appointed to lead the great Tsari pilgrimage, due in the following year\(^5\). The estate owner (*sger*) Na-p’od-pa is mentioned in 1900 and 1901\(^6\).

But the family had to wait for the 20th century to give two members to the *bka’-šag*. The first, whose name is nowhere given and everybody seems to have forgotten, was born in the sNe-luñ family and entered the Na-p’od as *mag-pa*. For a long time he was a *p’ogs-dpon* (ZK, TR), and in 1921 he was appointed *bka’-blon*\(^7\). He appears as such in 1923\(^8\) but was not otherwise in the limelight. In 1929 he was concurrently appointed *mdo-spyi*; but he was badly defeated by the Chinese and died on his post at C’ab-mdo in 1932 (TR)\(^9\).

He had no sons, and to continue his family he adopted Na g-d b a n-jigs-med (b. 1910), the illegitimate son of a nun, sister of the Hor-k’añ-gsar jasak who died in 1918\(^10\). About 1931 he entered the «noble regiment» (groñ-drag dmag-sgar) and shortly later he married the dead *bka’-blon*'s young widow\(^11\). He became a *ru-dpon*.

\(^{1}\) PC5, 265a.
\(^{2}\) DL13, Ka, 169b; Shakabpa, 199–200.
\(^{3}\) CCCTTT, Wen-shih, 6.25. In 1884 he had been sent to Bhutan together with *bka’-blon* P’a-lha; CCCTTT, Chang Yin-t’ang, 5.34.
\(^{4}\) Waddell, plan of Lhasa facing p. 331. N. 35: ‘’Residence of the general (*mda’-dpon*) who visited Darjeeling in 1892 (Na-p’od-pa)’’.
\(^{5}\) DL13, Ka, 260b.
\(^{6}\) DL13, Ka, 340b, 342a, 361a.
\(^{7}\) Rahul 1969, 65.
\(^{8}\) DL13, K’a, 233b.
\(^{9}\) Shakabpa, 268–269. The date of 1934 in Pr. P. 1963, 421, seems to be incorrect.
\(^{10}\) Taring, 73; Pr. P. 1963, 421.
\(^{11}\) Taring, 110–111.
in the regiment (TR), quitted it upon its disbandment, and in 1936 he went to Eastern Tibet, being attached to the mDo-smad p'ogs-k'a'n (ZK). Upon his return to Lhasa in 1940 he was appointed bšer-dpaṅ (TR). About 1945 he obtained the post of rtsis-dpon (HR, ZK). In June or July 1950 he was appointed bka'-blon and concurrently mdo-spyi. He was completely defeated and was captured by the Chinese. Almost at once he went over to them; and owing to his new possibilities of negotiation, the Dalai-Lama appointed him head of the Tibetan delegation to Peking. In this capacity he signed the Sino-Tibetan agreement of 23rd May, 1951. After this he became the foremost personality in the new Tibet which was taking shape. In 1955 he accompanied the Dalai-Lama to Peking and in the same year became the General Secretary to the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region. In July 1956 he was sent to pacify the North-eastern regions infested by the K'ams-pa rebels, but met with little success. In the winter 1956–1957 he accompanied the Dalai-Lama to India on the occasion of the celebrations of the Buddha Jayanti. Upon the upheaval of March 1959, the bka'-šag was abolished and he ceased to be a bka'-blon, but was appointed one of the vice-chairmen of the Preparatory Committee, maintaining concurrently the post of general secretary. In 1962 he became also a vice-chairman of the Election Committee. After the deposition of the Pan-c'en in 1964, he became acting chairman of the Preparatory Committee; and upon the establishment of the Tibetan Autonomous Region on 8th September, 1965, he became chairman of the People's Council (the regional government). When the Cultural Revolution reached Lhasa, the People's Council was superseded by a Revolutionary Committee, presided by General Tseng Yung-ya, the commander of the Tibet Military Region; and Na-p'o-d-pa became merely one of the thirteen vice-chairmen of the committee.

1 Ford, 93; Richardson, 183.
2 Richardson, 187; Shakabpa, 304. The text of the agreement is given in Richardson, 275–278, and in Tibet, 19–23.
3 Tibet, 125, 142; Shakabpa, 310.
4 Richardson, 202.
5 Shakabpa, 313.
6 Tibet, 354, 357.
7 Tibet, 426.
8 Tibet, 494, 498, 514–515.
In the meantime he had also become a prominent figure in the central government at Peking, as a member of the National Defence Council (since 1954) and vice-chairman of the Standing Committee of the 3rd National People's Congress (since 1965)\(^1\). Thus, when the Cultural Revolution broke out, he adroitly avoided the local issues by leaving Lhasa in September 1966 and going to Peking, where he stayed during most, if not all, of the following years. He participated in public functions as late as the First of May ceremonies in 1973.

The house of LCAÑ–RG YAB\(^2\)

The estate of this name is in 'P'an-yul, near Glañ–t'añ–rdzoñ at the foot of the sGo-la; it was traditionally associated with Sroñ–btsan–sgam–po, whose image was found on the altar in the chapel along with those of the Chinese and Nepalese queens (HR). The family appears for the first time in 1822 with one bka'–mgron lCañ–rgyab–pa, in charge of the arrangements (gra–bsgrigs spyi–k'yang) for the installation of the new Dalai–Lama\(^3\).

The only man of the family who can claim distinction was Lhavañ–d b añ–m g o n–p o. In 1845 he was appointed bla–p'yang\(^4\). In 1853, still a bla–p'yang, he was appointed Tibetan plenipotentiary to the negotiations with the Nepalese commission which resulted in the border agreement of 1st Sravana sudi 1910 V.S. (= 4th August, 1853)\(^5\). Early in 1854 he was back in Lhasa, where he contributed means for the celebration of the smon–lam\(^6\). He became a bka'–blon at the end of 1858\(^7\) and is mentioned as such on 25.X, 1859\(^8\). On 13.VIII, 1860, he and bka'–blon P'a–lha–ba were ordered to open the reserve treasury

---

\(^1\) Who's Who, 543–544.
\(^2\) Not in Pr. P. 1954.
\(^3\) DL10, 90b, 92a–b, 96a.
\(^4\) DL11, 60a.
\(^5\) SPS, 115–116. His name and title of p'yag–mdzod are transcribed as cyañ–dhyañ LHAVAñ gonbo or LĂVĂñ dhyānjo.
\(^6\) DL11, 242a.
\(^7\) DL12, 46a–b.
\(^8\) DL12, 60b.
(rnam-gan) in the Potala\textsuperscript{1}, a not very common occurrence. About that time he was given the task of giving judgement in the quarrel between the opposite factions in C'ab-mdo; he fulfilled it to the full satisfaction of the Chinese government, who rewarded him by the grant of the inheritance for one generation of his title of 2nd-class taiji\textsuperscript{2}. The rescript was received in Lhasa and the recipient was honoured by the Dalai-Lama on 9.II, 1861\textsuperscript{3}. We hear nothing further about lCañ-rgyab, and it seems that he fell from office together with the Rva-sgrem regent in 1862.

After him the family never again held high office. A lCañ-rgyab Grags-pa-lags was killed at Guru on 31st March, 1904\textsuperscript{4}. Its last member known is lCañ-rgyab m K‘y en-r a b-y o n-t a n, who became the 89th K‘ri Rin-po-c‘e of dGa’-ldan (1914–1921) and in 1923 was still alive\textsuperscript{5}. Then the family became extinct and its estates were given to the house of Lha-klu (ZK).

This is the official name, being that of their hereditary estate in the 'P‘yons-rgyas district (TK). Much more common, especially in recent times, is the name bKras-k‘a`n\textsuperscript{7} (in full: bKra-sis-k‘a`n-gsar), derived from that of their Lhasa house below the Potala. The monk officials coming from this family bore usually the name dÑos-gżi (TR)\textsuperscript{8}, which is an estate some 7 miles west of Lhasa (HR).

The family held office in the ecclesiastic branch already in the times of the 5th Dalai-Lama. The autobiography of the latter was partly based on material collected by Nag-d b a n-m k ‘y e n-b r t s e of C‘a‘n-k‘yim in 'P‘yos\textsuperscript{9}; and in 1687 a mgon-ghan C‘a‘n-k‘yim-nas Nag-d b a n-b l o-b z a n-r g y a-m t s ‘o went

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} DL12, 68a.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} WTLS, 335.4b. For the C‘ab-mdo affair see under dGa’-bżi, p. 62.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} DL12, 79b.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Shakabpa, 212.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} DL13, K’a, 228b.
  \item \textsuperscript{6} Not found in Pr. P. 1954.
  \item \textsuperscript{7} Pr. P. 1954, n. 182.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} Pr. P. 1954, n. 133.
  \item \textsuperscript{9} Ahmad, 29.
\end{itemize}
with other officials to Bhutan to conclude a peace treaty. One dNos-gzi-ba was a minister of Lajang Khan; the Dsungars dismissed and later killed him (c. 1718). A C'añ-k'yi-m-pa is mentioned in passing in 1754, a Lha-sa bKra-śis-k'añ-gsar-ba in 1765 and a dNos-gzi-ba in 1784.

Šod-gdan gñer-smad dNos-gzi-ba occurs in 1808 and is possibly identical with the druñ bKras-k'añ-pa mentioned in the same year. Other members of the bKras-k'añ family were Goñ-dkar rdzoñ-sdod at the end of 1808, p'yang-mdzod in 1809 and gñer-pa in 1814. The mother of Lho bKra-śis-k'añ-gsar-ba was received in audience by the 10th Dalai-Lama in 1829.

The foremost member of the family in the 19th century was bKras-k'añ Ts'e-brtan. He is apparently the žol-sde-pa Ts'e-brtan, holder of the 3rd-rank button and of the peacock feather, who took part in the mña'-ris campaign and was appointed mda'-dpon in 1842. Some years later he was given the post of acting bka'-blon, to take care of affairs pending the illness of bka'-blon sPyi-lcags. When the latter finally retired, the emperor waived the usual presentation of two candidates to the vacant seat and confirmed Ts'e-brtan as full bka'-blon (15th February, 1852). Later in the same year he was sent as commissioner to Brag-gyab, to settle the trouble that had arisen again among the lamas of that great monastic centre. Then he returned to Lhasa, and there on 8.VIII, 1853, he received the seal of taiji and

---

1 Life of the First rgyal-ts'ab of Bhutan Łag-dbañ-bstan-'dzin-rab-rgyas, 249b. But the name may be a mistake, being that of the 5th Dalai-Lama himself.

2 MBTJ, 156b.

3 DL7, 458a; PC3, 239b; Samati, 165b. To these we may add (if we can trust the transliteration) the sde-pa Šāsi-śasā Eti, who in 1796 was among the Lhasa officials who welcomed the Nepalese embassy going to China; SPS, 24.

4 DL9, 39a.

5 DL9, 43a.

6 DL9, 87b, 92a, 156b.

7 DL10, 213a.

8 MP, 1.20a (= FRH, 164), 1.44b, 1.47b.

9 WTSI, 50.24b-25a; DLII, 159b; as usual, the personal name is found in the Chinese texts only. – This evidence disposes of the statement in Shakabpa, 181, that bKras-k'añ was appointed bka'-blon in succession to Zur-k'añ-pa in 1844–1845.

10 WTSI, 72.9a-10a, 75.16a-b; DLII, 198a. On Brag-gyab and its two incarnates see above under T'on (p. 68). For the end of the Brag-gyab affairs see WTSI, 93.1a-b (5th month of 1853).
the coral (2nd rank) button granted him by the emperor. At the end of that year, having caused loss to the government during his mission, he gave a present of 5000 silver ounces. In 1854 he is listed among the contributors to the repairs of bSam-yas.

When in 1855 the conflict with Nepal broke out, he was sent to summon the troops of K'ams and Koñ-po, whom he brought to Lhasa and thence led to the theatre of war (15.III). His troops re-occupied Roñ-śar, as a first step to the recovery of gNaN-ślam (Kuti); however, the ambans accused him of false claims of success, and on 19th January, 1856, the emperor degraded him (i.e. took away his Chinese honours), but left him in command in order to allow him a chance to redeem himself. We have no information about his subsequent activities, but bka'-blon taiji bKras-śan was one of the Tibetan representatives who signed the peace treaty with Nepal in April 1856. After that date he disappears from the Tibetan texts. We are told that in 1858 he plotted with bŚad-sgra and then betrayed him and caused his downfall. It also appears that he fled to China along with the regent Rva-sgreń sprul-sku in 1862. If this piece of information is correct, we may recall that the Chinese documents tell us that the "followers" of Rva-sgreń, who arrived to Peking with him, were not allowed after his death to return to Lhasa, partly to avoid trouble, partly because it was feared that the amban Man-ch'ing and the new regent bŚad-sgra would eliminate them in order to put out of the way troublesome witnesses of the events. bKras-śan may have been one of these followers, the more so as ZK informs me that he and the Rva-sgreń sprul-sku were brothers.

---

1 DLII, 235b.
2 DLII, 238a; the text is not quite clear.
3 bSam-yas, 232.
4 DLII, 256a, 275a. Cf. WTLS, 185.9a–11b; also Shakabpa, 181. On this war see Rose, 108–118.
5 WTLS, 186.7b–9b. Indeed the Nepalese account of the war leaves the impression that in the summer campaign of 1855 the Tibetans were strictly on the defensive; Rana, 176–184.
6 Tharchin, 124.
7 Shakabpa, 184.
8 Shakabpa, 187, based on the "Notes of the bka'-blon bKra-śis-śan-gsar", which are not available to me.
9 MTSL, 111.10a.
The bKras-k’añ who was sde-p’yag (treasurer) of the ’Bras-spuñs monastery in 1851\(^1\) belonged to the same generation as Ts’e-brtan. He is the same as the bKras-k’añ sde-zur Blö-bzañ-p’un-tso gs mentioned in 1869\(^2\).

The son of Ts’e-brtan received in 1854 the rank of taiji\(^3\). He must have been quite young, because on New Year’s day of 1855 he (bKras-k’añ taiji) was among the appointments to civil service (ţabs-gsar)\(^4\). Nothing else is heard about him.

Another C’añ-k’yim-pa entered civil service in 1860\(^5\); he may not be the same as the bla-rtsis dÑos-gži-ba who on 29.II, 1861, presented the estimates for the state revenue of that year\(^6\).

A rtse-mgron C’añ-k’yim-pa was on attendance during the journey of the Dalai-Lama to Yar-kluns in 1874\(^7\). He is again a different man from the bla-rtsis dÑos-gži-ba who is mentioned in 1877\(^8\) and on 27.II, 1882, presented the estimates for that year\(^9\). The latter retired in 1896\(^10\). Perhaps he was the official of that name who soon after befriended Kawaguchi\(^11\).

The owner (sger) of C’añ-k’yim paid his respects to the Dalai-Lama during his stop at Sol-nag T’añ-po-c’e in P’yons-rgyas (1900)\(^12\); he may be the same as the ru-dpon C’añ-k’yim-pa who was killed at Guru fighting against the British on 31st March, 1904\(^13\). We are told that a commissioned officer of the C’añ-k’yim family was killed during the fighting in Lhasa in 1912\(^14\); I wonder whether this is a mistake and this refers to the ru-dpon of 1904.

---

1. DL11, 147a.
2. DL12, 159a.
3. DL11, 246a.
4. DL11, 252b.
5. DL12, 72a.
6. DL12, 80a.
7. DL12, 232a.
8. DL13, Ka, 44b, 45a.
9. DL13, Ka, 102b.
10. DL13, Ka, 267a.
12. DL13, Ka, 348b.
An outstanding ecclesiastic member of this family was bKras-k’aň (or dÑos-gži) Byams-pa-t’ub-dbaň. In 1892 he was mk’an-drungi and took part in the building of the new mgon-k’aň of the sNags-pa college at ’Bras-spuňs. He was a renowned medical man, and in 1897 was appointed physician to the Dalai-Lama (bla-sman mk’an-c’un)2. In the same year he assisted bka’-blon Zur-k’aň in the preparations for the Dalai-Lama’s tour to the three great monasteries. In 1910 he followed the Dalai-Lama to India, and when he returned to Lhasa he was appointed spyi-k’yab mk’an-po (1913)5. He maintained that position of high responsibility till 1921, then he resumed his duties as physician to the Dalai-Lama. The date of his death is unknown.

Other distinguished members were mK’yen-rab-byan-c’ub-dpal-bzaň (d. 1920), bka’-blon bla-ma (v.) 1901–1903 and blon-c’en 1907–1920; and his nephew T’ub-bstan–ṣākya (1886–1949), bka’-blon bla-ma 1934–1939. A nephew of the latter was T’ub-bstan-kun-ye’n (1893–1941). He is apparently identical with the dÑos-gži sde-sras mentioned in 1926 together with his uncle, at that time a rtse-mgron7. In 1927 or 1929 the Dalai-Lama sent him to India, to be trained in the printing of banknotes. In 1932 he was sent with a considerable body of troops to sKye-rgu-mdo (Jyekundo), as a sort of military governor of Northern K’ams. Upon the death of mdo-spyi bka’-blon ṉa-p’od-pa, he was in charge of all K’ams for a few months, till the arrival of the new mdo-spyi bKras-mt’on. He negotiated with the Chinese the border agreement of 15th June, 1933, after which he returned to Lhasa to resume his former duties; on that occasion he was promoted mk’an-c’en9.

T’ub-bstan-t’s’e-dpaľ (b.c. 1918), a younger brother of the well-known Žva-sgab-pa dBaň-p’jug-bde-ldan (Shakabpa), was

---

1 DL13, Ka, 222b.
2 DL13, Ka, 278b.
3 DL13, Ka, 280a.
4 Shakabpa, 228.
5 DL13, K’a, 121b.
7 DL13, K’a, 263a, 264b.
8 Rahul 1962, 191.
9 DL13, K’a, 303a; Shakabpa, 269–270; Rahul 1962, 191.
adopted in the C’añ-k’yim family, to which he was closely related on the distaff side (TK). He held at first some post in the Potala and became žol-sde-pa in 1940. He was appointed wool tax gatherer in P’ag-ri and promoted mk’an-c’uñ c. 1944 (HR). In 1947–1948, he was appointed a member of the Tibetan trade mission who went to China, Europe and America under the leadership of his brother Shakabpa¹. He is now living in Calcutta (TK).

The house of BDE–SKYID–GLIŃ ²

The name comes from the family estate in Roñ. The family is also called Ram-pa–k’añ–gsar ³. They never played a great role in Tibetan politics. A few scattered mentions are found in the course of the 18th century. Thus in 1751 a sNe–t’añ bDe–skyid–gliñ–pa was appointed mgron–gñer ⁴. In the years between 1760 and 1769 sNe–t’añ d Ń o s – g r u b – r a b – b r t a n was sbyin–bdag of Kloń–rdol Bla–ma ⁵, who met him again in 1782 ⁶; he was still alive in 1784 ⁷.

No member of this family held high office in the 19th century, and we must come down to 1910 to meet the name again. In that year the Dalai-Lama, upon his flight from Lhasa, ordered the regent to appoint the bšer–dpāñ bDe–skyid–gliñ–pa as acting bka’–blon, but the Chinese debarred him from taking office ⁸. When the Dalai-Lama returned to Lhasa, bDe–skyid–gliñ–pa was given the full title of bka’–blon in 1913 ⁹; but he died in 1914 ¹⁰.

In 1954 the family was dying out; the only male member then alive had donated all his property to the late regent sTag–brag Rin–po–c’e ¹¹.

¹ Shakabpa, 294–297; Harrer, 213.
² Pr. P. 1954, n. 47.
³ Pr. P. 1954, n. 150.
⁴ sTag–luñ, 418a.
⁵ KDJB, 7a, 16a–b; KDTT, 37a.
⁶ KDTT, 59b.
⁷ Samati, 166a.
⁸ Shakabpa, 233; Rahul 1962, 177.
⁹ DL13, K’a, 128b.
¹⁰ DL13, K’a, 141a.
The house of BDE-MK'AR

Another name, more commonly used, is Klu-k'añ. This dBus family was not quite reckoned as belonging to the nobility (TR). It never obtained a seat in the bka'šag and hardly ever occurs in the 18th century. Even in the 19th century only two mentions can be found: a žol-gñer bDe-mk'ar-ba in 1808 and 1809, and the rtsis-dpon bDe-mk'ar-ba T sı ´e-brtan-rnam-rgyal who was active at bSam-yas in 1849-1853.

The only important member of the family was Klu-k'añ T sı ´e-dbañ-rab-brtan (1896-1965). He entered government service in 1915 and served on the staff of the bka'-blon bla-ma Byams-pa-bstan-dar in K'ams. Back in Lhasa, he became a bka'-drunj and accompanied Ts'a-rön to India and Nepal in 1924. Then he was appointed gñer-ts'aiñ and succeeded Šel-dkar-gliñ-pa as rtsis-dpon in 1937. He is said to have refused the post of rtsis-dpon several times before 1937. He had a great reputation for being un-selfseeking and public spirited, and was much respected as a speaker in the National Assembly (ts'ogs-du) for plain speaking combined with a modest manner (HR). In November 1950 the Dalai-Lama appointed him as the lay Prime Minister (srid-blon). On 1st April 1952 he founded the so-called People's Council, an organization which was at once denounced as reactionary and anti-Chinese. He was accused of obstructing the reforms, was arrested, and on 27th April the Dalai-Lama had to sanction his dismissal; later he was released. In 1954 he took refuge in India and settled at Kalimpong, where he started a skeleton Tibetan government in exile. In 1958 he led a delegation

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 46.
2 DL9, 38b, 41a, 62b, 86b, 106a.
3 bSam-yas, 218.
5 Taring, 70.
6 Rahul 1962, 182.
7 Tibet, 24, 691, 736; Dalai-Lama, 78, 81-91; Shakabpa, 301, 305-306; Rahul 1969, 60-61; Taring, 186.
8 Tibet, 178, 691-692, 782.
of Tibetan refugees to New Delhi to present a manifesto to Nehru, asking for his support. In 1959 he joined the Dalai-Lama at Dharmsala and was his chief adviser till his death.

The house of GNAñ-BYUN^3

The form Glañ-c'uñ seems also to occur. The family, whose estate was in the P'o-brañ district in the Yar-kluñs valley, was of small standing and their name seldom occurs in the earlier period, the only information being due to their close connection with the 8th 'Brug-c'en in the first quarter of the 19th century. The sde-pa gNañ-byuñ D on-g rub-pa met the 'Brug-c'en in 1815, and at about the same time the latter sent him a letter on religious subjects. In 1817 he was rdzoñ-dpon of Lhun-rdzoñ; he is mentioned again in 1820 and 1822.

The only member of the family to ascend (quite undeservedly) to high office was Pen-pa-don-grub (1884–1951 or 1952). He entered the service in 1907 and was bka'-'gag in 1909, after which we hear nothing of his subsequent career for many years. He was bka'-'mgron in 1924 and sTod sgar-dpon in 1932, when he was appointed bka'-blon. Nobody quite knew the reason of this appointment, and rumor had it that it was due to a spite of the Dalai-Lama toward the bka'-sag. He was very conservative, even absurdly so, and on the whole certainly not a brilliant personality. Late in 1939 he became concurrently mdo-spyi. He was dismissed in 1943 (HR, ZK), because he had returned to Lhasa without orders from the government (TR); however, he was allowed to retain the title of jasak (HR). He died in 1951 or 1952 (ZK).

---

1 Tibet, 750; Shakabpa, 318.
2 Rahul 1969, 61.
3 Pr. P. 1954, n. 97.
4 bSam-yas, 260; BC8b, 26a.
5 BC8, 69a.
6 gSuni-'bum of the 8th 'Brug-c'en, K'a, n. 75.
7 BC8b, 3b.
8 BC8b, 15a, 19b, 22a, 26a, 29a.
9 ŠBR, 14 (where the name is given as Padma-don-grub); DL13, K'a, 72a.
10 Chapman, 75; Schäfer, 34; Rahul 1969, 66.
11 Gould 1940, 4a; Rahul 1969, 66.
The house of dPAL-LHUN

Full name: dPal-'byor-lhun-po; a gTsāṅ family. This a typical case of a house with a fairly brilliant past which later met with evil days and suffered total eclipse in the time of the 13th Dalai-Lama.

bKa'-mgon dPal-'byor-lhun-po b S o d - n a m s - b k r a - ś i s is first mentioned in 1790 and in 1792 was sent to the Qara-usu region to investigate and report on a matter of 13 soldiers of the brgya-pon Nor-ts'ō who had deserted.

A rtsis-dpon dPal-'byor-lhun-po occurs in 1822.

In 1825 gšer-dpaṅ dPal-lhun accompanied bka'-blon dGa'-bzi (q.v.) to sPo-bo as his adjutant (las-bya); in 1835, still holding the same title, he again went to sPo-bo as the adjutant of bka'-blon Zur-k'aṅ (q.v.).

A šod-drui dPal-lhun was promoted to bka'-šag steṅ druṅ-yig in 1830.

A very doubtful piece of information is to the purport that in the Fire-Monkey, 16th year Tao-kuang (1836), dPal-lhun-ba was appointed to the post of rdzon-dpon of Rin-c'en-rtse.

A p'ogs-dpon dPal-lhun acted as sne-šan to the Pan-c'en when the latter at the beginning of 1844 went to Lhasa for the selection, by lots in the golden bowl, of the new Jēbtsun Damba. He had barely returned from bKra-sis-lhun-po after having accompanied back the Pan-c'en, that he was sent post-haste back to gTsāṅ to fetch once more the Pan-c'en, who was to take up provisionally the post of regent after the deposition of the mTs'o-smon-gliṅ sprul-sku. He is again mentioned in 1845, and at the end of the same year he

---

1 Not included in Pr. P. 1954.
2 YSGT, 128a. Perhaps he is the same as the bSod-nams-bkra-śis who was among the defenders of Šel-dkar in 1788; KTSL, 1332.27b-29b.
3 WTTC, 14b.15b-16b.
4 DL10, 69b.
5 DL10, 159b, 163a.
6 DL10, 296b.
7 DL10, 253b.
8 "List of Offices", in Tharchin, 164.
9 DL11, 46b, 48b, 52a; PC4, 288b.
10 DL11, 52b; PC4, 289a.
11 DL11, 64a.
was promoted to *rtsis-dpon* 1. At the beginning of 1847 he was appointed *bka’-blon* 2. In the 5th month of that year he went out as officer in charge of the training of the troops (*dmag-sbyon spyi-k’yab*) in the Yañs-can area 3. At the end of 1850 he was present at the ceremony of the selection by the golden bowl of the new incarnation of the Jebtsun Damba Qutuqtu; one candidate was the son of one of his family retainers, but fortune decided for the opponent, the son of a servant of the P’a-lha family 4. In 1852 he was among the officials in charge of the *smon-lam* festival 5. He appears again in 1853 and 1854 6, and when the 11th Dalai-Lama fell ill, on 6.VII, 1855, he was deputed to interrogate the oracle of gNas-c’un 7. In 1856 he was one of the signatories of the peace treaty with Nepal 8. His last mention in office belongs to the 9th month of that year 9; but we can go beyond that, because he is is almost certainly identical with the *ţabs-pad* dPal-gliṅ-pa, who on 14.IV, 1858, went to the *yamen* of the *ambans* to receive an imperial rescript 10. In the 2nd month of 1864 he was already retired and had become a monk under the name of mK’yen-rab-sam-gtan-p’un-ts’ogs, residing in the dGa’-ldan-ts’es-glin hermitage near bKra-sis-lhun-po 11. He was still alive in 1865 12.

His son dPal-lhun *stras dGe (− ’d un) − dba ņ (− p ’y u g)* was appointed to civil service in 1849 13. In 1853, still a simple *šod-*

---

1 *DLII, 66a; cf. PC4, 297b, 300b.*
2 *DLII, 80b.* Shakabpa, 177–178, mentions a *bka’-blon* dPal-lhun, who allegedly held a high command in the Dogra war of 1841–1842. This is certainly incorrect, because he was not yet a *bka’-blon* at that time and his name appears in no Chinese or Tibetan text concerning that campaign.
3 *DLII, 85b, 87b.* Yañs-pa-can is one of the Four Communities of Northern Tribes (*Byañ-rigs sDe-bzi*); Wylie, 88.
4 *DLII, 142a, 143b–144a.*
5 *DLII, 158a.*
6 *DLII, 238a; bSam-yas, 232.*
7 *DLII, 258b.*
8 *See under bSa’-sgra, p. 172.*
9 *PC5, 46b.*
10 *DLII, 43a.*
11 *PC5, 153a–b; NGUL, 133b.*
12 *PC5, 161b.*
13 *DLII, 123b.*
drui, he was given the post of rtsam-len. In 1854 he went to the Nepalese frontier in the staff of bka'-blon bSad-sgra. In 1856 he was the sne-šan of the administrator of bKra-sis-lhun-po (dByiṅ-sa-mc'og) going to Lhasa for the ceremony of the selection by lot of the 5th Pañ-c'en, and in the first month of 1857 he was at bKra-sis-lhun-po paying his respects to the Pañ-c'en. At the end of the same year he was given a task in the ceremonies of the selection by the golden bowl of the 12th Dalai-Lama. In the meantime he must have obtained promotion, because he is the same as the p'ogs-dpon dPal-gliṅ-pa, who in the 1st month of 1858 was sne-šan for the solemn entry of the new Dalai-Lama in the Nor-bu-gliṅ-k'a (p'ebs-gra'i spyi-k' yab). P'ogs-dpon dPal-lhun-pa was transferred (gnas-'p'os) to the post of rtsis-dpon on 29.II, 1861. It is doubtful whether he is the same as the Lhasa rtse-p'yag dGe-dbaṅ, who in 1864 went to bKra-sis-lhun-po. Finally he shifted to the military branch, and in 1868 the retired mda'-dpon dPal-lhun sku-žan dGe-dbaṅ-lags took holy orders.

With him the family quitted the scene. We hear that "at one time the dPal-lhun were a large family, but at one time its head was dismissed from service and the estates were given to Ts'a-roṅ" (ZK). In 1920 the family was very poor, although still frequenting and intermarrying with the nobility.

The house of SPO-ŠOD P'UN-K' AÑ

The first half of the name is also spelt Pu-šud; the full form of the second half is P'un-ts'ogs-k'aṅ-gsar. Another name is Byaṅ-ños-

---

1 DLII, 237a.
2 DLII, 250a.
3 PC5, 42b, 61b.
4 DLII, 32a-b.
5 DLII, 36b; cf. 46a.
6 DLII, 80a.
7 PC5, 158a.
8 PC5, 190b, 192b.
9 [But see the Addenda].
10 Bell 1928, 95.
11 Wrongly spelt Bon-šod P'un-k'aṅ by Pr. P. 1954, n. 15.
This family from the 'P'yoṅs-rgyas district is not to be confused with the yab-gžis house of P'un-k'aṅ.

A bka'-drun P'un-ts'ogs-k'aṅ-gsar, first mentioned in 1808, was appointed rtsis-dpon in 1809.

The 'P'yoṅs-rgyas sPu-śud-pa of 1809 may be another man.

A sōd-drun sPu-śud-pa was appointed mi-dpon in 1815. Later he was promoted to rtsis-dpon, and on 1.VI, 1822, he arrived back in Lhasa from having accompanied the Pan-c'en to bKra-sis-lhun-po. During the journey, one day he had seen the Pan-c'en prostrating himself before his yoṅs-'dzin before and after obtaining religious instruction; he was scandalized and upon the next occasion reproached the yoṅs-'dzin with harsh words accusing him of spiritual pride; but this earned him a stern correction by the Pan-c'en, with which he had to put up. In 1823 he accompanied bka-blon dGa'-bži (q.v.) to the Nag-c'u region; and in 1825 and again in 1827 he acted as sne-šan to the Pan-c'en who was going to the hot springs. He is the 4th-rank rtsis-u'pon Pu-Sud-pa (Pu-hsii-pa) whom the emperor promoted to the 3rd rank in the 10th month of 1830. He appears as rtsis-dpon Pu-śud-pa in 1833 and as rtsis-lipon P'un-k'aṅ or Pu-Sud P'un-k'ari in 1834, which shows that the two halves of the name were used indiscriminately. He is mentioned for the last time as rtsis-dpon P'un-k'aṅ in 1838, when he held also concurrently the title of deputy bka-blon (bka-ts'ab).

sPo-śod-pa Blo-bzaṅ-dar-rgyas was bka'-drun when in 1837 he acted as aide (las-bya) to bka'-blon T'on-pa, who was going as sne-šan of the amban to Western Tibet. In 1842 he was bka'-
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1 hSam-yas, 260.
2 DL9, 26a, 97a.
3 DL9, 50a.
4 DL9, 177b.
5 DL19, 86b.
6 PC4, 213a.
7 DL10, 138a.
8 DL10, 161a, 185b.
9 HTSL, 178.33a.
10 LZTK, 27b.
11 PC4, 247b; LZTK, 29a.
12 PC4, 264b, 265a.
13 DL10, 311a.
śag druñ-yig c'e-ba and was rewarded with the 5th rank and the peacock feather 1. In 1847 he (P'un-k'añ) was rtse-p'ral-bde-ba (i.e. rtse-p'yag), aide (las-byā) to bka'-blon gSar-byun-ba on his mission to the Ladakhi border 2. In 1849–1851 he (rtse-p'yag P'un-k'añ) contributed to the expenses of the repairs at bSam-yas 3. In 1852 he (rtse-p'yag sPo-šod-pa) met the Dalai-Lama during the latter's progress through gTsañ 4. Afterwards he was transferred to the parallel post of bla-p'yag, which he was filling when in 1860 he was promoted to bka'-blon 5. He is not mentioned after that date and we may suppose that he fell from office with the Rva-sgreñ Qutuqtu in 1862. We only know that he died in 1872 6.

In 1900 the Dalai-Lama, on tour in 'P'yoñs-sgyas, was met by the master (sger-pa) of sPo-šod 7.

sPo-šod sras T s 'e-r i ņ ' g y u r-m ed (b. 1885) entered the service in 1902 and was mTs'o-sna rdzoñ-sdod in 1924 8. Then he became P'ag-ri rdzoñ-dpon and later 'bru-p'og. In 1938 he was appointed sNe'u-gdon rdzoñ-dpon (HR).

The house of SPYI-LCAGS 9

Full name: sPyi-k'añ-lcags-groñ. This is a Lhasa family.

A sPyi-k'añ-lcags-groñ was admitted into the civil service in 1753 10.

In the 7th month of 1788 one lcags-groñ-spyi-k'añ-pa was in the staff of bka'-blon gYu-t'og (‘Bum-t'añ, q.v.), sent to gNa'-nañ and sKyid-groñ to repel the Gorkhal invaders 11.

On 15.VIII, 1821, another sPyi-k'añ-lcags-groñ-pa left Lhasa on a mission to C'ab-mdo, where he arrived on 27.IX; he was charged

---

1 MP, 1.45a–b, 1.48a.
2 DL1, 84a.
3 bSam-yas, 218.
4 DL1, 211b.
5 DL2, 56a–b; LZTK, 104b.
6 LZTK, 121a.
7 DL13, Ka, 348b.
8 ŠBR, 9.
9 Wrongly spelt as sPyi-p'yag by Pr. P. 1954, n. 37.
10 DL7, 429b.
11 DL8, 173a.
with the travel arrangements for the second part of the journey to Lhasa of the Li-t’ān boy who shortly later was selected as the 10th Dalai-Lama; at that time he was bka’-ṣag-’gag. In 1825 he was aide (las bya) to bka’-blon bṢad-sgra on his mission to mTs‘o-srib. In 1828 he was a mi-dpon and was sent to the Nag-c’u region to meet the Tibetan complimentary mission returning from Peking. All these entries refer most probably to one and the same man: this was the rtsis-dpon sPyi-lcags D o n-g r u b-s t o b-s-r g y a s, who in 1839, at the age of 53, was proposed for a post of bka’-blon, but was not then appointed. He had better success some years later, probably in 1843; he is said to have been bka’-blon in 1844 and to have played a role in the events of that year, when he was severely beaten. In the Tibetan texts he is not found before 1847, when he offered gifts for his recovery from illness, and later in the same year, when he and bka’-blon dPal-lhun organized the bathing festival. In 11.IX, 1849 he had a private audience with the Dalai-Lama; During those years he contributed funds toward the restoration of bSam-yas. He never went on mission out of Lhasa and his activity seems to have been confined to routine and ceremonial matters. This was apparently due to his age; and indeed he resigned in 1851 on account of advanced age.

A monk official belonging to this family was mk’an-c’un sPyi-lcags B l o – b z a n – d b a n – p’y u g, who was appointed rtse-ṣod in 1855.

After him, the family played a minor role. We find only a bka’-mgron sPyi-lcags, who in the 4th month of 1893 was on the staff of the bka’-blon bla-ma, sent to the Sikkim border; and one sPyi-lcags

---

1 DL10, 40a, 41b. The bka’-[ṣag-]’gag is a 7th-rank usher of the bka’-ṣag; Tharchin, 165.
2 DL10, 159b.
3 DL10, 200a.
4 MP, 10.5a-6a.
5 DL11, 85b, 89b.
6 DL11, 125a-b.
7 DL11, 136a.
8 bSam-yas, 232.
9 WTS, 50.24b-25a.
10 DL11, 252b.
11 DL13, Ka, 233a.
Don grub dpal 'byor (b. 1890), who entered government service in 1906 and was Lhasa mi-dpon in 1924 ¹.

The house of P'U-LUÑ ²

Full name: P'u-gu-luñ. The family estate of the same name is not far from C'an-k'yim and about one mile from 'P'yoñs-rgyas-rdo-ñ (ZK) ³.

In 1751 P'u-luñ-ba Zil-gnon-rdo-rje was appointed joint (sbrel-zlar) dBus mda'-dpon ⁴ as a colleague of g-Yu-t'og ('Bum-t'añ) dNos-grub-rnam-rgyal; he received the fief of rGya-rgain-pa as his office estate (mda'-gžis) ⁵. After that he is mentioned only in 1754 ⁶, in 1757–1758 when he attended the funeral rites of the 7th Dalai-Lama and sponsored his biography ⁷, and in 1759 when he met the Pan-c'en in Lhasa ⁸. His funeral rites were performed in 1763 ⁹.

One of his sons, by name Blo-bzan-rnam-rgyal, became a pupil in the Potala monastic school and twice gave a display of his knowledge in the course of 1756 ¹⁰; he is the rtse-druñ P'u-luñ mentioned in 1768 ¹¹.

Another son, Blo-bzan-pun-tsogs, was appointed dBus mda'-dpon in 1770 ¹². He is mentioned in 1779 ¹³ and was still in office in the 3rd month of 1783 ¹⁴; in the same year he was succeeded by 'Bum-t'añ-pa. After that, the family went out of office for half a century.

In the thirties of the 19th century a P'u-luñ-ba made a career among

¹ ŚBR, 13.
² Pr. P. 1954, n. 147.
³ bSam-yas, 260. See also Tucci 1949, 643, and Ferrari, 53.
⁴ DL7, 387b; cf. TWC, 24.10b–11a.
⁵ DL7, 401a.
⁶ DL7, 463a.
⁷ DL7, 544a, 557b.
⁸ PC3, 170a.
⁹ Si-tu, 225b.
¹⁰ DL7, 493b, 508a.
¹¹ DL8, 58a.
¹² DL8, 65b.
¹³ PC3b, 67b.
¹⁴ DL8, 134a.
the monk officials: at the end of 1835, being a c'ibs-dpon, he was one of the two officials in charge of the Tsari pilgrimage. He was placed on a similar assignment for the Roṅ pilgrimage in 1836, at which time he was a rtse-mgron 1.

P'u-lun P'un-t'sogs-t'se-dbaṅ-rdo-rje, whose early career is unknown, was appointed bka'-blon in 1862. He was selected by bSad-sgra (q.v.) to lead the Tibetan expedition to ņag-roṅ; on 13.I, 1863, he received the order to proceed to mDo-smad with the Chinese paymaster Li Yū-pu. In the meantime several refugees from the “Three Hor States” (Hor-ser-k'ag-gsurn), fleeing from the war zone, reached Lhasa and were kindly received and helped by the Dalai-Lama’s officials. P'u-lun gathered a small army, and in the 4th month he left Lhasa with the blessing of the Dalai-Lama for him and his men 2. mGon-po-rnam-rgyal, the ruler of ņag-roṅ, was already hard pressed by the Chinese and their local allies, who had not, however, been able to overcome his stubborn resistance. Hedged all around by enemies, he held out successfully for quite a time and enrolled in his forces many lamas of the monasteries subject to sDe-dge. But in the 9th month of 1864 P'u-lun and his brother with forces from Central Tibet, Brag-g.yab and Ri-c'ab occupied sDe-dge. Soon after, a well-contested battle was fought; it was a complete victory for P'u-lun, and the ņag-roṅ forces had to retire to their own territory 3. This success was marred by the indiscipline of the Tibetan troops, who inflicted much looting and violence upon the local population 4. Further advances were made in the 6th month of 1865 5, whereupon many rebels submitted and the queen of sDe-dge and her son, who had been captured by the ņag-roṅ ruler, were freed 6. The campaign was brought to an end by mda'-dpon K'ri-smön, who in the 8th month of 1865 surrounded the castle of the enemy chief and set it on fire; mGon-po-rnam-rgyal and two of his sons perished in the flames 7. Another
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son and many of his followers were arrested and later sentenced to
death or to lesser penalties. The emperor entrusted the administra-
tion of \( \text{Nag-ron} \) to the Dalai-Lama, to be represented by a \( \text{mk'an-po} \). An unpleasant aftermath of the victory was a widespread purge of \( \text{rNiin-ma-pa} \) elements, suspected of collusion with \( \text{mGon-po-rnam-rgyal} \). As for P'u-luñ-ba, after his victory he marched farther east to Hor-k'oog, then back to sDe-dge, and thence he started on his return journey to Lhasa early in 1866. In the same year he got from the emperor his reward for the well managed campaign: he was granted the 2nd-rank button, the two-eyed peacock feather and the title of \( \text{taiji} \) with rights of inheritance. Afterwards we hear very little of him. He is apparently the \( \text{sa-dbañ mi-rije guñ-blon taiji} \) who in 1869-1870 met the dByañs-can Lama at Lhasa. About the same time for some unknown reason he was deprived of his Chinese honours, but was placed on probation; this was his position when in 1871 he and his son were among the victims of dPal-lidan-don-grub's attempted coup.

