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PART I with PLATES VII–XI

The Karma-pa sect, an important offshoot of the bKa’-rgyud-pa, derives from dPal Chos-gyi-grags-pa, generally known as Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa, who was born in A.D. 1110 at Dre-šod in East Tibet. He was, by some accounts, the first Lama to originate a continuous line of reincarnations lasting to the present day—a claim which is contested by the Lamas of ’Bri-khuñ. At the age of 30 Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa became the principal disciple of sGam-po-pa, himself the chief disciple of rJe-btsun Mid-la (Mi-la-ras-pa), and so entered the direct doctrinal succession from Mar-pa, the founder of the bKa’-rgyud-pa sect. A pious explanation of the name Karma-pa is that an assembly of gods (lha) and Dakini bestowed on Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa, in his sixteenth year, knowledge of the past, present, and future—together with a magical black mitre woven from the hair of a million mKha’-'gro-ma (angels or fairies). That story is found in vol Pa of the Chos-’byun of dPa’-bo gTsug-lag; but however early the name Karma-pa came into existence its perpetuation was probably due to the association of Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa with the monastery of Karma gDan-sa, or Lho Karma’i sGar, which he founded in 1147 to the east of the Nom-chu, somewhere between Ri-bo-che and sDe-dge. A few years before his death in 1193 he returned to Central Tibet and in 1189 he founded mTshur-phu in the sTod-luñ valley some 50 miles west of Lhasa. This became the principal monastery of the sect and the home of its chief incarnate Lama, who is known as the rGyal-dbañ Karma-pa or the Žva-nag-pa.

In the main courtyard of mTshur-phu monastery there is an inscribed stone pillar recording the establishment during the reign of Khri gTszug-lde-brtsan (Ral-pa-can, A.D. 815–841) of the “gsug-lag-khan of lCañ-bu as a dependency of the great gtsug-lag-khan of ’On-cañ-rdo”. The inscription has been edited by me in JRASB., 1949, and by Professor G. Tucci in The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings, Rome, 1950. In my article I suggested that the pillar might have come from an older religious foundation on or near the site of mTshur-phu monastery; but on two visits I could find no trace in that neighbourhood of a place called lCañ-bu or of any ancient

1 bLa ma. I use the popular spelling “Lama” throughout.
remains. The name appears several times in the Tun Huang Annals (Documents de Touen Houtang, Bacot, Thomas, and Toussaint, Paris, 1940): "Ñen kar lcaṅ bu," p. 18; "sTod gyi lcaṅ bu," pp. 57, 58; "Byar gyi lcaṅ bu," pp. 58, 59, 60. At first sight the case for sTod gyi lcaṅ bu looks attractive because mTshur-phu is in the sTod-luṅ valley. But "sTod"—"the upper country, the upper part of a valley"—is a place-name of quite wide application. Moreover, all the references to lCaṅ-bu in the Tun Huang Annals are to a place of winter residence. That does not accord well with the sTod-luṅ valley, which is cold in winter. Of the other places mentioned, Ñen-kar seems to be not far from Brag-mar; and Byar, according to Professor Tucci (Preliminary Report on Two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal, Rome, 1956, p. 82), is east of Yar-lha-šam-po and north of Lho-kha. The name Byar, Byar-mo, dByar-mo, appears also in East Tibet, where Professor Thomas connects it with the Pailan people (Nam, F. W. Thomas, O.U.P., 1946, pp. 34, 35); but that identification does not seem relevant here. The valleys south of the gTsān-po in the Yar-luṅ and Lho-kha areas would generally provide much better winter quarters than sTod-luṅ; and, to narrow the choice more closely, attention may be directed to the proximity of Ñen-kar to the Yar-luṅ valley, the royal burial ground at ’Phyon-rgyas, and the castle of Phyin-ba’i-stag-rtse (Tun Huang Annals, pp. 34, 35; Tucci, Tombs, pp. 30, 31). In the bLōn-po bKa’-thain (f. 9) the neighbourhood of “Yar-luṅs and Phyin-luṅs” (“Phyin-luṅs” in the Tun Huang Annals, p. 154) is ascribed to the gNags and Tshe-spoṅ (Tshes-poṅ) families. A member of the Tshes-poṅ family was responsible for the erection of the inscribed pillar now at mTshur-phu and its seems not unreasonable to locate lCaṅ-bu of that inscription in the Tshes-poṅ country round about Yar-luṅ and to suppose that the 8 ft. stone pillar was removed from there to mTshur-phu—a troublesome task for porters but quite feasible.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that other possibilities remain open. lCaṅ-bu seems to have been a common name perhaps signifying a place where willows (lcaṅ-ma) grew (cf. the name lCaṅ-lo; lCaṅ-lo-can, which is fairly widespread at the present time). There may formerly have been a lCaṅ-bu in sTod-luṅ of which the name has now vanished; or it may be, as was related to me by the Phyag-mdzod (Treasurer) of mTshur-phu, that the pillar was brought all the way from East Tibet by one of the early Lamas. This information was offered without great conviction and no literary evidence could
be produced to support it. The monks of mTshur-phu seem to take little interest in the pillar nowadays nor could I find mention of it in any of the three accounts of the Karma-pa sect which I have followed in writing this article, viz. the Deb-ther-sion-po of 'Gos gZon-nu-dpal (1478); the Chos'-byun of dPa'-bo gTsug-lag-phreṅ-ba, himself a Karma-pa Lama (1564); and a short rNam-thar of the rGyal-dbaṅ Karma-pa Lamas¹ down to the XIVth Incarnation, who was born in 1797. (Hereafter I shall refer to these sources as DT, PT, and NT respectively.) These works all draw on original records at mTshur-phu and a detailed study of those records might discover confirmation of the Phyag-mdzod's story, but I am inclined to see in it no more than a vague echo of the close connection between mTshur-phu and East Tibet which began with Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa and continues to this day—most of the sixteen Žva-nag Incarnations, including the present one, having been born in East Tibet. If it is necessary to speculate who might have moved the pillar from Yar-luṅs to mTshur-phu, the second incarnation, Karma Pakṣi (1206-1283), to whom the rNam-thar attributes descent from the Kings of Tibet, appears a probable person to have brought that royal relic to the monastery which, by tradition, he did much to adorn.

In addition to the original line of Žva-nag—Black Hat—Karma-pa Lamas there came into being at an early date a second branch known as the Žva-dmar or Red Hat. Its first Lama, Grags-pa-sen-ge, was contemporary with the third Žva-nag incarnation, Raṅ-byun-rdo-rje. Some accounts, e.g. that of Kloṅ-rdol Lama, mentioned by Professor Tucci on p. 682 of his monumental and invaluable work Tibetan Painted Scrolls, assign a more extended spiritual lineage to both the Black and Red Hat Lamas, the former going back through Po-to-pa to five earlier incarnations and the latter, through four incarnations, to Ti-lo-pa; but when numbering the incarnate Lamas of the two lines the Karma-pas themselves invariably begin with Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa and Grags-pa-sen-ge respectively. At first the Red Hat Lamas were closely connected with the monasteries of Lha-luṅ, in Lho-brag, and gNas-naṅ, near mTshur-phu, but later, in 1489, the monastery of Yaṅs-pa-can, about 20 miles north of mTshur-phu, was founded and became their chief seat. The line of Žva-dmar-pa incarnations was officially terminated in 1792, as will

¹ Chos rje Karma pa sku 'phreṅ rin khyon gyi rnaṅ thar mdor bsdus dpag bsam khri śiṅ.
be recounted in the proper place, because of the part taken by the
ninth Lama in the Nepalese invasion of Tibet.