His brother mentioned in 1864 may be the P'u-luñ-ba who in 1874 greeted the 12th Dalai-Lama near the tomb of Sroñ-btsan-sgam-po in Yar-kluñs, en route to C'os-k'or-rgyal.

\( \text{mda'-dpon} \) P'u-luñ-ba d B a n - c ' e n - d g r a - ' d u l \) was active in K'ams after 1913 and died in battle there in 1917 or 1918.

P'u-luñ bu P ' u n - t s ' o g s - d b a ñ - r g y a l \) (b. 1906) entered the service in 1924. In 1936 he was a clerk in the office of the \( \text{dmag-spyi} \), and in 1937 he was promoted to \( \text{mda'-dpon} \) and posted to K'ams. He had founded a side-branch of the family, known as P'u-luñ-zur-pa (HR).

P'u-luñ G r a g s - p a - t s ' e - b r t a n \) (b.c. 1917) became Rin-rtse \( \text{rdzoñ-dpon} \) in 1938, C'u-şur \( \text{rdzoñ-dpon} \) in 1939 and \( \text{rtsis-pa} \) in 1942 (HR). Later he became a \( \text{mda'-dpon} \) (PL).

---

1 MTSL, 163.8b-9b, 222.11b-12a.
2 MTSL, 163.10a; DL12, 131b. Secondary accounts of this war are found in Teichman, 5; Li Tieh-tseng, 62; Shakabpa, 187.
3 KPRPC, 108b-109a.
4 DL12, 135b.
5 NGUL, 144b, 145a, 147a-b.
6 MTSL, 313.14b-16a.
7 DL12, 223a.
8 Shakabpa, 250, 261.
9 SBR, 44.
The house of BON-GROṈ

Full name: Bon-groñ-šod-pa. This gTsañ family appears in a list of the nobility of that province in 1722. It held estates both in the Rin-spunṣ and in the Pa-snam districts.

Bon-groñ Nang-bde-c'en, who about 1721 became a bṣer-dpañ but never went beyond that post, was a close friend of P'o-lha-nas. They were comrades in the calamitous times of the Dzungar conquest in 1717, when he restrained P'o-lha-nas from further risking his life for a lost cause, and later sent him food and clothes in the dungeon where the Dzungars had thrown him. Early in 1720 he and his elder brothers Ts'e-brtan and K'ams-pa accompanied him to his new post in gNa'-nañ. Even afterward we continue to find information, neither very interesting nor important, about his relations with P'o-lha-nas. In 1723 he offered a feast in Lhasa and in 1725 he was also present at the capital. In 1726 he went with P'o-lha-nas to the hot springs of 'Ol-dga' sTag-rtse and in 1727 saw him off on his journey to P'o-lha. Shortly after P'o-lha-nas asked him (apparently in vain) to warn K'añ-c'en-nas of the plot brewing against his life. He took no part in the civil war. When Lhasa fell into his hands, P'o-lha-nas saved his house from being looted; their friendship was such as to rouse the jealousy of the gTsañ officers. Nevertheless, while mDo-mk'ar-ba and T'on-pa, who shared this jealousy, were appointed bka'-blon, Nag-dbañ-bde-c'en got no further promotion. Nor does his name occur afterwards; we only know that he was still alive in 1747 and 1748.

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 17.
2 MBTJ, 191a.
3 bSam-yas, 269, 275.
4 MBTJ, 130b-131a, 139b.
5 MBTJ, 160b.
6 MBTJ, 203a-b; sTag-luñ, 395b.
7 MBTJ, 223a, 235a.
8 MBTJ, 237b.
9 MBTJ, 302a-b.
10 Si-tu, 130a-b, 139a.
Another member of the family, Bon-rigs bSod [−nams]−lhub [−grub], was among the gTsan nobles who laid siege to the fortress of Gyantse in 1727.

In 1851–1852 we find a šod-druṅ Bon-groṅ-sod-pa Rig-'dzin-rnam-rgyal; in 1860 Bon-groṅ-pa Ts'e-rin-don-grub was appointed šod-druṅ.

The only member of this family to obtain a seat in the bka'-šag was Ts'e-brtan-rdo-rje (1889–1945), who entered government service in 1906. In 1909 he was appointed rdzoṅ-dpon of rGya-mdā', in 1912 Nag-ts'an 'go-pa (ZK) and in 1915 bka'-druṅ, a post which he held for nearly twenty years. This experience endowed him with a thorough knowledge of government affairs and policy, which gave him considerable influence in the bka'-šag (HR). He was appointed bka'-blon in 1934. In September 1939 he went to Nag-c'u-k'a to meet the boy Dalai-Lama coming to Lhasa. Nothing else is known about him, except that he died in 1945 (TR, ZK).

He had a brother, by name bSKal-bzaṅ-p'un-ts'ogs (b. 1897), who founded a branch of the family known as Ts'es-gsum-p'un-k'aṅ-pa. He entered the service in 1919 and was Lho-rdzoṅ rdzoṅ-sdod in 1924. Later he was P'ag-ri rdzoṅ-sdod until 1938, when he was promoted rim-bži and appointed gro-spyi. In 1941 he was made an assistant in the agricultural office (so-nam las-k'uns) (HR). He died sometime before 1959 (PL).

The son of the bka'-blon, called Ts'e-brtan-dbāṅ-rgyal (b.c. 1910), was salt tax collector in 1930, Pa-snam rdzoṅ-dpon in 1933, Nag-ts'aṅ 'go-pa in 1935. In 1942 he became a rim-bži and was appointed p'ogs-dpon (HR). He died at a fairly young age (TR).

---

1 MBTJ, 260b.  
2 bSam-yas, 218.  
3 DL12, 72a.  
4 ŠBR, 12.  
6 Rahul 1969, 64. For a short character sketch see Chapman, 75.  
7 Gould 1940, 7b–8b; Gould 1957, 212–213.  
8 Pr. P. 1954, n. 198.  
9 ŠBR, 35.
The house of BHRUM-PA

Other spellings are Brum, sBrum, Grum. This is the premier family of Dvags-po; Bhrum-pa is Drumpa of the maps, on the gTsañ-po to the north-east of Lhapso-dzong.

The head of the family is mentioned in 1725, 1735 and 1737, but held no office. In 1751 they put forward claims for estates confiscated by 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal.

Bhrum-pa b s K a l - b z a n was mNa-'ris sgar-dpon rïiñ-pa in 1766. The family is mentioned again in 1778 and its head (sde-dpon) in 1782. In 1791 we find a rtse-druñ Bhrum-pa-ba on duty during the ceremonies for the reception of the imperial general Fu-kangga.

The nephew of Bhrum-pa-ba entered holy orders in 1808 and was given the name Ña g-d b a n - b s t a n - 'd z i n ; he is mentioned again in 1809.

A sde-druñ Bhrum-pa-ba 'P'rin-las-bzañ-po occurs in 1812; he may be the same as the las-bya druñ-yig Bhrum-pa-ba of 1820.

The head of the family came to Lhasa to have an audience with the Dalai-Lama in 1828.

In 1852 we find a bka'-mgon Bhrum-pa sras; he may be identical with the bka'-druñ sBrum-pa sras who early in 1855 was on the staff of bka'-blon bSad-sgra during his mission to Western gTsän. He is apparently also the Bhrum-pa sras, nephew (ts'a-bo) of bka'-blon bSad-sgra (probably on the feminine side), whose name is included among the signatories of the peace treaty with Nepal in 1856. We conclude all

---

1 Pr. P. 1954, n. 196.
2 DL7, 110b, 186b, 229a.
3 DL7, 383b.
4 PC3, 261a; TWC, 24.13b-14a.
5 Samati, 41b; DL8, 122b.
6 DL8, 201b.
7 DL9, 82b, 97b.
8 DL9, 130b.
9 BC86, 19b.
10 DL10, 195b.
11 DL11, 189a.
12 DL11, 250a.
13 Tharchin, 124; SPS, 118.
these identifications with the one (pretty sure at that) with rtse-p'yang Bhrum sras rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje, who in 1859 was appointed to conduct and protect the great pilgrimage to Tsari, due in the following year. In 1861 the amban sent him to bKra-sis lhun-po. He was then still a rtse-p'yang, but soon after he shifted to the parallel post of bla-p'yang, and this was the title he wore in 1866, when he was granted the 3rd-rank button. In 1868 he was sent on a mission to Nepal, coming back in the following year; this was certainly in connection with a dispute over the barter trade in salt and rice, which was settled in 1869. In 1870 at last he was promoted bka'-blon; but this is also the last piece of information we have about him. Apparently he lost his seat in the upheaval of 1871.

The next head of the family was the one who in 1874 paid homage to the Dalai-Lama during the latter's progress. He is mentioned again in 1886 (simply as sger Bhrum-pa).

In 1888 a p'ogs-dpon Bhrum-pa sras was one of the two officials in charge of the travel arrangements for the Dalai-Lama; in 1891 another (?) Bhrum-pa sras was tonsured and received the religious name T'ub-bstan-ye-ses-rnam-rgyal.

The Bhrum-pa sras Ts'e-brtan-dbañ-p'yang, born in 1880 (?), in government service since 1910 and sPo-bo C'os-rdzon tog-'dzin in 1924, was still a member of the old house.

The family, however, was not continued by him, but by the 13th Dalai-Lama's elder brother Blo-bzañ-bkra-sis. He had entered the official career on New Year's day of 1882. It is difficult to ascertain whether he is the rtse-drun Blo-bzañ-bkra-sis, who in 1888 was sent to Southern Tibet to hasten the movement of the troops

---

1 DL12, 50b. On this very important pilgrimage, which took place every Monkey year (i.e. at intervals of twelve years) see Lamb 1966, 322-323.
2 PC5, 126a.
3 DL12, 135b.
4 PC5, 198a, 201a; Rose, 122.
5 DL12, 162b.
6 DL12, 211a.
7 DL13, Ka, 146a.
8 DL13, Ka, 180a.
9 DL13, Ka, 217a.
10 SBR, 21.
11 DL13, Ka, 110a cf. 125a.
toward the Sikkim border 1. In 1894 it was announced that in the fol-
lowing year he would go to bKra-sis-lhun-po to take his full vows 2; after this he was given the rank of a mk‘an-c‘e, and on 5.XI, 1895, he was appointed to bear the Dalai-Lamas gratulations and presents to the Pañ-c‘en on his entering his 13th year, an event which was to happen in the following year 3. But in 1896 he left clerical status, became a mag–pa in the Bhrum–pa family (ZK), and during the New Year’s festival of 1897 he was granted the rank of a jasak 4. Henceforward he was known as the Bhrum–pa jasak (ZK), or as the gcen-po Bhrum–pa sras; and with the latter title he is mentioned in 1898 5. In 1899 he was appointed chief sne–shan (sne–spyi) to the amban Wên-hai, whom he probably accompanied when the latter went to P‘ag–ri in the same year 6. Afterwards he is mentioned again only on 12.IX and 18.IX, 1909, when the Dalai-Lama was coming back to Lhasa 7.

His son Bhrum–pa jasak rNam-rgyal-rgyal-mt‘an (1898–1930) in 1915 was given military training by the British at Gyantse 8. In 1917 he entered the service 9. In 1921 he was a «junior military officer» and was fined for small offences in connection with the trouble which led to the dismissal of bka’-blon K‘e-smad 10. In 1924 he appears simply as Mal-gun tog‘dzin. But immediately after he must have been appointed mda‘-dpun and Deputy Commander-in-Chief; he utilized his new position to undermine the seemingly unassailable position of Ts’a-roñ 11, whom he replaced at the head of the Tibetan army in 1925. He was dismissed in 1929, but retained the rank and title of a jasak. He died in 1930 (ZK), and the Dalai-Lama appointed the former oracle of gNas-c‘uñ, by name rGyal-mts‘an-mt‘ar-p‘yin, “a distant relation of Bhrum–pa, as manager of the Bhrum–pa house

---

1 CCCTTT, Wên-shih, 7.8–9.
2 DL13, Ka, 247b.
3 DL13, Ka, 261a.
4 DL13, Ka, 277a.
5 DL13, Ka, 284a, 288b.
6 DL13, Ka, 319a, 320a.
7 DL13, K‘a, 82a, 83a.
8 DL13, K‘a, 151b; Shakabpa, 259.
9 SBR, 30.
10 Bell 1946, 289.
11 Taring, 105.
mainly for the upbringing of Bhrum-pa's young children and for the managing of the big Bhrum-pa estates in Dvags-po.

A son of the Bhrum-pa jasak, by name bSod-nams-'p4e1-mdzod (b. 1922) was rtsam-len in 1939 or 1940, bka'-mgon in 1943, and rTsa-brani rdzon-dpon in 1944 (HR). He did not advance farther on the official ladder (TR).

The house of 'BUM-T'AN

In the late 18th century the family was known by the alternative name of g'Yu-t'og; of course they had nothing to do with the family of that name, which was founded later by the father of the 10th Dalai-Lama. The 'Bum-t'an estate is in the 'P'yoñs-rgyas district (TK).

This is an old family, and in 1674 a 'Bum-t'an bSod-nams-dban-po was sent by the 5th Dalai-Lama to China. In the early 18th century they were mainly connected with the military service. The first member of the family to attain distinction in that field was 'Bum-t'an-pa dNos-grub, first mentioned in 1714 as dBus mda'-dpon. Later in the same year, when Lajang Khan and his army invaded Bhutan in three divisions, 'Bum-t'añ-pa commanded the left wing of the central division, and during the retreat from Bya-dkar he was in charge of the rearguard, a difficult task which he acquitted creditably. After the end of the campaign he returned to Lhasa. In 1717 he was with Lajang Khan at the hot springs of 'Ol-dga' sTag-rtse; there he got wind somehow of the march of the Dsungar army toward Tibet, and it was on his advice that Lajang Khan returned to Lhasa. In the campaign against the invaders in 'Dam he again commanded the dBus troops in the Qoñot army, fell wounded from his horse and died soon after.

He had two sons, of whom the elder (name not given) was in 1717 a sort of aide to the Qoñot minister Pakṣi. Nothing else is known.

---

1 Rahul 1969, 71.
2 Pr. P. 1954, n. 18.
3 Ahmad, 212, 216.
4 MBTJ, 93b.
7 MBTJ, 122b.
8 MBTJ, 122b.
about him, unless he is identical with the c'iibs-dpon 'Bum-t'ana-pa who in 1725 presented a t'ani-ka to the Dalai-Lama, when the latter was visiting the Yar-klu'ns valley.

The younger son Blo-bzan-dar-rgyas learned the profession of war in the Bhutan campaign of 1714. When his father was killed, he too was serving in the Tibetan army, and succeeded to the command of the dBus troops, although he was put under the general supervision of the Mongol officer Dural taiji. We have no information about his position during the Dzungar occupation, but early in 1722 he appears with the title of dBus mda'-dpon, and he was the sole holder of that post during the whole of his life; a second mda'-dpon was appointed only in 1751. Thus he commanded the advance-guard of 500 men of the small Tibetan army, which P'o-lha-nas led against the Kukunor rebel Lobjang Danjin in 1723. In 1726 he went with P'o-lha-nas to the hot springs of 'Ol-dga' sTag-rtse; otherwise he seldom went away from Lhasa, where he was a member of the clique of P'o-lha-nas. For that reason we may suppose that he was regarded with suspicion by the killers of K'ana'en-nas; in any case, he held no command during the civil war of 1727-1728, and stayed on in Lhasa. P'o-lha-nas saved his house from looting after the occupation of the capital and had to defend him against the jealousy of the gTsan officers. In 1734 he was appointed a jasak first-class taiji, but in the following years he was not much to the fore, being mentioned only on two ceremonial occasions in 1736. In 1744 and 1748 he took part in the reception of the Dzungar embassies who visited Tibet in those years, and in the military precautions

---

\[1 \text{DL7, 114a-b.} \\
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4 \text{DL7, 84a.} \\
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6 \text{MBTJ, 223a.} \\
7 \text{MBTJ, 230a, 237b.} \\
8 \text{MBTJ, 289b, 302b.} \\
9 \text{Hsi-tsang-chih, 1b.} \\
10 \text{DL7, 193a, 206b.} \]
which were taken; the emperor recognised his services by some presents. He died in 1748.

His son was called at first indifferently Dar-rgyas-bkra-sis or dNos-grub-rnam-rgyal, but after 1750 he was known by the latter name alone. He succeeded his father and during the New Year's festival of 1749 arranged for his funeral rites. In the 5th month of 1750 he was at bKra-sis-lhun-po and some months later he was sent to the Nag-c'u to meet 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal's Mongol bride. During the following years the family name starts to alternate between g-Yu-t'og-pa (used mainly in PC3) and 'Bum-t'añ; in the last quarter of the century g-Yu-t'og-pa is by far the more common of the two. He hardly ever left Lhasa, and we hear of no military activity whatsoever. In 1754 he wrote a small biography of the 7th Dalai-Lama, limited to his young years before his coming to the see of Lhasa. In 1757 he took part in the funerals of the Dalai-Lama and in the following years he was one of the officials who offered means for compiling and printing the DL7. He waited upon the Pan-c'en during the latter's visit to Lhasa in 1759, 1762 and 1765, and is otherwise mentioned as residing at the capital in 1761 and 1763. In 1770 he was ill and must have died in the same year.

The g-Yu-t'og sprul-sku, who was a prominent churchman during the fifties of the 18th century, may have been a member of this family.

dNos-grub-rnam-rgyal was in all likelihood the father of g-Yu-t'og-pa bKra-sis-don-grub, who appears for the first time in 1777 as simple g-Yu-t'og sras. In 1779 he was already a bser-
dpāñ and was in charge of the ledgers and accounts of the work being carried out in the 'P'rul-snañ 1. In 1780, still a bśer-dpāñ, he and the Žva-nag-pa were charged with the arrangements for the recitation of formulae (?: zlos-gži) 2. On 9. Vbis, 1783, he was appointed rdzöñ-dpon of bSam-yas and special commissioner for the pilgrimage of recitation there 3; but in the same year he shifted to the military career and in the 10th month was appointed mda’-dpon 4. This was his rank in 1784 and 1786 5. At last in the 7th month of 1788 he appears for the first time as bka’-blon 6. Thus the 'Bum-t’añ-pa were the first new house to enter the narrow circle of the families descended from the bka’-blons of P’o-lha-nas (and from the 7th Dalai-Lama), who had hitherto monopolised the seats in the bka’-šag. In the same 7th month of 1788 he was sent to repel the Gorkhali invaders, who had occupied gNä-nañ and sKyid-gron 7. He reached Šel-dkar, but was blocked there and besieged for some time; he held out stubbornly, and eventually the Gorkhalis slowly retired 8. For this brave action he and his officers (63 in all) and soldiers (214 men) were rewarded by the emperor with some satin and silver 9. Then an agreement was negotiated by bka’-blon dGa’-bii, and in the 3rd month of 1789 bKra-sis-don-grub returned to Lhasa, where he delivered to the regent a formal report on the events 10. At the time of the arrival of the new regent Samati Pakṣi (11.XII, 1790), he was in Lhasa as a regular member of the bka’-šag 11. In 1791 he accompanied bka’-blon dGa’-bzi (q.v.) on his ill-starred mis-

1 Samati, 217a.
2 Samati, 109a.
3 Samati, 142b.
4 DL8, 138a; Samati, 152b.
5 Samati, 155a, 166a, 195a. In 1787 we find a rTa-dbañ mk’an-po g’Yu-t’og sprul-skü along with the [g’Yu-t’og] mda’-dpon; DL8, 165a.
6 PC4, 55a. He must have succeeded mDo-mk’ar bSod-nams-dbañ-rgyal, who had died in that year.
7 DL8, 173a-b; KDTT, 74b. Kuti, the headquarters of the gNä’-lam district, had been occupied on 1st Åšādha (28th June); sKyid-gron fell on 9th Šrāvana (27th July); Regmi, 171.
8 KTSL, 1313.15a-16b; cf. Shakabpa, 158. The failure before Šel-dkar happened on 23rd Šrāvana (9th August).
9 KTSL, 1322.27b-29b.
10 DL8, 177b, 179b.
11 Samati, 349a.
sion^1 and was taken prisoner by the Gorkhali; he is the Ito Kaji or Ilau Kaji of the Nepalese documents^2. During his forced stay in Kathmandu he was dismissed from office^3. On 27th July 1792 he was handed over to the imperial commanders^4, and in the following month the emperor gave orders that he should be sent to Peking for judgement^5; we do not know whether the order was actually carried out. He seems to have been still alive in 1794^6. The g'Yu-t'og estate was apparently confiscated.

Still, the name g'Yu-t'og was not dropped at once. In 1809 we find a lha-gñer g'Yu-t'og-pa^7, who in 1809 was among the officials in charge of the smon-lam ceremonies^8. In 1813 there is mention of a g'Yu-t'og-pa without official title; he may be the same as the drun-yig 'Bum-t'añ-pa of 1814^9. A sde-dpon g'Yu-t'og-pa appears for the last time in 1822^10; three years later the g'Yu-t'og estate was granted to the family of the 10th Dalai-Lama, which took the name from it.

The family never recovered from the blow it had suffered in 1792, and never again obtained high office in the lay branch. The only mention after 1822 is that of a nobleman 'Bum-t'añ-pa who in 1874 waited upon the 12th Dalai-Lama during the latter's journey in Lho-k'a^11. Similarly, the 13th Dalai-Lama, during his stay in 'P'yoñs-rgyas (1900), was met by the landholder (sger) 'Bum-t'añ-pa^12.

The clerical members of the family fared better. A rtse-mgron 'Bum-t'añ-pa was appointed in 1859 to second Bhrum-pa sras in taking care of the Tsa-ri pilgrimage^13; and his name occurs again in 1862^14.

---

^1 WTTC, 13a.11b. In KTSL, 1391.8b, and KEKCL, 9.23a, 9.25b, concerning the same event, he is called by mistake "the mda'-dpon of the land g'Yu-t'og"; see also Shakabpa, 164. But the proper title is found e.g. in KEKCL, pref. 2.15a, pref. 2.17a, pref. 3.12a, 1.1a.

^2 Regmi, 175; SPS, 18.

^3 WTTC, 13b.24b; KEKCL, 31.19a.

^4 WTTC, 13b.25b, 13b.28b; Shakabpa, 167.

^5 WTTC, 13c.3a.

^6 KDTT, 183a.

^7 DL9, 45b-46a, 54b.

^8 DL9, 92a.

^9 DL9, 145b, 159a.

^10 DL10, 112b.

^11 DL12, 122b.

^12 DL13, Ka, 348a.

^13 DL12, 50b.

^14 DL12, 90b.
'Bum-t'añ rtse-drun B y a m s-p a c' o s-r g y a n was mDo-smad sgar-dpon in 1886¹. Most important of all, 'Bum-t'añ Ye-šes-p'ul-'byuñ became ecclesiastic minister (bka'-blon bla-ma; q.v.) in 1889.

In the 20th century the family is seldom mentioned. A las-ts'an-pa 'Bum-t'añ B y a m s-p a-t'a r-p'y i n visited the Dalai-Lama at Kalimpong in 1912², and 'Bum-t'añ-pa b S o d-n a m s-d p a l-' b a r (b. 1888) entered the service in 1905 and was in 1924 joint official for the corn-tax collection ('bru-bskyel las-rogs las-ts'an-pa) in dBus³. In 1936 he was appointed 'P'yoñs-rgyas rdzoñ-dpon (HR). As a matter of fact, the economic position of the family had deteriorated, and "in modern times it owned only a small estate in Lho-k'a" (ZK).

The house of 'BROÑ-RTSE⁴

The history of this ancient house of gTsañ belongs wholly to the 18th century, as it died out before the end of that century.

Originally it enjoyed a semi-autonomous status, and in 1697 we find the princelet (rgyal-p'ran) 'Broñ-mk'ar-rtse-pa governing upper Ñañ⁵. Their normal title, however, was usually sde-pa⁶.

In 1720 the Dsungar commanders ordered the confiscation of the estate⁷; but soon after they had to evacuate Tibet and the measure was never actually carried out. At that time the chief of the family was d Bañ-r g y a l-r a b-b r t a n⁸. In 1722 and 1723 he was rdzoñ-dpon of Shigatse⁹. In 1733 he is still simply called sde-pa, but in 1734 he was already a bka'-blon¹⁰. About that time he received

---

¹ DL13, Ka, 147a.
² DL13, K'a, 109a.
³ ŚBR, 11.
⁴ Not listed in Pr. P. 1954.
⁵ MBTJ, 43a. The chiefs of 'Broñ-rtse were said to be descended from the kings of Tibet; G. Tucci, Indo-Tibetica, IV, 1 (Rome 1941), 65-66.
⁶ So he is called in 1692; PC2, 132a.
⁷ PC2, 294a.
⁸ Usually called 'Broñ-btsan; the Bronze of the Italian missionaries. His full name is found only in TWC, 24.6b-7a.
⁹ PC2, 315a, 324b, 325b.
¹⁰ PC2b, 46a. His earliest mention as bka'-blon would be 1733, if he is to be identified with the Chung-tzu bka'-blon, whom P'o-lha-nas sent in that year to Bhutan; W提倡, 15.9b.
also the title of jasak 1st-class taiji. He was a rather pale figure and little is known about him. He was dismissed by ‘Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal in 1750 and, having become blind in both eyes, was not reinstated by the imperial commission after the tragic death of the last “king”. In 1751 he was visited at ’Broń-rtse by Bla-ma Nag-dbañ-byams-pa, after which we hear nothing further about him.

In 1727 one ’Broń-dkar-rtse-pa bsTan-dzìn Noyan was among the gTsan nobles who tried to stop the Lhasa troops on the Karo-la, but failed. In 1730 he was one of the commanders of the expeditionary force despatched by P’o-lha-nas to Bhutan. It is difficult to say whether we have to identify him with the minister. A sde-pa ’Broń-rtse-ba, probably a son of the bka’-blon, occurs in 1759 and 1762. In 1767 he took holy orders. A bser-dpañ ’Broń-rtse-ba met the Pan-c’en when the latter passed through ’Broń-rtse in 1778. He may be different from the sde-pa or sde-dpon ’Broń-rtse-ba mentioned in 1779, 1781 and 1782. With them the family seems to have died out, and the ’Broń-rtse estate, north-west of Gyantse, was inherited by the P’a-lha family (PL), which later was compelled to cede it to the house of sTag-’ts’er, the family of the 14th Dalai-Lama (TR).

The house of SMAN-STOD

Full name: sMan-k’ab-stod-pa. The family estate is in the district of Šel-dkar-rdzon. It was an obscure family and is prac-
tically never mentioned in the texts before its single outstanding member. This was sMan-stod rDo-rje-rnam-rgyal, who was sTod sgar-dpon in 1911 (ZK). Later he became dBu mda’-dpon and was joint (las-’p’ar) bka’-blon at the end of 1923. In 1926 he became concurrently mdo-spyi, succeeding K’ri-smon in the latter office. In 1929 he returned to Lhasa, and probably on that occasion was appointed full bka’-blon; he died in 1931, during a big feast he gave to the gentry.

He had two sons. One of the two may be identified with sMan-stod bu Nag dbaṅ bstan ’dzin (b. 1901), who entered the service in 1919 and was P'o-bran tog-'dzin in 1924. It seems that he became a bka’-mgon, but died young soon after his father (TR). The other, sMan-stod Blo-bzaṅ dbaṅ 'dus (1917–1959), was perhaps a mag–pa. He entered service in 1936, was rDzoṅ-dga’ rdzoṅ-dpon in 1938 and bka’-druṅ in 1939, when he accompanied the mdo-spyi bka’-blon gNaṅ-byuṅ to K’ams (HR). Later he became a bla-p’yag. He was killed while fleeing to India in 1959 (PL, TR).

The house of TS'A-ROṅ

The family estate of Ts’a-roṅ is near Sa-skya. They claimed to be descended from the famous physician g-Yu-t’og Yon-tan-mgon-po, who is said to have lived in the 8th century, but ceased to call themselves g-Yu-t’og-pa after the name was taken by the family of the 10th Dalai-Lama in 1827. The connection of the family with medicine lasted far in the 19th century.

One Ts’a-roṅ Tse-brtan-rdo-rje waited upon the Pan-c’en in 1692 and 1695.

They led an obscure life during most of the 18th century, the one exception being bs Kal bzaṅ c’os grags, a monk official.
He first appears in 1783 together with several medical men, during the preparation of magic–medical pills (ril-bu)\(^1\). In 1796 and 1798 we find him as rtse-p’
yag\(^2\). Later he became spyi-k’yab mk’an-po\(^3\).

Another Ts’a-rove-pa, also a monk official, was in 1801 a rtse-mgron and was sent to meet on the road the Pañ-c’en coming to Lhasa; he was also appointed with other officials to see him off\(^4\). We find him again as head of the lCags-po-ri medical college (bla-smam), preparing medicines for the 8th Dalai-Lama during his last illness\(^5\).

In 1808 a p’ogs-dpon Ts’a-rove accompanied the amban to gTsan\(^6\). In 1809 he was appointed rdzoñ-dpon of sNañ-dkar-rtse and in 1810 he was in charge of some repair work in the Potala\(^7\).

His (?) son Ts’a-rove bu showed his proficiency in medicine (1812) and in the following year was appointed bka’-mgron\(^8\); he is still mentioned as such in 1815\(^9\).

A s
d dru
Ts’a-rove bu was appointed bka’-mgron in 1845 and appears as gs
er-dpon Ts’a-rove sras in 1848\(^10\). He is possibly identical with b s K a l - b z a n - d g r a - ’d u l , governor of rTsa-brañ (Tsaparang) and holder of the 6th-rank button, who took part in the mNa’-ris campaign and in 1842 was granted the 5th-rank button and the peacock feather\(^11\). We find him again in the 1st month of 1856, when Ts’a-rove rtsis-dpon bsKal-bzañ-dgra-’dul, after having participated in the campaign against the Gorkhali in the staff of bka’-blon kun bSad-sgra, went by his order to dÑul-c’u and gave to dByan-c’en Grub-pa’i-rdo-rje the means for compiling and printing the biography of the latter’s uncle Dharmabhadra (d. 1851)\(^12\).

---

\(^1\) DL8, 135b.
\(^2\) DL8, 254b, 269b.
\(^3\) Taring, 5. I did not find him with this office in DL8; of course the entry may have escaped me.
\(^4\) DL8, 278a, 209a; PC4, 109a.
\(^5\) DL8, 340b, 347b.
\(^6\) DL9, 55a.
\(^7\) DL9, 97a, 114b.
\(^8\) DL9, 129b, 132b.
\(^9\) DL9, 177a, 182b.
\(^10\) DLII, 59b, 103b.
\(^11\) MP, 1.45a-b, 1.48a.
\(^12\) NGUL, 112b; Life of Dharmabhadra (Tohoku 6260), 175a.
The *mda’-dpon* Ts’a-roñ-pa mentioned in 1852 is apparently a different person.

In 1886 *rtsis-dpon* Ts’a-roñ-pa was sent, along with *mk’an-c’en ’Brug-rgyal*, to demarcate the border with Sikkim; it was a measure of precaution against the Macaulay mission, which the Sino-British agreement of 1886 allowed to be sent to Lhasa, but which in the end was abandoned. On 1.III, 1888, *rtsis-dpon* Ts’a-roñ-pa was again sent to P’ag-ri, this time as an aide to the commander of the frontier forces, *bka’-blon* Lha-klu-pa. We may identify him with *rtsis-dpon* rDo-rje-rig-'dzin, who according to the Chinese documents was in direct command of the Tibetan force at and near Lun-t’ur in March–May 1888. In the 3rd month of 1891 he was back in Lhasa from a mission to Koñ-po. He died not much later, immediately after being appointed *bka’-blon* but before actually taking office.

His son Ts’a-roñ dBaN-p’yu rgyal-po (1866–1912) was dBus *mda’-dpon* when he was sent to the Chumbi border in the 4th month of 1903; but he failed to persuade the British not to advance beyond Ge’u-sgan (Giaogong). On the 22nd July he had an inconclusive meeting with Younghusband at Gam-pa-rdzon, after which he stayed on in that forlorn place till the autumn; but no further talks took place; then he returned to Lhasa. At the end of 1903 or early in 1904 he was appointed *bka’-blon*; he was one of the Tibetan representatives who negotiated the Lhasa treaty. In 1907 he went to Darjeeling (July).

---

1 *DLII*, 189a.
2 Shakabpa, 199; Taring, 5; Lamb 1960, 175–176, 180.
3 *DLII*, Ka, 170a.
4 *CCCTTT*, Wên-shih, 5.11, 5.11–13, 6.24, 6.25, 6.26–27, 7.1–2, 7.4, 7.13, 7.15, 7.21, 7.23, 8.20.
5 *DLII*, Ka, 212b.
6 Taring, 5.
7 *DLII*, Ka, 380a; *Ch’ing-tai Hsi-tsang shih-liao ts’ung-k’an*, Shanghai 1937, 1.37–39, 1.45–46; Taring, 15; Shakabpa, 206–207.
9 Shakabpa, 209; Taring, 16. The imperial sanction was given only on 5th March, 1905; *CCCTTT*, Yu-t’ai, 1.32–33.
10 P. Mehra, *op. cit.*, 327.
and then to Simla (August) as an attaché to the Chinese representative Chang Yin-t'ang. In December he was in Calcutta and soon after signed on behalf of the Tibetan government the trade agreement of 1908. When the Chinese occupied Lhasa in 1910, he remained in office and soon became their subservient tool. For this he and his elder son bka'-mgon 6 Bsam-grub-tse-rin (1887–1912) were killed by order of the Tibetan leaders at the beginning of the 4th month of 1912. His second son Bskal-bzan-ha-dba-n (1903–1936) survived; but he was a ne'er-do-well and did not enter official career 7.

The bka'-blon's daughter Padma-sgroldkar and daughter-in-law Rig-'dzin-c'o-s-gron 8 and the family estates were given to the hero of the day, Zla-bzan-dgra-'dul (1886–1959). He was issued from a very humble family, and was at first a body servant of the monk official in charge of the Nor-bu-glin-k'a palace and park. Then he obtained office under the court physician P'a-lha Byams-pa-c'o-s-rgyan and later became one of the valets of the Dalai-Lama, whom he followed to Mongolia and then to China. He earned the deep-felt gratitude of his new master, when late in 1910 his pluck saved the Dalai-Lama from being overtaken by the Chinese cavalry upon his flight to India. After that, he remained in close attendance to the Dalai-Lama, whom he followed in his tour of the holy places of Buddhism in India. In the middle of 1911 he was sent to Tibet to engineer a revolt against the Chinese occupation forces; for this purpose the Dalai-Lama issued a proclamation to his people. At the end of the year he could already send to his master a report of his activity. His
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2 **CCCTTT**, Chang Yin-t'ang, 5.50; Younghusband, 353–354; Taring, 18.
3 English text in Richardson, 260–265; Chinese text in **CCWCSL**, 217.1a–7b.
4 Shakabpa, 231.
5 Lamb 1966, 272.
6 Taring, 21–22.
7 Taring, passim.
8 Taring, 24–25.
9 On his early career see Bell 1946, 140–141.
10 **DL13**, K'a, 92a–b; Bell 1946, 83.
11 **DL13**, K'a, 100b.
12 **DL13**, K'a, 104a.
13 **DL13**, K'a, 107a.
seemingly hopeless task was rendered easy by the Chinese revolution and the collapse of the monarchy and of the old order. The Tibetan national rising under his lead was successful 1. In the autumn of 1912 he was able to welcome the Dalai-Lama back to Tibet at bSam-sdiñs; at that time he held the title of spyi-k’yab c’en-po of the forces of dBus and gTsañ 2. In the 3rd month of 1913 he was appointed commander-in-chief of the army with the title of jasak 3. His half-forced marriage with the women of the old Ts’a-roñ family ennobled him and assured his standing in the narrow circle of the ruling class; and his talent for finance and for international trade made him the richest man in Tibet 4. In 1914 he was appointed bka’-blon 5 and dedicated most of his activity to the organization of the new Tibetan army 6. For some years he was the most influential man in the country. But then the Dalai-Lama grew somewhat suspicious of his power and wealth, and in 1925 abruptly dismissed him from the command of the army 7. In 1929 (HR) he lost his seat in the bka’-fag as well 8. Nevertheless, his wealth and his practical wisdom ensured a large share of influence in Tibetan politics far into the forties of the present centuries. After the Lhasa outbreak of 1959 he was thrown into jail, where he died on 14th May of that year 9.

The house of MTS’O-SGO 10

This is a family from Western gTsañ; mTs’o-sgo is Tsogo of the maps, not far from Šel-dkar-rdzon 11. It was practically unknown in
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1 Bell 1946, 119–120; Shakabpa, 241.
2 DL13, K’a, 113a.
3 DL13, K’a, 121b; Lon-’ba’i-dmigs-bu, in Tharchin, 191.
4 On Ts’a-roñ žabs-pad in general see e.g. Chapman, 80–81; W. W. McGovern, To Lhasa in disguise, London 1924, 277–278; Hayden, 58–59; Schäfer, 34–35.
5 DL13, K’a, 136a. Further mentions in this Tibetan text refer to 1916 and 1923; DL13, K’a, 162b, 163b, 233b.
6 Rahul 1962, 184–185. In 1919 he passed in review the newly-formed bodyguard (sku-druri dmag-sgar); DL13, K’a, 177a.
7 Rahul 1969, 69–70; Taring, 71.
8 Taring, 105, gives the date of 1930, but this seems to be not quite correct.
9 Taring, 269.
10 Pr. P. 1954, n. 203.
11 bSam-yas, 281.
the 18th century 1 and in the first part of the 19th, and its ascent is a fairly recent development.

mTs’o-sgo Gañs-c’en-pa (?) : kang-ch’ing-pa) was sTod gar-dpon at the time of the Dogra war in 1841–1842. He held the 5th rank, and on account of his good behaviour was granted in 1842 the 4th-rank button and the peacock feather 3.

In the 8th month of 1866 rtse-p’yang Mig-dmar-tse-rin was in charge of some refurnishing work in the audience hall of the Potala 4. On 5.VI, 1867 he was appointed bka’-blon 5. We know nothing at all of his activity. In 1871, while being under inquiry, he fell a victim of the conspiracy of dPal-ldan-don-grub: he was bound into a skin and thrown into the river 6.

mTs’o-sgo bSod-nams-dba-n ’dus (b. 1891) entered government service in 1908 7. As a sŏd-druñ he went in 1910 to Kalimpong to wait upon the Dalai-Lama 8. In 1912 he helped in the preparations for the ruler’s journey back to Tibet 9. Later he was appointed acting mda’-dpon, and in 1914 he was sent to mDo-smad 10. He took part in the war against the Chinese and in 1916 was promoted to full dBus mda’-dpon 11. About 1918 he came back to Central Tibet, and in 1919 acted as chief sne-śan to the Pan-c’en on his visit to Lhasa 12. It appears that he was dismissed in 1921 13, but soon re-entered the service at a lower level. In 1923 he tried in vain to catch the Pan-c’en on his flight to China 14. In 1924 he was a ru-dpon 15. Somewhat

1 I found mention only of one mTs’o-sgo Ts’e-brtan-rnam-rgyal, who was chief of the painters during decoration works in the ’P’rul-snañ in 1790; DL8, 184b. It is highly doubtful whether he was a member of the noble family.

2 MP, 1.24a–27b (= FRH, 168).

3 MP, 1.45a–b, 1.47b.

4 DL12, 135a.

5 DL12, 141a.

6 MTSL, 313.14b–16a; Shakabpa, 189; Bell 1931, 158.

7 ŠBR, 16.

8 DL13, K’a, 95b.

9 DL13, K’a, 110b.

10 DL13, K’a, 140b.


12 DL13, K’a, 178b.

13 Shakabpa, 264.

14 Taring, 106.

15 ŠBR, 16.
later the Lhasa government had to settle the problem of sPo-bo. This half-wild and little known region in the southeast was ruled by a chief styled the Ka-nam sde-pa. In 1910 he had successfully opposed the Chinese, and his resistance had contributed not a little to the utter demoralization of the Chinese occupation corps. Although he married in the circles of the Lhasa aristocracy, his allegiance to the government of the Dalai-Lama was most slender. The mdo-spyi K‘ri-smön tried in vain to instal a Tibetan official there. In 1927 open war broke out; it began with a disaster for the Lhasa troops, the mda’-dpon sTag-sna being ambushed and killed with many of his troops. Then mTs‘o-sgo was placed in command, and after long fighting he succeeded in crushing opposition in sPo-bo (1931). The Ka-nam sde-pa fled in the Mishmi hills and died of exposure and fatigue while wandering there. The country was placed under the administration of the mdo-spyi 1. mTs‘o-sgo received no particular reward for his success and was rather querulous about this lack of recognition for his achievements. He was still alive in 1939, but his health was not good and he was not then holding any appointment (HR).

His younger brother dNōs-grub-rdo-rje (1904-1972) entered government service in 1924 2. He was later known as mTs‘o-sgo zur-pa. He was appointed sNam-glin rdzoṅ-dpon about 1926 and remained there until 1936, when he was made a mda’-dpon and sent to K‘ams; he returned to Lhasa in 1941 (HR). Soon after he retired. In 1961 he fled to India and died at Dharamsala in 1972 (PL).

bSod-nams–dbaṅ-dus had one daughter, who took a mag-pa from the bSam-grub P'o-braṅ-family (ZK); his name was mTs‘o-sgo sras Ts‘e-dbaṅ-don-grub (b.c. 1917) and he entered the service in 1940. In 1944 he was sne-śan to Mr Gould, Political Officer in Sikkim, on his journey to Lhasa (HR).