There are also many lesser incarnate Lamas of the Karma-pa sect,
such as the rGyal-tshab Sprul-sku of mTshur-phu, the Karma Si-tu
Rin-po-che of dPal-spun in sDe-dge, and the dPa’-bo bLa-ma. The
last-named line included, as its second incarnation, the historian
gTsug-lag-’phreṅ-ba (1503–1566); its seat was formerly at Lha-luṅ,
in Lho-brag, which had been founded by Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa in
1154 on what appears to have been the site of an older chapel, but
this monastery was taken from the Karma-pa by the fifth Dalai
Lama and the present dPa’-bo bLa-ma lives at gNas-nañ, near
mTshur-phu.

It is not my intention to attempt here a comprehensive history of
the Karma-pa sect and all its branches but rather to examine some
incidents in the relations of its principal Lamas, especially the
Žva-nag-pa, with Mongolia and China. The connection began with
the second Žva-nag-pa, Karma Pakši, who is, after Padma Sambhava,
probably the most famous miracle-worker in Tibetan religious history
and is known by the epithet “Grub Chen”.

Association between the Tibetan church and the Mongols was
established by the Sa-skya-pa sect in 1244 when the Sa-skya
Pan-chen, taking with him his nephews ’Phags-pa, aged about 10,
and Phyag-na, aged about 6, accepted the invitation—or obeyed
the command—to visit Godan Khan, governor of the Kansu region,
and was shortly afterwards appointed by Godan as the Mongols’
vice-regent in Tibet. At that time supreme authority in the Mongol
dominions was nominally held by Godan’s mother, who acted as
regent during the long rivalry for the office of Khakan which
followed the death in 1241 of her husband Ogotai, the third son of
Genghiz Khan. The vacancy was filled in 1246 by the election of
Godan’s elder brother, Ogotai’s first son, Kuy-kt; but he died in
1248 and the struggle for power among the grandsons of Genghiz
began all over again. It ended in 1252 when Mongka (Mangu), the
eldest son of Genghiz’s fourth son, Tului, was chosen as Khakan
and thus ousted from the succession the line of Ogotai which had
patronized the Sa-skya Lamas. In 1251, shortly before this dynastic
change, the Sa-skya Pan-chen had died; and in 1253 his nephew
’Phags-pa, making a politic transference of loyalty to the new ruling
family, was received by Mongka’s youngest brother, Kubilai Khan,
who was then governor of the territories conquered by the Mongols
on the north and east borders of the Sung Empire. Continuance of Sa-skya-pa influence was thus ensured; but other sects also had attracted the notice of the Mongols, whose generals had been conducting occasional raids into Tibet, and in 1255 Kuhilai sent for Karma Pakši, who was then at m'Tshur-phu. The Lama, then in his fiftieth year, obeyed the summons and joined Kuhilai at Roñ-yul gSer-stod, which is perhaps somewhere in the neighbourhood of Tachienlu. Sa-skya tradition shows that Karma Pakši was a serious rival to ‘Phags-pa, who had to prove himself an equally good miracle-worker (Tucci, TPS., p. 627); but the position of the newcomer cannot have been easy and Karma Pakši declined a request by Kuhilai that he should stay permanently at his court. He set out northwards on a journey in the course of which he founded 'Phrul-snañ-sprul-pa’i Lha-khañ, on the Hor Mi-ñag border, and visited Ling-Chow (or perhaps Liang Chow), where he met with some Zin-šin (Hsien-seng: Taoists), whom he confounded by his magical powers, and Kan Chow, where people from China, Hor, Sog, and Mi-ñag flocked to see him. In 1256 he decided to return to Tibet but, on being summoned by the Khakan Mongka, he went to the Great Palace of Zi-ra 'Ur-rdo in 'On-ge’i Yul, i.e. Sira Ordo, on the Ongin, not far south of Mongka’s headquarters at Karakorum. There he won the favour of the Khakan and became his personal chaplain. Karma-pa records also say that he took part in a debate there with Taoists and other religious sects. His arrival at Mongka’s court was long after the departure, in 1254, of the Franciscan missionary William of Rubruck, who had triumphed over Buddhists and others in a religious debate organized by Mongka. There was another debate in 1258 in which the Buddhists, led by Fou-yu, abbot of Chao-lin, overcame their Taoist rivals; but from Karma-pa sources it is clear that the occasion on which Karma Pakši is said to have taken part was in the Dragon year, 1256. According to Inscriptions et Pièces de Chancellerie Chinoises de l’Epoque Mongole, E. Chavannes, T‘oung Pao, Series II, vol. 5, p. 381, there was an assembly of Buddhists at Sira Ordo in 1256, but none of the Taoists dared to confront them there. This was taken as a confession of defeat and Mongka issued an edict in favour of the Buddhists. It is perhaps this meeting which has been slightly misrepresented by Karma-pa historians as the occasion of a debating victory by Karma Pakši. The next debate was in 1258. It took place, under the presidency of Kubilai, at Shang-tu and it appears that ’Phags-pa was present.
It is not possible to trace Karma Pakṣi among the Buddhist leaders named in the Mongol documents quoted by Chavannes. He cannot be the same as Na-mo for the latter was appointed as Master of the Buddhists in 1252, before Karma Pakṣi had left Tibet; nor can he be readily identified with the Abbot of Chao-lin (a monastery, according to Chavannes, loc. cit., p. 374, north of Shang-tu). The only other person mentioned in Chavannes’ selection is an unnamed monk from Ta-li. Examination of the complete list of persons present at the debates might discover the name of Karma Pakṣi; there is even a faint possibility that a reference to 'Phags-pa may be a mistake for Pa ka si pa because Chavannes notes that the characters used for the name in the record of the debate in 1258 are different from those used elsewhere; but there is no suggestion from Karma-pa sources that Karma Pakṣi returned to Kubilai’s court after joining Mongka until a much later date.