Another member of the family was mTs‘o-sgo Don-grub-ts‘e-rin. He was a bka’-druṅ and later became a rtsis-dpon (TK). In 1950 he went to C‘ab-mdo as an adjutant to mdo-spyi Na-p‘od-pa; he surrendered to the Chinese 3, and soon became convinced that the

---

1 Rahul 1969, 57; Rahul 1962, 191; Shakabpa, 265-266. For sPo-bo in the first quarter of the present century see Carrasco, 137-138.
2 ŠBR, 45.
3 Tibet, 3.
only practicable way for the Tibetans was cooperation with the Chinese (PL). At the time of the outbreak in March 1959 he was one of the Deputy Commanders of the Tibet military area and collaborated heartily with the Chinese 1. After the repression of the revolt, he became a member of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region, and concurrently acting Mayor of Lhasa; in November 1960 he became titular Mayor and kept that office till 1965 2. In 1961 he had been appointed vice–chairman of the Preparatory Committee 3, and in 1965 he was elected member of the People's Congress of the Tibet Autonomous Region 4. From September 1965 to September 1968 he was one of the vice–chairmen of the regional government (People's Council) 5.

The house of ŽOL–K’AÑ 6

The family estate was in the 'P'yoñs–rgyas district 7. It played no great role in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The Žol–k’añ–nas mentioned without a title in 1747 8 is probably Žol–k’añ T s ‘e–d b a ñ of 'P'yoñs–rgyas who was appointed sTod sgar–dpon early in 1751 9. Although no personal name is given, he may still be the sTod sgar–dpon Žol–k’añ–pa of 1754–1755 10. But in 1756 Žol–k’añ–pa r D o – r j e – r n a m – r g y a l, possibly his son, was sTod sgar–dpon 11. The family is mentioned in connection with a journey of the Dalai–Lama in 1754 12. About the same time another member of the family made his career in the ecclesiastic branch. This was druñ–’k’or 'P'yoñs–rgyas Žol–k’añ–pa b s K a l – b z a ñ – r g y a l –
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1 Tibet, 755.
2 Tibet, 507, 755.
3 Tibet, 804.
4 Tibet, 511.
5 Who's Who, 649.
7 bSarn-yas, 259.
8 Si-tu, 130b.
9 DL7, 387b; TWC, 24.13a–b.
10 DL7, 466a.
11 DL7, 504a.
12 DL7, 458a.
m t s 'a n', who in 1753 was in charge of restoration work at Ra-lun. In 1755 he was sent to meet and escort the Sa-skya bdag-c' en and his brother on their visit to Lhasa, and in 1756 he directed the preparation of a handwritten copy of the bKa'-'gyur.

The family is mentioned in 1778 when the 3rd Pa-n-c'en made his last visit to Lhasa. In 1779 we find again a Žol-k'añ-pa as sTod sgar-dpon, and in 1783 he is given the title of elder (or former?) sgar-dpon (sTod sgar-rin'i).

After a long silence, we find a Žol-k'añ-pa 'N a g-d b a n-t s 'u l-k' r i m s, who in 1861 got his first appointment to civil service. He may be the father of the blon-c'en Žol-k'añ, who in 1871 was a mi-dpon.

The only member of the family to play a really important role was Don-grub-p'un-ts'ogs. In 1888 he was a mi-dpon; he was sent to the P'ag-ri frontier as an adjutant to rtsis-dpon ICan-can-pa. In 1890 he was holding a military command, and for his meritorious service was promoted from the 5th to the 4th rank. In 1896 he was rtse-p'yag, entrusted with the control of accounts in the Se-ra monastery. He was appointed bka'-blon at an unknown date; in any case, he appears as member of the bka'-šag in 1900, 1901 and 1902. He was dismissed and imprisoned with his three colleagues on 13th October 1903, for having advised the Dalai-Lama to come to an agreement with the British. By way of redress and upon the insistence of bŠad-sgra, the Dalai-Lama appointed him in 1907 as one of
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1 DL7, 440a.
2 DL7, 5006b.
3 PC3b, 33b.
4 Samati, 60a.
5 Samati, 138a.
6 We find only a sger Žol-k'añ-pa, who paid his respect to the Dalai-Lama near K'ra-'brug in 1856; DL10, 210a.
7 DL12, 80a.
8 Bell 1931, 158.
9 DL13, Ka, 164a.
10 CCCTTT, Shèng-t'ai, 3.22.
11 DL13, Ka, 266b.
12 DL13, Ka, 350a, 360a, 367a; Kawaguchi, 351.
13 Landon, II, 10, 12; Shakabpa, 208-209. The measure was sanctioned by the emperor of 31st March, 1904; CCCTTT, Yu-t'ai, 1.24-25.
the three blon-c’en. He fled with the Dalai-Lama to India, upon which the Chinese dismissed him and ordered his arrest. He returned to Tibet with the Dalai-Lama in 1912–1913. In 1914 he signed the letter by which the Tibetan government offered help to British in the First World War. He is briefly mentioned on formal occasions in 1916, 1923 and 1924. In the latter year, being by now aged and in indifferent health, he was given as deputy the nephew of the Dalai-Lama, Glañ-mdun Kun-dga’-dbañ-p’yug (q.v.) 5. He died in 1925.

His one son became a lama and was known as the Blo-glin Šar-pa sprul-sku. The two daughters took two mag-pa from the gDoṅ-sna family, a branch (zur-pa) of mDoṅ-mk’ar (ZK). The first, R i n-c‘e-n-o d-z e r (b. 1886), entered the service in 1914 and in 1924 was Gyantse rdzoṅ-sdod 6. He may be the sger Žol–k’aṅ-pa mentioned in 1926 7. Nothing else is known about him.

The second, Don-grub-rdo-rje (b. 1898), entered the service in 1920. He was a bka’-mgon from 1923 to 1927, and after the latter date he may have been appointed rtsis-dpon (HR). In 1934 he became a rtse-p’yag (HR, TR). Before 1959 he was lho-spyi (PL).

Don-grub-rdo-rje had a large family, about a dozen children. One of them was T’u b-b s t a n-n i-m a (b. 1914), usually known as Žol–k’aṅ rje-druṅ dBaṅ-dus-lags. He became a rtse-druṅ and was a cheerful, friendly person with somewhat advanced views for a Tibetan monk official (HR) 9. His interest in new things led him almost at once to collaborate with the new regime. In 1952 he was teacher of Tibetan at the cadres school of the Military District of the Tibet Region and in 1962 he was appointed member of the Election Committee of the Preparatory Committee 10. He was also chairman of the Youth
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1 Shakabpa, 221.
2 HTCC, 34.24a–25a (where the name is given as P’un-ts’ogs-don-grub).
3 Shakabpa, 257–258.
4 DL13, K’a, 159b, 160a, 230b, 238a.
5 DL13, K’a, 248a.
6 ŠBR, 25.
7 DL13, K’a, 258a.
8 ŠBR, 37; DL13, K’a, 181a–b. According to HR, his name was Don-ldan-rdo-rje.
9 See Harrer, 164, 179, 181, 183–184, 190, 219.
10 Tibet, 48, 426.
Association of Tibet. Sometime after 1959 he left clerical status and married a daughter of Ts'a-ron Ḫabs-paṭ 2.

Another son of Don-grub-rdo-rje was BSo d-nams-drargyas (b. 1918). He entered the service in 1939 and was appointed Sa-dga' rdzoṅ-dpon in 1943 (HR).

The house of ZUR-K'AṆ 3

This dBu family claims to be descended from the 4th Dalai-Lama (ZK).

A Zur-k’aṅ Gu-yañ K’a-śa-k’a was among the minor commanders in the Bhutan war of 1714 4.

Another Zur-k’aṅ-nas was rdzoṅ-dpon of Gyantse at the beginning of the civil war in 1727; the Lhasa troops took the fort by surprise, and he escaped with most of his men to Shigatse 5. There the men of P'o-lha-nas, who apparently made him responsible for the loss of Gyantse, threw him into prison; but when P'o-lha-nas returned from mNa'-ris, he let him free, as a well-calculated act of mercy 6. He may be the Zur-k’aṅ-pa mentioned in passing in 1735 and 1736 7.

The family appears again during the journey of the Dalai-Lama to the Yar-kluṅs valley in 1754 8.

In 1768 a Zur-k’aṅ-pa was appointed bka'-mgon 9, and held this office for an uncommonly long time. In 1779 he was on the staff of bka'-blon mDo-mk'ar-ba, who acted as sne-šan to the Pan-č'en from the Nag-c'u to the 'Bri-c'u 10. Further mentions on ceremonial occasions occur in 1782 and 1785 11. Lastly, on 6.II, 1791, he was sent to
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1 Tibet, 756; Harrer, 240.
2 Taring, 275.
3 Pr. P., n. 178.
4 MBTJ, 103a.
5 PC2, 363a.
6 MBTJ, 263a; Cf. 248a.
7 DL7, 186b, 193a.
8 DL7, 458a.
9 DL8, 47b; mentioned again in the same year: 50b, 57b.
10 Samati, 73b.
11 DL8, 128a, 151a.
settle the cultivators and the tilled soil in the districts of Roṅ-ṣar and P'ag-ri 1.

In 1804 a Zur-k’aṅ mda’-dpon was promoted to bka’-blon 2; it seems that his personal name was Sri-gcod-tse-brtan 3. He is mentioned on two formal occasions in 1808, and in the same year he met in Lhasa the 8th 'Brug-c’en 4. In 1809 he performed the funeral rites for his mother 5. In 1813 he was received in a private audience by the Dalai-Lama and later in the same year he went out of town to meet the Paṅ-c’en who was coming to Lhasa 6. On the whole, his activity was confined to the capital. He tendered his resignation (dgoṅ-ṭus) at the beginning of 1815, his duties being provisionally entrusted to rtsis-dpon Grön-sdod-pa mGon-skyabs-ts’e-rin 7. Shortly later he was ordained as a monk with the name of Blo-bzaṅ-c’os’-byor-rgya-mts’o (ZK).

In 1813 a son of his was appointed bka’-ṣag mgon-gñer 8. He is probably different from ru-dpon Tse-brtan-ro-dje, also a son of Sri-gcod-ts’e-brtan (ZK), who in 1823 was promoted to mda’-dpon 9. In 1827 he was detailed to escort as far as sMar-k’ams (Chin. Chiang-k’a) the Nepalese tributary embassy on its way to Peking 10. During the smon-lam of 1829 he came back from a journey to Western Tibet 11; probably he had joined bka’-blon bṢad-sgra (q.v.) in his diplomatic mission to Ladakh to secure the delivery of the Kashgar rebels. On 4.IX, 1829, he escorted the retinue of the Rva-sgren abbot coming to Lhasa 12. On 24.XII of the same year
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1 k’ul du sa mi ldin bsgrigs; Samati, 361a.
2 DL8, 323b.
3 The personal name appears in none of the available sources; I obtained it from ZK.
4 DL9, 41a, 75b; BC8, 57b.
5 DL9, 96a.
6 DL9, 133b; PC4, 162b.
7 DL9, 173b.
8 DL9, 132b.
9 DL10, 133a.
10 DL10, 184b, 188a. On the Nepalese mission see HTSL, 123.8a-b, 131.26b–27a, 132.13a-b.
11 DL10, 204b.
12 DL10, 228b.
(i.e. in January 1830) he received the imperial confirmation of his promotion to the rank of bka'-blon. At the end of the smon-lam of 1830 and of 1832 he had special audiences with the Dalai-Lama. On 10.VII, 1832, he was entrusted with a mission to rGya-sde. On 14.III, 1835, he was sent to rGya-mdas in Kon-po; in the 5th month he was already back, and he must have found in Lhasa the rescript by which the emperor granted to him, who already held the 2nd-rank button, the non-hereditary title of 2nd-class taiji.

Almost at once (end of 6th month, 1835) Ts'e-brtan-rdo-rje was sent out again, this time as government commissioner to the war in sPo-bo. It seems, however, that the overall command was entrusted to bSad-sgra (q.v.), who left Lhasa some weeks later. The campaign dragged on for a long time, till in the 7th month of 1837 the ambans and the Lhasa government decided upon a final effort; substantial reinforcements (2000 men of dBus and gTsan troops) were sent to the theatre of war, the whole movement being in the charge of Zur-k'a'n. The war was brought to a victorious end by bSad-sgra (q.v.) in 1838. Zur-k'a'n had distinguished himself in three campaigns (1835, 1836, 1838), and his merits were duly recognized by the emperor; the heredity of his rank of taiji was repeatedly extended, so that eventually it amounted to four generations.

In 1840 Ts'e-brtan-rdo-rje went to bKra-sis-lhun-po. In 1841 he was selected by the Lhasa government and by the ambans to deal with the invasion of the Dogra forces of Raja Gulab Singh of Jammu, who under the command of Zorawar Singh had completed the conquest of Baltistan and Ladakh and were now marching into Western
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1 DLIO, 230a.
2 DLIO, 237a, 268a.
3 DLIO, 271b. On rGya-sde (Jyade), the land of the Thirty-Nine Tribes, see back p. 92. Zur-k'a'n's mission may have something to do with the grant in 1835 of the 2nd-rank button to bSod-nams-rab-rgyas, the younger brother of the chief of the Thirty-Nine Tribes P'un-ts'ogs-min-'dzin-rnam-rgyal; HTSL, 264.12b-14a.
4 DLIO, 295a, 296a.
5 HTSL, 264.14a.
6 DLIO, 296b.
7 HTSL, 300.37b-39a; DLIO, 313b.
8 MP, 1.43a.
9 PC4, 268a.
Tibet. Zur-k’añ left Lhasa on the 29th August, accompanied by bka’-blon mDo-mk’ar-ba. He had received the title and authority of special commissioner (don-spyod spyi-k’yab). The operations he led culminated in the defeat and death of Zoravar Singh near Taklakot on 14th December, 1841. For this resounding success he was rewarded by the extension of the heredity of his title of tajji by one more generation. After his victory he placed his headquarters at sGar-t’ogs (Gartok), in order to supervise the re-occupation and pacification of mNa’-ris. In the following spring a Tibetan division under bSad-sgra dBañ-p’yug-rgyal-po (q.v.) invaded Ladakh in support to the inhabitants of that region, who had risen against the Dogras; he entered into a military agreement with the insurgents. But when a fresh Dogra force, composed of regular battalions and led by Devan Hari Chand and Wazir Ratanu appeared on the scene, bSad-sgra was defeated near Leh and retreated to Klun-gyog-ma on the border. There Zur-k’añ joined him with 5000 men freshly arrived from Lhasa. However, they were no match for Hari Chand’s relatively modern forces; the Tibetan camp was flooded by the Dogras, powder became wet, fire weapons were useless, and Zur-k’añ had to capitulate. The bulk of his army was allowed to retire to mNa’-ris; he himself with bka’-blon mDo-mk’ar and mda’-dpon bSad-sgra were brought to Leh. Negotiations with the Dogra commanders were started, and he went to Jammu to conclude peace with Raja Gulab Singh. The treaty, consisting of two separate letters of agreement, was signed on 14th May, 1842.
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1 For a general account of this war see FRH, 49-59. The study of C. L. Datta, Zoravar Singh’s invasion of Western Tibet, in Journal of Indian History, 44 (1966), 529-536, brings nothing new. Our main source is the reports of the amban Mong-pao to the emperor: they are based mainly on the dispatches of Zur-k’añ. Some of these reports are included also in the Shih-lu: HTSL, 357.44a-45a, 361.1b-2a, 363.20a-b, 366.10b-11b, 370.29a-b, 370, 29b-30a.

2 MP, 1.1a-b (= FRH, 157-158).

3 MP, 1.19a-22b (FRH, 163-166); LdGR, 51 (transl. 133-134).

4 MP, 1.43b, 1.47a-b.

5 MP, 1.24a-27b (= FRH, 166-169).

6 MP, 1.33a-36a (= FRH, 169-171). Most of this document is reproduced in HTSL, 371.20a-21b. For the Ladakhi rebellion see LdGR, 51-52 (transl. 135-136).

7 LdGR, 52. It is Lung-wu of the Chinese documents.

8 LdGR, 52 (transl., 136).

9 LdGR, 53 (transl., 137).
17th and 20th September, 1842

whereupon he returned to Lhasa,
arriving there on 15.XII, 1842. For his work in Ladakh he was rewarded by yet another generation of inheritance of the taiji title.

His career had thus reached a climax, and in spite of his ultimate failure he still was the best Tibetan general after the death of bŚad-sgra Don-grub-rdo-rje; his influence was enhanced by his marriage with the sister of the 9th Dalai-Lama (ZK). His end, however, was in sad contrast with his distinguished career. When in 1844 the regent was deposed, bka'-blon Zur-k'añ was so severely beaten, that he died of his injuries a month or so later, probably in the 10th month of 1844.

An obscure member of the family was in 1830 mgron-gner of the Pañ-c'cen.

Ts'e-brtan-rdo-rje had two sons. The elder, r Do-rje-dgra, was physically weak and lived apart from the family at the small K'a-rag Šan-k'a estate near Lhasa; he had no issue (ZK). The younger, P'un-t'sogs-rdo-rje, accompanied his father in the mNa'-ris campaign and early in 1842 was selected with others for the honorific task of bringing to Lhasa the severed head of Zoravar Singh as a trophy of victory. About one year later he was a bka'-śod, entitled to wear the button of a 2nd-class taiji; on 15th January 1843 he was granted the peacock feather. Later he quarrelled with his family, married the daughter of bka'-blon bŚad-sgra dBan-p'yug-rgyal-po and became a mag-pa in the house of bŚad-sgra (q.v.) (ZK).
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1 Tibetan text, translated in 1855 from a Persian original, with the Tibetan date 23. VIII, in Tharchin, 121-122. English translation of an abridged Tibetan text in K. M. Panikkar, The founding of the Kashmir state, London 1953, 85-87, and in Shakabpa, 327-328; it gives the Indian date 2nd [badi] Āśvayuj [śārimānta] 1899 V.S. and the Tibetan date 13.VIII. English translation of a Persian text (same date) in K. M. Panikkar, op. cit., 84-85, and in Richardson, 246-247. There is also a so-called (spurious) treaty between the Lahore government and the Chinese emperor; K. M. Panikkar, op. cit., 87-89. The Indian date corresponds to 20th September, 1842. Verifying the Tibetan dates by the Chinese calendar (which is a rather doubtful procedure), 13.VIII and 23.VIII work out to 17th and 27th September; the first one is correct.

2 DL11, 30a, 31a, 35a. The account of the Dogra war in Shakabpa, 176-180, is somewhat muddled; his "Kalon Pal-lhun" is actually Zur-k'añ-pa.

3 MP, 1.60a.

4 Shakabpa, 180; ZK.

5 DL10, 243a.

6 MP, 1.22a (FRH, 166).

7 MP, 1.60a.
He is apparently the Zur-k’aň taiji who in 1852 met the 11th Dalai-Lama during the stay of the latter at K’ra-brug¹, and who in 1854 and preceding years contributed toward the expenses of the repairs at bSam-yas². With him the title of taiji became extinct.

The Zur-k’aň family was continued by a son of the gTsaň mda’-dpon 1Caň-lo-can-pa, who became mag-pa to the only daughter of Ts’e-brtan-rdo-rje and assumed the name Zur-k’aň (ZK)³. Their only son dBAň-c’en-nor-bu was at first a lha-gñier (ZK) and is possibly the Zur-k’aň-sras who in 1859 was granted the peacock feather ⁴. His first wholly certain mention (with full name) is found in 1866, when he was a rtsis-dpon and was granted the 3rd-rank button ⁵. Later he became dBu mdz’-dpon and since about 1877 served as spyi-k’yab in Ñag-roň. In 1880 there was a serious dispute between the dGe-lugs-pa monastery of ‘P’el-rgyas-gliñ (?: P‘i-chiez ling) in or near Hor Gam-rdzes, and the Karma-pa (Ţva-nag) monasteries of P’u-na (?) etc. in the Hor country. A bka’-blon was sent from Lhasa to mediate, but, as was to be expected, was accused of partiality toward the dGe-lugs-pa. The dispute degenerated into open armed struggle, and the governor-general of Szechwan sent in Chinese troops under the command of the chih-fu Yang Fu-ts’ui. Zur-k’aň collaborated with him, but in a very arbitrary manner, culminating in his leading his soldiers into what the government considered purely Chinese territory; worse than that, he allowed some of the rebel chiefs to escape into Ñag-roň and to abscond there. Thereupon, on 3rd February, 1881, the Peking government instructed the amban St-1Cng4 to request the bka9-Sag to recall him ⁶. The bka9-Sag complied, and Zur-k’aň arrived in Lhasa at the beginning of 1882; on 3.X of the same year he presented the accounts of his five-years governorship ⁷. In 1888 he was sent, along with mda’-dpon Na-p’od-pa, to serve under bka’-blon Lha-klu on the Sikkim border; he was one of the officers who commanded the Tibetan

¹ DL11, 210a.
² bSam-yas, 232.
⁴ DL12, 50a.
⁵ DL12, 136a.
⁶ TTSLS, 125.2a–b, 126.8b–9a, 126.9a–b; CCCTTT, Ting Pao-chen, 1.20–26, 1.39; CCWCSL, 82.26a–27a, 83.24a.
⁷ DL13, Ka, 97a–b, 108b.
troops badly defeated by the British at Luñ–t’ur on 20th March, 1888. “In the confusion mda’–dpon Zur–k’ani and some of his troops found themselves fleeing into Bhutan” 1. Back in Tibet, he retired from the service; it appears that he died at a very advanced age in 1905 (?) (ZK).

Of his four sons, two did not enter official service. Another, Nor–bu–ts‘e–riñ, became a mag–pa in the bSam–grub P’o–brañ family (q.v.) (ZK). The eldest (?) Sod–na ms–d b a ñ–c‘e n served as brgya–dpon under his father in Ñag–roñ from 1877 to 1881. In 1886 he was promoted to dBus ru–dpon and accompanied his father to the Sikkim border in 1888; he was wounded in the Chumbi valley (ZK) 2. Immediately after, he was sent to C’ab–mdo, Brag–g‘yab, Ri–bo–c‘e etc. to enrol troops for further resistance to the British 3. In the same year he was appointed dBus mda’–dpon upon his father’s retirement (ZK). In 1890 the Peking government promoted him to the 3rd rank 4. In the 4th month of 1893 he was included in the suite of the bka’–blon bla–ma Ye–šes–p’ul–’byuri, who was sent to the Chumbi valley (and to Darjeeling) to represent Tibet in the negotiations for the trade agreement 5. At the end of that year he was promoted to bka’–blon 6. In 1897 he was in charge of the arrangements for the Dalai–Lama’s tour to the three great monasteries 7. He retired in 1901 on account of illness and died in that same year (ZK).

He had three sons. The eldest d B a ñ–c‘e n–ts‘e–br t a n (1891–1953) entered service in 1907 8 as rtsam–len. In 1913 he became a p’ogs–dpon 9 and was sent to K‘ams (HR). In 1917 he came back to Lhasa and was appointed mda’–dpon of the bodyguard 10. In 1924, upon the general stand–down of the army, he was degraded and sent again to K‘ams as acting mda’–dpon (HR, ZK). About 1928 he divorced

---

1 Shakabpa, 199–200. He is not mentioned in the Tibetan texts on this occasion, although the departure of his colleague Na–p’od–pa is duly registered in DL13, Ka, 169b.
2 Cf. CCCTTT, Wên–shih, 7.8.
3 CCCTTT, Wên–shih, 7.9.
4 CCCTTT, Sheng–t’ai, 3.22. But in this text he is still given the title of ru–dpon.
5 DL13, Ka, 233a.
6 He appears as such in the smon–lam of 1894; DL13, Ka, 238a.
7 DL13, Ka, 280a.
8 SBR, 14.
9 Pr. P. 1963, 446.
10 Rahul 1962, 191. SBR, 14. For a sympathetic little sketch of him in his early years see Hayden, 229.
from his first wife, a Lha-rgya-ri lady, and married a girl from a commoner family, upon which he renounced the headship of the family to his eldest son from the first marriage, and founded a new line, the Zur-k'añ-zur-pa. He served in K'ams for many years, was promoted again to mda'-dpon, in command of the 7th (Ja) regiment, and signed the truce of 15th June, 1933, with the Chinese, upon which he was given the title of jasak. In 1936 he was appointed mdo-spyi and about this time was engaged in the abortive negotiations for the return of the Pañ-c'en to Tibet (HR). He left K'ams in 1939 and in the following year he was appointed joint head of the Foreign Bureau (p'yi-rgyal las-k'uns); he held that post until it was abolished in 1952. At the end of 1950 he was sent to India, to try negotiations with the Chinese through their ambassador in Delhi. According to HR, he was an eccentric, blunt, never bothering about the normal polite façade of Tibetan life, witty often in a rather mischievous way, careless about his appearance, often latterly somewhat stupefied by opium; but usually an amusing, shrewd companion. Upon his death, his son 'Jigs-med became the head of the Zur-k'añ-zur-pa family.

bSod-nams-dbañ-c'en's second son P a d m a d b a ñ c ' e n (1894-1917) began his official career as p'ebs-byams 'go-pa gžon-nu (junior keeper of the Dalai-Lama's palanquin) (ZK). In 1910 he followed the Dalai-Lama to India, and there in 1912 he was appointed bka'-druñ. In 1915 he became bka'-druñ c'e-ba (ZK). He authored books on Buddhism and on grammar, as well as a booklet of ten leafs entitled Ri-dvags kyi gtam ńes 'byun gi p'o-ña, composed in 1916. He also reformed the system of keeping the official records of the bka'-śag and prepared projects of reform of education; but his premature death in 1917 prevented them from being tested into practice (ZK).

bSod-nams-dbañ-c'en's youngest son bSod-nams-dbañ-'dus (1901-1971) became a mag-pa in the K'e-smad family (q.v.).

---

2 Shakabpa, 269.
3 Shakabpa, 303.
4 Pr. P. 1963, 446.
5 Pr. P. 1963, 428.
6 DLI3, K’a, 113a.
dBaṅ-c'en-ts'e-brtan's elder son dBaṅ-c'en-dge-legs (b. 1910), the head of the family after his father's renunciation, became a bka'-drun c'uṅ-bal in 1928. For some time he held concurrently a post in the account department (žibs-k'ain). His long experience in both these posts gave him an excellent grounding in governmental matters (HR). In 1934 he was appointed bṣer-dpaṅ. In 1936 he went to Eastern Tibet as chief secretary to his father, with whom he returned to Lhasa three years later; while in K'ams he had been promoted mda'-dpon (1938). In 1941 he was given the office of senior keeper of the Dalai-Lama's palanquin (p'ebs-byams 'go-pa rghan-pa; 4th rank). In March 1943 he was appointed assistant to the mdo-spyi, but he did not take up that appointment, because in August 1943 he was appointed bka'-blon (HR, ZK). In 1947 he showed his coolness and courage when arresting the former regent Rva-sgren, in which as senior member he took the lead (HR). In 1955 he accompanied the Dalai-Lama to Peking, and the Chinese suspected him to have fomented the K'ams-pa rebellion on his way back to Lhasa. During the events of March 1959 he escaped to India. He stayed at the University of Washington, Seattle, from 1960 to 1972, after which he went to Taiwan.

His younger brother Lha-dbaṅ-stobs-rgyas (1915-1970) attended the English school at Gyantse (for one year only) and entered the service in 1931. In 1934 he became assistant in the Grva-bzì hydroelectric station. In 1942 he was appointed mda'-dpon and in 1943 was posted with the Grva-bzì regiment to Nag-c'u-k'a (HR). In 1948 he was a member of the Tibetan trade mission to China, Europe and America led by Žva-sgab-pa. He left Tibet in 1959 and died at Seattle in 1970.

A third brother mK'ye-n-rab-dbaṅ-p'ug (b.c. 1918) entered service as rtse-drun in 1936 and became a sīṅ-gñer in 1938 and a rtse-mgon in 1942. He was promoted mk'an-c'uṅ about 1950. He escaped in 1959 to India, where he married (HR).

---

1 HR doubts this appointment.
2 Lowell Thomas, 154; Taring, 168; Richardson, 169-170.
3 Tibet, 125.
4 Tibet, 359.
5 Chapman met him in Lhasa in 1936; Chapman, 86-87.
6 On him see Harrer, 116.
7 Harrer, 213; Pr. P. 1963, 447.
Family tree of Zur-k’aṅ

Sri-gcod-ts’e-brtan d. after 1815
Ts’e-brtan-rdo-rje d. 1844

rDo-rje-dgra-’dul P’un-ts’ogs-rdo-rje daughter, married lCaṅ-lo-can svras
d. after 1854
dBaṅ-c’en-nor-bu d.c. 1905 (?)
bSod-nams-dbaṅ-c’en d. 1901 Nor-bu-ts’e-riṅ
mag-pa in bSam-grub P’o-braṅ fam.
dBaṅ-c’en-ts’e-brtan Padma-dbaṅ-c’en bSod-nams-dbaṅ-’dus
d. 1954 d. 1917 mag-pa in Kun-bzaṅ-rtse fam.
dBaṅ-c’en-dge-legs Lha-dbaṅ-stobs-rgyas mK’yen-rab-dbaṅ-p’yug
mK’yen-rab-dbaṅ-p’yug
d. 1970

The house of RAṅ-BYON ¹

The family estate was in the Rin-spun’s district in lower Ron ². It played a small role in Tibetan history. Before the middle of the 19th century, we find only a Raṅ-byon rje-druṅBlo-bzaṅ-bkra-sis, who in 1779 met at Nag-c’u-k’a the Pan-c’en en route for Peking ³ and a mgron-gñer Raṅ-byon-pa who was on duty at the time of the selection of the 10th Dalai-Lama ⁴.

Raṅ-byon rDo-rje-don-grub was dBuṣ mda’-dpon in 1853, when he was granted the 3rd-rank button and the peacock feather, apparently because of work with bka’-blon bṢad-sgra (q.v.) on his mission to rTa-dbaṅ ⁵. In 1854 he again accompanied bṢad-sgra, this time to Western gTsaṅ ⁶. In 1856 he was sent on a diplomatic mission to the Nepalese border. He passed through bKra-sis-lhun-po

---

¹ Not registered in Pr. P. 1954, unless it be Raṅ-byon-braṅ-mk’ar, n. 151.
² bSam-yaṅ, 269.
³ PC3b, 73a.
⁴ DLII, 91b, 92b, 93b.
⁵ DLII, 236a.
⁶ DLII, 250a.
on 27.X of that year, and on 1914 V.S. Śrāvaṇa śūdi 13 roz 2 (= 3rd August, 1857) he negotiated and signed with Nepalese officials the border delimitation and settlement agreement, that was a complement to the peace treaty of 1856. On 16.XII Earth-Sheep, i.e. January 1860, he was received by the Pañ-ć’en at bKra-śis-lhun-po. On 26.II, 1861, he was transferred as gTsaṅ mda’-dpon. At some time in 1862, apparently after the ascent to power of bSad-sgra to whom he was closely tied, he was appointed bka’-blon. He appears as such in 1863 and 1864. In 1865 he and the spyi-k’yen-pa Blo-bzan-dban-ltan presented to the Dalai-Lama the translation of the imperial rescript by which the new regent Blo-bzan-mk’yen-rab-dbaṅ-p’yug was given the title of Nomin Han. In 1866 the emperor granted him the 2nd-rank button. He is mentioned for the last time in 1867, when he visited the Pañ-ć’en. I wonder whether he was the Ran-byon-pa who mediated the agreement within the house of Sa-skya, by which the principle of seniority was adopted for the succession to the abbatial throne. After rDo-rje-don-grub the Ran-byon family never again held high office. It seems to be no longer in existence (PL), unless it is known under another name.

The house of RAM-PA

The original estate of the family was in the upper part of gTsaṅ-roṅ (TR). This was in the 18th century one of the three “military” houses of gTsaṅ.

Its first member to achieve distinction was Dayan taiji dPal-
ldan-dbaṅ-rgyal. We have probably to identify him with g·Yag-sde Ram-pa-ba, who in the winter of 1717–1718 helped P'o-lha-nas, then held in a dungeon by the Dzungars, and after his release feted him for twelve days in his house in the g·Yag-sde region. Early in 1728 he was gTsan mda'-dpon, in command of P'o-lha-nas's troops in gTsan-roṅ, where he operated with complete success. When P'o-lha-nas denounced the truce, he sent Dayan taiji with one thousand men to Rin-spuṅs; from there he advanced towards Lhasa, joined forces with P'o-lha-nas's elder son coming up from Naṅ-roṅ, and together they decisively defeated the Lhasa troops at Yul-sbus-sde. In 1734 the emperor granted him the title of jasak first-class taiji. In 1736 the Dalai-Lama, returning from bKra-sis-lhun-po, stopped at his house in gTsan. He is mentioned again in 1737 and he was still alive in 1744, when he received a small present from the emperor, on account of the work done in connection with the arrival of the Dzungar mission in Lhasa.

His post as gTsan mda'-dpon was taken up after his death by his son Ram-pa-ba Rab-brtan, who was succeeded in his turn by his son mGon-po-dar-rgyas. It is impossible to distinguish chronologically the two, because the Tibetan texts always omit the personal name and mention merely a mda'-dpon Ram-pa-ba, with dates ranging from 1756 to 1774.

1 The personal name is found only in TWC, 24.12b.
2 MBTJ, 139b, 144b. g·Yag-sde is at no great distance from Ram-pa, across the hills to the north (HR).
3 MBTJ, 278b.
4 MBTJ, 283a, 285b.
5 Hsi-tsang-chih, 3.1b.
6 DL7, 215b.
7 PC2b, 106b.
8 KTSL, 314.9b–10a.
9 TWC, 24.12b–13a. An awkward problem is raised by a passage in the Hsi-tsang-chi-shu, 36a. This work was written probably about 1740 by Chang K'o-ts'ai, who had arrived in Tibet in 1733; see R. Stein, Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet, Paris 1959, 41, and Petech 1972, 168. The passage in question shows that in the thirties of the 18th century the Tibetan commander in mNa'-ris was gTsan mda'-dpon Ma-kung-ta-chi, a name which seems to transcribe mGon-[po]-dar-rgyas. But as we have shown above, Dayan taiji was certainly still alive in 1744. A solution of the contradiction appears impossible at present.
10 DL7, 512b, 515a, 544a, 557a; DL8, 136a; PC3, 61b, 82a, 91b, 95a, 159a, 205b, 238a, 303b, 355a; PC3b, 33b, 63b; DPDG, 122a; Samati, 166a, 171a–b. A daughter of gTsan
ments, they tell us that in 1748 the emperor rewarded the *mda’-dpon* Ram-pa-ba in connection with the Dzungar embassy of that year.  

In 1792 a *mda’-dpon* Ram-pa was posted at rDzoṅ-dga; he is the same as the *mda’-dpon* Ts’e-dbaṅ-rab-brtan, whom we find slightly later at the same place and with the same companions. *mda’-dpon* Ram-pa-ba occurs again in 1798, and met, or was the host of, the 8th 'Brug-c’en in 1800, 1804 and 1806. It is hard to tell whether the gTsāṅ *mda’-dpon* Ram-pa-ba of 1808 was still Ts’e-dbaṅ-rab-brtan.

*mda’[-dpon]* Ram[-pa] *sras mi rje* Ts’e-dbaṅ-bsod-nams-stobs-rgyas, perhaps the son of Ts’e-dbaṅ-rab-brtan, entertained the 8th 'Brug-c’en in 1820.

A Ram-pa-ba was brgya-dpon in 1830.

In 1858 a *bka’-drun* Ram-pa was on the staff of *bka’-blon* sKyid-stod-pa, who on 21.II was sent as commissioner to rGya-sde; they came back in the 6th month of the following year and were both granted the seal of taiji.

Ram-pa-ba Lha-dbaṅ-rdo-rje was *mda’-dpon* in 1871 and behaved creditably in the attempted coup of dPal-ladan-don-grub, so that the amban rewarded him with the peacock feather; but the emperor did not confirm the grant. He was appointed *bka’-blon* before 1878, when he met the Paṅ-c’en in Lhasa. In December 1881 he went with *bka’-blon* Lha-klu (q.v.) to Shigatse, to investigate

**Notes:**

5. *BC8*, 44a, 50b, 53a, 55a, 55b; in this last passage the full name Ts’e-dbaṅ-rab-brtan is used. In the gsurū-’bum of the 8th 'Brug-c’en there are some religious tracts written for him: Ka, n. 14; K’a, nn. 3, 68.
10. *MTSL*, 331.6a–b, 337.3b–4a.
the riot against the junior *amban* Wei-ch'ing. In the autumn of 1883 he was again a colleague of Lha-klu (*q.v.*), this time in settling the dangerous conflict with Nepal. Then he was given an assignment to Bhutan. The civil war that had broken out in that country late in 1884 had ended with the defeat and suicide of the sPa-gro *dpon-slob*, while the K'roñ-sa *dpon-slob* had concluded peace. To eliminate the aftermaths of the struggle and to enhance Chinese and Tibetan prestige in Bhutan, early in 1886 the *amban* and the regent convoked the Bhutanese chiefs to a conference at Galing in the Chumbi valley. Ram-pa-ba went there as representative of the Tibetan government, and his diplomatic skill succeeded in effecting a settlement of the outstanding questions. In June 1886 the *sde-srid* (Deb Raja) of Bhutan sent a mission with presents to Lhasa, to express his gratitude to the Dalai-Lama and to Ram-pa-ba.

When the conflict with the British broke out, Lha-dbañ-rdo-rje remained at first in Lhasa. Then on 17 IX, 1888, he was sent to P'ag-ri as deputy commander of the military base there, in special charge of the commissariat arrangements for the troops. In February 1889 he came back to Lhasa. In 1890 he was still there, and that is the last we read about him. He is said to have retired in 1898 (*ZK*).

His (?) son was bSod-nams-mgon-skyabs (b. 1875), who entered government service in 1892. In 1904, when he was a rtsis-*dpon*, the *amban* proposed him to the Chinese government as second choice for a seat in the *bka'-šag*; following the precedents in this matter, he was not appointed. There is an amusing little story behind this dry official document. "A year or two before the British military expedition" (more exactly, at the end of 1903) the *amban* tried to impose Ram-pa-ba as *bka'-blon*. The Dalai-Lama simply

---

1 Das, 64, 68; PC5, 272b.
2 See above under P'a-lha, pp. 84–85.
3 DL13, Ka, 143a; White, 131–133; Lamb 1960, 179; Shakabpa, 198; R. Rahul, *Modern Bhutan*, Delhi 1971, 44–45. While traveling to sPa-gro, Ram-pa-ba voiced his displeasure because he was met on the Sikkim border not by the Sikkim ruler in person, but merely by his brother; Shakabpa, *loc. cit.*
4 DL13, Ka, 186a; CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 2.12.
5 DL13, Ka, 195a.
6 DL13, Ka, 208b; CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 3.22.
7 ŠBR, 3.
8 CCCTTT, Yu-t'ai, 1.24–25.
ordered Ram-pa-ba to reside for some time out of the capital and told the amban that his nominee had died; and the imperial representative accepted from the Tibetan authorities what he knew to be a patent lie and submitted the name of his protegee to the Peking government in a way that the appointment was bound to be refused, thus saving his face in both directions! The rtsis-dpon Ram-pa-ba is mentioned again in 1909. After the flight of the Dalai-Lama to India, early in 1910 the Chinese made him a bka'-blon; because of this, upon the return of the Dalai-Lama in 1912 he was thrown into prison. Shortly after he was released, and remained a commoner until sometimes before 1924 he was given the title of taiji; but he never held office again.

We find a Ram-pa sras as c'ibs-c'e las-ts'an (assistant master of the stud) at the time of the two returns of the Dalai-Lama to Tibet in 1909 and 1912. In 1920 he was žol-gñer and was placed in charge of the Tsari pilgrimage. Another member of the family, officially called skYid-stod sras but usually Ram-pa sras, was r Nam rgyal dbaṅ-p'yug (b. 1905). He entered government service in 1923 and was rtsva-gñer in 1924. Afterward he was Jo-mo rdzoñ-dpon, then bka'-mgon, then bka'-druñ. In 1932 he accompanied bKras-mt'öñ žabs-pad to K'ams; when he returned in 1934, he was appointed žol-gñer, in which capacity he acted as sne-šan to the Political Officer in Sikkim (Mr Gould) in 1936. He was promoted bla-p'yag in May 1943 and was still holding that post in 1949. He may be identical with the Ram-pa who became a p'ogs-dpon in 1950 (HR). In 1959 was still living in Lhasa (TK).

The house of ŠEL-DKAR-GLIÑ

A family from the Šel-dkar-rdzoñ district. It was practically unknown before the present century.
Sel-dkar-gliṅ-pa (c. 1864–1913) was for a long time rdzoṅ-dpon of Sel-dkar-rdzon. In 1910 he fled with the Dalai-Lama to India, and while residing at Darjeeling composed a poem “Memories of Lhasa” (dPal gyi c’os ’k’or Lha sa dran gli) 1. In 1912 he was still a simple šod-druṅ, when the Dalai-Lama, upon entering Tibetan soil in the Chumbi valley, appointed him deputy minister (bka’-ts’ab) 2. In the same year he received the appointment as full bka’-blon 3; but he died already at the end of 1913 or early in 1914 4. His personal name is unknown.

His son Sel-dkar-gliṅ ’C’i-med-rdo-rje (1896–1936) entered government service in 1914 and was mDa’-mk’ar rdzoṅ-dpon in 1924 5. Later he was mda’-dpon at sMar-k’ams between 1929 and 1933, and then rtsis-dpon from 1933 to his death in 1936 6.

Sel-dkar-gliṅ-pa bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas (b. 1914) was a mag-pa from the Nor-naṅ family. He entered the service in 1935 and was appointed bka’-druni in 1938 and žol-gney in 1944 (HR).

The house of Bṣad-Sgra 7

Full name: bṢad-sgra ’Og-pa. It is the name of an estate at the foot of the hill on which dGa’-ldan monastery is situated; it had a close connection with dGa’-ldan (HR). An earlier form was Śa-ra ’Or-pa, which “occurs in the biography of the 5th Dalai-Lama as well as in other biographies and historical sources of the ’Brug-pa and Kaṃ-ts’aṅ bKa’-brgyud-pa belonging to the 16th and 17th centuries”. (It seems that the name Śa-ra was derived from a mc’od-rten of Śa-ra-ba Yon-tan-grags, 1070–1141, near dGa’-ldan; HR from ZK). It was changed to bṢad-grva ’Og-pa during the time of the 8th Dalai-Lama, as a part of the family’s effort to enlist the help of the monks of dGa’-ldan in the power politics of Lhasa. The name gradually evolved into bṢad-sgra 8.

---

1 Smith, 127. It was printed by Tharchin at Kalimpong in 1936.
2 DL13, K’a, 111a–b. He took the seat vacated by Ts’a-roh; Shakabpa, 242.
3 DL13, K’a, 114b.
4 Rahul 1969, 64; Shakabpa, 242.
5 ŚBR, 24.
6 Rahul 1962, 182, 192.
7 Pr. P. 1954, n. 170.
8 Private letter of Mr E. Gene Smith (22nd February, 1973). I did not check the original texts.
This is now perhaps the foremost among the *sku-drag* families. The more are we forcibly struck by the fact that not the slightest mention of the bŚad-sgra house is found under the rule of the Qośots, of K’añ-c’en-nas and of P’o-lha-nas, indeed during the whole of the first half of the 18th century. This rouses the suspicion that the old house had died out. And indeed there is reason to believe that it was founded anew in 1751, when a wholesale re-distribution of landed estates took place, mostly to churchmen and their relatives. Upon that occasion the estate (*sa-gžis*) of bŚad-sgra Hor-pa was granted to the Dalai-Lama’s librarian (*p’yag-dpe do-dam-pa*), the monk (*dge-sloṅ*) Klu-luṅ 1. The present family may be descended from his brother or nephew 2.

The founder of its fortunes was bŚad-grva ‘Og-pa K’un-d’ga-b’yor. In 1775, being lay *rdzoṅ-dpon* of Šel-dkar-rdzoṅ, he invited there *yoṅs-’dzin* Ye-šes-rgyal-mts’an 3. In 1788 he was *bka’-druṅ*, and the *bka’-blon* bla-ma sent him to Kloṅ-rdol bla-ma, to inform that revered scholar of the Gorkhali invasion 4. When in the 3rd month of 1792 the imperial general Fukangga marched to gTsaṅ for the Gorkha campaign, the Dalai-Lama sent *žabs-pad* bŚad-gra to his service (*žabs-p’yi*) with numerous officers and men 5; apparently he succeeded Hor-k’añ-gsar-pa as Tibetan commissioner with the imperial army and commander of the Tibetan auxiliary corps 6. Usually the title *žabs-pad* is synonimous with *bka’-blon*. But the Chinese documents shows him as a mere deputy *bka’-blon*, collaborating with Fukangga’s staff (6th month of 1792) 7. Little is known of his activity during the campaign; it is also difficult to know when he was promoted from *bka’-ts’ab* to full *bka’-blon*. But probably it was not long afterward, because early in 1794 he is given both titles of *žabs-pad* and *bka’-blon* 8. In 1797 he caused a great statue of Aṃtiṭāba to be made, in 1798 he was charged with the performance of some rites,

---

1 *DL7*, 401b.
2 I wonder whether the Nag-ts’an ’go-pa’ Or-pa dBaṅ-rgyal-rdo-rje occurring in 1756 (*DL7*, 489a) was a member of this family.
3 *YSGT*, 73b.
4 *KDTT*, 74b.
5 *DL8*, 204b.
6 Shakabpa, 167.
7 *WTTC*, 13b.15a, 13b.19a.
8 *DL8*, 222b. Under the same date he is listed among the *sbyin-bdag* of Kloṅ-rdol Bla-ma; *KDTT*, 182b.
and in 1799 he went to Mal-dro to receive there the Chinese mission coming to Lhasa for the funeral rites of the late Ch'ien-lung emperor ¹.

His elder son Don-grub-rdo-rje was appointed bka'-druṅ on 13.III, 1794 ². In the 3rd month of 1801 he was a bṣer-dpaṅ and was charged as sne-šan to go to meet half-way the Paṅ-c''en coming to Lhasa ³. It is difficult to tell when he succeeded his father. The bka'-blon bŚad-sgra, who offered presents to the Dalai-Lama in 1804 ⁴, may be either of the two. The žabs-pad bŚad-sgra, who since the first days of 1808 took part in the formal acts and ceremonies of the recognition and enthronement of the 9th Dalai-Lama ⁵, was in all likelihood already Don-grub-rdo-rje. This is supported by a fairly strong argument: in that year a little son of the bka'-blon bŚad-sgra was given the name rDo-rje-rab-brtan ⁶; and it is highly unlikely that this baby could be the son of the old bka'-blon Kun-dga'-dpal-'byor.

On 15.VII, 1808, bŚad-sgra accompanied to gTsān the āmban Yū-ning 王 平; they came back in the 9th month ⁷. At the end of 1808 a bka'-blon had to be chosen to accompany Yū-ning who was returning to Peking, as well as to settle local troubles that had arisen in sMar-k'ams, mGo-'jo and C'ab-mdo. Apparently nobody was keen for the job, so the regent and the bka'-ṣag sought the blessing of the child Dalai-Lama, addressed prayers to the Lha-mo and drew lots; bŚad-sgra was designated and he left on 24.XI ⁸. At the end of 1809 he returned to Lhasa and was warmly commended for his work ⁹.

In 1813 he caused some new statues to be made in the 'P'rul-snaṅ ¹⁰, and in 1815 donated the means for the compilation of the DL9 ¹¹. But the decisive event in his life, after which his career developed along more brilliant lines, was his superintendency of one of the periodical

---

¹ DL8, 258b, 269b, 273a.
² DL8, 225b.
⁴ DL8, 338a.
⁵ DL9, 26a, 37b, 43a, 47b, 50b.
⁶ DL9, 40a.
⁷ DL9, 55a, 60b.
⁸ DL9, 85a, 86b.
⁹ DL9, 106a. Other mentions on formal occasions are found in 1809 and 1811; DL9, 106b, 125a, 127a. In 1813 he is included in a list of bka'-blon found in JTSL, 262.18b.
¹⁰ DL9, 137b.
¹¹ DL9, 202b.
restorations of bSam-yas. He was entrusted with this task in 1816, and his work there brought him into repeated and close contact with the 'Brug-c'en. After seven years (counted Tibetan fashion), the work was finished and in 1822 he returned to Lhasa to receive his reward in the shape of the peacock feather. Earlier in the same year he had met on the way the Pañ-c'en coming to Lhasa, and later he was present at the funeral rites of his old friend the 'Brug-c'en.

In 1823 he was sent as commissioner to sMar-k'ams and Sa-ñan, coming back at the end of the same year. In 1824 he accompanied the amban Sung-t'ing in his tour of inspection in gTsañ. In 1825 he was sent on two short tours: the first (1.V – 1.VI) to mTs'o-srib, the second (2.X–29.XII) to the Sog district (k'ul).

Three years later he was entrusted with a diplomatic mission which arose from the abortive attempt of Jehangir, a scion of the Khoja family exiled in Khokand, to regain his ancestral dominions in Kashgaria. His first try met with a fleeting success, the second ended with his falling in the hands of the imperial troops (14th February, 1828). Some of his followers sought refuge in Ladakh and the ambans and the regent, being informed of the fact, in the 3rd month sent to Ladakh bSad-sgra, attended by sNañ-dkar sras, to request from king Don-grub-rnam-

---

1 bSam-yas, 70-71; BC8, 70b.
2 BC8b, 12b, 17b, 24a–25b.
3 DL10, 68a, 108a–b.
4 BC8b, 29a.
5 DL10, 68a, 108a–b. Perhaps there is some connection with the contents of the Chinese document of the 7th month of 1824 in HTSL, 70.35a. On sMar-k'ams and Sa-ñan see pp. 55 and 54n.
6 DL10, 146a, 147b.
7 DL10, 159b. mTs'o-srib is unknown, but cannot be far from dBus.
8 DL10, 161b, 163b. The Sog k'uul is the valley of the Sog-c'u, a tributary of the Nag-c'u, c. 93° E, 32°20' N; it is the nomad community ('brog-sde) called Sog-sde in Wyllie, 103.
9 See the biography of Ch'ang-ling (1758–1838) in Hummel, 68. PC4, 221b–222a gives the résumé of the letter dated 5.III, by which the emperor informed the Tibetan authorities that on 26.XII (11th February) Ch'ang-ling (P'rañ-liñ) had captured Jehangir (sKrañ-sger). It seems that this is the rescript arrived in the 11th month; DL8, 201b.
10 Besides the orders from Peking, they could have received some information from Ahmad Khan, envoy of the king of Ladakh, who arrived in Lhasa at the end of the 2nd month; DL10, 193a. This Muslim was perhaps a trader; it is however curious that Ahmad Khan was also the name of the Khan of Skardo (Baltistan) in that period. There may be some confusion here.
rgyal the extradition of the rebels. The king complied, arrested the refugees and handed them over. Having thus accomplished his task, bSad-sgra returned home in the 10th month. As a reward, he was granted the 2nd-rank coral button.

In 1829 he accompanied again the junior amban Hsing-k'o to gTsaṅ. During the smon-lam of 1830 he offered a great feast to the clergy. In 20.IX, 1830, he was given the special assignment (spyi-k'yab), with a staff comprising rtsis-dpon P'a-lha-ba and his own steward bsKal-bzan-nag-dbaṅ, to effect a revision (ṭib-dpyod) of the taxes and of the grain deliveries due to the government; it was a big affair, known as the land settlement (ṭib-gṭuṇ) of the Iron-Tiger year (1830). Already in the 10th month the revenue commission had been able to effect and collect an enhancement of 5000 silver ounces (dhul-sraṅ), for which the Dalai-Lama commended bSad-sgra. The emperor too recognized the services of bSad-sgra by the promotion to 2nd-class taiji; the investiture in Lhasa took place on 28.IV, 1831.

Then he was put in charge of repairs and embellishments in the Potala, which were inaugurated on 15.X, 1831. In 1832 he accompanied the junior amban Lung-wèn on inspection to gTsaṅ. Nothing is known of his activity in the following years, but it must have been uniformly meritorious, because on 6th April 1835 the emperor granted to his son the inheritance of the taiji title for two generations. On 10.VII, 1835, he left Lhasa as government commissioner for the war in sPo-bo, which had broken out because of the refusal of the local ruler (the Ka-nam sde-pa) to pay tribute to the Lhasa go-

---

1 DL10, 194b; the aim of the mission is passed under silence in the Tibetan texts.
2 DL10, 201a; PC4, 223b; HTSL, 141.6b–7b.
3 HTSL, 148.11a–b; DL10, 204b. The king of Ladakh too was suitably rewarded; HTSL, 154.4b–6b.
4 DL10, 217a, 218a.
5 DL10, 234b–235b.
7 DL10, 254b.
8 DL10, 259b–260a. The imperial decree is missing, but is referred to in MP, 10.7a–b, and HTSL, 264.14a.
9 DL10, 262b–263a.
10 DL10, 271a, 272a; PC4, 241b.
11 HTSL, 264.14a. MP, 10.7b, wrongly attribute this honour to his conduct in the sPo-bo war, which is both chronologically impossible and in contrast with the clear motivation in HTSL.
vernment. He earned much credit in the campaign of 1836, not so much for his feats of arms as because of his efficient handling of the commissariat of the Tibetan troops; for this, the emperor extended the heredity of his taiji title by one more generation. The war proved itself more wearisome and difficult than expected, and a decision was reached only when in 1837 Lhasa sent substantial reinforcement under bka'-'blon Zur-k'าน (q.v.). With their help, bSad-sgra obtained a decisive victory; in 1838 the sPo-bo chief Ts'e-ri'n-nor-bu fell in battle and the war was brought to a successful end; the heredity of bSad-sgra's taiji title was enhanced by yet another generation. This was, however, his last success. He must have been pretty old for a Tibetan, worn out by a strenuous life, and, worst of all, his sight was failing. He became blind on both eyes and, being unfit for official work, he tendered his resignation, which the amban Mêng-pao submitted to the emperor on 26th October, 1839. He died on 29th November 1840.

Don-grub-rdo-rje's younger brother, whose name is unknown, became a monk in 1796; he is the bSad-sgra'i rje-dru'n mentioned in 1808 and the bka'-'blon's brother, bla-zur of the Šar-rtse college of dGa'-ldan, mentioned in 1830.

The name of Don-grub-rdo-rje's son seems to have been bSod-nams-dpal-'byor-ts'e-rin (?: Ssu-lang-pan-chü-chê-li of the Chinese texts), born in 1816. As we have seen, he was granted the hereditary right to the taiji title in 1835, the right being enhanced in 1836, when he was allowed to carry and use the taiji button. On 6th June 1842 the emperor approved his succession to the

---

1 DLIO, 296b. On this war see the few lines in Shakabpa, 176. Tibetan troops were gathered for it from Dvags-po, Koń-po and K'ams; DLIO, 297b. Some contingents returned home in 1836; DLIO, 308b.
2 MP, 10.7b. Cf. DLIO, 308b, which speaks generally of the emperor awarding titles and rank buttons, without specifying names.
3 HTSL, 306.9a-10a. This text leaves out the name of the bka'-'blon to whom the final victory was due; but it coincides almost verbatim with MP, 10.7b, where the name of Don-grub-rdo-rje is expressly given.
4 MP, 10.8a.
5 MP, 10.5a.
6 MP, 10.7a.
7 DL8, 245a, 253a.
8 DL9, 38a.
9 DLIO, 235b.
10 He was 26 sui in 1841; MP, 10.8a.
title of 2nd-class t'aiji that had been his father's. We hear nothing further about him.

Another family member of this period, whose place in the genealogy is unknown, is bka'-drun bSad[sgra] rje[-drui] bLo bza ŋa'n-'ja ma-m de-pa l mentioned in 1827; he was appointed p'ogs-dpon in 1829, and as such took part in the restoration work in the Potala in 1831. After a long interval we find him, no longer a p'ogs-dpon but a mk'an-po, as assistant director of the works at bSam-yas for eighteen months in 1852 and 1853; in 1852 he received there the Dalai-Lama.

The most famous of the bSad-sgra was originally an outsider. This was d Baṅ-p'yuṅ-rgyal-po, of the sPel-bži family. At an early age he became a monk at bKra-sis-lhun-po, where he received his religious and administrative tuition. At the age of thirty he settled in Lhasa and became a monk official (rtse-drui); he fell into trouble and was saved by Don-grub-rbo-rje, who employed him as his secretary. Later he left the church to marry Don-grub-rdo-rje's daughter and to be adopted by him. Upon the death of his adoptive father he took the name bSad-sgra. So far the family tradition as recounted by S.Ch.Das. The texts seem to tell the same tale. We find in 1827 a bka'-drun sPel-bži-ba, sent on a short tour of inspection of the estates (gžis-skor).

Relating his return to Lhasa, the text gives him the more exact title of bka'-'šod dge-rgan, i.e. monk official in charge of the ecclesiastical section.

---

1 MP, 10.8a-b.
2 DL10, 187b.
3 DL10, 205b.
4 DL10, 263a.
5 bSam-yas, 217-218.
6 DL11, 214a.
7 A first draft of the following pages was already published under the title "bSad-sgra dBaṅ-p'yuṅ-rgyal-po, régent du Tibet", in Etudes tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou, Paris 1971, 392-401.
8 The sPel-bži (Pr. P. 1954, n. 145) were a family from Pa-snam in gTsah (the seat of "Pishi Deba", i.e. sPel-bži sde-pa, is mentioned in Das, 98-99). They were distant relations of P'o-lha-nas (MBTJ, 161a; DL7, 364a) and one of them commanded the Naḥ troops during the civil war of 1727-1728. The family is seldom mentioned in the texts; but it still exists and one of its members was mda'-dpon and governor of the Chumbi valley (Gro-spyi) in 1912; DL13, K'a, 111a. For two others see ŠBR, 3 and 40.
9 S. Ch. Das, Yid Kur Nam Shag, Calcutta 1901, i-ii. But his statement that Don-grub-rdo-rje had no male offspring is certainly incorrect.
10 DL10, 180b.
of the secretariat of the bka'-'stag. In 1830 he was given an unspecified post, marking probably his passage from the ecclesiastical to the lay branch of the administration. In 1832, still a bka'-'drun, he was on the staff of bka'-'blon bsad-sgra accompanying the amban Lung-wên to gTsan. It seems almost certain that this sPel-bści-ba was dBaṅ-p'yug-rgyal-po. We note that for a long time after 1840 he continued to be known under both names, the old and the new.

Soon after he passed to the military branch, being appointed dBus mda’-dpon. The date is unknown, but he probably held that rank in 1836, when he took part in the sPo-bo campaign, with such brilliancy that he was promised the first vacant post of bka’-blon; it was probably on the same occasion that he received the 2nd-rank button and the peacock feather. But in the sPo-bo campaign of 1838 he failed to live up to his reputation, and his expectancy of a seat in the bka’-stag was cancelled. The Dogra invasion gave him the possibility to redeem himself. When in May–June 1841 the sTod sgar-dpon reported the advance of Zoravar Singh’s army, dBaṅ-p’yg-yug-rgyal-po was ordered to proceed to the frontier to repel the invaders. He found that the Dogras had already occupied Ru-t’og and sGar-t’og. He reported that he had gathered about 1000 men of local levies, but they were of little military value and fled without striking a blow, whereupon the Dogras occupied Zla-ba-mk’ar, rTsa-bran and sPu-raňs; some skir-

1 DL10, 183a.
2 DL10, 240a.
3 DL10, 271a.
4 During the Dogra war the Chinese documents (MP and HTSL) know him only by the name Pi-hsi 比喜, i.e. sPel-bści. The peace treaty with Gulab Singh was also signed by him with the name of mda’-dpon sPel-bści. As late as 1856 (WTSL, 185.9a–11b) and 1862 (MTSL, 36.49b–51b) the Chinese authorities use the name Pi-hsi, although with another spelling (喜). But the identification of this sPel-bści with bsad-sgra dBaṅ-p’yug-rgyal-po is made absolutely certain by a definite statement to this effect in MTSL 67.44a (cf. 82.3a); another piece of evidence clinches the matter: the LdGR, p. 52.11.28–29, gives the name of the Tibetan commander in phonetic spelling as mda’-dpon Pi-si Ša-kra, i.e. sPel-bści bsad-sgra. The DL11, on the other side, uses the name bsad-sgra alone in relating the events of 1842.
5 MP, 1.44a. For the distribution of titles and seals in 1836 (no names given) see DL10, 308b.
6 MP, 1.1a–2b (= FRH, 157–158). Ru-t’og (Rudok) is one of the four rdzoṅi which form Western Tibet. sGar-t’og or sGar-dbyar-sa (Gartok) is the summer headquarters of the sgar-dpon of Western Tibet.
mishes occurred with losses on both sides (22–23rd August) \(^1\). Upon the arrival of bka’-blon Zur-k’aṅ (q.v.) with reinforcements, bŚad-sgra passed under his orders; he took part in the mNa’-ris campaign and the battle of Taklakot. After the victory over Zoravar Singh he was placed in charge of the three posts of Zla–ba–mk’ar, rTsa–braṅ and Ru–t’og \(^2\); and his very creditable action was rewarded with the restoration of his expectancy for the first vacant seat in the bka’-ṣag \(^3\). In the spring of 1842 he was sent to Ladakh with an advance force and posted himself at 1Ce–’bre \(^4\). He succeeded in rousing the anti–Dogra feelings of the Ladakhis, who broke into open rebellion. Having concluded a provisional agreement with the rebels, they besieged the fort of Slel (Leh), occupied by the remnants of Zoravar Singh’s army \(^5\). Then the freshly arrived regular troops of Devan Hari Chand turned the tables upon him; he was defeated near Leh, the Ladakhi levies dispersed, and he had to retreat to Klun–g’yog–ma, on the Tibetan border \(^6\). There he was joined by the two bka’-blon and was involved in the disaster and surrender of the Tibetan army. He followed Zur–k’aṅ (q.v.) to Leh and took part in the negotiations for the peace treaty, of which he was one of the signatories.

His conduct during the whole war had been such, that on 7th December 1842 the amban Mēng–pao proposed him for promotion to bka’-blon \(^7\). On 15th January, 1843, the emperor sanctioned the proposal \(^8\), and the formal investiture took place in Lhasa on 9.II (c. 9th March) \(^9\). On the same date of 15th January he had been granted the personal title of 2nd-class taiji \(^10\). We do not know much of the activity of the new minister during the following years. At the end of 1843 he

---

\(^1\) MP, 1.5a–6a (= FRH, 159); MTSL, 356.26a–b, 357.44a–45a. Zla–ba–mk’ar or Zla–ba–rdzoṅ (Dawadsong), rTsa–braṅ (Tsaparang) and sPu–raṅs (Purang; capital sTag–la–mk’ar, Taklakot) are three of the four rdzoṅ of Western Tibet.

\(^2\) MP, 1.24a–27b (= FRH, 166–169).

\(^3\) MP, 1.44a, 1.47b.

\(^4\) Chimray of the maps, in a side–valley on the right bank of the Indus, south–east of Leh.

\(^5\) MP, 1.33a–36a (= FRH, 169–171), 1.53a–54a (= FRH, 173); LdGR, 52 (transl., 136(; MTSL, 371.20b–21b.

\(^6\) LdGR, 52 (transl., 136).

\(^7\) MP, 57a–b (= FRH, 175), 10.11a–b.

\(^8\) MP, 1.57a–58a (= FRH, 175), 10.11b.

\(^9\) DLII, 34b.

\(^10\) MP, 1.60a.
came back from an unspecified mission to K'ams. In 1844 he was sne-san to the junior amban Chung-fang, who went to inspect the effectives of the troops (dmag-rtsis sa-skor) at gZhis[-ka-rtse], rGyal[-rtse] and sDiins[-skyes]. In the 7th month of the same year he was sent as commissioner to sMar-k'ams and the Sa-nian district. The date is interesting. On 29.Vbis the new amban Ch'i-shan, by imperial order, had summoned the Pañ-c'en post-haste to Lhasa, to participate in the trial of the mTs'o-smon-glin regent; the latter was deposed and on 6.VIII the Pañ-c'en was appointed regent pro tempore. It seems that for some reason bSad-sgra was kept away from Lhasa during those momentous events. After the short interim of the Pañ-c'en, on 26.IV, 1845, the young Rva-sgren incarnate was appointed regent. bSad-sgra had returned to Lhasa at an unknown date, but was certainly there on 19.V of that year. The change of regime had made him the outstanding figure in the Tibetan government. The Lazarist fathers Gabet and Huc, who arrived in Lhasa at the end of 1845, describe him as a man of about fifty, full of energy and highly respected. In practice he acted as a sort of prime minister and Huc gives him even the title of regent, which is of course incorrect. The two Frenchmen found him courteous and helpful, although he could not save them from the expulsion ordered by Ch'i-shan (end of February 1846). Actually his friendliness was on the surface only, as he was merely carrying out definite instructions from Ch'i-shan to investigate and to report on the two missionaries.

bSad-sgra's name looms large during those years. In the 4th month of 1846 he offered a great feast. Immediately afterward, on

---

1 DLII, 46a.  
2 DLII, 50a-b. This is apparently the Chinese-Tibetan inspection of the Sikkim border which the Tibetan officials mentioned to J. C. White in 1898; Lamb 1960, 224.  
3 DLII, 52a.  
4 PC4, 288b-289a.  
5 PC4, 294b; ZTK, 70a. On these events see Petech 1959, 389-391.  
6 PC4, 295a-b.  
7 Huc, II, 235-240.  
8 He is sometimes called bka'-blon c'en-po or bka'-blon k'ri-pa; PC4, 295a-b, 305b, 346b.  
10 CPIWSM, Tao-kuang, 75.21b-23a, 75.23a-26a. Also HTSL, 428.4a-b, 430.11a-12a. Cf. S. Cammann, New light on Huc and Gabet, in FEQ, 1 (1942), 348-363.  
11 PC4, 298b.
4.V, he received the coral button and the peacock feather 1. The Pan-c’en at last left Lhasa in the 8th month 2, but even afterward contacts between the two were very cordial 3.

In 1847 bŠad-sgra organized the smon-lam festival 4, after which on 15.11 he was entrusted with a mission to Brag-g’yab; actually he left only on 18.V 5. His task was to settle the sharp conflict arisen between the ‘P’ags-pa-lha incarnate of C’ab-mdo and the twin incarnates of Brag-g’yab 6; it had been going on for some months and had led to serious armed clashes. The difference was terminated by granting to the Brag-g’yab Lamas a rank nearly equal to that of C’ab-mdo 7. bŠad-sgra’s work had been so successful, that at the end of 1847 the emperor granted him the heredity of the taiji title for one generation 8. He returned to Lhasa in the 3rd month of 1848 9. For a while he was given less important tasks, such as the supervision of masonry work in the Nor-bu-glin-k’a (5th month) or opening the reserve treasury (rnam-gan; 24.X) 10. During the smon-lam of 1849 he was in Lhasa and in the 6th month of that year he was again in charge of masonry work in the Nor-bu-glin-k’a 11.

This repeated connection with building activity qualified him for something much more important: when bka’-blon gSar-‘byun-ba, in charge of the restoration work at bSam-yas, died in 1850, bŠad-sgra was appointed to succeed him. The following years were spent by him in supervising that great enterprise, perhaps the most through restoration the ancient temple ever underwent. There were few interruptions. In the 8th month of 1850 he returned to Lhasa to take part

---

1 PC4, 299b. The decree is missing in the Shih-lu, but is alluded to in a document of the following years: HTSL, 448.31a–32b.
2 PC4, 304b; DLII, 78b.
3 See e.g. the exchange of compliments on 1.X, 1846; PC4, 306b.
4 DLII, 82a–b.
5 DLII, 84a, 85b.
6 HTSL, 440.16a–b.
7 On the Brag-g’yab affair (Draya of the maps, Cha-ya of the Chinese texts) see HTSL, 436.5a–6a; Huc, 344–345, 368; and in general Rockhill 1894, 324–327, and Schulemann, 354.
8 HTSL, 448.31a–32b.
9 DLII, 104b, 105b; PC4, 331b. He obtained initiations from the Pan-c’en, then at the capital; PC4, 332b–333a; DLII, 105a.
10 DLII, 107a, 112a.
11 DLII, 115a, 122b.
in the funeral rites for the Tao-kuang emperor. An affair of larger import was his mission to rTa-dbaṅ (1852–1853), where a dispute had broken out over the distribution of the sum of Rs. 5000, paid by the Indian government to the local chiefs in compliance with the agreement of 1844. The lamas of the rTa-dbaṅ monastery, who depended from the steward of mTs'o-sna, in his turn an official of 'Bras-spuṅs, had intervened in the dispute and had gone so far as to send an armed force to the Indian border. The Lhasa government, who did not wish to have trouble with the British, had ordered its recall; but the monks had refused obedience. bṢad-sgra settled the affair to the full satisfaction of the emperor, who granted him the extension to two generations of the heredity of his title of 2nd-class taiji, besides other rewards to his large staff. In 1854 the work at bSam-yas was concluded, and bṢad-sgra compiled and published a detailed report, giving a full account and embodying most of the earlier dkar-c'ag of the temple. As a reward for the successful completion of the repairs, on 28th May, 1854, the emperor granted him the rank of fu-kuo kung and the ruby button; it was the first (and last) concession of this title to a man who was neither a relative of the Dalai-Lama or Paṅ-c'en, nor a member of the ICan-can family; and his prestige was correspondingly enhanced.

Since the middle of 1854 Jang Bahadur, the all-powerful premier minister of Nepal, was making preparations to extort from the Lhasa government a series of concessions, even by force of arms. On 15th February 1855 he sent an ultimatum to the ambans and the bka'-śag, giving them time until Vaiśākha 15 (16th April) to accept his terms. At first the Tibetan authorities had tried to organize a border defence by sending there K'ams-gsum-dbaṅ-'dus, a lesser official. But then the arrival of the ultimatum (or perhaps the rumor of its impending arrival) compelled the amban He-t'ē-ho 赫特賀 to ask bṢad-sgra to go himself to sTod (in this case, Western gTsaṅ), to direct the mili-

---

1 DLII, 140b.
2 DLII, 236a–237a; cf. WTSL, 50.8b–9a, 75.15b–16a, 89.38b–39a. For the rTa-dbaṅ (Tawang) tract on the Assamese border and its problems see Lamb 1966, 294–305; for the trouble of 1852, ibid., 300.
3 bSam-yas, 312.
4 WTSL, 129.4b; DLII, 246a, 247a; bSam-yas, 293.
5 Rose, 109–110. I have verified the Indian dates whenever possible.
tary preparations on the frontier and to try to come to terms with the Nepalese. He left Lhasa on 25.XII (c. 11th February 1855)¹. Negotiations failed, and early in April 1855 the Nepalese troops crossed the border. Kuti (gNa'-lam) fell on the 3rd April after a skirmish of little account ². sKyid-groṅ was occupied and the army of general Bam Bahadur pushed on to rDzoṅ-dga', which was taken on the 29th April after a 9-days battle ³. bSad-sgra placed his headquarters at Šel-dkar in the 5th month (June–July). His time there was not completely taken up by war and diplomacy; he had also an exchange of letters with dByaṅs-c'en of dNul-c'u, as a result of which he contributed a substantial sum to the expenses of the compilation and printing of the life of dByaṅs-c'en's uncle dNul Dharmabhadra, and supplied a sufficient quantity of wood for the printing blocks ⁴. But the political outlook was dark. The bulk of the Tibetan troops was still in Eastern Tibet, at Brag-g yab, C'ab-mdo and Ri-bo-c'e ⁵. It was of vital importance to gain time. A truce was proposed by bSad-sgra on Āśāḍha śudi 5 (19th July) and accepted by Bam Bahadur on Bhādra-pada badi 5 (1st September) ⁶. Actually negotiations had started already in May at Šel-dkar, where the Tibetan delegation was headed by bSad-sgra and the senior amban He-t'ê-ho ⁷; they finally broke down in September. But in the meantime the Lhasa government, with the financial help of the Chinese, had been able to summon 7–8000 men from Eastern Tibet. The imperial government too ordered two Szechwan officers, Lo-pin and Kuang Tsung-han, to concentrate 3000 men of provincial troops, but these never actually reached Tibet ⁸. With this body of seasoned men, bSad-sgra launched an offensive on the 1st November,

---

¹ WTS,L, 159.15b–16a; DLII, 250a. Cf. WTS,L, 161.16b–17b, 163.6b–8a.
² Rana, 178.
³ Rose, 110–111; Rana, 180–181. For the date of the fall of rDzoṅ-dga' see WTS,L, 168.1a–2b. Cf. WTS,L, 164.24a–25a, 170.15a–16b, 170.16b–18b.
⁴ NGUL, 111b–113b.
⁵ WTS,L, 164.22a–24a, 168.1a–2b.
⁶ Rose, 111.
⁷ Rose, 112 (but the discussions were held at Šel-dkar and not at Lhasa). In the Chinese texts the Nepalese emissary is called Kaji Tsang-ko Batur; he is obviously the Subha Siddhiman of the Nepali documents; WTS,L, 168.1a–2b, 168.2b–4a, 170.16b–18b, 214.7a–8b. Cf. Rana, 184.
with simultaneous attacks on Kuti (gNa'-lam) and sKyid-groṅ 1. He commanded personally in the Kuti sector, where on the 3rd November he stormed the Nepalese camp at 'P'el-rgyas-gliṅ (Sona Gomba, "golden temple", of the Nepali documents), killing several hundreds of the enemies and capturing Kuti 2. The Nepalese garrison of rDzoṅ-dga' held out, although closely invested. In December the Gorkhalis mounted a counterattack; Kuti was recaptured, burnt and then evacuated; the siege of rDzoṅ-dga' was raised 3. With this, military operations practically came to an end. Negotiations were started on the border in January 1856, and it seems that in February bṢad-sgra went personally to Kathmandu. The treaty was signed at Thapathali on 24th March, 1856. After some modifications of mere form were inserted on the request of the amban, the final copy was sealed by the regent, by representatives of the great monasteries ('Bras-spuṅs, Se-ra, dGa'-ldan, Sa-skya, bKra-siś- lhun-po, Ts'e-mc'og-gliṅ), by bṢad-sgra (who is expressly called the head of the Tibetan government), by the other three bka'-blon and by two minor officials; it was presented to Jang Bahadur on 21st June 4.

After the conclusion of peace, bṢad-sgra returned to sTod (Western gTsan) and then started back for Lhasa. On 21.VI he was at P'un-ts'ogs-gliṅ, where he was met by dNul-c'u dByaṅs-c'en 5. In the 9th month he was in Lhasa, where he witnessed the ceremony of the selection of the 5th Pan-c'en by drawing lots from the golden bowl 6.

We have little information about his activity in 1857, except that dNul-c'u dByaṅs-c'en, having completed the edition of the life of Dharmabhadra, sent him once more his thanks 7.

---

1 Rose, 113. For the date: Rana, 185.
2 WTSL, 183.3a–4b. Cf. WTSL, 183.4b–6b, 183.21b–22b.
3 Rose, 113–114; Rana, 187–189. Cf. WTSL, 186.7b–9b, 189.21a–22a.
4 Rose, 114–118; Rana, 189–190; WTSL, 192.4b–6a, 204.8a–9a, 214.7a–8b, 214.10b–11b. The Tibetan text of the treaty is found in Tharchin, 123–125; the date is given as 28.II, apparently a copying error for 18.II (=24th March). English translation from the Tibetan in Bell 1924, 278–280, with the correct date 18.II. The Nepali text is published in SPS, 118–120, with the date Caitra badi 1, Monday, which is wrong and cannot be verified; it should read Caitra badi 3, corresponding to 24th March, Monday. English translation from the Nepali in Richardson, 247–249, with the correct date Caitra badi 3.
5 NGUL, 113a–b.
6 PCS, 46a.
7 NGUL, 117a.
At that time bṣad-sgra was by far the most powerful man in Tibet. But his exalted position, coupled with a certain amount of high-handedness, had procured him many enemies. In 1853 he had caused the De-mo sprul-sku Ǹag-dbaṅ-blo-bzaṅ-’jigs-med-rgyal-mtš’an to be exiled to rDzon-dga’ because of alleged misdemeanour 1. The incarnate died there on 6th February 1855, and the monks of the De-mo monastery charged bṣad-sgra with having caused his death. In the 4th month of 1857 the amban referred the matter to Peking, where however it was quashed 2. It was in any case an ominous sign. Ani-
mosity in the ruling class mounted, and when in 1858 he attempted to weaken the power of the regent by getting himself appointed keeper of the seal, he met with disaster. The regent was no longer the inexperienced youth of 1845; besides, he found support in a respected church-
man: Blo-bzaṅ-’p’rin-las-rnam-rgyal, the author of DL10 and DL11. Together, they reacted with unexpected energy. bṢad-sgra was sum-
moned to the presence of the regent, accused of a number of malprac-
tices and stripped of his rank of kung and of his post of bka’-blon. He was exiled to his estate of sNe-mo Bya-sgo 3. Later (r. 1861) as the result of a love affair and of an imprudent letter to the Nepalese prime minister Jang Bahadur, he was suspected of conspiring with the Gorkhalis against Tibet. The regent sent mda’-dpon T’on-pa with some soldiers to sNe-mo, hinting obliquely that bṢad-sgra ought to be put out of the way. But the mda’-dpon did not take up the hint and merely imprisoned him in the monastery of sNe-mo rGyal-byed-tṣ’al 4. On that occasion he shaved his head and thus came in a sort to be considered as a monk 5. It was a measure of self-protection, but later it served as an excuse for the imperial government to grant him the religious title of Nomin Khan. He is hardly ever mentioned during those years; only in the spring of 1861 he sent presents to the Pān-c’en 6.

---

1 WTS1, 112.37a-b, 115.10a-11a.
2 WTS1, 224.24b-25b; 254.12a-b.
3 In the sNe-mo valley near the rGyal-byed-tṣ’al monastery; bSam-yas, 285.
4 This account is based on Shakabpa, 183–185. Only vague hints are found in the Tibetan texts; PC5, 81b; DL12, 35a. The Chinese documents are silent, except for a brief allusion in WTS1, 82.3a. On the rGyal-byed-tṣ’al monastery see Wylie, 74 and 145–146, n. 281.
5 CSK, 1642a-b.
6 PC5, 121b.
bSad-sgra had his revenge in the events of 1862, as a consequence of which the regent fled to China. The Tibetan texts are reticent about them, but the Chinese documents for once are numerous and fairly clear. The trouble had started already in the 8th month of 1861, when the Rva-sgren sprul-sku roused the anger of the lamas by curtailing their money allowances. This roused the wrath of the monks of 'Bras-spuńs, and particularly of Blo-gsal-gliñ, one of the four colleges (grva-ts'ani) of that monastery. They went to the residence of the regent and protested in a truculent manner. The amban Man-ch'ing sent the food commissioner Li Yü-pu to appease the riot, but the latter took the party of the rebellious monks. At this point the whole community of 'Bras-spuńs revolted, obtaining the support of dGa'-ldan as well; they proclaimed the deposition of the regent; they stole arms and ammunition from the stores in the Potala and attacked the regent, who defended himself by gunfire. Li Yü-pu went into hiding, Man-ch'ing did nothing. In spite of the lukewarm support of the monks of Se-ra, the Rva-sgren sprul-sku was besieged in the hZi-sde monastery. He held out for while, but soon his position grew hopeless and he escaped from Lhasa; he took the route to China, carrying with him his official seal.

The high lay and ecclesiastic officials then took a curious action. The Sa-skyä bdag-c'en bKra-sis-rin-c'en, summoned by the amban, and the gsol-dpon of the Pañ-c'en tried to mediate, but failed. Then, since the Rva-sgren sprul-sku was no longer in a position to govern, they declared the 5-years old Dalai-Lama head of the government; on 12.III a ceremony was held in the Potala, during which the Dalai-Lama ascended the throne, having two edicts with seals in jewel and in gold placed on a table near it; the Sa-skyä bdag-c'en, the yoñs-'dzin, the chief bka'-drun and bka'-blon mDo-mk'ar offered ceremonial scarves. The purpose of this gesture was probably to get around the rule according to which only a monk could be regent for a

---

1 The best account of these events is that of Shakabpa, 185–187.
2 MTS, chiefly 36.49b–51b; also 27.37a–39a, 32.10a–12a, 47.39a–40b.
3 CSK, 1642a.
4 MTS, 32.10a–12a, 32.12b–13b, 62.33b–35a.
5 MTS, 36, 23a–24a, 36.49b–51b.
6 DL12, 90a–b. Cf. PC5, 136a. The yoñs-'dzin was the former 76th K'ri Rin-po-c'e Blo-bzañ-mk'yen-rab-dbañ-p'yug (1852–1859), who became regent in 1864.
minor Dalai-Lama. Indeed, the monks of 'Bras-spunś and dGa'-ldan had vociferously requested the return and rehabilitation of bSa'd-sgra 1; and when the trouble grew serious, Man-ch'ing summoned him to Lhasa, to act as peacemaker 2. When on 13.V the assumption of power by the Dalai-Lama was publicly proclaimed in Lhasa, the infant ruler granted audience to the newly appointed heads of 'Bras-spunś and to bSa'd-sgra 3; it is easy to guess what was going on behind the scene. The matter was clinched when on 19.V the heads of Se-ra monastery came in to tender their allegiance 4. On 27.V the officials recognized that, "although the Dalai-Lama had taken up the burden of both spiritual and temporal rule, he was too young in the body to exercise it, and therefore it was imperative to appoint a head of the administration". For this task, 'Bras-spunś and dGa'-ldan proposed bSa'd-sgra; their request was forwarded to the ambans. On 2.VII bSa'd-sgra was received in audience by the Dalai-Lama and was installed in office 5; as he was a layman, the title chosen was not rgyal-ts'ab, but the ancient one of sde-srid, which had been borne by the regents in the time of the 5th Dalai-Lama and which usually implied government in the name of a grown-up ruler. The imperial confirmation followed soon after. Man-ch'ing had immediately memorialized the emperor, proposing the deposition and arrest of the Rva-sgreñ sprul-sku; on August 29th the imperial government passed orders accordingly and appointed bSa'd-sgra as provisional administrator with the ecclesiastical title of Nomin Han 6. The decree and official seal were received in Lhasa on 7.IX (c. 29th October), and the amban handed it solemnly to the recipient 7.

Of course not everybody agreed with bSa'd-sgra's appointment. There were protests and warnings in official circles at Peking, and at a certain moment the government even thought of dismissing him and sending him back to his exile 8. The idea, however, was not followed up, chiefly because he enjoyed much popularity and the complete trust

---

1 MTSL, 36.49b-51b.
2 MTSL, 32.19-12a.
3 DL12, 91a.
4 DL12, 92a.
5 DL12, 92a-b.
6 MTSL, 36.23a-24a, 36.24b-25b.
7 DL12, 95a-b; PC5, 136a; LZTK, 111a.
8 MTSL, 36.51a-b.
of the lower clergy. And thus he was finally confirmed in his office on 10th February 1864, which was late enough. He was the first and only layman to govern Tibet between the death of 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal in 1750 and the end of the old order of things in 1959.

As to the deposed regent, he did arrive at Peking and lost no time in accusing Man-ch'ing of having been bribed by bSa-sgra; he even mentioned the sum: eighty "silver shoes" (rla-mig-ma). It was difficult to substantiate the charge, and the subject continued to be discussed at length in Peking. However, the Rva-sgreng sprul-sku died soon after and his charges were eventually quashed.

Man-ch'ing's action, being both indecisive and partial, was at once the target of adverse criticism in Peking. As a matter of fact, he was only acting amban at that time; his regular tenure had expired in 1859, when Ch'ung-shih (1820-1876) was appointed in his place. But Ch'ung-shih had stopped on his way in Szechwan to secure that province against the rebels who were threatening it, and his work there was so successful, that he was appointed provincial general and stayed on in Szechwan. In 1861 Ching-wên was appointed amban, but when the trouble started in Lhasa, he was still en route and had barely reached Ch'eng-tu. The government repeatedly urged him to hasten to Lhasa, but to no avail.