The apparent silence of Mongol documents about Karma Pakṣi need not be thought to throw doubt on the veracity of Karma-pa historians. It may signify no more than that Karma Pakṣi’s powers, as can clearly be seen from the rNam-thar and from dPa'-bo gTsug-lag, were those of a magician rather than a dialectician; but there may also be some possibility that 'Phags-pa was able to suppress references to his rival.

In some Tibetan histories, including Vol. Ma of dPa'-bo gTsug-lag, it is suggested that Karma Pakṣi was in Mongolia before 'Phags-pa. This seems to be a misunderstanding due to the fact that Karma Pakṣi’s patron Mongka preceded 'Phags-pa’s patron Kubilai as Khakan. The careful chronology in Vol. Pa where dPa'-bo gTsug-lag, himself a Karma-pa, gives detailed attention to the history of his sect puts the sequence of events beyond serious doubt. Although 'Phags-pa preceded Karma Pakṣi in Tibet, the Karma-pa were the first Tibetan sect to establish influence with a ruling Khan. But their ascendancy was short-lived. Mongka died in 1260 and his death was followed by a bitter struggle, with Kubilai, who had declared himself Khakan, in opposition to his younger brother Ariq Boga, who by Mongol custom had some grounds for claiming to be the legitimate successor. When Kubilai was victorious in 1261 Karma Pakṣi found himself in difficulties. He had earlier offended Kubilai by refusing to stay at his court and now, whether rightly or wrongly, he was suspected of having sided with Ariq Boga. Moreover it is probable that 'Phags-pa and his followers did what they could to
add to the troubles of their rival. Karma Pakši was persecuted by Kubilai and eventually banished to Ke’u Chu, a hot and unhealthy place “on the shore of the ocean”. Some of his disciples were put to death (DT, Vol. ȘNa, f. 51). Karma-pa records claim that eventually, by a display of his magic and spiritual powers, Karma Pakši won restoration to favour and converted Kubilai to his own religious views. He left Mongolia about 1264 and took eight years on his journey back to mTshur-phu, where he died in 1283.

The monks of mTshur-phu tell many stories of Karma Pakši’s feats in Mongolia—how he could not be confined in any prison or hurt by any torture and how when he was finally loaded with costly presents but had no means of transporting them to Tibet he threw them into a spring near Shang-tu from where, by his magic powers, they soon reappeared in a pool near mTshur-phu. To support this story they point to the discoloured gold roof of one of the temples which, they say, shows the effects of its underground journey from China. Of the same roof, which covers a great image of Sakyamuni made by Karma Pakši, it is also said that it had once belonged to the monastery of Nalanda, whence it had been carried off in a Mongol raid on India.

Karma Pakši’s fame as a magician recalls those Lamas who, according to Marco Polo, could make the Khan’s cup move from the table to his lips without visible human agency. Karma Pakši could not, of course, have met Marco Polo because he left the Mongol court before Marco’s arrival in 1275; but he might have met Nicolo and Maffeo Polo on their earlier visit between 1260 and 1263.

After the rather chequered introduction of the Karma-pas to the Mongol court the next Žva-nag Lama, Rañ-byuñ-rdo-rje (1284–136 ), paid a visit to China on an easier footing when he was invited in 1331 by the Emperor Togh Temur. Although by then the Yuan dynasty had sunk into luxury and into that extravagant adulation of Buddhism which so speedily enervated and degraded the Mongol character, the Emperor was still the unquestioned overlord of Tibet and his letter of invitation has the ring of authority. It is addressed as a command (“luñ”) to “Rañ-byuñ-rdo-rje” without the addition of any honorific titles. The letter is quoted in the rNam-thar (ff. 65, 66) and has the appearance of being authentic. In rambling and involved Tibetan (which can be seen in the transcription included in Appendix B) the Emperor writes of the devotion to Buddhism shown by the kings of the North (in Mongolia) and by his ancestor
Se-chen (Kubilai) in China; and he declares that he, too, desires to be the protector and servant of the faith. Having heard the reputation of the Lama for learning and holiness he has sent his envoy mGon-po and others to conduct him to China. The letter continues, in a rather minatory tone, that if the Lama disregards the command he will be responsible for all manner of harm to the practice of the faith in China and will also displease the Emperor; but, as it cannot be thought that he could bring himself to cause such a calamity, he will surely come quickly for the benefit of all creatures from the Emperor downwards. If he does so, everything will be done for the faith according to his wishes. To accompany the letter, the Emperor sent a gold seal which had been given by Mongka to Karma Pakṣi. Raṅ-byuṅ-rdo-rje let it be known that he would go to China and he set about rather dilatory and hesitant preparations for the journey. In the following year he received a further letter expressing the Emperor’s satisfaction that his command was being obeyed and exhorting the Lama not to delay. In this letter, which also is quoted (NT, f. 67), the Lama is addressed as dGe-ba’i-bṣes-gūn—Kalyanamitra.

Raṅ-byuṅ-rdo-rje entered China in 1332 but before he could reach Peking the Emperor died. The new Emperor, Rinchenpal, urged him to continue his journey and he went on to the capital; but soon after his arrival Rinchenpal, too, died. Raṅ-byuṅ-rdo-rje stayed on in Peking and, in the disturbed conditions of intrigue and faction then prevailing, he assisted in the succession and enthronement of the new Emperor, Toghan Temur (PT, Pa, f. 44). In 1334 he left for Tibet after promising to return in two years; and early in 1336 he received a letter from Toghan Temur reminding him of that promise. This letter also is quoted in the rNam-thar (f. 69). Although employing a similar formula to that of Togh Temur’s letter—expressing fears that, if the Lama does not come, much harm will be done to the faith—the tone is less authoritative and the language more respectful. Moreover, the Emperor offered the Lama the same exalted honours and facilities for his journey as those enjoyed by the Ti Śri Chen-po, the Imperial Viceregent for Tibet. Raṅ-byuṅ-rdo-rje returned to China in 1338 and died there in the same year after a brief further exercise of his mediating and religious authority in the troubled conditions of the decadent Yuan court.