There was also the matter of the charges of bribery against Man-ch'ing. Although they concern bSa-sgra only indirectly, we may as well give here a summary of this affair, which throws an interesting light on the internal crisis of the Chinese administration in Tibet following the events of 1862. Even before the Rva-sgreng sprul-sku reached Peking, some imperial officers had sent in reports concerning bribes accepted by Man-ch'ing. Clearly the matter was one for investiga-

1 MTSL, 82.3b.
2 MTSL, 90.9b-10a, 90.12a, 111.8a-10a.
3 MTSL, 47.49a-50b, 62.33b-35a.
4 MTSL, 62.33b-35a, 82.1a-7a.
5 MTSL, 66.31b-33b, 82.1a-7a, 82.7a-9b, 86.46a-b.
6 MTSL, 86.46a-b, 111.6b.
7 MTSL, 90.10a.
8 MTSL, 27.39a, 32.12a-b, 36.24b-25b, 36.25b-26a.
9 See on him Hummel, 211-212.
10 MTSL, 27.37a-39a, 32.10a-b, 32.12b-13b, 36.24b-25b, 36.25b-26a.
11 MTSL, 37.42a-b.
tion, and the emperor ordered Fu-chi (d. 1875) to proceed to Tibet as special commissioner and to investigate the charges along with Ching-wên. At this point Ching-wên reported that he had arrived at Ta-chien-lu, but was compelled to stop there, because the war in ṇag-roñ rendered the route unsafe. The government urged him on; but eventually Fu-chi and Ching-wên returned to Ch'êng-tu and loitered there in spite of the emperor's repeated orders. Man-ch'ing of course was recalled, to justify himself at Peking. But although repeated orders to this effect were sent, he pleaded, not without justification, that he could not possibly leave his charge before his successor had arrived. Li Yü-pu too was ordered back to China, to be heard as witness on the charges, but mainly to separate him from Man-ch'ing and bŠad-sgra, with whom he apparently worked hand in glove; Man-ch'ing insisted in vain to be allowed to retain him in Lhasa. As the accused would not leave for Peking and the enquiring commission would not reach Lhasa, the situation verged on the ridiculous. But the comedy remained without a conclusion. Fu-chi was recalled to Peking; Ching-wên reached Lhasa only in summer 1865 and Man-ch'ing at last left for Peking. As it seems, the proceedings against him were tacitly abandoned. The whole is illuminating evidence of the increasing paralysis of the Manchu government, which was slowly losing its grasp on Tibetan affairs.

bŠad-sgra must have faced also some amount of internal opposition. But the Tibetan texts are utterly silent about it and we have to turn once more to the Chinese documents. The main hotbed of discontent was, as might be expected, the monastery of Se-ra, and above all the Se-ra sMad college under its head mT'u-stobs-luñ-pa (T'u-to-pu-lung-pa). They gave refuge to Blo-bzan-'p'rin-las-rnam-gyal, the old enemy of bŠad-sgra. In 1858 the regent had rewarded
his services with the appointment to *spyi-k' yab mkan-po*; of course bSad-sgra had dismissed him as soon as he had seized power. Now the monks of Se-ra apparently intended to use him as the figure head of the opposition. Things came to a head, and on 23rd September, 1863, the plotters (about one hundred men) fled from Se-ra to the hills behind the monastery, taking with them Blo-bzang-p'rin-las-rnam-rgyal. On the way the latter fell from his horse. What exactly happened was never wholly cleared up. So much is certain, the former *spyi-k' yab mkan-po* died under suspicious circumstances; on 30th September his body was found in the hills inside a circle of stone slabs. Government soldiers pursued the fugitives, killing sixty-seven of them and arresting mTbu-stobs-lun-pa. At the same time Se-ra was compelled to give up the other members of the conspiracy, to hand over their weapons and to promise to behave correctly in the future. The Peking government claimed for themselves the trial of this obscure case. Matters dragged on, the culprits being kept in custody till the arrival of the new *ambans*. It was not until 20th January, 1866, long after the death of bSad-sgra, that the emperor confirmed the sentence of death passed on mTbu-stobs-lun-pa.

We do not know much about bSad-sgra's activity during the two years or so of his rule. His most important act was his intervention in the little war which had been going on for some years in Nag-roñ and neighbouring zones. Nag-roñ (Chan-tui of the Chinese) was then ruled by mGon-po-rnam-rgyal, an energetic and enterprising warrior. Since 1848 he had encroached upon the lands of other native chiefs, as far as Li-t'an. He even invaded sDe-dge, seizing the widowed queen and her son. At last Lo Ping-chang, the governor-general of Szechwan, sent against him the *tao-yüan* Shih Chih-k'ang, but with insufficient troops. The latter obtained the help of the Ming-ch'eng chief rGyal-mts'an-rin-c'en, who was the strongest enemy of mGon-po-rnam-rgyal. As his force were still insufficient, he requested Man-ch'ing to send him reinforcements.

---

1 Acting appointment: *DL12*, 45a; final appointment: *DL12*, 47a-b.
3 MTSL, 96.35b-36a, 103.17b-18a, 105.11a-12b, 105.12b-14a, 111.8a, 148.26b-27b.
4 MTSL, 162.22b-24a.
5 MTSL, 163.8b; CCWCSL, 82.19b-23a.
6 MTSL, 163.8b. Cf. 45.46b-47b, 67.44a-45a, 67.45a-b, 82.1a-7a.
sgra gladly seized the occasion to extend the influence of the Lhasa government in Eastern Tibet. He concentrated a substantial body of troops and entrusted them to the command of bka'-blon P'u-luṅ-ba. The narrative of this campaign belongs by right under the heading of P'u-luṅ-ba (q.v.; pp. 120–121). At first the initiative of bŚad-sgra was frowned upon by the Peking government, who sent to the amban orders to recall and disband these forces. But later the Tibetan intervention was silently accepted. The war ended with a complete success, mGon-po-rnam-rgyal died in his burning castle; the government of Nag-roṅ was entrusted to the Dalai-Lama. This happened after the death of bŚad-sgra, to whom the merit of this resounding success belongs, even if he disappeared before the conclusion.

The reasons for another enterprise commenced by bŚad-sgra are not so apparent; he started to build a wall enceinte around Lhasa, which had been an open town since 1721. But the work was not finished, nor perhaps even well advanced when he died; and apparently it was never carried to an end.

Another measure of a semi-military character was the abandonment of the Grva-bži barracks north of Lhasa. The yamen of the amban and the quarters of the Chinese garrison (little more than a personal escort) were transferred to the south-west ward of the city, notwithstanding the protests of the Peking government.

The Tibetan texts have little to say about his two-years rule. Formally, its most outstanding event was the taking of the dge-ts'ul vows by the Dalai-Lama (4th month of 1864); bŚad-sgra was present at all the pageants and ceremonies. Some months after he fell ill. He was by then in his late sixties, an old man by Tibetan standards, and power had come to him too late in life for him to give further proofs

---

1 In this connection bŚad-sgra had approached the Nepalese government for the loan of some modern artillery, of which Tibet had none. Jang Bahadur offered 3000 men, who were refused. In the end what was agreed upon was the loan of six mountain guns, without gunners to serve them. The payment for the loan and the difficulty in obtaining their return were the subject of some acrimonious negotiations, extending down to 1869. Rose, 122; MTSL, 86.44a–45v, 86.48a, 111.7b–8a, 115.13b–14a, 260.3a–b, 260. 25a–b.

2 MTSL, 67.44a–45a, 67.45a–b, 82.1b, 90.10a–b, 90.12b.

3 CSK, 1642b; MTSL, 86.47a.

4 CSK, 1642b; MTSL, 86.45a, 86.47a–b.

5 DL12, 108a–114b.
of his capacities. He died on 25.VIII (c. 25th September), 1864 1. dBan-p'yurg-rgyal-po had no sons. He left only a daughter, apparently born when he was already old; she married Zur-k'aṅ P 'un-t s'o g s-r do-rj e, who took the name of bṢad-sgra. He became a rtsis-dpon, but had no outstanding career and is not mentioned in the texts. He had two daughters, who married dPal-'byor-rdo-rje, on whom see later (ZK).

After the death of the sde-srid dBan-p'yurg-rgyal-po, the direct line of the house came again to the fore, although for a very short time. bSod-nams-dpal-'byor-ts'e-rin was possibly the father of Ts'e-b r t a n-d p a 1 ' b y o r, who appears in 1853 as the nephew (ts'a-bo) of dBan-p'yurg-rgyal-po; he had accompanied his uncle to rTa-dban, and for his services the emperor granted him the button of 2nd-class tajji 2. He must be the bṢad-sgra'i tajji who in 1860 was put in charge of the arrangements for the journey of the regent in gTsan 3. He died in 1863 and the title of 2nd-class tajji was inherited by his son Ts'e-rin-dban-p'yu g 4. As a boy, he is said to have been adopted by dBan-p'yurg-rgyal-po 5, which is quite possible. In 1866 he was dBus mda'-dpon and the emperor granted him the peacock feathers 6; in the same year he (bṢad-sgra'i tajji) acted as snešan to the amban Ching-wên in inspection to gTsan 7. On 16.II, 1869 he was appointed deputy bka'-blon and on 9.VIII in the same year he became a full bka'-blon 8. In 1871 he threw in his lot with dPal-ladan-grub, whose chief supporter he was. When the plot was discovered, he abandoned his office and fled to dGa'ldan to organize resistance against the government forces. He was dismissed, attempted to flee, but was caught and thrown into prison 9. With him the direct

1 DL12, 121a; PC5, 158a-b. The news of his death was acknowledged, and his successor in the regency was appointed, by the Chinese government on 28th December; MTSL, 122.45b-46a, 122.46a-47a, 123.32b-33b.
2 DL11, 236a. This may be the same young nephew whom in 1846 dBan-p'yurg-rgyal-po wanted to entrust to Gabet and Huc for education; Huc, 238.
3 DL12, 68a.
4 MTSL, 56.11b.
5 Shakabpa, 187.
6 DL12, 135b. The grant is alluded to in MTSL, 313.15b.
7 PC5, 171a.
8 DL12, 160a-b. The statement of Shakabpa, 187, that he was appointed bka'-blon already in the lifetime of dBan-p'yurg-rgyal-po, is certainly incorrect.
9 MTSL, 313.14b-16a, 319.8a-9a. Some details in Shakabpa, 189–190, according
line of the bSad-sgra family came to an end and the title of 2nd-class taiji lapsed.

When in 1869 and 1870 dNul-c'u dByaṅs-c'en came to Lhasa, he was met at bKra-sis-lhun-po by a Lhasa gzim-šag bSad-sgra sras, a married man ¹, whose place in the family tree is unknown (unless he is identical with P'un-ts'ogs-rdo-rje).

A bSad-sgra-ba is mentioned in passing in 1874, 1878 and 1879 ²; but it is impossible to identify him.

dPal-'byor-rdo-rje was the son of p'ogs-dpon Śan-k'a-pa ³ and became a mag-pa in the bSad-sgra house by marrying both daughters of P'un-ts'ogs-rdo-rje (ZK) ⁴. He appears for the first time in 1888, when he was a 6th-rank official, posted as local military commander (ying-kuan ṇa ṇa ⁴ ⁴) on the Sikkim border ⁵. According to Tibetan tradition, shortly after there was an alarm in Lhasa about a party of foreign travellers, believed to be Russians, having arrived in the gNam-ru area. dPal-'byor-rdo-rje volunteered to go and deal with them and succeeded in turning them back; for that he was soon rewarded with the post of bla-p'iyag (HR, from ZK). No trace of this is found in DL13; but according to a Chinese document of 3rd May, 1890, the De-mo regent informed the Chinese authorities that the French travellers Gabriel Bonvalot and prince Henri d'Orléans had been stopped and turned back; it was also suspected that there was some connection with the contemporary Russian expedition of M. V. Pevtsov ⁶.

As it is well known, the two Frenchmen, coming from Russian territory, were held up on the route to Lhasa in February–March 1890 ⁷; it seems that at first the Tibetans mistook them for Russians, whom they knew, while they had no inkling of France and the Frenchmen. The “Ta Amban” of Bonvalot, sent expressly from Lhasa and quite

to whom his life was spared on the intercession of the K'ri Rin-po-c'e, but he was sent into exile.

¹ NGUL, 143a, 144b, 145a, 146b.
² DL12, 206b; PCS, 253a; DL13, Ka, 67a.
³ Possibly the same as the bka'-drun Śaṅ-dga'-ba mentioned in 1878; PCS, 263b. In 1880 he was posted in Nag-roh; CCCITT, Ting Pao-ch'en, 15-17. The name comes from the Lha-gdod San-k'a estate near Lhasa (HR, ZK).
⁴ Cf. Bell 1928, 65.
⁵ CCCITT, Wên-shih, 7.8-9.
⁶ CCWCSL, 83.3b-6a.
⁷ G. Bonvalot, L'Asie inconnue, à travers le Tibet, Paris 1896, 247-262.
clearly a lower Tibetan official, was dPal-'byor-rdo-rje. Thus the tradition is substantially correct 1.

In any case, bŠad-sgra was already a bla-p’yag when in 1891 he was sent to Yatung in the Chumbi valley 2. On 2nd January, 1892, the amban proposed him as deputy bka’-blon, in the seat left vacant by the death of bka’-blon Lha-klu 3. After appointment, he was immediately sent to Darjeeling, to participate in the British–Chinese negotiations for the trade agreement 4. The British, however, took no notice of him, not even unofficially, and he was even insulted and manhandled by a group of British subalterns 5. After a stay of more than one year, he went back to Lhasa in the 6th month of 1893 (long before the conclusion of the trade agreement on 5th December), and in the same month he received the appointment as full bka’-blon 6. However, by then his activities had roused the suspicions of the Chinese; not only he was said to have too close (although private) contacts with the British officials, but also to have claimed undue authority with a Russian envoy (an allusion to Dorjeev), so that the chief Chinese negotiator Huang Shao-hsün 黃紹勳 was very displeased with him. His intrigues were said to have obstructed and delayed the conclusion of the agreement. Therefore on 17th January, 1894, the Chinese government ordered a discreet enquiry in his activities 7. But apparently nothing came of it. In 1895 he seems to have taken some part in the fall of the regent and the assumption of full powers by the Dalai-Lama 8; but his name seldom appears in the records, the only instance being a formal occasion in 1900 9. On 13th October, 1903,

---

1 Except for the place name. Bonvalot was stopped in ‘Dam, to the south-east of the Tengri-nor (op. cit., 240), while gNam-ru is the region to the north and north-west of the Tengri-nor. It is curious to note that one year later local people told Captain Bower that Bonvalot had been stopped in gNam-ru after having passed the Dangla range; H. Bower, Diary of a journey across Tibet, London 1894, 131–132.

2 CCCTTT, Shêng-t’ai, 4.12, 5.13, 4.14, 4.18.

3 CCCTTT, Shêng-t’ai, 4.19.

4 Shakabpa, 203. CCCTTT, Shêng-t’ai, 5.7 and 5.10 show that he was present at Darjeeling in March and May 1892.

5 E. Candler, The unveiling of Lhasa, London 1905, 26; Landon, II, 4–5. According to Waddell, 48–49, it was only a servant of bŠad-sgra who was assaulted.

6 DL13, Ka, 234a–b.

7 TTS, 331.8b–9a. For bŠad-sgra’s contacts with Dorjeev see Kawaguchi, 501–504.

8 Kawaguchi, 503.

9 DL13, Ka, 357a.
the Dalai-Lama dismissed him and had him imprisoned, for having expressed himself in favour of negotiations with the British. He was soon freed, but exiled to gSaṅ-śṅags-c'os-rdzon in South-East Tibet.

The events proved his advice to have been sound; and in a way of redress, in 1907 the Dalai-Lama, then at Hsi-an in China, made him one of the three Grand Ministers (blon-c'en). His steadfast loyalty to the ruler roused the hostility of the Chinese, who refused to recognize his appointment. In 1910 he followed the Dalai-Lama in his flight to India, and the Chinese sentenced him to death in absentia. They occupied his Lhasa house and during the fighting in 1912 it was used by soldiers (HR). He returned to Tibet in 1912, and on 20.VI, 1913, was appointed to lead the Tibetan delegation to the tripartite talks in Simla. His capable handling of a complicated situation secured for Tibet a fair measure of success, although the Chinese government refused to ratify the agreement initialled by their representative. bŚad-sgra returned to Lhasa on 17.IX, 1914. He continued in office as a much respected elder statesman, although the Dalai-Lama grew somewhat jealous of his prestige; he died in 1919.

It appears that only one of dPal-'byor-rdo-rje's true sons lived to reach grown age. This was dPal-'byor-bsod-dbaṅ (1896-c. 1928). He entered government service in 1914 and was appointed rtsis-dpon in 1919. Five years later he was dismissed and sent into a half-exile in sPo-bo. Eventually the Dalai-Lama recalled him to Lhasa and intended to appoint him a bka'-blon; he died, however, about 1928 before the appointment was actually made. His death was popularly attributed to magic by Luṅ-šar.

---

1 Shakabpa, 208–209; date in Landon, II, 10. The dismissal was sanctioned by the emperor on 31st March, 1904; CCCTTT, Wu-t'ai, 1.24–25.
2 Waddell, 110.
3 CCWCSL, Hsūan-t'ung, 1.27a–b, 1.27b–28b; HTCC, 25.3a–6a.
4 DL13, K'a, 128b.
5 The best overall account of the Simla Tripartite Conference is that by Lamb 1966. For the part of bŚad-sgra see Shakabpa, 251–257. All the books of Sir Charles Bell speak with high praise of his action in the conference.
6 DL13, K’a, 141a.
7 Mentions on formal occasions in DL13, K’a, 145b, 159b, 160a.
8 Bell 1928, 65; Bell, 1932, 206; Bell 1946, 143. Shakabpa, 262, dates bŚad-sgra's death in 1923, possibly by confusion with C’aṅ-k’yim-pa.
9 SBR, 24.
10 Bell 1946, 170.
11 Taring, 106.
His only son dGa’-ldan-dpal-’byor (1922-1969) entered service in 1938 (HR); in 1942 he married a daughter of Ts’a-ron žabs-pad 1. In 1943 he was appointed rtsam-len and later became a bka’-mgron (HR, TR). In 1947 he was one of the officials who held a post-mortem on the body of the former regent Rva-sgreñ, who had died in prison 2. In 1959 he was imprisoned for some years, and died in 1969 (TR).

Blon-c’en bṢad-sgra had legally two other sons; actually they were fathered by the blon-c’en’s brother Šan-k’a-pa, who had taken over one of the two bṢad-sgra daughters who had married dPal-’byor-rdo-rje 3. About 1913 or 1914 they took their share out of the family and founded a side-line, the bṢad-zur, also called Šan-k’a-pa. The elder 4 was a bka’-šod in 1910, when he visited the Dalai-Lama at Darjeeling 5. On 14th May, 1912, he accompanied his father in a visit to Sir Henry MacMahon, to ask for a British escort for the Dalai-Lama going back to Tibet; the request was refused 6. In the autumn of 1912 he was promoted to bka’-mgron 7. In 1915 he was appointed mda’-dpon 8 and put in command of the bodyguard. He is said to have died about 1917 (ZK), but possibly one or two years later.

His younger brother ’Gyur-med-stobs-rgyas (1896-1967) was educated at dGa’-ldan and became a rtse-drun; as such, he served as collector of the corn-tax (’bru-bskyel) for the full term of three years. When his elder brother died, the blon-c’en made him to abandon clerical status, and he succeeded his brother in the bṢad-zur estates. On New Year’s day of 1921 he was formally admitted to the šod-druñ branch of the administration; at the same time he was appointed sne-šan to Sir Charles Bell. After that he stayed out of office for a quite considerable time 9. In agreement with his upbring-

---

1 Taring, 274; Pr. P. 1963, 433.
2 Taring, 169.
3 Bell 1928, 65; Bell 1946, 319.
4 I wonder whether this was the bṢad-sgra dGa’-ldan-rab-rgyas (1891-1919) mentioned by Rahul 1963, 181. Both PL and ZK denied that such a man ever existed; Rahul’s whole account of bṢad-sgra in that page is rather a mess.
5 DL13, K’a, 95a.
6 Lamb 1966, 415.
7 DL13, K’a, 113a.
8 DL13, K’a, 142b.
9 ŠBR, 39; Bell 1931, 181; Bell 1946, 319; Shakabpa, 264.
ing, he had the reputation in Lhasa of being a rather retiring scholar, in good relations with the monks (HR). For the same reason in 1935–1936 he was sent to bSam-yas to carry out restoration work 1. In 1938 he received the title of taiji, but only in 1939 he was given his first important appointment as sTod sgar-dpon; however, he never went to Western Tibet but sent a representative there (HR). In the spring of 1951 he was appointed bka’-ts’ab, but with the full powers of a bka’-blon (PL, ZK) 2; nothing is known of his activity. He fled to India with the Dalai-Lama in 1959 2 and died at Dharamsala in 1967 (PL).

Family tree of bSad-sgra

Kun-dga’-dpal-’byor d. after 1804(?)
Don-grub-rdo-rje d. 1840

| bSod-nams-dpal-’byor-ts’e-riñ d. after 1842 daughter — — dBañ-p’rug-rgyal-po d. 1864 |
| Ts’e-brtan-dpal-’byor d. 1863 P’un-ts’ogs-rdo-rje — daughter |
| Ts’e-riñ-dbañ-p’rug d. 1871 (?) daughters — — dPal-’byor-rdo-rje d. 1919 |
| dPal-’byor-bsod-dbañ d. c. 1928 N.N. d. c. 1917 ’Gyur-med-stobs-rgyas d. 1967 |
| dGa’-ldan-dpal-’byor d. 1969 |

The house of GSAR-BYUN 3

This dBus family first appears in modern history with the dBus mda’-dpon m Gon-po-sk yabs, mentioned on formal occasions in 1808 and 1809 4.

gSar-byuñ sras gNod-sbyin-p’un-t’s’ogs was appointed bka’-söd druñ-yig in 1823 5. In 1825 he was an assistant

1 Rahul 1969, 63. Rahul wrongly gives to this man the name bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas. The mistake was pointed out by HR, TR, TK.
2 Tibet, 350 and 357, gives him the name ’Jigs-med-rdo-rje. This is simply a wrong reconstruction of the Chinese transcription of ’Gyur-med-stobs-rgyas.
3 Pr. P., n. 163.
4 DL9, 43b–44a, 97a.
5 DL10, 130a.
(las-byas) to bka'-blon bSad-sgra (q.v.) in his mission to the Sog district 1. On 6.II, 1829, he was promoted to bka’-śag druṇ-yig 2 and on the 5th month of the same year he left for the Nag-c'u, as an assistant to bka’-blon T'on-pa (q.v.) 3. Perhaps as a reward, at the end of the following year he was appointed žol-gņer 4. Later he became a rtse-p'yag, and with this rank he took part in the sPo-bo campaign of 1837-1838, for which he was given the peacock feather by the emperor (27th January, 1839) 5. He seems to have participated in the last stages of the Ladakh campaign in the staff of bka’-blon Zur-k'ari, together with whom he was received in audience by the Dalai-Lama on 20.XII, 1842 (c. 20th January, 1843) 6; on that occasion he was still a rtse-p’yag.

One of the stipulations of the treaty of Lahore (9th March, 1846), which terminated the first Sikh war, was the cession of Lahul and Spiti to the British. Having thus acquired a common frontier with Western Tibet, the government of India took steps to have it properly demarcated. In July 1846 they sent to the border for this purpose Mr Vans Agnew and Captain Alexander Cunningham, who endeavoured to gain direct contact with the Tibetan authorities by forwarding to the sTod sgars-dpon a letter from the governor-general Lord Hardinge; it was brought to Gartok by their interpreter Anand Ram, a man from Bashahr. No reply being forthcoming, the British commission left the frontier a few weeks later 7. Actually this letter had caused some worry to the sgars-dpon, who was in doubt whether to forward it to Lhasa or not and asked for instructions. In the Tibetan capital both the bka’-śag and the ambans were keenly aware of the new situation that had arisen in the West 8; they reacted by sending out gSar-byun, who on that occa-

--- 186 ---

1 DLIO, 161b.
2 DLIO, 205b.
3 DLIO, 213a.
4 DLIO, 254a.
5 HTSL, 317.19b.
6 DLII, 30a.
7 Lamb 1960, 73-76; CPIWSM, Tao-kuang, 77.16b-20a. This Chinese document mentions not only Saheb Vans Agnew Bahadur (Sa-hai Wan A-ku-lu Pa-tu-érh), but also Anand Ram (Men-ta Jan) from K'u-lu (Tib. K'u-nu, Bashahr), showing that British suspicions about the latter's faithful behaviour were unfounded. Cf. also CPIWSM, Tao-kuang, 77.20b-26a, 77.32a-b.
8 See HTSL, 437.32b-33b, 437.22b-34b, 438.10b-11b, 440.15a-16a, 442.17b-19b, 444.19a, 445.7b-8b, 450.38b-39a, 450.39a-40a; CPIWSM, Tao-kuang, 75.23a-26a, 77.42b-45a.
sion appears for the first time as bka’-blon (3rd month of 1847). His ostensible mission was to inspect the frontier, but he was particularly required to spy out the real intentions of the British, a task in which he probably succeeded 1. In July 1847 the Indian government sent Alexander Cunningham and Lieutenant Henry Strachey, to complete the demarcation of the border. When they reached Hanle on the 14th September, they were informed that “Ghalun Ghakchoo” (bka’-blon gSar-byun) from Lhasa had been sent to Gartok to settle some revenue disputes; but he was not deputed for the demarcation of the border between Ladakh and Tibet 2. The two Britishers were pointedly ignored by the Tibetan authorities (i.e. by gSar-byun), who by indirect means and passive resistance successfully prevented them from crossing into Tibet 3. Having thus completed his task, gSar-byun returned to Lhasa on 28.XII (c. 2nd February, 1848) 4. Only a few months later he was sent again to Gartok, where he arrived on 12th June. He reported that all was quiet, but that on the 22nd May an extraordinary snowfall had blocked the passes; traders were unable to come through and thus he could not gather information about the British 5. As the British about the same time gave up their attempts, the presence of a bka’-blon in Western Tibet was no longer needed; in the 8th month gSar-byun came back to Lhasa, where he gave to the regent a careful account of the situation on the border 6. After his Western assignment, in 1849 the regent, acting on the recommendation of the bka’-sag, appointed him special commissioner to direct the great restoration work at bSam-yas 7; he died there on 10.V, 1850 8.

Two sons of his are mentioned on a formal occasion in 1851 9. One of them was the bka’-sod druñ-yig gSar-byun sras who in 1847

---

1 DLII, 84a; CPIWSM, Tao-kuang, 78.16a–17a.
4 DLII, 94a; PC4, 312a.
6 DLII, 110b; PC4, 335a.
7 DLII, 116a; bSam-yas, 74, 232.
8 bSam-yas, 76.
9 DLII, 148a.
had accompanied his father to Western Tibet and is mentioned also in the following year 1.

It is difficult to tell whether he is the same as the gSar-byun-ba who was appointed bka'-blon late in 1865 2. He must be the bka'-blon Ts'e-dbañ-dpal-'bar, whom in the same year the emperor honoured by the grant of the peacock feather 3.

gSar-byun Ts'e-brtan-dban-p'yu g (1857–1914) is perhaps identical with the bla-p'yang Ts'e-brtan-dbañ-p'yu g-rdo-rje who in 1890 was given first place in the waiting list for appointment as bka’-blon 4. Still a bla-p'yang, he was proposed as second choice for the seat in the council vacated by Zur-k'añ in 1902, but was not appointed that time 5. He was more successful two years later, becoming a bka’-blon early in 1904 6. The regent sent him to India in 1906, to join the Chinese delegate Chang Yin-t'ang as Tibetan representative 7; he left Lhasa on 4th February and arrived in Calcutta early in March 8. His task, a merely formal one, consisted in handing over to the British representatives the first instalment of the war indemnity, which the Peking government had decided to pay on Tibet's behalf. After some delay, he went back from Calcutta to Darjeeling, and then again to Calcutta, where on 29th May he at last handed over the cheque for the sum due 9. In 1909 he went to the gDañs-la to meet the Dalai-Lama coming to Lhasa 10. A few months later he fled with the Dalai-Lama to India, whereupon the Chinese dismissed him from his post 11. He returned to Tibet in 1912, but died in 1914 12.

His son (gSar-byun sras) was supply officer at the time of the fighting on the Karo-la in 1904 13.

1 DL11, 84a, 103b.
2 DL12, 131b.
3 DL12, 135b.
4 CCCTTT, Sheng-t'ai, 3.22.
5 CCCTTT, An-ch'eng, 10.
6 Shakabpa, 209. The imperial confirmation was given on 2nd November, 1904; CCCTTT, Yu-t'ai, 1.25.
7 CCCTTT, Yu-t'ai, 2.29, 2.44. Cf. Li Tieh-tseng, 111.
8 CCCTTT, Chang Yin-t'ang, 1.13–15.
9 Younghusband, 352; Lamb 1968, 11.53–54.
10 DL13, K'a, 76a–b.
11 HTCC, 34.2a–25a; Ho Tsao-hsiang, Tsang-yu, 62.
13 Shakabpa, 214.
The son of the latter, by name d Ban-dus-rin-c'en (b. 1903) entered the service in 1920 and was a bka'-sod in 1921, when he was charged with some religious ceremonies 1. In 1924 he was a joint (las-'p'ar) bka'-mgon. Later he became post-master (dag-spyi), then c'ibs-dpon c'en-po. In 1934 he was appointed bla-p'yag. He was deprived of that post in 1938 and was sent to Hsining to join the party who brought to Lhasa the infant Dalai-Lama (1939). He married a daughter of blon-c'en bSad-sgra (HR).

The house of HOR-K'AN-GSAR 2

This family is one of the very few which has a genealogical list in the Chinese texts 3; nevertheless, its importance in Tibetan eyes was not particularly outstanding. Their original estate was in the rGyarma valley, to the east of dGa'-ldan 4.

This house was founded by Noyan Qosüci Rab-brtan. In spite of his Mongol titles, he was a Tibetan, being a younger brother of P'o-lha-nas 5. It is, however, peculiar that this fact finds no direct support in the MBTJ or in any other Tibetan text 6; a little piece of indirect evidence will be dealt with later. In 1727 No-yon K'o-so'u-c'i led a division of the gTsaṅ troops, operating with success in gTsaṅ-ron 7; in 1727 he and lCaṅ-lo-can mda'-dpon concentrated 2000 men near Gyantse 8. In the same year the emperor, upon the proposal of the amban Mala, granted him the title of a jasak first-class taiji 9. He was sent as district governor to the Nag-c'u (Qara-usu) 10; in 1730 he is mentioned as Nag-c'u mgo-pa Noyon Qošüci 11. In 1735 he went out of Lhasa to meet the returning Dalai-Lama 12. He died in

---

1 ŠBR, 38; DL13, K'a, 213b.
2 Pr. P. 1954, n. 83.
3 TWC, 24.8a-9a; WTTT, 35b-36b; FPYL, piao 3.18a-b; KCHLC, 105.7a; CSK, 929c.
4 Ferrari, 109 (n. 112). Cf. DL7, 444b; Samati, 45a.
5 Hsi-tsang chih, 3.1b, 3.4b; TWC, 24.8a; WTTT, pref. 35b-36a; KCHLC, 105.7a.
6 Unless he is bsTan-'dzin, younger brother of P'o-lha-nas, who in 1727 fought at the battle of 'Bras-k'ud; MBTJ, 264b-265a.
7 MBTJ, 278b.
8 MBTJ, 283a.
9 Hsi-tsang chih, 3.1b (with the wrong date of 1734); FPYL, 17.22a.
10 Hsi-tsang chih, 3.4b.
11 PC2, 389b.
12 DL7, 177a-b.
1736, and upon the proposal of Mala his Nag-c’u military command was merged with that of the Tengri-nor, then held by the future "king" 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal.

The taiji title passed to the younger brother of the deceased, named Qaśigha Rab-brтан-dон- grub, who till then had governed the Ku-mu-pu-mu (sKu-'bum?) area. This is apparently P'o-lha-nas's younger brother (?: mu-mo) U-c'ur K’a-ša-k’a, mentioned only once during the civil war, in 1728. He died in 1740.

The title was inherited by a third brother, T'se-d bang-dro-j.e. In 1744 he was appointed to accompany, together with Panḍita and the duke of mNa'-ris, the Dsungar embassy which came to Tibet in that year, and was rewarded by the emperor for his work on that occasion. He died in 1745.

Upon the proposal of P'o-lha-nas, endorsed by the amban and sanctioned by the emperor, the succession devolved upon Noyan Qo-süci’s son d Bañ-’d us. In 1746 he offered presents to the Pan-c'en. In 1747 he was placed in command of the military station of A-ha-ya-k'e (?). He was rewarded by the emperor in 1748, and later in that year he was employed on the frontier and against the Dsungars. In 1750 he was sent to the Nag-c’u, to receive the Mongol princess bSam-grub-sgrol-ma coming to Tibet as the bride of 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal; but the Dalai-Lama recalled him almost at once to Lhasa. He is mentioned on formal occasions in 1754, 1755 and 1757. Accord-
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1 DL7, 200a; FPYL, 17.21b–22a, 18.1a, piao 3.18a (= KCCHLC, 24.5a). According to Hsi-tsong chih, 3.1b, the date is 1735.
2 FPYL, 18.1a–b; Hsi-tsong chih, 3.1b.
3 MBTJ, 287a–b. This is a little piece of Tibetan evidence on the relationship with P'o-lha-nas.
4 Mentioned during the New Year's festival of 1741; DL7, 271a.
5 FPYL, 18.3a; KTSJ, 212.8a–9a.
6 FPYL, piao 3.18b (= KCCHLC, 24.5a); KCCHLC, 105.7b.
7 FPYL, piao 3.18a (= KCCHLC, 24.5a); WTTC, pref. 36a–b.
8 PC3, 61b.
9 KTSJ, 288.4b–5b; KCCHLC, 105.8a.
10 KTSJ, 311.9b–10a.
11 KTSJ, 322.24b–25b, 322.26a–27a.
12 DL7, 383a; sTag-luri, 415a–b.
13 DL7, 444b, 485b, 544a, 557a.
ing to an isolated Chinese text he was appointed bka’-blon in 1765; but this is probably a mistake. He died in 1766.

He was succeeded by his son b S o d-n a m s-b k r a-s i s, who met the Pan-c’en at Lhasa in 1777 and 1778. In 1779 he was in charge of the smon-lam and was sne-san to the Pan-c’en on the first stage of his journey to Peking. In 1781 he appears as dBus mda’-dpon, and in the same year he received at dByug-c’u-k’a the remains of the Pan-c’en who had died in Peking. In 1783 he was granted the perpetual heredity of the title of jasak taiji. In the 7th month of 1788 he led some troops to gTsas against the Gorkhalis; he must be the So-no-mu-la-shih who took part in the defence of Šel-dkar and who was rewarded by the emperor with some precious fabrics. At the end of 1790 he was already a bka’-blon, and went to 'Bri-gu-n-mt’il to meet the regent Samati Pakṣi; and upon the arrival of the latter at Lhasa (11.11) he took part in the first regular meeting of the bka’-šag, which was convened on that occasion. On 22.IX, 1791, he sent a representative to the funeral rites of the dead regent, which means that he was absent from Lhasa. And indeed in the autumn of 1791 he had been sent, together with a Manchu major, to lead a Tibetan unit to gNā’-lam. But he shirked his duties and acted in such a half-hearted way, that in March 1792 he was degraded from his rank of bka’-blon and was transferred to the commissariat service, to give him a chance to redeem his faults. However, three months later this

---

1 KCCHLC, 105.8a. But see the discussion under T’on-pa, p. 66n.
2 FPYL, piao 3.18a (= KCCHLC, 24.5a); WTTC, pref. 36a-b.
3 PC3b, 5a, 30b, 32a. In the same year he first met the new regent at rGya-ma-mda’; Samati, 45a.
4 Samati, 61b; PC3b, 55b, 70b, 72b.
5 DL8, 115a; PC3b, 281b.
6 FPYL, 18.20a, piao 3.18a (= KCCHLC, 24.5a).
7 DL8, 173b.
8 KTSL, 1322.27b–29b.
9 Samati, 343a, 344b, 349a.
10 Samati, 393b.
11 KEKCL, 4.8b. According to Shakabpa, 166–167, he commanded the Tibetan auxiliary forces and did most of the fighting. But there appears to be no basis for this contention in Chinese or Tibetan texts.
12 KEKCL, 31.18a. Cf. KTSL, 1405.11a, where the personal name of the bka’-blon is omitted.
punishment was rescinded, not because of his merits, but in order not
to disorganize the service by creating another vacancy in the bka’-śag 1. 
According to the Chinese records, he died in that same year 2. A 
Tibetan text implies that he was still alive at the beginning of 1794, 
when he offered presents to the Dalai-Lama 3; but this must be a mistake.

A brother of his became a novice in 1754, with the name bsKal-

bSod-nams-bkra-śis’s elder son T s’e-rin-dbaṅ-p’yug-rdo-rje inherited the title in 1792, the heredity being expressly 
stated as perpetual 5. He is the Hor-k’aṅ jasak mentioned in 1808, 
1813 and 1827 6, but nothing else is known about him, except that he 
died in 1828 7.

A Hor-k’aṅ sras mentioned in 1820–1822 8 may be a younger 
brother of the above, or may be identical with Don-grub-g’yul-rgyal.

D o n - g r u b - g’ y u l - r g y a l succeeded his father Ts’e-rin-
dbaṅ-p’yug-rdo-rje in 1828 9; but apparently the title he got was 
only that of 2nd-class taiji. He was active at the repairs of bSam-yas be-
tween 1849 and 1853 10. When the Paṅ-c’en died (1853) he was sent to 
bKra-śis-lhun-po 11. In 1854 he was appointed bṣer-dpaṅ and is also 
mentioned in passing in 1855 12. In 1860 he was a rtsis-dpon 13 and 
helped bka’-blon lCaṅ-rgyab to settle the C’ab-mdo dispute; the empe-
or granted him the personal title of first-class taiji 14. He must have 
died soon after.

---

1 KEKCL, 31.19a.
2 FPYL, piao 3.18a (= KCCHLC, 24.5b, CSK, 929c); KCCHLC, 105.8a. Also 
Shakabpa, 169, who places his death “ a few weeks earlier ” than the beginning of August. 
He is mentioned among the benefactors of Kloṅ-rdol Bla-ma; KDTT, 183a.
3 DL8, 223a: bka’-blon P’a-lha | Lha-sdils | Hor-k’aṅ jasak gsum.
4 DL7, 444b.
5 WTTC, pref. 36b.
6 DL9, 78b, 145b; DL10, 186a.
7 CSK, 929c.
8 BC8b, 19b, 26b, 29a.
9 CSK, 929c.
10 bSam-yas, 217; DL11, 214a.
11 DL11, 232a.
12 DL11, 252b.
13 DL12, 62b.
14 WTSL, 335.4b; DL12, 79b.
His son (Hor-k'ān sras) entered government service in 1862. He is the jasak taiji T'o g s-m e d-d g r a-'d u 1 who in March 1868 resigned because of illness; the emperor appointed his younger brother d B a-n-c e n-d g r a-'d u 2 in his place. In 1877 the new taiji met the boy Dalai-Lama upon his arrival near Lhasa. Later he fell into evil days, but we do not know what was the trouble; on 24th February, 1883, the emperor after due investigation deprived him of his title of jasak 2nd-class taiji, which passed to his elder son 4.

The latter, named b S o d-n a m s-s t o b s-r g y a s (1865–1903) 5, was in 1883 rdzoñ-dpon of mTs'o-sna 6. But his later career was closely connected with Ŋag-roñ. In 1889 that country had risen in revolt, expelled the Tibetan chief commissioner mda’-dpon dPal-lhun sras (q.v.) and requested the Szechwan governor-general to reimpose direct Chinese rule 7. The Lhasa government, confronted with a difficult situation, sent Hor-k'ān sras and mk’an-po Blo-bzañ-bkra-sis to investigate; and soon Hor-k'ān took over the office of high commissioner and succeeded in quelling the rebellion 8. The Szechwan governor-general had one leader, the Pa-tsung Lama, executed outright, and his main followers prosecuted according to the law 9. It seems that Hor-k'ān was still in Nag-roñ in 1892 10; but in the same year the gTsañ mda’-dpon bDe-smon-ba was appointed Ŋag-k’og spyi-k’yab, and in 1893 we find him holding this office 11. Hor-k’ān had returned to Lhasa.

Late in 1895 the Icag-la chief 12 invaded Ŋag-roñ. The Tibetan high commissioner bDud-’dul-rdo-rje (perhaps the same as mda’-dpon

---

1 DL12, 97b.
2 MTSL, 225.19b. No family name is given, but the identification is certain.
3 DL13, Ka, 45b.
4 TTSL, 158.11a.
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bDe-smon-ba) protested and offered resistance, counter-invading lCag-la. The governor-general of Szechwan, Lu Ch'uan-lin, considered this as a violation of Chinese territory. Upon his request, the amban K'uei-huan asked the Dalai-Lama to have bDud-'dul-rdo-rje and his ecclesiastic colleague mk'an-c'uñi Ye-šes-t'ub-bstan recalled and prosecuted. The Dalai-Lama refused to comply; the two officials remained in Ṛag-ron, organized resistance and appointed one rtse-drui Tse-chung-cha-pa as commander of their forces. Early in 1896 a considerable body of Szechwan troops penetrated into Ṛag-ron and occupied most of the country, as well as sDe-dge; the king of sDe-dge and his family were sent to Ch'eng-tu, where both his parents died in prison. The resistance in Ṛag-ron was crushed; bDud-'dul-rdo-rje went into hiding, his son was killed fighting (19th October), the rtse-drui fled, the mk'an-c'un absconded and eventually surrendered. At this point the governor-general memorialized the emperor, proposing to withdraw Ṛag-ron from the jurisdiction of the Dalai-Lama and to incorporate it into Szechwan (17th November, 1896). In the meantime (7th September) the Dalai-Lama had sent Hor-k'at'i to Ṛag-ron as high commissioner; soon after he gave him as colleague the bla-p'yug mk'an-c'uñi mK'yen-rab-p'un-ts'ogs, with the special task of arriving at an understanding with lCag-la. The two officials arrived at C'ab-mdo, where they cooperated with the lieutenant-colonel Yü Li-ch'eng 立誠 posted in that town. But the governor-general and the Lhasa amban requested the Dalai-Lama to recall the two, and in practice did not allow them to enter Ṛag-ron.
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The Dalai-Lama steadfastly refused to comply; nevertheless Hor-k'ab seems to have returned to Lhasa at the end of 1896 or early in 1897. Gradually things cooled down and negotiations started; and when the Dalai-Lama formally asked for the restitution of ṇag-roṅ, the emperor endorsed a memorial by the Szechwan provincial general pointing out that the trouble encountered was out of all proportion to the advantages gained; and on 2nd December, 1897, he decreed the rendition of ṇag-roṅ. The two sons of the sDe-dge ruler were liberated and the elder was appointed king. mK'yen-rab-p'un-ts'ogs, who seems to have stayed all the time in Eastern Tibet and to have arranged the local truces, was able at last to return to Lhasa, where he arrived on 18.XII (c. 10th January, 1898). Even in the case of Hor-k'aṅ-gsar the Lhasa government, though giving some formal satisfaction to the emperor, won their point in the end; on 26.VI, 1898, Hor-k'aṅ-gsar, by now a dBus mda'-dpon, was officially appointed as ṇag-k'oṅ spyi-k'yab and left Lhasa to assume office. During the smon-lam of 1899 the Dalai-Lama offered a special service for the happy overcoming of the road dangers by the commissioner in ṇag-roṅ.

He stayed in ṇag-k'oṅ until he succeeded Zur-k'aṅ as bka'-blon late in 1901 or early in 1902. On 13th October, 1903, he was dismissed with all his colleagues and, being afraid of torture, soon afterward he committed suicide.

His son dཔ་ན་ཅེན་པུན་ཙོགས་ was granted in 1906 the title of jasak 2nd-class taiji; he married a daughter of Ts'a-roṅ dPaṅ-p'yug-rgyal-po. He met the Dalai-Lama in 1909, and at
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the end of 1911 came to visit him at Darjeeling; lastly, he offered puja during the smon-lam of 1915. He died in 1918.

His posthumous son ḃ S o d n a m s d p a l b a r (b. 1918) entered the service in 1937 and was appointed rtsam-len. In 1941 he was placed in charge of the Glin gţis-ka near sNañ-dkar-ṛtse. Then he was appointed Dva-rdzon rdzoń-dpon and was sent to Gyantse for military training (HR). In 1950 he was a p'ogs-dpon posted at C'ab-mdo; he was taken prisoner there by the Chinese. His later destiny is unknown.

A brother of dBaṅ-c'en-p'un-ts'ogs (?), by name P ' u n t s o g s d b a ŋ p y u g (b.c. 1886), separated from the family in c. 1906 and founded the Hor-zur house (HR). He received the title of jasak and in 1932 was in charge of the Tsari pilgrimage. In 1934 he was officer in charge of the Tea and Salt tax (HR).

His elder son ḃ S o d n a m s c o s g r a g s (b. 1916) entered the service in 1937 and was appointed bka'-gag to the bka'-blon blama in 1938. He was appointed Žo-k'a gţis-gñer in 1941 (HR).

A younger son, ḃ S o d n a m s c o s p ' e l (b. 1920), entered the service in 1938 and was made collector of the salt-tax in gTsani in 1941 (HR).

The house of LHA-SDINŚ

The family estate is in the upper Mal-dro valley. Full name: P'ag-mo Lha-sdiņś.

The first member of the family we meet with is a Lha-sdiņś-pa who in the New Year of 1744 left Lhasa to take up office as mDo sgar-dpon.

In 1753 a P'ag-mo Lha-sdiņś-pa was rdzoń-dpon of sKyd-gron; in 1756, after a mission to mGar-t'ar, he was appointed lha-gñer.
In 1768 the son of Lha-sdiṅs-pa (perhaps of the above) was recognized as the incarnate of 'Bru-la in Koṅ-po and received the vows of a novice and the name Blo-bzaṅ-bstan-'dzin-lhun-grub 1. He is mentioned again in 1786, 1790 and 1791 2.

Lha-sdiṅs-pa Don-grub-tsh'e-dbaṅ was lha-gños in 1775 3, and is apparently identical with the rtse-p'yaṅ Lha-sdiṅs-pa of 1779 and 1786 4. It 1793 he was already a ṭabs-pad and was sent to accompany as far as sMar-k'ams the general Fukangga returning to Peking 5; probably he was one of the appointments of 1791-1792. He is mentioned in passing in 1794 6. On 3.XII, 1796, he had come back from a mission to K'ams 7. Late in 1799 he accompanied the rTa-ts'ag regent on a visit to the Pan-c'en 8. In 1801 he resigned his seat to become a monk 9 and is still mentioned as former minister (bka'-zur) in 1808 10.

In 1808 a Lha-sdiṅs-pa was appointed rtsis-dpon 11.

A bka'-druṅ Lha-sdiṅs-pa is mentioned in 1825 and accompanied the junior amban Kuang-ch'ìng to gTsāṅ in 1827 12.

His (?) son (Lha-sdiṅs sras) was appointed lha-gños in 1829 13. gŠer-dpa'i Lha-sdiṅs was promoted to dBus mda'-dpon in 1847 14. In the same year he came back from an inspection of the estates (gžis-skor) and soon afterwards went with bka'-blon dPal-lhun (q.v.) on duty in the Yaṅs-can area 15.

In the ecclesiastical branch, Lha-sdiṅs c'os-mdzad Ts 'ul-k 'rim s-c'os-p 'el entered civil service in 1847 16. In 1849 he
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superintended a new printing of the biography of Tsoṅ-k’a-pa and shortly later he worked at some embellishments at gNas-c’un and sPro-bde-k’aṅ-gsar. He may be the same as the Lha-sdiṅs-pa who was mk’an-druṅ in 1862, 1864 and 1865, and in the latter year was promoted to mk’an-c’e.

In 1882 Lha-sdiṅs sras b s K a b z a n f i m a as the head of the family, and rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje of the Na-p’od family who had married his niece, gave away the latter’s daughter Ye-ses-sgrol-ma in marriage to the Maharaja of Sikkim mT’u-stobs-rnam-rgyal (1874–1914).

In 1883 a c’ibs-dpon Lha-sdiṅs sras was appointed joint supervisor of the Tsari pilgrimage, due in the following year. This may have been rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje himself, but more probably a son of his, because rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje was then in his forties and c’ibs-dpon was a junior charge. On 18.II, 1888, he was sent to Koṅ-po to collect soldiers, who were needed against the British on the Sikkim border. He is probably the same as the mda’-dpon Lha-sdiṅs who arrived at P‘ag-ri at the end of 1903, stayed at Tuna during the winter and was killed fighting at Guru on 31st March, 1904.

His brother m G o n p o s n a n g r a g s (1868–c. 1934) entered government service in 1907. In 1916 he was rim-bži and commissioner in the Chumbi valley (Gro-mo spyi-k’yab). In 1924 he was bla-p’yag. He died c. 1934 (ZK).

The son of the mda’-dpon, by name b S o d n a m s t s e r i ŋ (b. 1902), entered government service in 1923. He was first appointed a police officer. In 1929 he became a mda’-dpon and in 1931 was sent to Sikkim to take delivery of some munitions; in 1935
he was given the command of the Diñ-ri regiment, stationed in K'ams. In 1938 he returned to Lhasa. In 1943 he resigned from government service and became a monk (HR).

His son bSod-nams-dPal-'byor was bla-p'yang in the fifties; in 1959 he was imprisoned, as one of the leaders of the revolt.

Another member of the house of Lha-sdiñs was Nag-dBangs-pa (b.c. 1891), a son of Maharani Ye-ses-sgrol-ma (later called bsKal-bzañ-sgrol-ma) by another father; a piece of information which raises several difficulties, but seems to rest on sure ground (HR). He was a rtse-drun. In 1930 he was sent to take charge of the Dalai-Lama's treasury in Urga and came back to Tibet with the advance party of General Huang Mu-sung's condolence mission in 1934. Then he was put in charge of mTs'o-smon-glin monastery. In 1936 he was sne-san to the mission of Mr Gould. In 1937 he was appointed rtse-p'yang and was given the title of mk'an-c'un. In 1944 he was promoted druñ-yig c'en-mo (HR).

---
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IV.

SOME SKU-DRAG FAMILIES CONNECTED WITH THE TERRITORIAL MILITARY ORGANIZATION

In a priest-ridden society the office of provincial commander (mda’-dpon) was among the highest open to the lay nobility. The same trend toward heredity that can be observed in the case of the bkca’-śag is noticeable also in the highest rank of the Tibetan army. The four posts existing after 1728 (one in dBus, three in gTsaña) were the apanage of four noble families: g-Yu-t’og (alias ’Bum-t’añ) in dBus, lCañ-lo-can, Pad-ts’al and Ram-pa in gTsaña. The office showed thus a definitely feudal character and may be compared with the ministeriales of post-Carolingian times in Europe. The second post of dBus mda’-dpon added in 1751 was not tied to a definite family (in spite of a certain prevalence of the P’u-luñ house). The same principle was extended to the other four posts in 1792, when the rights of direct heredity (but not of exclusive tenure) of the aristocracy in the military administration were done away by the Chinese.

Of the four families mentioned above, ’Bum-t’añ and Ram-pa have been treated in the preceding section; lCañ-lo-can and Pad-ts’al are the subject of the present section, together with three other families of some relevance in early times.

_The house of LCAÑ-LO-CAN_ ¹

This was one of the foremost families of gTsaña; the village lCañ-lo-can lies near Gyantse ². They descended from the famous king

---

¹ The lCañ-lo-can listed by Pr. P. 1954, n. 22, refers to the lCañ-can gun (P’o-lha).
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Rab-brtan-kun-bzan-'p'ags (b. 1389) (ZK), who in 1427 built the sku-bum of Gyantse 1.

The played a political role already in the 17th century, and in April 1672 lCañ-lo-can bsTan- 'dzin- dpal-bzan was sent by the Dalai-Lama to the emperor 2.

lCañ-lo-can-pa P 'un- t s ' o g s - dba n - p ' y u g is mentioned in 1701 and 1707 3 and is probably the rGyal-rtse lCañ-lo-can-pa who was killed by the Dsungars in 1718 4.

He was succeeded in the estate by lCañ-lo-can-pa A - j i g 5, who since the very beginning was a close friend of P'o-lha-nas. Already in 1723/1724 and 1726 he was gTsan mda'-dpon 6. At the outbreak of the civil war he was posted at Šel-dkar; P'o-lha-nas called upon him to avenge the murder of K'añ-c'en-nas, and he joined him at once 7. He led a division of the gTsan troops in the advance on 'Broñ-dkar-rtse and took part in the first clash at 'Bras-k'ud 8. In 1728, when the war was resumed, he and Noyan Qosūči were at first posted with 2000 men at Gyantse; but almost immediately he and P'o-lha-nas's elder son were despatched to invade dBus from the Yar-'brog region 9. This division defeated the dBus forces at Yul-sbus-sde and advanced on Lhasa from the south, thus contributing to P'o-lha-nas's easy final victory 10. According to a Chinese source, in 1734 he was granted the title of jasak 1st class taiji 11, a piece of information which is uncon- firmed by other texts. He presented his respects to the Dalai-Lama upon his return to Lhasa in 1735 and met him in gTsan when he jour- neyed to bKra-sis-lhun-po in 1736 12. He is mentioned in passing in 1737 and 1743 13. In 1744 he was granted some slight rewards by the
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5 The personal name is found only in TWC, 24.11a.
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emperor for his careful handling of the Dsungar embassies of those years 1. But then he attached himself to the fortunes of 'king' Gyurmed-rnam-rgyal, thus backing the wrong horse. For this he was exiled to China, where he died shortly after his arrival in 1751 2.

However the emperor, acting upon the proposal of the Dalai-Lama, on 17th December, 1751, sanctioned the succession of the son of the deceased, a lad of seventeen called bSod-nams-mtus-tobs, to the post of mda'-dpon held by his father 3. He must have held it for a considerable time, and the mda'-dpon lCañ-lo-can-pa is repeatedly mentioned after 1756, mostly in connection with the Pan-c'en, but always without his personal name 4. He may be the lCañ-can sde-pa who in 1763 made a gift of his estate (rañ-gzis) to the Karma-pa 5. At the end of 1779 he accompanied duke Panḍita on his mission to 'Ba' Sa-ñan; he came back from mGo-'jo in the 8th month of 1780 6. In 1784 he waited upon the Dalai-Lama during his journey to gTsān, and early in 1786 was at his court in Lhasa 7. Later in 1786 his behaviour at bKra-sis-lhun-po was considered so improper, that the Pan-c'en was advised to refuse him the initiation for which he had applied; but the Pan-c'en (or rather his tutors) replied that it behoved him to be compassionate to all beings, and thus also to lCañ-lo-can-pa 8. In 1788 mda'-dpon lCañ-lo-can-pa was sent against the Gorkhalis, and in August of that year he took part in the defence of Šel-dkar, where he personally killed a Gorkha officer and three soldiers; the emperor rewarded him for this brave act 9. In the 2nd month of 1791 he went again to the war zone 10. He accompanied bka'-blon dGa'-bži and 'Bum-t'aṅ to gña-lam 11 and was taken prisoner along with them. He died in Nepal soon after 12. Whether this still refers to bSod-nams-
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mt'u-stobs is a moot question; as said above, our texts never give the personal name and for once even KTS L employs the family name. But there is no impossibility on chronological reasons: if bSod-nams-mt'u-stobs was still alive in 1791, he was then only 57 sui.

After 1792 mentions of the family grow scarce. We find a mda'-dpon lCañ-lo-can-pa in 1798 and 1805 1, and another in 1832 and 1835 2.

On 28.VII, 1860, bšer-dpaṅ rGyal-rtse lCañ-lo-pa was appointed bla-p'yag; a few weeks later (3.IX) he received the peacock feather from the emperor 3. Immediately afterward he went to pay his respects to the Pan-c'en 4. We have to wait eleven years to learn his name: he is the "treasurer of the Great Jo-bo" (i.e. bla-p'yag) lCañ-lo L h a - d b a ŋ - p ŋ n - t s ' o g s , who was one of the victims of the conspiracy of dPal-ldan-don-grub in 1871 5.

In the third quarter of the 19th century there still was a gTsaṅ mda'-dpon lCañ-lo-can-pa, whose son went as a mag-pa in the Zur-k'aṅ family (q.v.) (ZK).

After this the family apparently died out, and the lCañ-lo-can estate near Gyantse was given to the house of P'un-k'aṅ 6.

During the 19th century it is often very difficult to keep this family apart from the almost homonimous house of lCañ-can (P'o-lha), as the abbreviation lCañ-can is used in both cases. I am not at all sure that I have not attributed to one house members really belonging to the other.

The house of SNAÑ-DKAR 7

Another name is lCañ-ra. A gTsaṅ family. A sNañ-dkar-ba was among the gTsaṅ nobles who in 1727 tried to stop the dBus forces of Lum-pa-nas on the Karo-la 8. He joined then P'o-lha-nas and distinguished himself in the first clash at 'Bras-k'ud 9.

---
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In the sixties of the 18th century a sNañ-dkar-ba was sTod sgar-dpon. He is probably different from the sNañ-dkar-ba who in 1778 was tol-sde-pa, is mentioned in 1779 and was rdzoñ-dpon in 1781.

A sNañ-dkar sras accompanied bka’-blon bSad-sgra (q.v.) on his mission to Ladakh in 1828. In 1830 he was appointed rtsis-dpon.

A ru-dpon sNañ-dkar sras was a member of the commission which in 1840–1841 went to mGar-t’ar to examine the characteristics of the boy who later was chosen as the 11th Dalai-Lama.

sNañ-dkar sras was rdzoñ-dpon of Gyantse about 1853, then of sTag-rtse till 1861, when he was transferred to Lho-rdzoñ.

A sNañ-dkar-ba was sod-druiñ in 1895. d Bañ-p’yug-mt’ar-p’yiñ (1878–c. 1939) entered the service in 1902. In 1905 he was in Urga with the Dalai-Lama and in 1912 he still appears as a simple sod-druiñ. In 1917–1918 he served in the Roñ-pa-rtsa region under the orders of the bka’-blon bla-ma. Then he came back to Central Tibet and was appointed Nag-c’u’go-pa; he was holding that office in 1924.

In 1926, at the age of forty-eight, he was appointed a general (he was usually known as the lCañ-ra mda’-dpon) and was given the command of the bodyguard (sku-sruri dmag-sgar). In 1933 he became acting commander-in-chief, and early in 1934 he was given the full rank and position of commander-in-chief (dmag-spyi) with the title of jasak; however, the regent gave him an ecclesiastical colleague, bsTan-pa-jam-dbyaṅs, who later became a bka’-blon bla-ma. The lCañ-ra dmag-spyi, who had been ailing for a long time, died in 1939 (HR).

sNañ–dkar–ba P’un-t’s’ogs-stobs–rgyas (b. 1923) entered the service in 1940 (HR). He is probably the lCañ-ra mda’-
dpom posted in K‘ams in 1950, “one of the poorest types of officer produced by the Tibetan social system” 1. He commanded at Ri-bo-c’e and was taken prisoner there 2.

The house of PAD-TS‘AL 3

This gTsān family 4 drew its name from an estate in the Pa-snam district, on the road to bKra-śis-lhun-po 5. Like the ICañ-lo-can-pa, it rose to prominence in the times of P’o-lha-nas.

Pad-ts’al-ba T’s e-r i ṅ-n a m-r g y a l 6 was among the gTsān nobles who in 1727 besieged Gyantse, but were compelled to retreat by the arrival of the army of Lum-pa-nas and sByar-ra-nas; shortly later he was on the staff of mda’-dpom lCañ-lo-can-pa on his march to ’Broñ-dkar-rtse 7. In 1731 he was still a simple nobleman 8, but soon after he was appointed gTsān mda’-dpom and in 1734 the emperor gave him the title of jasak first-class taiji 9. He is mentioned in passing in 1736, 1737 and 1741 10. In 1744 and 1748 the emperor rewarded him for his work during the visit of the Dsungar embassies 11. Further mentions on formal occasions belong to 1749 and 1752 12. In 1752 he resigned and took the vows of a novice 13.

His brother T’s e-b d a g was in 1750 a mgron-gñer, and as such he accompanied bka’-blon mDo-mk’ar (q.v.) to the Nag-c’u, to meet ’Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal’s Mongol bride; but they had to go
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back at once to Lhasa because of the upheaval there. He succeeded his brother in 1752 and died in 1756.

He was followed by a third brother, called b K r a ś i s d a r r g y a s. In the following years (1756–1758) the Tibetan texts mention him on some formal occasions, without ever giving his personal name. He is the m d a' dpon Pad-ts' al at whose estate the Pan-c'en stopped in 1762, and probably also the one who visited bKra-sis-lhun-po in 1763 and 1765.

Other members of the family are noticed in about the same period, because of the close connection of the family with the Ts'e-mc'og-gliṅ yoṅs-'dzin Ye-šes-rgyal-mtš'an (1713–1793). They are: Pad-ts' al dge-sloṅ b s K a l b z aṅ ' p r i n l a s r n a m r g y a l (1754 and 1762); gNā'-naṅ so-pa Pad-ts' al-ba m G o n p o r d o r j e d b aṅ-'dzin (1756 and 1758); Śel-dkar rdzoṅ-sdod Pad-ts' al-ba d B aṅ r g y a l t s ' e r iṅ, who in 1766 received the yoṅs-'dzin at Pad-ts' al.

bKra-sis-dar-rgyas was succeeded by his son P ' u n t s' o g s r n a m r g y a l, who appears for the first time as gTsaṅ m d a' dpon in 1766. As traditional in his family, he was closely connected with the Pan-c'en, to whose biographies we owe most of his mentions, always with both family and personal name, on the usual formal occasions in the following years: 1767–1769, 1771, 1772, 1774, 1775. On 17.VIII, 1774, the regent had sent the mgron-giṅ Ča-vu-lu mk'an-po to mediate the conflict between Sikkim and Nepal; in 1775 the Ča-vu-lu mk'an-po was sent out again with the same task, but this time he was accompanied by P'un-ts'ogs-rnam-rgyal. Their mission met with

---

2 DL7, 417a; TWC, 24.11b (where his personal name is given).
3 DL7, 501a.
4 The personal name is found only in TWC, 24.12a–b.
5 DL7, 508a, 512b, 557a; PC3, 156b.
6 PC3, 206a, 208a.
7 PC3, 215a, 238a, 245b.
8 YSGT, 45a, 55a.
9 YSGT, 56b, 49a.
10 YSGT, 60a.
11 YSGT, 62a.
12 PC3, 263a, 277a, 281a, 304b, 323a, 342b, 352b, 353a, 355a, 358a.
13 PC3, 354b.
14 PC3, 361b.
complete success, although the so-called treaty of Walung, was broken almost at once by the Gorkha king. On the same occasion they concluded with Nepal a treaty concerning monetary, commercial and traffic questions. He returned to gTsan on 18.II, 1776 and we get the rather odd information that in the same year the yoṅs-'dzin conferred upon him the vows of dge-bsen. He appears also in 1778, 1779 and 1781. The next mention of mda’-dpon Pad-ts’al belongs to February 1788. In the same year he was sent to stem the Gorkhali advance and in November he fought the invaders at Sa-hai, taking prisoners two of their leaders. It is likely, but by no means certain, that this was still P’un-ts’ogs-rnam-rgyal.

Another member of the family was bka’-mgon Pad-ts’al-ba T’s‘e dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal, who appears only once in 1790. In 1801 his son was one of the candidates to be selected by drawing lots from the golden bowl for the incarnation of yoṅs-’dzin Ye-ses-rgyal-mtstan.

Then the family receded in the background. A gTsan mda’-dpon Pad-ts’al-ba occurs in 1835 and another in 1857 and 1867. A ru-dpon Pad-ts’al-ba is mentioned in 1852–1853 and another in 1880. A śod-druṅ Pad-ts’al-ba was posted at Shigatse in 1882.

In recent times, Pad-ts’al-ba m Gon-po-un-ts’ogs (b. 1897) entered the service in 1917 and was appointed rNam-gliṅ rdzoṅ-dpon (HR). In 1924 he was Rin-spun rdzoṅ-dpon and in

---

1 Rose, 32–33. The Newari text of the treaty with Nepal, dated 895 Newari Samvat, bhadrapada śukla 3 (29th August, 1775), is found in SPS, 70–71; it seems to show that yoṅs-’dzin Ye-ses-rgyal-mtstan headed the Tibetan delegation, although his biography says nothing about it.

2 PC3, 366a.

3 YSGT, 92a.

4 PC3b, 27b, 34a, 35a, 36a, 37b, 44a–b, 63b; Samati, 32a, 64a; PC3c, 55a, 63a.

5 DL8, 167b.

6 KTSL, 1314.21a, 1315.30b–31a. Cf. Shakabpa, 158n, 159.

7 YSGT, 128a. He might be the son of mda’-dpon Pad-ts’al who was žabs-sdod in 1786 and 1788; DL8, 155a, 168a.

8 DL8, 279b.

9 DL10, 295b.

10 PC5, 61b, 180a.

11 bSam-yas, 234, 275.

12 PC5, 269a.

13 DL13, Ka, 102a.

14 SBR, 30.
1930 Pa-snam rdzoṅ-dpon. In the same year he was sne-šan to the Political Officer in Sikkim, Colonel Weir. He retired in 1934. He had married a sister of bKras-mt‘oṅ žabs-pad (HR).

His son mGon-po-dbaṅ-p’uṅ-g (b. 1915) was bka’-’gag to bKras-mt‘oṅ žabs-pad; he retired through ill-health. His brother (name unknown) was born in 1919, entered the service in 1939 and was P’ag-ri rdzoṅ-dpon in 1943 (HR).

The house of BSAM-GRUB-GLIṅ

A gTsan family. It appears in history with a bSam-grub-glin-pa, who about 1706 was one of the two mda’-dpon of Ŋaṅ (Central gTsan), the other being bKra-sis-rtse-pa. At the time of the Dsungar invasion in the autumn of 1717 he held the same command with the same colleague, and was placed under the orders of P’o-Iha-nas; but we hear nothing about his activities in the war, under Dsungar rule and in the following years. At the outbreak of the civil war in 1727 he was still mda’-dpon, this time with lCaṅ-lo-can-pa, and P’o-Iha-nas sent him an appeal to join him. We are not told about his reaction; and in any case this is the last mention of him.

In the following decades the family remained in obscurity, till we find a sde-pa bSo-d-nams-ts’e-rin whom the emperor on 9th March, 1789, rewarded with the peacock feather and the expectancy of the next vacant post of mda’-dpon. This is probably the same as the bSam-grub-glin-pa who was appointed dBus mda’-dpon in the 10th month of the same year. In 1791 he held a command against the Gorkhalis. He was wounded at Seṅ-ge-rdzoṅ on 7th October, 1791, and died on the following 25th October. His son Ts’e-rin-byuṅ-skyabs (?: Ts’e-ling-chung-chia-pu) was granted the rank of a fourth-class taiji, hereditary forever.

---

2 MBTJ, 57b, 71b.
3 MBTJ, 127a.
4 MBTJ, 248b.
5 KTSIL, 1323.27b–29b. Cf. KEKCL, 8.7b–8a.
6 DL8, 181b.
7 KEKCL, 7.19a–b, 8.7b–9a, 8.10b–11a, 17.8a–b, 47.30a–31a; WTTC, 13a.13b.
8 WTTC, pref. 37b–38a.
A gTsan mda’-dpon bSam-grub-gliṅ-pa appears again in 1808. He is certainly a different person, because at the end of the same year bSam-gliṅ taiji (i.e. Ts’e-riṅ-byun-skyabs) and a bSam-gliṅ mda’-dpon are mentioned together as two separate persons.

During the rest of the 19th century no member of the family played a role of some importance. In more recent times we find a bSam-grub-gliṅ-pa b So d-nams-rgyal-po (b. 1891), who entered the service in 1909 and was c’ibs-dpon in 1924.

His (?) son dBaṅ-p’ug-rgyal-po (b. 1913) entered the service in 1938 and was bka’-’gag to P’un-k’aṅ žabs-pad in 1939. He was appointed gNa’-lam rdzoṅ-dpon in 1942.

His brother P’un-ts’ogs-rdo-rje (b. 1918) entered service in 1941, but had not received an appointment by 1944 (HR).

The house of O-ROṅ

In the 18th century this was a prominent family of Koṅ-po, second only to Na-p’od. It seems that in the early years of the century they held the office of Koṅ-po mda’-dpon, which was abolished soon after.

A mda’-dpon O-roṅ-pa was killed fighting against the Dzungars in ’Dam (1717).

His son commanded the Koṅ-po troops in Lajang’s army after the death of his father. After the arrival of the Chinese and of the 7th Dalai-Lama he appears in 1721 with the rank of mda’-dpon.

An O-roṅ-pa from Nags-roṅ was put forward by bka’-blon Lumpa-nas as candidate for the office of junior bka’-blon (1723), but was not appointed.

A boy of six, son of the sde-pa O-roṅ-pa of Koṅ-po, was recognized in 1722 as the ’Brug-c’en incarnate.

---

1 DL9, 61b.
2 DL9, 76b.
3 ŠBR, 19.
4 Not listed in Pr. P. 1954.
5 MBTJ, 121a.
6 MBTJ, 127a.
7 DL7, 75b.
8 MBTJ, 205b.
9 Si-tu, 51a.
A Koñ-po O-roñ-pa is frequently mentioned as a respected nobleman, but without an official standing, between 1735 and 1749; all these entries seem to refer to Koñ-po O-roñ-pa b S o d - n a m s r a b - b r t a n , who occurs in 1753.

One generation later we find an O-roñ gžis-sdod S a n s r g y a s b s t a n - ' d z i n in 1781, 1783 and 1784. He was not a member of the old family, but an administrator of the estate.

The house of O-roñ had died out, apparently in the second half of the 18th century, and their estate was given to bŠad-sgra, to which family it belonged in 1913. The name O-roñ was used by a hereditary retainer of the bŠad-sgra (ZK).

---

1 Si-tu, 81b, 126b, 127a, 145b; DL7, 198a, 229a, 277b; PC3, 73a; Hsi-tsang chih, 3.2b (c. 1740; he is given the title of Koñ-po mda'-dpon).
2 DL7, 422a.
3 Suntari, 116a, 142a, 156a.
4 Bailey, 162.
V.

THE FORMER RULING HOUSE OF LCAÑ-CAN (P'O-LHA)

Because of the outstanding role played in the second quarter of the 18th century, the house of P'o-lha could be expected to be included in the highest nobility, the sde-dpon. However, this is not the case. The family never recovered from the disaster of 1750 and both the emperor and the Dalai-Lama, although recognizing their hereditary title of duke (kung), did not elevate them above the average sku-drag and saw to it that they should never obtain high office.

The ancestors of this house, Dar-rgyas and his younger brother A-gsum, were local magistrates in gTsän about the middle of the 17th century. A-gsum was granted by the Qošot ruler Dalai Khan the fief of 'Brum P'o-lha in the hills to the south of Gyantse, which became the main seat of his descendants 1.

His son Padma-rgyal-po played a role in the conquest of Western Tibet and the war against Ladakh (1681–1684) and died at the beginning of the 18th century.

He had several sons, of whom the eldest (gcen) is mentioned in 1697 and following years, but always without his personal name 2. Three of them were in turn the founders of the house of Hor-k'añ-gsar (q.v.) and another perhaps founded anew the house of Na-p'od (q.v.). But by far the most important of the brothers was bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas (1689–1747), usually called Mi-dbaṅ, the central figure of Tibetan history of the early 18th century; he ruled

1 MBTJ, 8a–10a. On P'o-lha see Wylie, 72, and the discussion in n. 255. We may add that 'Brum P'o-lha is Drungpala in Tucci 1956, 63.

2 MBTJ, 43a–b, 47a, 48a, 56a.
the country for nearly twenty years. A full account of his life is given in Petech 1972, to which book we may refer the reader.

The younger of his two sons, 'Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal, succeeded his father as "king" of Tibet. He was cut down by the ambans Fucing and Labdon on the 11th November, 1750. His wife and his son were sentenced to death; most of the family estates were confiscated; the title of chün-wang, granted to P'o-lha-nas in 1740 and confirmed to his sons, lapsed.

The lineage of P'o-lha-nas was continued through his elder son 'Gyur-med-ye-šes-ts'e-brtan, whom the Chinese usually called 'Gyur-med-tse-brtan. The emperor had granted him the titles of fu-kuo kung in 1731 and of chên-kuo kung in 1746; he was popularly known as the duke of mNa'-ris. He died, allegedly of illness but actually murdered, on January 25th, 1750. His elder son P'un-ts'ogs-dban-po met with the same fate.

The younger son 'Gyur-med-dban-rgyal barely escaped with his life. He had fallen into the hands of his uncle; but he was spared because the emperor had given strict orders for his protection, and he was interned in bKra-sis-lhun-po as a novice. When things settled down, the emperor, who remembered the loyal services of P'o-lha-nas, revived the title of fu-kuo kung in favour of 'Gyur-med-dbañ-rgyal. He was also given back some of his family estates, but not the main ones of P'o-lha and Rin-c'en-rtse, nor the government of mNa'-ris. The old house of P'o-lha had come to an end; 'Gyur-med-dbañ-rgyal founded a new one, in his own title and not as heir to his illustrious grandfather. To emphasize the break with the past, not even the old name was preserved; the new duke took the family name of lCañ-can, derived from the lCañ-lo-can mansion in Lhasa (north-west of the 'P'rul-snan, next to P'un-k'añ), which already in 1735 belonged to the sons of P'o-lha-nas. The name lCañ-can gun occurs for the first time in 1768 and 1777 and is the only one

---

1 On these events see Petech 1972, 198-229.
2 Ta-Ch'ing li-ch'ao shih-lu, Shih-tsung, 103.4b; KTSL, 256.6b-7b.
4 KTSL, 358.12a–13b, 273.9a–b.
5 Petech 1972, 228–229.
6 Si-tu, 81b, 126b. Waddell, map of Lhasa opposite p. 331, n. 26.
7 DL8, 50b; PC3b, 6b.
occurring in the Tibetan texts down to the present day; from our point of view, the choice was particularly unfortunate because of the always possible confusion with the lCaṅ-lo-can family of Gyantse, on which see pp. 200–203.

Gyur-med-dbaṅ-rgyal died in 1777. He was succeeded by Nor-bu-p'un-nts'sogs, who according to a Chinese source was not his natural son, but an adopted one. On 8th April, 1778, the emperor granted him as a special grace the continuance of the kung title, and in 1783 made it hereditary. He is the lCaṅ-can guṅ mentioned in 1779, 1780, 1781, 1783, 1786, 1788. He died in 1793.

His son and successor was Rin-ce nd baṅ-p'yuṅ, to whom the title was confirmed on 3rd April, 1794. He is the lCaṅ-can guṅ of 1796, 1798, 1808, 1813, and died in 1816.

His son and successor Ts'e-dbaṅ-'gyur-med is the lCaṅ-can guṅ of 1822, 1825, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1837. A doubtful piece of information is found in a Tibetan text: in the Fire-Ox year, Chia-ching 22, i.e. in 1817, lCaṅ-can guṅ bKra-sis-rab-brtan was appointed to the posts of rdzoṅ-dpon of Rin-c'en-rtse and of Yar-stod. As the date is doubly certain, it seems that the name of bKra-sis-rab-brtan is a mistake for that of his father Ts'e-dbaṅ-'gyur-med. The latter died in 1841.

His son was b K r a-s i s-r a b - b r t a n. In 1847 the emperor confirmed (somewhat belatedly) his title of kung; we get this information both from Chinese and Tibetan sources, and this coincidence

1 It is difficult to tell whether the mNa'-ris-pa family listed by Pr. P. 1954, n. 131, has some connection with the lCaṅ-can guṅ; Nor-bu-p'un-ts'ogs is expressly given the style of mNa'-ris kung in WTTC, 5.18a.
2 PC3b, 25a.
3 FPYL, piao 3.16b–17a (KCHLC, 24.1a–b). Also KCHLC, 104.2b.
4 KTSL, 1053.9b–10a; FPYL, 18.17a; KCHLC, 104.3a.
5 FPYL, piao 3.16b (KCHLC, 24.1a–b); KCHLC, 104.3a.
6 DL8, 103a, 160b; PC3c, 57b; PC4, 55a–b; Samati, 87a, 151a, 271b.
7 FPYL, piao 3.16b (KCHLC, 24.1a–b).
8 KTSL, 1448.11b, where the name is given as Rin-c'en-p'un-ts'ogs. I prefer the form given in FPYL, loc. cit., and CSK, 929a.
9 DL8, 252a, 266a; DL9, 57a, 75b, 145a–b.
10 CSK, 929a.
11 DL10, 101b, 155a, 1861, 194b, 213b, 243b, 314b.
12 "List of offices" in Tharchin, p. 165.
13 CSK, 929a.
14 DL11, 83b; CSK, loc. cit.
is absolute proof that the lCañ-can gun are indeed the descendants of P'o-lha-nas. He is the lCañ-can gun mentioned in 1855, 1860, 1873, 1874, 1877, 1878. He died some time before 1887.

A relative of his was the lCañ-can sras who in 1843 entered government service. In 1859 he went to K'ams and in 1861 the amban sent him to gTsan to settle questions of pay to the Chinese soldiery.

bKra-sis-rab-brtan's son and successor rNam-m-'gya-'ts'e-brtan was granted the title of kung on 31st August, 1887. He is the lCañ-can gun of 1909, but apart from this absolutely nothing is known about him.

Another member of the family was the rtsis-dpon to whom S.Ch. Das gives the title of Kung Chyang[-lo]-chen, probably by mistake. At the end of October 1881 he was in charge of the journey of the junior amban Wei-ch'ing to gTsan, failed to supply him with the extortionate amount of money he required, was sentenced to a flogging and was at the bottom of the trouble with the gTsan villagers, which was quelled by bka'-blon Lha-klu (q.v.) and Ram-pa. He must be the same as the rtsis-dpon lCañ-can who on New Year's day of 1888 was sent on a mission to P'ag-ri and took part in the fight at Luñ-t'ur on March 21st. He may not be identical with the rtsis-dpon lCañ-can sras mentioned in 1897.

rNam-rgyal-ts'e-brtan had two sons. The elder attempted to murder his parents and was therefore disowned by his family (ZK). The younger, lCañ-can sras bSod-nams-'rgyal-po (b. 1898) was given the title of kung by the Dalai-Lama in 1919. At the end of 1923 he was sent to Gangtok for a course in gunnery. When

---

1 DL11, 252b-253a; DL12, 72a, 193a, 221b; PC5, 253b; DL13, Ka, 45b, 46b.
2 DL11, 42a.
3 DL12, 49b.
4 PC5, 126a.
5 TTSL, 245.7a; CSK, loc. cit.
6 DL13, Ka, 76b.
8 DL13, Ka, 164a; CCCTT, Wen-shih, 7.15-17, 8.7-8; Shakabpa, 200.
9 DL13, Ka, 280a.
10 Correct date in Rahul 1962, 173, and Rahul 1969, 59; misprinted as 1878 in Rahul 1962, 192.
11 DL13, Ka, 173a.
12 DL13, Ka, 235a.
in 1925 the army tried to gain political power and failed, he incurred the displeasure of the Dalai-Lama and was deprived of his title ¹; this was the end of the hereditary dukedom of the lCañ-can house. In 1931 he got again a military rank and was posted to K'am (RI) ². In 1933 he was appointed sTod sgar-dpon; he did not go to Western Tibet, but sent a representative (HR). He himself worked as an assistant to the Dalai-Lama's favorite T'ub-bstan-kun-p'el (alias Kun-’p'el-lags) in the Grva-bži factory near Lhasa. He was implicated in his downfall and in 1934 was banished to Koñ-po; in 1937 he fled to India together with Kun-’p'el-lags ³. While staying at Kalimpong, in 1940 he helped Sir Basil Gould to translate into Tibetan his account of the finding and enthronement of the 14th Dalai-Lama ⁴. In 1951 he went back to Lhasa and was given the title of taiji (TK). In 1959 he was still alive in Tibet (ZK).

From his first wife, whom he divorced, he had a son called d Bañ-dr do-rje (b. 1914), who left the family and founded a separate branch, the lCañ-zur. He entered service in 1934, became Rinrtse rdzoñ-dpon in 1942 and assistant to the mdo-spyi in 1943. In 1946 he came back to Lhasa (HR).

bSod-nams-rgyal-po had two sons from another wife. The elder, called d Bañ-’gyur-rgya-p (b. 1922), entered the service in 1939 and became ’Ol-dga’ rdzoñ-dpon in 1942. He married a daughter of bKras-mt‘on žabs-pad (HR).

¹ Rahul 1962, 192.
² According to Rahul 1962, he was appointed mda’-dpon, but this is denied by ZK.
³ Rahul 1962, 192.
Family tree of lCañ-can (P‘o-lha)

A-gsum (fl. c. 1640-1670)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Padma-rgyal-po d.c. 1700</th>
<th>dGra-’dul d. 1720</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas</td>
<td>Noyan Qošüci Rab-brtan d. 1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruler 1728-1747, d. 1747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>house of Hor-k’añ-gsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Gyur-med-ts’e-brtan d. 1750</td>
<td>’Gyur-med-rnam-rgyal, ruler 1747-1750, d. 1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P’un-ts’ogs-dbañ-po d. 1750</td>
<td>’Gyur-med-dbañ-rgyal d. 1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor-bu-p’un-ts’ogs d. 1793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rin-c’en-dbañ-p’yug d. 1816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts’e-dbañ-’gyur-med d. 1841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bKra-sis-rab-brtan d. before 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rNam-rgyal-ts’e-brtan d. after 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bSod-nams-rgyal-po alive 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dBañ-’gyur-rgyal-po</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL MINISTERS (BKA’-BLON BLA-MA)

Following a proposal submitted by the Manchu commissioners in Tibet and sanctioned by the emperor in 1751, one seat in the bka'-\textit{sa}g was reserved to a Lama, presented by the Dalai-Lama from among his monk officials (\textit{rtse-dru}n), chiefly of the treasury.

The first incumbent was Ñi-ma-r gy a l-m t s\' a n, of the lDum-ra-k'aña-gsar (lDum-k'aña) family from 'P'yoñs-rgyas. His earlier career is fairly well known. In 1735 he was appointed mgron-\textit{g}i\textit{er} \textsuperscript{3}. In 1739 the Dalai-Lama sent him to re-establish discipline in the monastery of T'ai-ning (mGar-t'ar in Eastern Tibet) \textsuperscript{4}. In 1746 he was still a mgron-\textit{g}i\textit{er} \textsuperscript{5}, and somewhat later received the title of darhan. In 1751 he was appointed bka'-blon and received also the title and seal of jasak bla-ma \textsuperscript{6}. In 1754, following a request by the \textit{ambans}, he was placed in particular attendance to them as a sort of liaison officer \textsuperscript{7}. He is mentioned, mostly on ceremonial occasions, in 1756, 1757, 1761 and 1765 \textsuperscript{8}, and died in 1767 \textsuperscript{9}.