Toghan Temur’s devotion to the Karma-pa’s continued; and in 1386 he invited the fourth Žva-nag Lama, Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje
(1340–1383), to visit China. By then Mongol supremacy over Tibet had been reduced to a formality by the vigorous nationalism of Byaṅ-chub-rgyal-mtshan, but the Emperor was still titular overlord. His letter to Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje is still described as a “command”; but the wording shows an increase in politeness and reverence and the Tibetan, an increase in lucidity and elegance (see Appendix B, no. 4). It is therefore rather strange that the Emperor attributes his continued good fortune not to the “Three Jewels” (dkon-mchog-gsum), as was done in all the previously mentioned Imperial letters, but to the “protection of everlasting Heaven” (tshe-rin gnam gyi še-moṅ), which seems to be a reversion to the formula of the old Mongol religion. The letter refers to the degeneration of the times and exhorts the Lama, who is addressed as Great Teacher (blo-dpon chen-po), not to confine his loving-kindness to Tibet but to lead back to the faith creatures who have erred and strayed from the right path.

Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje went to China in 1359 and stayed there until 1363. At that time the Yuan dynasty was tottering to its fall; and in the last stages of its dissolution Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje seems to have established himself as a revered and influential figure. From the accounts in my three sources (DT, Ǹa, ff. 40–5; NT, f. 76–99; PT, Pa, f. 49–59) he was clearly an exceptional visionary and miracle-worker; and he is famed as one of the early teachers of the rJe-Rin-po-che bLo-bzah-grags-pa (Tson-kha-pa).

On his way back to Tibet Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje received an invitation to visit the “King of Stod Hor” (Mogholistan), the Jagatid Mongol, Toghlag Temur but, not surprisingly, he did not accept for Toghlag Temur had some years earlier been converted to Islam. In 1368, after the change of dynasty in China, the first Rīn Emperor, Tai Tsung, sent the envoy Hsu Yun-te with letters inviting the principal Lamas to visit him (Tucci, TPS., p. 685; and Li Tieh-tseng, The Historical Status of Tibet, 1955, p. 95). Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje was one of the persons invited (NT, f. 95). He did not revisit China himself but he sent messengers to the Emperor in 1374 and thereafter at regular intervals until his death.

His successor, De-bzin-gsegs pa (1384–1415), was an even more famous wonder-worker. In 1407, when he was twenty-three, he accepted an invitation to go to China and perform memorial services for the parents of the Emperor Ch’eng Tsu (Yung Lo). The letter is preserved in PT, Pa, f. 77, and a transcription may be seen in
Appendix B. It makes an interesting contrast with the letters of the Yuan Emperors. If dPa’-bo gTsug-lag’s quotation is complete, there is no suggestion of a “command” nor is there any overt claim to authority, but behind the courteous and respectful language there are tentative hints of some sort of superior connection. The Emperor states that before he was established in his high position he had heard of the Lama’s fame; and he refers to the peace prevailing in the Kingdom of dBus (Yul dBus rgyal-khams). Later he remarks that the former King (his predecessor?) had been careful to maintain the peace of the Kingdom of dBus. For the rest, the letter is made up of polite and complimentary requests to the Lama to confer on the Emperor the benefit of his presence.