\textsuperscript{1} KTSL, 385.15b–16a (= Petech 1972, 276).
\textsuperscript{2} In TWC, 24.6b–7a, he is wrongly described as a nephew of the 7th Dalai-Lama, perhaps confusing him with bsKal-bzañ-bstan-'dzin-rnam-rgyal. – The lDum-ra-k'aña-gsar-pa Ts'e-dbañ-rnam-rgyal, who in 1756 was appointed co-governor ('ga-pa shrel-zla) of Nag-c'u (DL7, 498a; TWC, 24.14b–15a), may have been his nephew or a relative.
\textsuperscript{3} DL7, 191a–b.
\textsuperscript{4} KTSL, 100.11a.
\textsuperscript{5} DL7, 327b.
\textsuperscript{6} KTSL, 386.17b–18a (= Petech 1972, 280); DL7, 386a; TWC, 24.7a.
\textsuperscript{7} DL7, 473b, 475a.
\textsuperscript{8} DL7, 489b, 496a, 499a, 506b, 542b, 557a; PC3, 187b, 239b.
\textsuperscript{9} PC3, 265b.
We have no direct information about his successor. However, we may hazard a guess. There was one b s K a l – b z a n – y o n – t a n, who appears as darhan mk'an-po in 1754, 1757 and 1758 1. After a long silence we find him in 1782 as former minister (bka'-zur) Guñ-t'añ mk'an-po 2. We may suppose that he had filled the ecclesiastic seat in 1767 and had resigned in 1773.

The next bka'-blon bla-ma was b s K a l – b z a n – b s t a n – 'd z i n – r n a m – r g y a l, a nephew of the 7th Dalai-Lama and therefore a brother of the bSam-p'o duke bKra'-śis-rnam-rgyal. In 1759 he was a simple c'os-mdzad 3. Afterwards he became a darhan mk'an-po, and on 18.X, 1773, he announced to the Pañ-c'ën his appointment as bka'-blon 4. In 1778 he was still in charge 5, but in the 5th month of 1779, when he was appointed sne-san to Pañ-c'ën passing through Lhasa on his way to Peking, he was a bka'–zur 6. He is mentioned also at the time of the return of the corpse of the Pañ-c'ën in 1780 7, and on formal occasions in 1782 and 1786 8. He died in 1787 9.

His successor was b s K a l – b z a n – r n a m – r g y a l. Nothing is known of his early career. Early in the 7th month of 1779 he was already a bka'-blon (and a jasuk bla-ma), accompanying the Pañ-c'ën on his way out of Lhasa 10. In the same year he took part in the restoration work at the 'P'rul-snañ 11 and in 1780 in the ceremonies for the corpse of the Pañ-c'ën 12. After that, the Tibetan texts usually allude to him merely by his title, without giving the personal name 13. During the Gorkha war be acted in 1791 as the trusted agent of the

1 DL7, 440b, 449b, 423a, 534a; PC3, 137a, 152b. He is mentioned with the title of darhan mk'an-po but without a date in TWC, 24.16a, and in KDJB, 15b.
2 DL8, 130b.
3 DL7, 557b.
4 PC3, 334a.
5 PC3b, 27a.
6 PC3b, 59b, 63a.
7 PC3c, 54b.
8 Samati, 134b, 270b.
9 DL8, 167a, where his titles are given as bka'-zur bSam-p'o'i rje-drun darhan. He was a benefactor of Kloň-rdol Bla-ma; KDJB, 15b.
10 PC3b, 70a, 71a; PC3c, 4a.
11 Samati, 217a.
12 PC3c, 56b.
13 DL8, 151a, 196b; Samati, 109a, 349a; PC 4, 55a.
Dalai-Lama in the abortive negotiations for a truce. In the 12th month he went out of Lhasa to receive the imperial commander-in-chief Fukangga. At the beginning of the intercalary 4th month (May) of 1792 he met at rGya-mda' in Kn̤-po the amban Ho-lin coming to Lhasa. But he must have died immediately afterward, because his funeral rites were performed in Lhasa on 26.V (c. 14th July), 1792.

The next bka'-blon bla-ma was Byams-pa-stobs-ladan. As usual he issued from the financial branch of the ecclesiastical administration, being mentioned with the title of p'yaq-mdzod[-c'en-po] several times between 1778 and 1791. Apparently he owed his career to the protection of the Samati Pakši; he was an old pupil of his and sponsored the biography of his master. In the 6th month of 1791 he received the seal of jasak lama, and about the same time the Dalai-Lama nominated him as the new bka'-blon bla-ma; on 27.VII he was already a bka'-blon (probably acting), accompanying a Manchu officer to seize the Žva-dmar-pa monastery of Yaṅs-pa-can. His formal installation by the Dalai-Lama seems to have taken place in the 10th month. As to the imperial confirmation, it took a longer time. The proposal was forwarded to Peking only at the end of 1792, and in a somewhat different form; the amban Ho-lin requested that he should be placed in charge of the dependants of the monasteries of the Dalai-Lama. This definition seems to apply rather to the office of spyi-k'ya br 'mk'an-po than of bka'-blon; but the filling of the vacant post in the bka'-śag was intended implicitly. The emperor, commenting upon the evil consequences of the nepotism and corruption which characterized the presentations the Dalai-Lama had made in the past,
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1 KTSL, 1392.9a.
2 DL8, 200b; KEKCL, 11.8a, 11.13b.
3 WTTC, 13b.4b–5a; KEKCL, 31.10b, 31.12b.
4 DL8, 204b. Further rites were performed on 2.II, 1792; DL8, 206b.
5 PC3b, 282b; PC4, 55a, 64a; DL8, 150b, 187a; Samati, 34b, 119b, 166b, 274b, 330b, 343a–b, 354a.
6 Samati, 397b.
7 Samati, 382a–b.
8 WTTC, 13c.1b.
9 Samati, 394b.
10 KTSL, 1416.18b–19a; KEKCL, 45.13a.
nevertheless sanctioned the appointment, but merely as a special case; he laid down that the clerical reservation should be waived upon Byams–pa–stobs–ldan’s retirement or death. Regulations were ordered to be framed accordingly. The new bka’-blon bla-ma thus got his final confirmation. His name occurs rather sparingly in the following years. In 1794 he was present at the smon-lam festival and later in that year he visited the Pan-c’en. In 1800 he supervised the drawing of lots from the golden bowl for the new incarnation of his old master Samati Pakṣi. A last mention belongs to 1804. In 1805 he was involved in the bribery case against the amban Ts‘e–pa–k’e, whom dGa’-bži bsTan–’dzin–dpal–’byor had heavily bribed to procure a seat in the bka’-ṣag for his son. Since three seats were already filled by K‘ri–smon, bŚad–sgra and Zur–k’an, and since dGa’-bži appears as bka’-blon soon after, it is clear enough that Byams–pa–stobs–ldan had ceded his seath to dGa’-bži with the connivance of the amban. The whole unsavoury proceeding was made possible by the vacancy of the Dalai-Lama see; probably the regent was too weak to hinder this serious weakening of the influence of the clergy in the government. In any case, in the 10th month of 1808 Byams–pa–stobs–ldan appears as retired bka’-blon (bka’-zur).

The rescript of 1792 having thus taken its effect, there was no ecclesiastic bka’-blon during most of the 19th century. Only in 1867 the monk dPal–ldan–don–grub, then all-powerful at the court of the young Dalai-Lama, received an appointment as joint minister (bka’-blon las–’p’ar); of course the post lapsed with the execution of dPal–ldan–don–grub after the failure of his coup in 1871.

The clerical reservation was revived in or shortly before 1878.
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1 KTSL, 1417.14b–15a; M CSL, 882b; KEKCL, 46.2b–3b, 48.22a.
2 DL8, 221b; PC4, 80b.
3 DL8, 277a.
4 DL8, 338a.
5 See under dGa’-bži, p. 60.
6 The account of Shakabpa, 171–172, seems to be not wholly accurate.
7 DL9, 80b.
8 DL12, 143b.
9 The survey Pundit Kishen Singh, who visited Lhasa in 1878, informed his employers that the bka’-ṣag had been expanded to include four laics and one Lama; Records of the Survey of India, VIII, Dehra Dun 1915, 222. Also according to Das, 231, that was the situation which had come “lately” into being.
and the fact received its official confirmation when an imperial rescript dated 12th April, 1879, appointed Blo-bzan-yon-tan as supernumerary member of the bka'-šag. We find his name for the first time in 1861, when he was governor (’go-pa) of Nag-c’u; in that year he was appointed mk’an-c’uň. In 1862 he seems to have played some indefinable role in the events which led to the deposition of the regent Rva-sgraen sprul-sku. In 1866 he was granted the rank of mk’an-druň c’e-ba with the title of ta bla-ma. In 1871 he succeeded the rebel dPal-lidan-don-grub in the office of spyi-k’yab mk’an-po. On 10.XII, 1874, he received the young ailing Dalai-Lama back in Lhasa from his fatiguing journey to C’os-k’or-rgyal, and in the following year he and bka’-blon mDo-mk’ar were charged with the erection of the tomb of the 12th Dalai-Lama. At that time he was at the top of the ecclesiastical pyramid of Tibet, and thus his choice for the re-established post of bka’-blon bla-ma was almost a matter of course. After his appointment he is seldom mentioned; in 1880 he took part in the smon-lam festival and in 1882 he organized a ceremony. He retired from active duty at the end of 1888 or at the beginning of 1889.

Yešes-p’u1-byuň, of the ’Bum-t’aň family, was in 1859 a rtse-mgron, included among the officials charged with the protection of the Tsa-ri pilgrimage due in the following year. In 1862 we find him associated with Blo-bzaň-yon-tan in whatever action (if any) he was engaged in. In 1873 he was sde-druň. After some obscure years we find him in November 1888 with the title of ta bla-ma, holding the post of acting supernumerary bka’-blon. This was his rank when he returned from the frontier to Lhasa (February 1889).
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12 DL12, 193a.
13 CCCTT, Sheng-ť’ai, 1.16.
to report on the situation. In April and May of the same year he went again for a spell to the frontier, again to gather information. Upon his final return to Lhasa in July he was appointed full bka'-blon. In 1890 and 1891 he was in Lhasa, but in the 6th month of 1892 he was sent again to P'ag-ri. In 1893 he was put in overall charge of frontier affairs and in June of that year he was sent to the Chumbi valley and to Darjeeling, as a successor to bka'-blon bŚad-sgra, to follow as observer the British–Chinese negotiations. We have no further information about him, and he may have died soon after.

Hitherto the ecclesiastical seat in the bka’-śag had been a super-numerary one, and the Chinese documents are at pains to point out the fact repeatedly. But in the 3rd month of 1894 the Tibetan “officials, upper, middle and lower” (drugi drag-briṅ-dkyus), i.e. the unofficial, newly formed so-called National Assembly (ts’ogs-du), decided, after a formal bow to imperial authority, to return to the statutes of 1750; the bka’-śag was to consist once more of three lay and one ecclesiastical member. Accordingly, as the bka’-blon mDo-mk’ar was applying for leave, his seat was provisionally occupied by bla-p’yag g’Yu-t’og mk’an-c’un ‘Jam-dbyaṅs-bstan-’dzin. Soon after, probably after mDo-mk’ar-ba’s final retirement in 1896, the seat was finally filled by a monk.

We are completely in the dark as to who this regular bka’-blon bla-ma was, as all our sources are silent on the subject. He definitely was not g’Yu-t’og ‘Jam-dbyaṅs-bstan-’dzin (q.v.), who later became a spyi-k’yab mk’an-po.

The next incumbent was mK’yen-rab-byaṅ-c’ub-dpal-bzaṅ, of the C’an-k’yim family. In 1892 he was mk’an-drui and directed some building works at ’Bras-spuṅs. In 1897 he was a mk’an-c’e on the staff of bka’-blon Zur-k’aṅ in the preparations
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for the Dalai-Lama's tour to the three great monasteries. In 1900 he was employed in the work at the 'P'run-snañ. In 1901 we find him as bka'-blon. On 13th October, 1903, he was dismissed and imprisoned like all his colleagues, but was freed very soon and lived quietly at C'añ-k'ym for some time (TK). In 1907 the Dalai-Lama, then at Hsi-an, appointed him as one of the three blon-c'en. Late in 1908 he joined the Dalai-Lama, then at Peking, and in April 1909 he took his leave and returned to Lhasa. In 1910 he fled to India together with the Dalai-Lama, whereupon the amban dismissed him and ordered his arrest. In 1912 he played a role in the negotiations with the Chinese commanders for the evacuation of Lhasa. Nothing is known of his activity in the following years; he died shortly before the arrival of the British mission in November 1920.

Byams-pa-bstan-'dzin was a rtse-mgron in 1882, when he directed some repairs at gDan-sa-t'il, and in 1888, when he together with P'uñ-k'añ sras led some 1000 men of Brag-g-yab coming through Lhasa on their way to the Sikkim border. He was mk'an-druñ in 1897, on the staff charged with the preparations for the forthcoming visit of the Dalai-Lama to the great monasteries, and thus in 1898 accompanied him to dGa'-ldan. On 17.III, 1900, he was present at a great solemn audience. In 1903, after the dismissal of C'añ-k'ym-pa, the Dalai-Lama appointed him acting bka'-blon bla-ma. In 1904 he became also commander-in-chief of the Tibetan army and in July negotiated with Colonel Younghusband at Gyantse; having failed to stem the British advance, he lost his head and fled away. In July
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5 Shakabpa, 221.
6 DL13, K'a, 63a, 65a.
7 HTTC, 34.24a-25a.
8 DL13, K'a, 114a; Shakabpa, 243.
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13 Younghusband, 211. Younghusband calls him the Ta Lama.
and August of that year he negotiated the treaty of Lhasa 1. But immediately after the departure of the British he was dismissed and arrested 2. He died in 1914 or 1915 (ZK).

Blo-bzān-'p rin-las (b. 1860) was in 1898 rtse-mgon, charged with a mission to Ńag-ron 3. In 1903 he was mk'an-druñ and in April of that year he was sent, along with mda’-dpon Ts’a-roñ-pa to the Chumbi valley to parley with Captain O’Connor first at Ge’u-sgañ (Giaogong) and then at Gam-pa-rdzoñ (Khambadzong) 4. He may have been the druñ-yig c’en-mo who accompanied the “Ta Lama” and whom Younghusband regarded as the evil influence (HR). In 1904 he was appointed bka’-blon 5. In 1909 he went out to receive the Dalai-Lama returning from China 6. When the latter fled to India, he remained in Lhasa; but the Chinese decreed his dismissal 7. Nothing else is known about him, and he may have died soon after.

bsTan’-dzin-dbañ-po was a rtse-druñ in 1888/9, when he was in charge of some maintenance work at bSam-yas, and in 1890 8. He was a sort of confidential agent of the Dalai-Lama in the border talks with White and Nolan in November 1895 9. In March 1896 the new amban Wên-hai 受海 sent him to Chumbi with a dBus mda’-dpon; at the same time he invited the Viceroy of India Lord Elgin to hold border talks for the delimitation of the border. Nothing materialized during the whole of the summer, but in November bsTan’-dzin-dbañ-po had several interviews with White 10. In 1910 he is said to have been a deputy bka’-blon and to have followed the Dalai-Lama to India 11; he is apparently identical with the bka’-druñ bsTan’-dzin-rgyal-po,
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1 CCCTTT, Yu-t’ai, 1.17-18, 1.18-19; Landon, 11, pp. 64, 102.
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3 See back under Hor-k’ab-gsar, p. 195.
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whom the Chinese sentenced to death *in absentia*\(^1\). In any case, he was never a full *bka’-blon*. He died in India in 1911 (*ZK*).

*bsTan-*’dzin-c’os-grags was a *rtse druñ* in 1885 and 1888\(^2\). Later he became a *p’ogs-dpon mk’an-c’uñ*, and after the flight of the Dalai-Lama the Chinese appointed him *bka’-blon bla-ma*; of course he was disowned by the Dalai-Lama and was dismissed and imprisoned when the latter returned to Lhasa at the beginning of 1913\(^3\).

Byams-pa-bstan-dar was a young *dge-ts’ul* when in 1883 he came to Lhasa in the train of the Caghan Nomin Han\(^4\). Later he became a *bka’-druñ*, and at the end of 1911 the Dalai-Lama instructed him to make secret preparations for the Tibetan revolt against the disorganized Chinese forces of occupation\(^5\). Soon after he was appointed *bka’-blon*. He entered Lhasa, and on 6.XII, 1912, he went to mNes-t’añ to meet the Dalai-Lama and to bring him to the capital\(^6\). In the same year he was sent to K’ams, to organize the resistance of the local officials against the Chinese; he obtained an overwhelming success in the short war of 1917–1918. In 1918 he was appointed concurrently *mdo-spyi*; he died at C’ab-mdo in 1922\(^7\).

Par-k’an rGyal-mts’an-p’un-ts’ogs (1863–1939) entered the service in 1886 and appears as *rtse-druñ* in 1900\(^8\). At the end of 1909 the Dalai-Lama appointed him co-head of a skeleton Foreign Bureau\(^9\). A few weeks later the Dalai-Lama, on the eve of his flight from Lhasa, gave order to the regent to appoint him acting *bka’-blon*, but he was debarred by the Chinese\(^10\). In 1914 he took Byams-pa-bstan-dar’s place in the *bka’-šag* as assistant minister (*šabs-pad las-rogs*) with the title of *jasak*\(^11\); he is mentioned as such in 1919 and in summer 1923\(^12\). He retired from office soon afterward.
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Blo-bzan-bstan-sknyon is a very pale figure; almost nothing is known of him. In 1922 he was mk'an-druŋ, charged with financial work along with rtsis-dpon Luṅ-śar. He was appointed bka'-blon bla-ma about 1925 (TR, ZK) and died in 1931.

do Ge-'dun-c'os-dar was in 1903 a rtse-druṅ and was sent to the Chumbi valley with Blo-bzan-'pr'in-las. Then he became a mk'an-druṅ and in 1926 was appointed ecclesiastic co-head of the Foreign Bureau. He became bka'-blon bla-ma in 1932 and died in 1934.

t'ub-bstan-sākya (1886-1950), a nephew of blon-c'en C'aṅ-k'yim-pa, was a rtse-druṅ when in the 3rd month of 1909 he went to China to visit the Dalai-Lama. Between 1913 and 1915 he was employed in the office of the blon-c'en, and accompanied bŚad-sgra to Simla. He was appointed rtse-mgron upon his return and is repeatedly mentioned between 1920 and 1926, mostly in connection with festivals and ceremonies. He was appointed bka'-blon in 1934 and retired in 1939 (HR). He died in 1950 (HR, TK).

bstan-pa-'jam-dbyangs (1888-1944) was appointed mk'an-druṅ in 1934, and almost at once concurrently ecclesiastic commander-in-chief (dmag-spyi). He succeeded T'ub-bstan-sākya as bka'-blon and held the seat till his death in 1944 (HR, TR).

T'ub-bstan-kun-mk'yen (c. 1896-1959), of the Ram-pa family, was in charge of the Ri-bo-c'e monastery for three years and was investigating officer in sPo-bo and in K'aṁs. In 1933 he became a druṅ-yig c'en-mo, was given the title of ta bla-ma in 1939 and was appointed bka'-blon bla-ma in September 1944 (HR); he was the most influential member of the bka'-šag. He resigned soon after
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the arrival of the Chinese in Lhasa in 1951 (*HR, TK*). In 1959 he tried to escape, but was too old to get beyond the 'P'an-yul valley (*HR*); he was arrested and died soon after (*TR*).

Don-po m K 'y e n - r a b - d b a ñ - p ' y u g (c. 1897–1959) was in 1924 *rtse*- *druñ* and Za-lha g žis-*sdod*¹; in 1925 he was steward (*las-* 'dzin) of the dPal-'k'or-c'os-sde monastery of Gyantse². In the thirties he was *mk'an*- *druñ*³. From Gyantse he went as assistant to the *jasak bla-*ma of Shigatse, then was *spyi*-k' yab of gTsän in the absence of the Pan-c'en. He became *druñ*-yig c'en-mo in 1936 and *mk'an*- c'en in 1940, which virtually implied retirement from the service (*HR*). He was appointed *bka’-blon bla-*ma in 1951 (*TK*) and retired in 1956 (*PL, TK*). In 1959 he was arrested, but being seriously ill was transferred to the hospital, where he died almost at once (*TK*).

sNe'u-śar T u b - b s t a n - t a r - p a (b. 1913) was appointed a *bla-p'yag* in May 1938. In September 1939 he accompanied *bka’-blon* Bon-gron to meet the new Dalai-Lama at Nag-c'u-k'a⁴. He became clerical head of the Foreign Bureau in 1947 and *bka’-ts’ab* in 1951 (*HR, PL*). Late in 1952 he headed a Tibetan delegation to Peking and gave some much-advertised talks on the radio on his impressions of the new China⁵. In September 1954 he accompanied the Dalai-Lama on his visit to Peking⁶. In 1955 he became *bka’-blon bla-*ma and fled with the Dalai-Lama to India in 1959. Afterward he was for some time the Dalai-Lama’s representative in New York, then retired and lived for some time in a monastery in New Jersey (*ZK*). In 1971 he returned to India and lives now (1973) in Dharamsala (*PL*).

When the Dalai-Lama betook himself to Yatung in 1950, he nominated two *srîd-blon*, to carry on administration in his absence. One of them was a monk, called Blo-bzaì-bkra-sís. In 1952 the Chinese accused him and his lay colleague Klu-k’añ-pa of obstructing reforms and of heading an anti-Chinese organization, the People’s Council;
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they applied pressure and on 27th April secured his dismissal without replacement 1. After the abortive rising of 1959 he was cast into prison, where he died in 1966 2.

1 Dalai-Lama, 91–92; Shakabpa, 301, 305–306; Taring, 183; Tibet, 736.
### (A) DALAI-LAMA

| I. | dGe-'dun-grub | 1391 – 1475 |
| II. | dGe-'dun-rgya-mts'o | 1475 – 1542 |
| III. | bSod-nams-rgya-mts'o | 1543 – 1588 |
| IV. | Yon-tan-rgya-mts'o | 1589 – 1617 |
| V. | Nyag-dbañ-blo-bzañ-rgya-mts'o | 1617 – 1682 |
| VI. | Ts'ans-dbyañs-rgya-mts'o | 1683 – 1706 |
| VII. | Blo-bzañ-bskal-bzañ-rgya-mts'o | 1708 – 1757 |
| VIII. | 'Jam-dpal-rgya-mts'o | 1758 – 1804 |
| IX. | Luñ-rtogs-rgya-mts'o | 1806 – 1815 |
| X. | Ts'ul-k'rim-rgya-mts'o | 1816 – 1837 |
| XI. | mK'as-grub-rgya-mts'o | 1838 – 1856 |
| XII. | 'P'rin-las-rgya-mts'o | 1856 – 1875 |
| XIII. | T'ub-bstan-rgya-mts'o | 1876 – 1933 |
| XIV. | bsTan-'dzin-rgya-mts'o | 1935 – |

### (B) PAN-Č'EN RIN-PO-Č'E

| I. | Blo-bzañ-č'os-kyi-rgyal-mts'an | 1570 – 1662 |
| II. | Blo-bzañ-ye-šes | 1663 – 1737 |
| III. | Blo-bzañ-dpal-ldan-ye-šes | 1738 – 1780 |
| IV. | Blo-bzañ-bstan-pa'i-ñi-ma | 1782 – 1853 |
| V. | Blo-bzañ-dpal-ldan-č'os-kyi-grags-pa-bstan-pa'i-dbañ-p'yug | 1855 – 1882 |
| VI. | Blo-bzañ-č'os-kyi-ñi-ma | 1883 – 1937 |
| VII. | Blo-bzañ-'P'rin-las-lhun-grub-č'os-kyi-rgyal-mts'an | 1938 – |
(C) REGENTS AFTER 1750

De-mo sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-'jam-dpal-bde-legs-rgya-mts'o 1757 – 1777
Samati Pakši Ṋag-dbañ-ts'ul-k'rms 1777 – 1781
rTa-ts'ag sprul-sku Ye-šes-blo-bzañ-bstan-pa'i-mgon-po 1789 – 1790
Samati Pakši Ṋag-dbañ-ts'ul-k'rms (second term) 1790 – 1791
rTa-ts'ag sprul-sku Ye-šes-blo-bzañ-... (second term) 1791 – 1810
De-mo sprul-sku Blo-bzañ-t'ub-bstan-'jigs-med-rgya-mts'o 1811 – 1819
mTs'o-smon-gliṅ sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-'jam-dpal-ts'ul-k'rms 1819 – 1844
The Fourth Pan-c'en Rva-sgren 1844 – 1845
Samati Pakši sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-ye-šes-ts'ul-k'rms-rgyal-mts'an 1845 – 1855
Rva-sgren sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-ye-šes... (second term) 1856 – 1862
bŠad-sgra dBañ-p'yug-rgyal-po 1862 – 1864
yons-'dzin Blo-bzañ-mk'yen-rab-dbañ-p'yug 1864 – 1872
rTa-ts'ag sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-dpal-ldan-c'os-kyi-rgyal-mts'an 1875 – 1886
De-mo sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-blo-bzañ-’p'rin-las-rab-rgyas 1886 – 1895
K'ri Rin-po-c'e Blo-bzañ-rgyal-mts'an 1904 – 1909
K'ri Rin-po-c'e Ṋag-dbañ-blo-bzañ-bstan-pa'i-rgyal-mts'an 1910 – 1912
Rva-sgren sprul-sku T'ub-bstan-'jam-dpal-ye-šes-rgyal-mts'an 1934 – 1941
sTag-brag sprul-sku Ṋag-dbañ-gsuñ-rab-grub-t'ob-bstan-pa'i-rgyal-mts'an 1941 – 1950

(D) PRIME MINISTER

blon-c'en

bŠad-sgra dBañ-p'yug-rgyal-po 1907 – 1919
C'añ-k'yan mK'yen-rab-byañ-c'ub-dpal-bzañ (eccles.) 1907-c. 1920
Žol-k'añ Don-grub-p'un-ts'ogs 1907 – 1925
**srīd-blon**

Glaṅ-mdun Kun-dga’-dbaṅ-p’jug 1926 – 1939  
Klu-k’aṅ Ts’e-dbaṅ-rab-brtan 1950 – 1952  
Blo-bzaṅ-bkra-sis (eccles.) 1950 – 1952

**E** **BKA’-BLON**

mDo-mk’ar Ts’e-riṅ-dbaṅ-rgyal 1728 – 1763  
T’on-pa Sri-gcod-ts’e-brtan 1728–1765(?)  
dGa’-bži rNam-rgyal-ts’e-brtan 1731 – 1739  
’Broṅ-rtse dBaṅ-rgyal-ts’e-brtan 1734 – 1750  
dGa’-bži Paṅḍita 1739 – 1782  
Ñi-ma-rgyal-mts’an 1751 – 1767  
bSam-grub-p’o-braṅ Kun-dga’-bstan-’dzin 1763 – 1773  
T’on-pa Srid-ži-dbaṅ-’dus 1765(?)–1787  
(bs Kal-bzaṅ-yon-tan)(??) 1767 – 1773  
bs Kal-bzaṅ-bstan-’dzin-rnam-rgyal 1773 – 1778  
mDo-mk’ar bSod-nams-dbaṅ-rgyal 1773 – 1788  
bs Kal-bzaṅ-rnam-rgyal 1779 – 1792  
dGa’-bži bsTan-’dzin-dpal-’byor 1783 – 1791  
bSam-grub-p’o-braṅ bKra-sis-rnam-rgyal 1788–1789/90  
g-Yu-t’og (’Bum-t’aṅ) bKra-sis-don-grub 1788 – 1791  
Hor-k’aṅ bSod-nams-bkra-sis 1789/90–1792  
Lha-sdiṅs Don-grub-ts’e-dbaṅ 1792(?)–1801  
P’a-lha bsTan-’dzin-rnam-rgyal 1792(?)–(1801)  
Byams-pa-stobs-ldan 1792 – 1805  
bŚad-sgra Kun-dga’-dpal-’byor 1792(?)–(1804 ?)  
K’ri-smon rDo-rje-ts’e-riṅ 1801 –(1813)  
Zur-k’aṅ Sri-gcod-ts’e-brtan 1804 – 1815  
dGa’-bži Mi-’gyur-bsod-nams-dpal-’byor 1805 – 1834  
bŚad-sgra Don-grub-rdo-rje (1808) – 1839

---

1 Only titular bka’-blon are listed, to the exclusion of deputy and joint bka’-blon (bka’-ts’ab and bka’-blon las-p’ar). The names of ecclesiastical ministers (bka’-blon bla-ma) are printed in italics. Dates between brackets indicate the first or last mention in the texts of the bka’-blon concerned.
The only mention of this bka’-blon is found in a Chinese document dated 12th October, 1873. He and the monk rim-bži Ye-šes-c’os-p’el seriously obstructed a political process, about which details are missing. For this the emperor ordered their dismissal; MTSL, 356.27a-28a.
When the Dalai-Lama and all his ministers except Ts'e-rod dBaṅ-p'yug-rgyal-po fled to India in 1910, the Chinese compelled the regent to appoint as bka'-blon Glad-mt'oṅ, Ram-pa and bsTan-'kin-c'os-grags. They were not recognized by the Dalai-Lama and were imprisoned when the Chinese occupation collapsed in 1912.
When the *bka’-sag* was abolished in March 1959, it included also the *bka’-ts’ab* bSādzur 'Gyur-med-stobs-rgyas (since 1951), who was practically considered as a full *bka’-blon*. The same position had been held by g’Yu-t’og bKra-sis-don-grub (1956–1957).
GLOSSARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS

bka'-mgon (in full: bka'-śag mgon-gñer); intermediary official entrusted with forwarding petitions from lower officials, transmitting the reply or orders etc.; 6th rank; three laymen.

bka'-'gag (in full: bka'-śag 'gag-pa); ushers of the bka'-śag; 7th rank; three laymen. They were specifically allotted each to one of the lay bka'-blon as a sort of A.D.C. (HR).

bka'-druñ (in full: bka'-śag druñ-yig); head of the secretariat office of the bka'-śag. Graded in senior (b. c'e-ba; 6th rank, two laymen) and junior (b. c'un-ba; 7th rank, three laymen).

bka'-blon (in full: bka'i-guñ-blon); minister, ordinary member of the bka'-śag; 3rd rank; four laymen (1728–1751, 1804–1878) or three laymen, one monk (1751–1804, 1878–1959).

bka'-blon bla-ma; ecclesiastic member of the bka'-śag.

bka'-blon las-'p'ar; joint bka'-blon. A distinguished senior official who was exceptionally promoted to the 3rd rank and took part in the sittings of the bka'-śag as a supernumerary member (PL).

bka'-ts'ab (in full: bka'-blon las-ts'ab); deputy bka'-blon. A senior official who officiated for a bka'-blon during his absence (PL).

bka'-śag (in full: bka'-blon śag lhan-rgyas); council of ministers; also its office rooms.

bka'-śod (in full: bka'-śag śod-druñ); member of a subordinate secretarial section of the bka'-śag, concerned mainly with ecclesiastic affairs (ZK). Two laymen. They were also responsible for the issue of lam-yig (travelling passes) and similar documents (PL). One of them was allotted to the bka'-blon bla-ma as a sort of private secretary (HR).

bka'-śod dge-rgan; monk official who was the head of the bka'-śod. The office was abolished by the 13th Dalai-Lama (ZK).

sku-dñas; head of a noble family.
k'ul; this term originally indicated a district, but was later replaced by rdzoñ. It is still used, with the more vague meaning of region or province.

mk'an-druñ (in full: mk'an-po druñ-yig); members of the yig-ts'añ. Monks. Graded in one senior (mk'an-c'e, in full mk'an-druñ c'e-ba; chairman, usually with the title ta bla-ma) and three juniors (mk'an-c'uñ, in full mk'an-druñ c'uñ-ba).

mk'an-po; in general: abbot, spiritual head of a monastery or college.

In Chinese texts: same as spyi-k' yab mk'an-po.

dge-rgan (in full: dge-bskos r gan-pa); chief disciplinary executive in a monastery.

mgRon-gñier; at the court of the Dalai-Lama and of the Pañ-c'en: chamberlain. With higher officials: a sort of liaison and public relations man.

mgRon-gñier c'en-mo; chief chamberlain of the Dalai-Lama. Monk. 'go-pa; head of some districts (Nag-ts'añ, Nag-c'u).

gar-dpon; high commissioner in Western Tibet (sTod s.; 5th rank; two laymen) and in North-Eastern Tibet (mDo s.; usually monk).

gos-gžis; estate (other than the p'a-gžis) granted by the government to a noble family.

brgya-dpon; military officer, below the ru-dpon; 6th rank; 24 laymen. c'ibs-dpon (or rta-dpon); master of horse and controller of the stud; 6th rank; two laymen; the senior of the two was styled c'ibs-dpon c'en-mo, usually shortened into c'ibs-c'e.

rje-druñ; ecclesiastic official of noble birth.

ta bla-ma; half-Chinese title, granted to the mk'an-druñ c'e-ba and to other high ecclesiastic dignitaries.

tog-'dzin; expectant official, i.e. one who is designate for an appointment (usually as rdzoñ-dpon), of which he may use the title, but without the powers attached thereto (PL).

do-dam-pa; head of a las-k'tuñs (q.v.).

druñ-k'or; more usual form of šod-druñ (q.v.).

druñ-rtsis; officials of the ecclesiastic chamber (yig-ts'añ) and of the finance office (rtsis-k'añ) in their corporate capacity, e.g. as leaders of the ts'ogs-'du (HR).

druñ-yig; secretary, lower official in general.

druñ-yig c'en-mo; popular designation of the mk'an-druñ (q.v.).

mda'-dpon; high military officer, provincial commander; 4th rank;
at first four laymen (one in dBuš, three in gTsan); since 1751 five, later six, in the 20th century several more.
mdu-na-'don; literary style for bka'-blon.
mdo-spyi (in full: mDo-smad spyi-k' yab); high commissioner in Eastern Tibet.
ldu-n-pa; military officer, below the brgya-pa; 7th rank; 120 laymen.
sde-druñ; same as mk'an-druñ.
nañ-so; for the meaning of this title in the middle ages see Tucci 1949, 35. During the 18th and 19th century the nañ-so was a lay official, who together with a mk'an-po was in charge of the regular biennial missions to the court of Peking. In the 20th century nañ-so was an official peculiar of the Nag-c'u district, who originally had to control and report upon the local people, while the p'yi-so performed the same duty for the foreigners. During the last years both became mere assistants to the Nag-c'u 'go-pa (PL).

rnam-gan (in full: rnam-sras gan-mdzod); reserve treasury in the Potala. sne-san; any official appointed to act as guide, in charge of the travel arrangements for the Dalai-Lama, the Pañ-c'en, the Chinese amban and foreign guests.

spyi-k' yab mk'an-po; highest ecclesiastical official. Stands in the same relation to the yig-ts'añ as the srid-blon to the bka'-šag.

spyi-mdar (in full: spyi-k' yab mda'-pa); for a short time after 1913 title of the commander-in-chief.

p'a-gžis; hereditary estate, from which a noble family usually takes its name.

p'ebs-'byams 'go-pa; keeper of the Dalai-Lama's palanquin, an honorific charge and practically a sinecure. Graded into senior (p. rgan-pa) and junior (p. gžon-pa).

p'ogs-k'añ; office of the paymaster of the army; also his subordinates. p'ogs-pa; paymaster of the army; 4th rank; one layman, one monk.

p'yag-mdzod-pa; general title of the chief officials of the state treasuries.


bla-p'yag (in full: bla-bran p'yag-mdzod-pa); head of the main state treasury in the Bla-bran buildings near the 'P'ruñ-snañ cathedral; 4th rank; one lay, two monks.
blon-c'en; grand minister, connecting link between the Dalai-Lama and the bka'-šag.

mag-pa; member of a noble family who marries into another and takes their name, becoming a member to all effects.

mi-dpon (in full: snañ-šag mi-dpon); magistrate of Lhasa city; 5th rank; two laymen.

dmag-spyi (in full: dmag-gi spyi-k'yab); commander-in-chief of the army; 1913–1929 one layman; 1929–1934 vacant; after 1934 one monk and one lay.

rtsam-len, rtsam-bžes-pa; collector of barley flour due as taxation; 7th rank; one layman, two monks.

rtsis-k'añ; office of finance.

rtsis-pa; subordinate official in the rtsis-k'añ.

rtsis-dpon; director of finance; 4th rank; three (later four) laymen.

rtsis-p'rug; pupil in the finance school (rtsis-bslabs).

rtse-druñ; monk official.

rtse-p'yang (in full: rtse 'p'ral-bde p'yag-mdzod-pa); head of the 'p'ral-bde p'yag-mdzod, the private treasury of the Dalai-Lama in the Potala; 4th rank; one lay, two monks.

ts'ogs-du; the so-called National Assembly, formed at the end of the 19th century and including the higher officials and representatives of the major monasteries.

rdzoñ; one of the 53 districts of Tibet; more properly, the castle which was its headquarters.

rdzoñ-dpon (obsolete form: rdzoñ-sdod); governor of a district (rdzoñ).

rdzoñ-g'gis; districts and estates, a general description of the administrative units outside Lhasa.

žabs-druñ; title of some high incarnates and of ecclesiastic heads of a few families of the high aristocracy.

žabs-sdod, žabs-sgar-pa; new official, appointed to the lowest rank of the bureaucracy.

žabs-pad; common title for bka'-blon.

žib-dpyod; control by a official specially appointed by government; this control could refer to land-revenue settlement, taxation matters, border dispute etc. (PL).

žol-gñer (also žol-sde-pa; currently and popularly known as žol-pa); magistrate in charge of the dependency (žol) at the foot of the Potala and of the state prison there; 5th rank; two laymen, one monk.
gžis-sdod; administrator of government estates; three of the 6th rank, 13 of the 7th rank.

zur; suffix added to the first syllable of a title to indicate a retired official; e.g. bka’-zur, retired bka’-blon; mda’-zur, retired mda’-dpon.
gzims-dpon; master of the bedchamber; the Dalai-Lama’s chief private servant. One monk.
yig-ts’añ; highest governing body of the clergy, a sort of ecclesiastic bka’-šag.

rim-bži; fourth-rank official. General title of the members of the upper bureaucracy.
ru-dpon; military officer, below the mda’-dpon; 5th rank; twelve laymen.
las-šuṅs; special governmental agencies, created by the 13th Dalai-Lama; e.g. p’yi-rgyal las-šuṅs (foreign bureau), so-nam las-šuṅs (agricultural office), etc.
las-ts’an-pa; lesser official (noble or commoner) in a las-šuṅs.
šod-druñ; noble lay official.
bšer-dpañ; law adviser to the bka’-šag sitting as court of appeal; 5th rank; two laymen.
sa-dbañ; popular style for bka’-blon.
sras-rnam-pa; member (son) of a noble family.
srid-blon; minister of state; took the place of the earlier blon-c’en.
gsol-dpon; cup-bearer of the Dalai-Lama. One monk.
lha-gñer (in full: Lha-sa gñer-ts’añ). The duties of these officials were supervising and providing catering services to the central government, and looking after public buildings and temples of Lhasa; in practice they formed the municipality of the capital (ZK). 5th rank; two laymen, one monk.
APPENDIX

The šin–byi roll

This document (ŠBR) was brought from Tibet by Professor Heinrich Harrer, who in January 1973 ceded it, together with his whole Tibetan collection, to the Ethnological Museum of the University of Zürich; it is registered now as Cat. Nr. 14480.

The roll contains a list (mts’an–t’o) of the lay officials (sod–druñ) for the Wood–Bird (šin–byi) year 1924. It is written in cursive Tibetan (dbu–med) and consists of 46 lines, with three or four entries each. An entry consists of the family and personal names of the official in a bold calligraphic hand, under which a line in a smaller and less readable writing gives the following information: 1) Age of the official in 1924 (more tibetico, i.e. counting both starting and last year); 2) date of his entrance in government service (žabs–sdod); 3) office held in 1924.

The particular importance of this document lies in its absolute reliability as far as dates are concerned. Also, in the case of families with two or more names, it shows which was the one in official use.