The events of the ensuing visit are described at length in a remarkable Imperial decree which was shown to me at mTshur-phu in 1949. It is contained in a silk-backed scroll some 50 feet long by 2 1/2 feet high composed of sections of text beautifully written in five scripts—Chinese, Tibetan, Arabic, Mongol, and Uighur—alternating with panels painted in the meticulously elegant Ming style. The inscriptions record the miracles performed by the Lama on twenty-two different days and the paintings illustrate those occurrences, day by day. On my visit to mTshur-phu I could not attempt to copy more than a few passages of the inscription and, as my special camera was unfortunately damaged on the journey, I was unable to take satisfactory photographs; but the present rGyal-dbaṅ Karma-pa kindly provided me later with a complete copy of the Tibetan text. It is written in the ’bam yig script and appears to be a translation, passage by passage, of the Chinese original, but there are so many deviations from normal grammar and usage that it can hardly be the work of a Tibetan any more than the above-mentioned letters of the Yuan Emperors appear to be. A Tibetan language school for diplomatic purposes was established at Peking in the seventh year of the Yung Lo era, i.e. about two years after De-bzhin gšegs pa’s visit to China, but the earlier employment of Chinese or Mongol translators of Tibetan is indicated by the style of the Yuan dynasty letters and, at that period, multilingual inscriptions which included Tibetan were quite common (Travels of Marco Polo, ed. Yule and Cordier, 1902, pp. 28, 29). Although De-bzhin-gšegs-pa’s visit and its extraordinary occurrences are well documented in Tibetan and Chinese sources (NT, ff. 108–111; PT, Pa, ff. 77–82; DT, Nāa, ff. 45–7; Ming Shih, trs. Tucci in TPS., p. 682), the Imperial con-
firmation of a series of miracles warrants quotation in full; but some details of the phenomena are rather repetitious and I have, therefore, relegated the translation, together with a transcription, of the Tibetan text to the Appendix.

Tibetan records claim that, among other successes of his visit, De-bzin-gsegs-pa dissuaded the Emperor from a plan to invade Tibet in order to establish his authority there, as had been done by the Mongols (NT, f. 111; PT, Pa, ff. 82-3). This is of interest in assessing the nature of the relationship between China and Tibet during the Ming dynasty, especially in view of the evidence of dPa'-bo gTsug-lag, who wrote before that relationship had been affected by the imperial designs of the Ch'ing dynasty.

From Nanking, which was at that time still the effective capital of China, De-bzin-gsegs-pa went to Omei Shan to conduct further requiem services for the Emperor's parents and from there he returned to Tibet, where he died of smallpox at the age of 31. His successor, mThon-ba-ldon-ldan (1416-1453), was also invited to the Chinese court. He did not go there; but eight times between 1436 and 1450 he sent missions which the Ming Shih describes as 'tribute'. Representatives of a Lama who made no claim to exercise temporal dominion over Tibet cannot have brought tribute in the strict sense of the word. In fact, the arrangement was a source of profit to the Tibetans and other neighbours of China, who secured disproportionately large return presents from the Emperor and also Chinese goods, especially tea, on favourable terms. So much so that by 1453 these missions had become such a burden that they had to be restricted by imperial decree (Li, op. cit., p. 26). Nevertheless, the nuisance continued and in 1499 an attempt to send a mission twice in one year had to be firmly rejected (Tucci, TPS, p. 683); and in 1569 another decree was promulgated limiting the frequency of such missions and the number of their members (Li, op. cit., n. p. 232). By the time of Father Matteo Ricci's stay in China (1578-1610) these "foreign embassies", which Ricci's informants appear to have attributed originally to the vainglory of the Emperor Yung Lo, had become a public scandal and a commercial racket between foreign merchants and the all-powerful court eunuchs (V. Cronin, The Wise Man from the West, p. 185).