1.1 šin byi – sod druñ rnams kyi mts’an t’o bkod par
Žva sgab pa bsTan ’dzin rnam rgyal | rañ lo 73 me yos [1867]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis pa |
gNas gsar ba C’os ’byor dbañ p’yug | rañ lo 61 me p’ag [1887]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Goñ dkar rdzoñ sdod |
1.2 C’a lu zur pa rDo rje dbañ rgyal | rañ lo 56 sa byi [1888] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis pa |
IDum k’añ pa dBañ–’dus–rdo–rje |
sNar skyid pa bSod nams rgyal po | rañ lo 62 c’u ’brug [1892]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sNe gdoñ rdzoñ sdod |
sNe stod zur pa bsTan skyoñ dbañ po | rañ lo 52 c’u ’brug
[1892] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTiṅ skyes rdzoṅ sdod |
1.3 t’a’i ji Ram pa ba bSod nams mgon skyabs | raṅ lo 50 c’u ’brug
[1892] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
sPel bži ba bSod nams kun dga’ | raṅ lo 48 c’u ’brug [1892] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sbrags spyi las ts’an pa |
K’e smad sras Rin c’en dbaṅ rgyal | raṅ lo 51 šiṅ rta [1894] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta so nam do dam pa |
1.4 sGog mk’ar ba sKal bzaṅ don grub | raṅ lo 48 šiṅ rta [1894] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Zo k’a gžis sdod pa |
Zas žim pa Karma ts’e dbaṅ | raṅ lo 51 šiṅ lug [1895] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta dBus mda’ dpon |
Brag t’on pa Žiṅ skyoṅ dbaṅ p’yug | raṅ lo 51 šiṅ lug [1895] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sNe gdoṅ rdzoṅ sdod |
mDo bde skyid pa Padma ts’e ’p’el | ......... (too faint to be read)
1.5 Man spel ba bSod nams rgyal po | raṅ lo 53 šiṅ lug [1895] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rim bži |
Ts’a rti ba rTa mgrin rgyal po | raṅ lo 50 me bya [1897] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Šel dkar rdzoṅ sdod |
Sa luṅ pa Ts’e rīṅ stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 43 sa k’yi [1898] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta mda’ dpon |
rTa ra mdo pa sKal bzaṅ rgyal mts’an | raṅ lo 53 sa k’yi [1898] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta so nam do dam pa rim bži |
1.6 sKyar srib pa Padma dbaṅ c’en | raṅ lo 43 sa p’ag [1899] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTiṅ skyes rdzoṅ sdod |
g’Yu t’og sras Ts’e rīṅ dbaṅ ’dus | raṅ lo 44 sa p’ag [1899] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtse p’yag |
sMon mts’o ba Ts’e dbaṅ rig ’dzin | raṅ lo 41 sa p’ag [1899] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sTod sgar dpon |
1.7 K’yuṅ ram pa Don grub rgyal po | raṅ lo 41 sa p’ag [1899] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTsaṅ mda’ dpon |
gNam dpon pa Mig dmar ts’e rīṅ | raṅ lo 41 lcags glaṅ [1901] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rGyal rtse ts’oṅ spyi las ts’an pa |
Luṅ šar ba rDo rje ts’e rgyal | raṅ lo 44 lcags glaṅ [1901] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis dpon |
T’aṅ dpon pa rNam rgyal dbaṅ ’dus | raṅ lo 47 lcags glaṅ [1901] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTsaṅ mda’-dpon |
1.8 Mu šaṅs bya rigs pa P’yag rdor ts’e rīṅ | raṅ lo 50 lcags glaṅ [1901] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gZhis rtse spyi rdzoṅ rim bži |
sNaṅ dkar ba dBaṅ p’yug mt’ar p’yin | raṅ lo 47 c’u stag [1902]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Nag c’u ’go pa |  
rGyal groṅ pa bSod nams dбаṅ brtan | raṅ lo 45 c’u stag [1902]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta snaṅ šag mi dpon |  
1.9 bKra šis dpal ra ba P’yag rdor dбаṅ p’yug | raṅ lo 41 c’u stag [1902]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Dar ma gžis sdod |  
mDo mk’ar sras bsTan ’dzin rnam rgyal | raṅ lo 39 c’u stag [1902]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta p’og dpon |  
sPo śod sras Ts’e riṅ ’gyur med | raṅ lo 40 c’u stag [1902]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta mTs’o sna rdzon sdod |  
1.10 guṅ P’un k’aṅ pa bKra šis rdo rje | raṅ lo 37 c’u stag [1902]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTsaṅ ’bru bskyel do dam pa |  
La zur ba dPal ldan ts’e riṅ | raṅ lo 53 c’u yos [1903]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta mDzo sgaṅ tog ’dzin |  
Rin c’en sgaṅ pa sKal bzaṅ ni ma | raṅ lo 45 śiṅ ’brug [1904]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Seṅ rdzon rdzon sdod |  
T’aṅ smad pa bSod nams dбаṅ p’yug | raṅ lo 38 śiṅ ’brug [1904]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sKyid groṅ rdzon sdod |  
1.11 sNe stod pa Ts’e dбаṅ rnam sras | raṅ lo 39 śiṅ sbrul [1905]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta dBus mda’ dpon |  
Bye pad sras Ts’e dбаṅ rnam rgyal | raṅ lo 38 śiṅ sbrul [1905]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis dpon |  
’Bum t’aṅ pa bSod nams dpal ’bar | raṅ lo 47 śim sbrul [1905]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta dBus ’bru bskyel las rogs las ts’an pa |  
1.12 lCog spe ba bSod nams stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 45 śiṅ sbrul [1905]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta ’On Brag k’a tog ’dzin |  
T’on pa sras Don grub rgyal po | raṅ lo 38 me rta [1906]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bšer dpāṅ |  
K’ro dga’ bo Blo bzaṅ t’ub bstan | raṅ lo 38 me rta [1906]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka’ druṅ las ’p’ar |  
Bon śod pa Ts’e brtan rdo rje | raṅ lo 36 me rta [1906]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka’ šag druṅ yig |  
1.13 dza sag Lha klu ba P’un ts’ogs rgyal po | raṅ lo 42 me rta [1906]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta žol gñer |  
P’un rab pa sKal ldan rigs ’dzin | raṅ lo 38 me rta [1906]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bšer dpāṅ |  
P’un i lcags pa Don grub dpal ’byor | raṅ lo 35 me rta [1906]  
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bšer dpāṅ |
žabs sdod žus | da lta snañ ság mi dpon |

1.14 Lha sдиhs pa mGon po sњan grags | rañ lo 57 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bla p'yag |
Zur k’añ sras dBañ c’en ts’e brtan | rañ lo 34 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sku sruñ mga’ dpon |
Yol ri ba dKon mc’og nor bu | rañ lo 42 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta c’os ’bru’i do dam |
gNañ byuñ ba Padma don grub | rañ lo 30 (sic!) me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka’ mgon |

1.15 Brag dkar ba bSod nams dBañ ’dus | rañ lo 39 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sPu hreu rdzoñ sdod |
rGyal nañ ba dPal ’byor rdo rje | rañ lo 34 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta P’ag ri rdzoñ sdod |
sTag sna ba rNam rgyal don grub | rañ lo 34 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta mga’ dpon |
Roñ brag pa dGra ’dul rdo rje | rañ lo 36 me lug [1907] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Nag ts’añ ’go pa |

1.16 Nu ma ba sKal bzañ rdo rje | rañ lo 45 sa spre [1908] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rTse sgnñ rdzoñ sdod |
sњ'e luñ pa Nam mk’a’ ts’e dBañ | rañ lo 35 sa spre [1908] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sku sruñ ru dpon |
mTs’o sgo ba bSod nams dBañ ’dus | rañ lo 34 sa spre [1908] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta ’don dmag ru dpon |

1.17 mK’ar gdoñ pa Blo gros ts’e riñ | rañ lo 35 sa spre [1908] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Dol gžis sdod |
IDan bya ts’añ pa dBañ c’en nor bu | rañ lo 33 sa spre [1908] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta P’ag ri rdzoñ sdod |
t’a’i ji sDe dge sras P’un ts’ogs rdo rje | rañ lo 47 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
P’a lha sras P’un ts’ogs rnam rgyal | rañ lo 34 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rGyal rtse rdzoñ sdod |

1.18 C’ab spel ba ’Jigs med kun dga’ | rañ lo 34 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTsañ mga’ dpon |
dGon t’añ pa Ye šes don grub | rañ lo 34 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta P’yöñ rgyas rdzoñ sdod |
C’a lu ba bSod nams p’un ts’ogs | rañ lo 34 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Lhun rtse rdzoñ sdod |

1.19 sTag sna gžon pa bSod nams ts’e dBañ | rañ lo 33 sa bya [1909]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Gön dkar rdzoñ sdod |
bSam grub gliñ pa bSod nams rgyal po | rañ lo 34 sa bya [1909]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta c'ibs dpon |
Rag rtsib pa bSod nams stobs c'en | rañ lo 44 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sTod sgar dpon |
1.20 gDoñ sna sras bKra šis don grub | rañ lo 34 sa bya [1909] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Roñ šar šo pa |
Blo bzañ nor bu | rañ lo 50 sa bya [1909] lo žabs k'oñs kyi | da lta las ts'an pa |
Blo bzañ rin c'en | rañ lo 46 sa bya [1909] lo žabs k'oñs kyi | da lta las med |
mK'ar mts'o ba bsTan 'dzin dpal 'byor | rañ lo 30 lcags k'yi [1910] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Rin spuñs tog 'dzin |
1.21 dGe rgyas pa dBañ 'dus rdo rje | rañ lo 30 lcags k'yi [1910] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta C'u šur rdzoñ sdod |
Brum pa sras Ts'e brtan dbañ p'yug | rañ lo 45 lcags k'yi [1910] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sPo bo c'os rdzoñ tog 'dzin |
Lha luñ zur lci ba Blo bzañ nor bu | rañ lo 35 lcags p'ag [1911] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta p'yug gñer tog 'dzin |
De bžin pa Don grub rgyal mts'an | rañ lo 43 lcags p'ag [1911] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta mTs'o sna tog 'dzin |
1.22 Yul lha ba bsTan pa ts'e dбаñ | rañ lo 46 c'u byi [1912] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
sGo yañs pa bSod nams p'un ts'ogs | rañ lo 40 c'u byi [1912] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta 'P'yoñs rgyas rdzoñ sdod |
sKyid smad pa dBañ c'en p'un ts'ogs | rañ lo 37 c'u byi [1912] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sPo bo c'os rdzoñ |
1.23 Sras nañ sras Don grub dбаñ rgyal | rañ lo 35 c'u glañ [1913] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta lha gñer |
bKras mt'оñ pa 'Gyur med rgya mts'o | rañ lo 35 c'u glañ [1913] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gTsañ mda' dpon |
1Diñ bya bo rDo rje rgyal mts'an | rañ lo 28 c'u glañ [1913] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta .... mda' dpon |
'Bri yul ba bSod nams dбаñ rgyal | rañ lo 34 c'u glañ [1913] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Sa ŋaŋ 'go pa |
1.24 Byiñ zur pa P'un ts'ogs dбаñ rgyal | rañ lo 33 c'u glañ [1913] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
bSad sgra sras dPal 'byor bsod dбаñ | rañ lo 29 šiñ stag [1914]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis dpon |
Šel gliṅ sras 'C'i med rdo rje | raṅ lo 29 šin stag [1914] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta mDa' mk'ar rdzoṅ sdod |
Glaṅ mt'oṅ pa Don grub rdo rje | raṅ lo 41 šin stag [1914] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta sKyid groṅ rdzoṅ sdod |
1.25 Gliṅ dbon pa 'P'rin las p'un ts'ogs | raṅ lo 35 šiṅ stag [1914]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gNa' naṅ śo pa |
Žol k'aṅ sras Rin c'en 'od zer | raṅ lo 39 šiṅ stag [1914] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta rGyal rtse rdzoṅ sdod |
Sreg šiṅ pa Ts'e riṅ rnam rgyal | raṅ lo 47 šiṅ stag [1914] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta Lhun rtse rdzoṅ sdod |
1.26 Lha mdun pa Padma rdo rje | raṅ lo 34 šiṅ stag [1914] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta E Ňin mk'ar gžis sdod |
'Jun pa ba Nor bu bsam grub | raṅ lo 34 šiṅ stag [1914] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta gNa' naṅ śo pa |
sNam skyid bu Blo bzaṅ rgyal po | raṅ lo 33 šiṅ stag [1914] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta c'ibs dpon |
sDiṅ yon pa rNam rgyal rdo rje | raṅ lo 44 šiṅ stag [1914] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta žol gñer |
1.27 Rin sgaṅ pa bSod nams rab brtan | raṅ lo 39 šiṅ stag [1914] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta Sa dga' 'go pa |
T'aṅ naṅ pa sKal bzaṅ mi 'gyur | raṅ lo 30 šiṅ yos [1915] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta rGyal gñer sdod |
bDe mk'ar ba Ts'e dbaṅ rab brtan | raṅ lo 29 šiṅ yos [1915] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' 'ṣag druṅ yig |
sKyid zur ba 'Jigs med dpal 'bar | raṅ lo 31 šiṅ yos [1915] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta rDzoṅ dga' rdzoṅ dpon |
1.28 dKar byuṅ pa 'C'i med g'yul rgyal | raṅ lo 32 šiṅ yos [1915]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Pa rnam rdzoṅ sdod |
K'ri smon sras bSod nams nor bu | raṅ lo 28 šiṅ yos [1915] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta lha gñer |
rTa ra ba sKal bzaṅ dbaṅ p'yug | raṅ lo 32 šiṅ yos [1915] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
Dol rab pa bsTan 'dzin rnam rgyal | raṅ lo 32 me 'brug [1916]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rNam gliṅ rdzoṅ sdod |
1.29 Bar mts'o ba 'Jigs med bstan 'dzin | raṅ lo 36 me 'brug [1916]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Sa dga' 'go pa |
rDo dgon pa bSod nams stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 26 me 'brug [1916]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Gra p'yi gžis sdod |
bDe smon pa rNam rgyal p'un ts'ogs | rañ lo 24 me 'brug [1916]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sku sruñ ru dpon |
1.30 dza sag Brum pa rNam rgyal rgyal mts'an | rañ lo 27 me sbrul [1917]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Mal guñ tog 'dzin |
Pad ts'äl ba mGon po p'un ts'ogs | rañ lo 28 me sbrul [1917]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Rin spuñs rdzoñ sdod |
t'a'i ji dGa' bži ba bsTan 'dzin nor bu | rañ lo 25 me sbrul [1917]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta da pa'i mda' dpon |
1.31 Byams pa skal bzañ | rañ lo ... me sbrul [1917]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta ru dpon las ts'an pa |
1Cags šar ba rNam rgyal rdo rje | rañ lo 33 me sbrul [1917]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta 'Ol dga' rdzoñ sdod |
gDoñ sna sras gžon pa dBañ 'dus rdo rje | rañ lo 28 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Gliñ ..... gžis sdod |
bSod nams sgañ pa P'un ts'ogs ts'e dباñ | rañ lo 31 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rGya mts'o gžis sdod |
1.32 Nor nañ pa bSod nams rdo rje | rañ lo 27 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta sKy u rnam rdzoñ sdod |
Ka bži pa dBañ c'en p'un ts'ogs | rañ lo 23 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rGya mda' rdzoñ sdod |
rña 'bo ts'a rti ba Kun dga' dpal 'byor | rañ lo 35 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta dGa' c'os las 'dzin |
mK'ar ldan pa bKra šis rdo rje | rañ lo 27 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rDzoñ dga' rdzoñ dpon |
1.33 dGa' bde ba rDo rje dgra 'dul | rañ lo 26 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta ..... rdzoñ sdod |
sKyid sbug pa dBañ 'dus nor bu | rañ lo 28 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
sñe mo mdo mk'ar ba 'Jam dpal ts'e dbañ | rañ lo 23 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rTsa hreñ rdzoñ sdod |
1.34 sñañ groñ pa bSod nams dBAñ 'dus | rañ lo 23 sa rta [1918]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
K'e smad sras bSod nams dBAñ 'dus | rañ lo 24 sa lug [1919]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' mgron |
sMan stod bu Ņag dBAñ bstan 'dzin | rañ lo 24 sa lug [1919]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta P'o brañ tog 'dzin |
sMar lam pa 'Jigs med dgra lha | rañ lo 23 sa lug [1919]
lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta sNa rtse rdzoṅ sdod |
1.35 ka śod pa C'os rgyal ŋi ma | raṅ lo 22 sa lug [1919] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gSaṅ rdzoṅ rdzoṅ sdod |
bSam p'o t'a'i ji Ts'e dбаṅ rig 'dzin | raṅ lo 20 sa lug [1919] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gur pa'i-tog 'dzin |
Ts'es gsum p'un k'aṅ pa sKal bzaṅ dбаṅ p'yug | raṅ lo 28 sa lug [1919] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Lho rdzoṅ rdzoṅ sdod |
1.36 sKyid zur gžon pa P'un ts'ogs stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 26 sa lug [1919] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
K'e smad sras gžon pa Ts'e dбаṅ don grub | raṅ lo 21 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' śod druṅ yig |
sMon gliṅ pa 'Jam dbyaṅs rgyal mts'an | raṅ lo 22 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Jo rdzoṅ rdzoṅ sdod |
1.37 Žol k'aṅ sras gžon pa Don grub rdo rje | raṅ lo 27 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' 'gag |
1Kog groṅ pa Ts'e brtan don grub | raṅ lo 29 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Ts'al gžis sdod |
C'a zur bu Don grub ts'e riṅ | raṅ lo 30 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis k'aṅ yig .... |
Na smon pa bSod nams stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 25 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' 'gag |
1.38 gNas gsar bu bSod nams stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 34 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' 'gag |
gSar byuṅ sras dBaṅ 'dus rin c'en | raṅ lo 22 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' mgron las 'p'ar |
bSam p'o sras dPal ldan c'os rgyal | raṅ lo 23 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta Lha sa'i 'go 'doms bka' ts'ab |
Mu bya bu Ts'e riṅ bkra śis | raṅ lo 26 lcags spre [1920] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsis pa |
1.39 Šan k'a ba 'Gyur med stobs rgyal | raṅ lo 29 lcags bya [1921] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
mDo mk'ar sras P'un ts'ogs rab rgyas | raṅ lo 22 lcags bya [1921] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' śod druṅ yig |
sDiṅ yon bu Ts'e riṅ dar rgyas | raṅ lo 25 lcags bya [1921] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' śod druṅ yig |
1.40 sPel bži bu 'Gyur med dge ldan | raṅ lo 25 lcags bya [1921] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta gur pa'i tog 'dzin |
1Cog spe bu bSod nams dбаṅ 'dus | raṅ lo 22 lcags bya [1921]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta dBaṅ ldan gžis sdod |
Byan nos pa Rig 'dzin rdo rje | raṅ lo 23 lcags bya [1921] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta las med |
Śud k'ud pa 'Jam dbyaṅs mk'as grub | raṅ lo 20 lcags bya [1921]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta 'Dus byuṅ gžis sdod |
1.41 Brag dkar bu Lha dbaṅ rgyal po | raṅ lo 23 lcags bya [1921] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta bka' 'gag |
sGog mk'ar bu rTa mgrin dbaṅ p'yuṅ | raṅ lo 26 lcags bya [1921]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
C'a pa sras Ts'e riṅ dbaṅ 'dus | raṅ lo 20 c'u k'yi [1922] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta rtsam len |
Že bo ba Ts'e riṅ dbaṅ 'dus | raṅ lo 24 c'u k'yi [1922] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta bka' 'gag |
1.42 'P'riṅ riṅ pa P'un ts'ogs g'yul rgyal | raṅ lo 47 c'u k'yi [1922]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rim bži |
K'yams stod pa bSod nams bkra śis | raṅ lo 30 c'u k'yi [1922]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
bKras bde ba P'un ts'ogs rgyal po | raṅ lo 31 c'u k'yi [1922]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
1.43 rDo groṅ pa Ts'e riṅ rdo rje | raṅ lo 32 c'u k'yi [1922] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta las med |
sKyid stod sras rNam rgyal dбаṅ p'yuṅ | raṅ lo 20 c'u p'ag [1923]
lo žabs sdod žus | da lta rtsa ĝner |
Lha sdiṅ sras bSod nams ts'e riṅ | raṅ lo 23 c'u p'ag [1923] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
'Bras k'ud pa Nor bu ts'e brtan | raṅ lo 21 c'u p'ag [1923] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
1.44 Ža sgab bu Blo gsal don grub | raṅ lo 20 c'u p'ag [1923] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta las med |
Ru t'og pa rNam rgyal dбаṅ 'dus | raṅ lo 30 c'u p'ag [1923] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
gYu t'og sras bKra śis don grub | raṅ lo 19 šiṅ byi [1924] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
P'u luṅ bu P'un ts'ogs dбаṅ rgyal | raṅ lo 19 šiṅ byi [1924] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
1.45 Yul lha bu rNam rgyal don grub | raṅ lo 26 šiṅ byi [1924] lo
žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
1Dum k'aṅ pa Ts'e riṅ nor bu | raṅ lo 24 šiṅ byi [1924] lo žabs
sdod žus | da lta las med |
mts’o sgo gzhon pa dNobs grub rdo rje | rañ lo 21 šiṅ byi [1924] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
’Byorrgyas pa rTa mgrin rdo rje | rañ lo 20 šiṅ byi [1924] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
1.46 sNon luṅ pa rDo rje rnam rgyal | rañ lo 19 šiṅ byi [1924] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
Brag ’jun pa bsTan pa ts’e riṅ | rañ lo 21 šiṅ byi [1924] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
mK’ar mts’o ba rDo rje rnam rgyal | rañ lo 22 šiṅ byi [1924] lo žabs sdod žus | da lta las med |
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mā'yen gzigs bcu pa c'en po Interstitial Nag dbaṅ blo bsan 'jam dpal bstan 'dzin ts'ul k'rims rgya mts'o dpal bsan po'i rnam par t'ar pa no mts'ar nor bu'i p'ren ba.
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**DL12** = Life of the Twelfth Dalai-Lama 'P'rin-las-rgya-mts'o (1856-1875), compiled by the yoins-'dzin of the 13th Dalai-Lama: Lha rin ches srid zi'i gtsug rgyan rgyal me c'en sgriṅ 'c'aṅ ba bcu gnis pa c'en po'i rnam par t'ar pa rgya mts'o lta bu las mdo tsam brjod pa dains šel me loṅ.

**DL13** = Life of the Thirteenth Dalai-Lama T'ub-bstan-rgya-mts'o (1876-1933), compiled by the P'ur-lcog yoins-'dzin Byams-pa-ts'u-l-k'rims and printed at the Žol par-k'an in 1940: Lha rin ches srid zi'am gtsug rgyan gong sa rgyal ba'i dbaṅ po bka' drin mts'un smed sku p'ren bcu gsum pa c'en po'i rnam par t'ar pa rgya mts'o lta bu las mdo tsam brjod pa no mts'ar. Vols Ka and K'a of the gsun-'bum of the 13th Dalai-Lama.

**DPDG** = Life of P'ur-bu-lcog Nag-dbaṅ-byan-pa (1862-1872), written by the 3rd Pan-c'en: Dus gsum 'saṅs rgyas t'ams kyi no bo rigs daṅ dkyil 'k'o rgya mts'o'i mna' bdag bka' drin mts'un smed rje btsun Nag dbaṅ byams pa rin po c'e'i rnam par t'ar pa dad pa'i 'dab bryaṅ bzhad par byed pa'i ni ma. In vol. Ga of the gsun-'bum of the 3rd Pan-c'en.
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**HTCC** = Ta-Ch'ing li-ch'ao shih-lu; Hsian-t'ung cheng-chi 大清歷朝實錄 宣統政紀.

**HTSL** = Ta-Ch'ing li-ch'ao shih-lu, Hsüan-tsung 大清歷朝實錄 宣宗.

**JTS** = Ta-Ch'ing li-ch'ao shih-lu, Jên-tsung 大清歷朝實錄 仁宗.

**KCCHLC** = Kuo-ch'iao ch'i-hsien lei-chéng 國朝耆獻類徵, edited by Li Huan 李桓.

**KDJB** = Life of Klon-rdol Bla-ma Nag-dbaṅ-blo-bzaṅ (1719-1794), compiled by the 2nd 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bzad-pa in c. 1786; dpal Idan bla ma dam pa kun spans c'en po Nag dbaṅ blo bsan dpal bsan po'i rnam par t'ar pa dad pa'i myu gu. In the gsun-'bum of the 2nd 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bzad-pa.

**KDTT** = Life of Klon-rdol Bla-ma Nag-dbaṅ-blo-bzaṅ (1719-1794), compiled by rTa-ts'ag rje-drúi (1762-1810), regent of Tibet: rJe btsun bla ma dam pa kun spans sems dpal c'en po grub pa'dan p'yang Nag dbaṅ blo bsan dpal bsan po'i rnam t'ar mgs gus rin c'en 'dren pa'i šin rta rgyal sras spyod pa'i rgyan.

**KEKCL** = Ch'in-tíng K'uo-érk-k'a chi-lüeh 欽定廓爾喀紀略.

**KPRPC** = Autobiography of Kon-sprul Blo-gros-md'ta-yas (1813-1899): P'рогs med ris med kyi bstan pa la bden šin dge sbyon gi gugs brñan 'c'an ba Blo gros md'ta-yas kyi sde'i byun ba brjod ba nor bu sna ts'ogs mdog can. Stops with 1894. Included in the Rin-c'en gter-mdzod.

**LdGR** = La-dvags rgyal-rabs, published by A. H. Francke, Antiquities of Indian Tibet, II, Calcutta 1926.

**LZTK** = Life of Blo-bzaṅ-ts'u-l-k'rims-byams-pa-rgya-mts'o (1825-1901), yoins-'dzin
of the 13th Dalai-Lama, compiled in 1903 by order of the 13th Dalai-Lama: bKa’
d rin gsum ldan rigs dan dkyil ‘khor rgya mts’o’i mi’a’ bdag mk’an c’en yo’is ‘dzin rdo
rje ’c’a’i rje btsun Blo bza’i ts’ul k’rims byams pa rgya mts’o dpal bza’i po'i rnam par
t’ar pa rgya mts’o lta bu’i na'i nas dad pa’i gsos su c’a’ sas tsam brjod pa mk’as ma'i
mdzes par byed pa’i don bza’i me tog gi mgul rgyan gsar ba. In vol. Ka of the gsun-
’bum of the 13th Dalai-Lama.

MBTJ = Life of P’o’-ha’-nas bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas (1869-1747), written in 1733 by
mDlo-mk’ar Ts’e-rin-dbahn-rgyal (1697-1763): dpal mi’i dban po’i rtags brjod pa ’jig
rien kun tu dga’ ba’i grnam.


MP = Hsi-tsang tsou-shu 西藏奏疏, Memorials and documents of Mëng-pao
孟保, amban in Tibet 1839-1844. Published c. 1851.

MTSL = Ta-Ch’ing li-ch’ao shih-lu, Mu-tsung 大清歷朝實錄, 穆宗.

NGUL = Life of d’Nu-l-c’u dByangs-c’en Grub-pa’i-rdo-rje (1809-1877), compiled in 1896
by his nephew dByangs-can dGyes-pa’i-rdo-rje, alias Blo-bza’i-jigs-med-dbahn-po:
Rigs dan dkyil ‘khor rgya mts’o’i mi’a’ bdag rdo rje sens dpal’i no bo bka’ drin gsum
ldan rje btsun bla ma t’ams cad mk’yen pa blo bza’i c’os ’p’el dpal bza’i po’i żal sna
nas kyi rnam par t’ar pa dge ldan bstan pa’i ṇi ’od.

PC2 = Autobiography of the Second Pan-c’en Rin-po’c’e Blo-bza’nye-ses (1663-1737):
Sākya’i dge sloy Blo bza’i ye sgyi spyod ts’ul gsal bar byed pa’i nor dkar cangyi_p’ren-ba.

PC2b = Continuation of PC2, compiled by the Third Pan-c’en: rDo rje ’c’a’i c’en
po Pan c’en t’ams cad mk’yen pa Blo bza’i ye sges dpal bza’i po’i sku gsun t’ugs kyi mdzad
pa ma lus gsal bar byed pa’i rnam par t’ar pa’i od dkar can gyi_p’ren-ba’i smad c’a. In
vol. Ga of the gsun-’bum of the Third Pan-c’en. Covers the years 1732-1737.

PC3 = Life of the Third Pan-c’en Blo-bza’-dpal-lidan-ye-ses (1738-1780),
compiled in 1785-1786 by ‘Jam-dbyangs-bzad pa (1723-1791): rJe bla ma srid żi’i gtsug rgyan
pa n c’en t’ams cad mk’yen pa Blo bza’i dpal ldan ye sges dpal bza’i po’i żal sna nas kyi

PC3b = Continuation of PC3, compiled in 1785 by ‘Jam-dbyangs-bzad-pa (1723-1791):
rgJe bla ma srid żi’i gtsug rgyan pa n c’en t’ams cad mk’yen pa Blo bza’i dpal ldan ye sges
dpal bza’i po’i żal sna nas kyi rnam par t’ar pa ni ma’i ’od ze zer žes bya ba’i smad c’a.
In vol. Ka of the gsun-’bum. Covers the years 1777-1780.

PC3c = List of the donors and their offerings made to the Third Pan-c’en on the occasion
of his journey to Peking, compiled by ‘Jam-dbyangs-bzad-pa: rJe bla ma srid żi’i
gtsug rgyan pa n c’en t’ams cad mk’yen pa Blo bza’i dpal ldan ye sges dpal bza’i po’i żal
sna nas kyi rnam par t’ar pa ni ma’i ’od ze zer ži’i ’debs šel dkar me loň.

PC4 = Life of the Fourth Pan-c’en Blo-bza’-dpal-lidan-bstan-pa’i ni-ma (1782-1853),
compiled in 1883 by Blo-bza’-sbyin-pa: Rab ‘byams rgyal ba’i spyi gzugs skyabs
ngon pa n c’en t’ams cad mk’yen pa rje btsun Blo bza’i dpal ldan bstan pa’i ni ma p’yo’gs
las rnam rgyal dpal bza’i po’i żal sna nas kyi sku gsun t’ugs kyi rnam par t’ar pa’i ’dzam

PC5 = Life of the Fifth Pan-c’en dpal-lidan-c’os-kyi-grags-pa (1855-1882), compiled
in 1888 by the yo’is-’dzin Blo-bza’-bstan-’dzin-rnam-rgyal: rJe btsun Blo bza’i dpal
ldan c’os kyi grags pa bstan pa’i dban p’yu’g dpal bza’i po’i rnam t’ar dad ldan pad ts’al
bza’i po’i ni byed sna’i ba. In vol. Ka of the gsun-’bum.

Samati = Life of the Samati Pakši Nag-dba’n-ts’ul-k’rims (1721-1791), regent 1777-1781
and 1790-1791, compiled in 1798 by the bka’-blon bla-ma Byams-pa-stobs-lidan.
Second part: bStag-'gro yongs kyi gtsug nor k'ri c'en c'os kyi rgyal po no min han sa ma ti pa k'i rin po c'e rje btsun rdo rje c'a'n Ńag dbaṅ ts'ul k'ri ms dpal bzañ po'i rnam pa dad pa'i sgo 'byed ces bya ba'i bam gzhis-pa. Vol. Ba of the gsun-'bum. Covers the years 1777-1791.

bSam-yas = History of the temple of bSam-yas and of its restoration by bka'-blon bSād-sgra, written by the bka'-blon himself in 1854: Rab 'byams dag pa'i ziṅ gi yon tan kun 'ts'an dpal lugs gsum mi 'gyur lhun gyis grub pa'i gtsug lag k'aṅ rten daṅ brien par bcas pa legs gso'i srid zu ji ltar bsgrubs pa'i ts'u'ul gyi k'ya'd par brjod pa'i dkar c'a'g skal bzaṅ dad pa'i sgo 'byed no mts'a'r rgya mts'o'i lde'u mig. Edited by Lokesh Chandra, The Samye Monastery, New Delhi 1961.

Si-tu = Autobiography and diaries of Si-tu Pañ-c'en (1700-1774). Edited and completed by Ba'i-lo Ts'e-dbaṅ-kun-k'yiab: Tā'ī si tur 'bod pa Karma bstan pa'i fiṅ byed kyi rai ts'u'ul brāns por brjod pa dri bral šel gyi me lōn.


sTag-luṅ = Genealogy of the sTag-luṅ religious and secular chiefs, compiled 1827-1829 by order of rtshis-dpon mDo-mk'ar-ba 'Gyur-med-ts'e-dbaṅ-dpal-'byor; the last chapter, being the biography of mDo-mk'ar Ts'e-riṅ-dbaṅ-rgyal, was added in 1831: dPal sTag-luṅ ga zi'i gduñ rabs zam ma c'ad par byon pa'i rnam t'ar no mts'a'r nor bu'i do šal skye dgu'i yid 'p'rog. Manuscript.

Tharchin = Yig-'bskur rnam gžag, by bka'-blon bSād-sgra and bka'-drun Nor-naṅ. Edited by G. Tharchin, Kalimpong 1956, including many other small texts, mainly of spha-rigistic and allied subjects.

TTSL = Ta-'Ch'ing li-ch'ao shih-lu, Tē-tsung 大清歷朝實錄. 德宗.

TWC = Ch'in-ting Hsi-yü t'ung-wén-chīh 钦定西域同文志.

WTLs = Ta-'Ch'ing li-ch'ao shih-lu, Wēn-tsung 大清歷朝實錄. 文宗.

WTTC = Wei-tsang t'ung-chīh 衛藏通志.

YSGT = Life of Ts'e-mc'o-gliṅ Ye-ses-rgyal-mts'an (1713-1793), yongs-'dzin of the 8th Dalai-Lama, compiled by the 8th Dalai-Lama in 1794: dpal ldan bla ma dam pa rigs daṅ dkyil 'k'o r or rgya mts'o'i miṅa bdag bka' drin gsum ldan yongs 'dzin paṇḍita c'en po rje btsun Ye sses rgyal mts'an dpal bzañ po'i sku gsuṅ t'ugs kyi riogs pa brjod pa t'ub bstan padmo 'byed pa'i fiṅ byed.

(B) Western studies

Ahmad = Z. Ahmad, Sino-Tibetan relations in the seventeenth century, Rome 1970.

Bailey = F. M. Bailey, No passport to Tibet, London 1957.


Bell 1924 = Ch. Bell, Tibet Past and Present, Oxford 1924.

Bell 1928 = Ch. Bell, The people of Tibet, Oxford 1928.

Bell 1931 = Ch. Bell, The religion of Tibet, Oxford 1931.


Carrasco = P. Carrasco, Land and polity in Tibet, Seattle 1959.


Ferrari = A. Ferrari, mK'yen-brtse's guide to the holy places of Central Tibet, Rome 1958.


Tibet = *Tibet 1950-1967*, ed. by the Union Research Institute, Hong Kong 1968.

(C) Personal communications

HR = Written communication by Hugh E. Richardson.
PL = Oral and written communications by P'ia-lha T'ub-bstan-'od-ldan.
TK = Oral communication by bKras-k'ah T'ub-bstan-ts'e-dpal.
TR = Oral and written communication by P'ren-rin Rin-c'en-sgrol-ma (Mrs R. D. Ta-ring).
ZK = Written communication by Zur-k'aṅ dBar-c'en-dge-legs.
On p. 115 add the following after 1.16:

In the 2nd month of 1883 gTsaṅ mda’-dpon dPal-lhun sras mK‘yen-rab-ts‘e-’p‘el was appointed Nag-ron spyi-k’yab 1. He ruled the country with a heavy hand and made himself so thoroughly hated, that late in 1889 a revolt broke out. The local gentry chose as their figurehead mGon-po-…. (Kung-pu-ch‘üeh-ang), the grandson of the last independent ruler mGon-po-rnam-rgyal; their actual leader was the chief of Sa-la in central Ňag-ron, seconded by other chiefs and by one Pa-tsung Lama. They applied to the governor-general of Szechwan for the return of direct imperial rule. As to dPal-lhun, they ordered him to disgorge the money he had squeezed out of the people and to quit the country at once. He evaded the first demand, maintaining that the money had already been sent to Lhasa, but had to comply with the second. Prompted by the amban, the Lhasa government dismissed him from office and subjected him to an enquiry 2. It appears from a passing hint in a Chinese document that he was sentenced to death 3; whether he was actually executed, is another question. His son was with him in Ňag-ron and passed through the same ordeal.

As to the rebels, their request for direct Chinese administration was turned down and the rising was adroitly quelled by Hor-k‘aṅ sras (q.v.).

---

1 DL13, Ka, 136a.
3 CCCTTT, Lu Ch‘uan-lin, 1.21.
The names included in the Tables (pp. 229-234) and in SBFR are not registered in this Index.

Ka-nam sde-pa 7n, 140, 163.
Ka-sod 88-89, 97.
Kam-ts'aṅ bKa'-rgyud-pa 159.
Karma-pa 149, 202.
[Sam-grub-p'o-bran] Kun-dga'-bstan-'dzin 33, 34, 73.
Kun-'p'el-lags 3, In, 215.
Kun-bzah-rtse 92-94.
Klu-k'aṅ (= bDe-mk'ar) 111, 227.
Kluṅ-gyog-ma 147, 167.
Klon-rdol Bla-ma 35n, 40n, 56, 59, 66, 81n, 110, 160, 192, 197, 218n.
Dkar-'cag 33n, 66n, 170.
[Na-p'od] dKon-me'og.... 100.
bka'-'gag, bka'-'gag 112, 118, 196, 208, 209, 235.
bKa'-'gyur 142.
bka'-'druṅ c'jun-ba 10, 38, 152, 235.
bka'-'druṅ c'e-ba 10, 151, 235.
bka'-blon k'ri-pa 168n.
bka'-blon bla-ma 9, 10, 21, 35, 86, 97, 109, 111, 118, 132, 150, 160, 195n, 196, 204, 217-228, 231-235.
bka'-blon las-'p'ar 14, 88, 90, 96, 134, 220, 231n, 235.
bka'-blon sāg lhan-rgyas 9, 235.
bka'-zur 68, 82, 197, 218, 220, 239.
bka'-'sāg mgon-gher 10, 145, 235.
bka'-'sāg-sten-druṅ-yig 113.
bka'-'sāg druṅ-yig 10, 117, 186, 235.
bka'-sod 10, 86, 94, 97, 148, 184, 187, 189, 235.
bka'-sod dge-rgyaṅ 96, 165, 235.
bka'i-gunī-blon 9, 235.
bKra-sis-k'aṅ-gsar, see bKras-k'aṅ 105, 106, 107n.
bKra-sis-c'os-rdzon 84.
[P'a-lha] bKra-si-s-dar-rgyas 84-86.
[Bum-t'an or g'Yu-t'o] g'bsKal-sis-don-grub 129-131.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 32n, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnam-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g' Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
[P'un-k'a] bKra-sis-rdo-rje 27.
[bSa-m-grub-p'o-bran] bKra-sis-rnani-rgyal 34, 218.
[mDo-mk'ar] bKra-sis-dpal-grags 73.
[g'Yu-t'o] bKra-sis-don-grub 30-32, 234n.
bDe-skyid-glin 69, 109.
bDe-mk'ar 111-112.
bDe-ltan-sgron-ma 54.
bDe-smon 193, 194.
mDa'-mk'ar 159.
mDa'-t'an 31.
mDa'-dpon 12, 14, 31, 38, 45, 53, 63, 67, 69, 73, 76-78, 80, 81, 84-86, 90, 92n, 94-97, 101, 102, 106, 115, 119-121, 126-128, 130, 131, 136, 139, 140, 145, 147, 149-156, 159, 166, 173, 180, 184, 185, 189, 191, 193, 195, 197, 198, 200-209, 210n, 224, 236-237, 232, 256.
mDa'-g'gis 119.
mdun-na-'don 9, 222n, 237.
mDo-k'ams 99.
mDo-mk'ar 15, 18, 30, 34, 50, 52, 70-80, 122, 130, 143, 144, 147, 156, 174, 205, 221, 222.
mDo sgar-dpon 13, 196, 236.
mDo-spyi, mDo-smad spyi-'k'yab 14, 31, 49, 86, 90, 97, 102, 103, 109, 112, 413, 140, 151, 152, 215, 222, 237.
mDo-smad 86, 103, 120, 132, 139, 237.
'Dam 35, 127, 182, 209.
[sKyid-stod] rDo-rje-don-grub 91.
[sMan-stod] rDo-rje-rnam-rgyal 134.
[Zol-k'a] rDo-rje-rnam-rgyal 141.
rDo-rje-brag 85.
[P'a-lha] rDo-rje-dbang-p'yu'g 87.
[K'ri-smon] rDo-rje-ts'e-ri'n 95.
[g Yu-t'o] rDo-rje-rab-brtan 28-29.
[bSad-gra] rDo-rje-rab-brtan 161.
[Ts'a-ron] rDo-rje-rig-'dzin 136.
rDo-ri'n (= dGa'-b'zi) 50, 59-62.
lDun-dpon 12, 237.
I Dun-[-ra]-k'a-'g sar 217.
sDi'ns-skyes (= f Ti'n-skyes) 168.
sDe-dge 32, 62, 77, 90, 120, 121, 178, 194, 195.
sde-drui 8, 83, 124, 221, 237.
sde-pa 12, 58, 64n, 65, 98, 106n, 112, 132, 133, 165n, 202, 208, 209.
sde-p'yu'g 108.
sde-srid 84, 157, 175, 180.
Nag-c'u 12n, 13, 60, 67, 68, 71, 72, 82, 93, 94, 101, 116, 118, 129, 144, 162n, 186, 189, 190, 204, 205, 217n, 221, 236, 237.
Nag-c'u-k'a 73, 88, 123, 152, 153, 227.
Nug-ts'e-ri'n 13, 65, 81, 123, 160n, 236.
Nags-ron 209.
na'-so 82, 237.
Nu-ma-ba 79.
Nor-bu-glin-k'a 32, 37, 115, 137, 169.
[bsam-grub P'o-bra] Nor-bu-dgra-'dul, 37.
Nor-bu-ts'e-ri'n 62.
[bsam-grub-p'o-bra] Nor-bu-ts'e-ri'n 38, 150.
Nor-tso 113.
gNa'nyon 112, 134.
gNam-ru 181, 182n.
gNa-s-bcu'i-lha-k'a-n 34.
gNa-s-c'ag 69.
gNa-s-c'un, gN. c'os-skyoni 23, 114, 126, 198.
gNod-sbyin-c'en-po 85.
gSar-byun] gNod-sbyin-p'un-ts'ogs 185-187.
rNam-glin, sNam-glin 89, 140, 207.
rNam-rgyal-grva-ts'an 73.
[Bhrum-pa] rNam-rgyal-rgyal-mls'an 126.
[T'bon] rNam-rgyal-don-grub 69.
[Bhrum-pa] rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje 125.
[Lha-sdi'ns] rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje 198.
[mDo-mk'ar] rNam-rgyal-dbang-'dus-rdo-rje 76.
[rNam-pa or sKyid-stod] rNam-rgyal-dbang-p'yu'g 158.
[dGa'-b'zi] rNam-rgyal-ts'e-brtan 52-53.
[ica-phon] rNam-rgyal-ts'e-brtan 214.
sNa'nyon 162, 203-205.
sNa-s-dkar rtse 30, 135, 196.
sNe-sran 32, 45, 56, 61, 62, 81n, 85, 89, 93, 94, 98, 113-116, 126, 139, 140, 144,
Pa-snam 122, 123, 165-11, 205, 208.
[P’o-lha] Padma-rgyal-po 211.
[Ts’a-ron] Padma-sgrol-dkar 137.
[Glaň-mt’on] Padma-rdo-rje 98.
[Zur-k’an] Padma-dbañ-c’en 151.
Pad-ts’al 200, 205-208.
Pag-c’en (in general) 2, 4, 8, 170, 229, 236, 237.
Pag-c’en, Second 65, 89, 134.
Pag-c’en, Third 34, 39, 41, 42, 54, 55, 66, 73, 74, 89, 90, 119, 129, 133, 142, 144, 153, 190, 191, 202, 206, 218.
Pag-c’en, Sixth 16, 64, 94, 126, 139, 151, 227.
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