The seventh Žva-nag Lama, Thams-cad-mkhyen-pa Chos-grags-rgya-mtsho, was born in 1454. There was no contact with the Chinese court in the early years of his life, by which time the
Emperor Ying Tsung (T’ien Shun), in the second part of his interrupted reign, had turned against Buddhism. In 1465 the succession of Hien Tsung (Ch’êng Hwa), a fervent Buddhist, brought an immediate resumption of correspondence and an exchange of presents. The *rNam-thar* records that when “Chin Hva” died his successor (Hsiao Tsung) sent to ask for the Karma-pa’s blessing. This was presumably an act of policy for during the greater part of his reign the new Emperor was disposed to treat Tibetan lamas with disapproving severity. Chos-grags-rgya-mtsho also had correspondence with the Mahapandita of Bodh Gaya, who invited him to visit India. The letter in Sanskrit is said to be reproduced in the original *rnam-thar* at mTshur-phu. Of greater interest is the statement that in about 1465 presents were received from a Mongol king in the direct succession from Genghiz Khan (*NT*. f. 127 b). This must have been Mandaghol Khan, the twenty-seventh successor of Genghiz, who died in 1467. There is little on record about the attitude of the Mongols towards Buddhism in the years immediately following the eviction from China of the lama-ridden relics of the Yuan dynasty. At that time, Buddhist influences do not seem to have penetrated much beyond the Khans themselves and their family circle and in the bracing air of their homeland the leaders probably returned to their ancestral shamanism; but the overture from Mandaghol shows that the connection with Tibet was not entirely severed. For all that, it cannot have been seen at its true value as a political weapon and there is no hint that Dayan Khan, Mandaghol’s successor who restored much of the lost greatness of his line, made any effort to use Tibetan religious influence in his rivalry with the Chinese Empire. Nor did the Karma-pa Lamas have sufficient prescience to make the most of this opportunity to strengthen their own position. The fourth Žva-dmar-pa, Chos-grags-ye-ses, did, it is true, visit Mongolia in 1470 (*NT*, f. 127 b) but he was then only seventeen and no important results seem to have flowed from his visit. Similar friendly exchanges continued from time to time but nearly a hundred years later the first evangelists of the dGe-lugs-pa sect found Mongolia an almost untouched missionary field.

Before returning to the succession of Žva-nag Lamas something should be said about the emergence of the Žva-dmar Lamas as a vigorous and ambitious force in Tibetan affairs. The fourth incarnation, Chos-grags-ye-ses, almost the exact contemporary of the seventh
Žva-nag Lama, turned with energy to politics and worldly interests. He acted as a sort of Cardinal-Counsellor to the Princes of Rin-spuñs, who in 1481 effectively usurped in Central Tibet the authority of the Phag-mo-gru-pa rulers which they had been undermining since about 1435. He joined in the struggle against the rivals of Rin-spuñs, including the rising power of the dGe-lugs-pa sect and its lay supporters. From 1498 to 1518 the Karma-pas excluded the monks of 'Bras-spuñs and Se-ra from the Great Prayer ceremony which had been initiated by Tsoñ-kha-pa; they also founded monasteries of the Žva-nag and Žva-dmar schools near Lhasa in order to overawe 'Bras-spuñs and Se-ra—that near 'Bras-spuñs was called Yam-mdag'-phur Thub-dbañ-legs bśad-gliṅ; and they exacted respectful salutes from any dGe-lugs-pa who met a Karma-pa. Chos-grags-ye-śes took the lead in these matters and the same militant spirit was shown by his successors, dKon-mchog-yan-lag (1525–1583) and Chos-gyi-dbañ-phyug (1584–1638). They allied themselves with the Kings of gTsan (gTsan sDe-erid : gTsañ Sde-pa), who superseded the Rin-spuñs princes, and also, as suited their purpose, with the Phag-mo-gru-pa, whose influence was renewed about 1517, and with the powerful Lamas of 'Bri-khun. This temporal activity of the Žva-dmar-pas may be partly explained by the fact that most of them, unlike the Žva-nag-pas, were born in or near Central Tibet. At all events, the Žva-dmar Lamas were so prominently the leaders in the rivalry with the dGe-lugs-pa that for some Western writers the name "Red Hat" has become the synonym of all the old sects in a way unrecognized in Tibet. This has to some extent affected the reputation of the Karma-pa sect as a whole and of its principal Lamas, the Žva-nag-pa, who in fact largely succeeded in preserving their character as teachers of religion, with special proficiency in its magical and mystic aspects; they also acted at times as mediators and moderating influences in political dissensions.

Turning again to relations between the Žva-nag Lamas and the Chinese court we come to a curious incident which seems to have been misunderstood by both Western and Chinese scholars. The eighth Žva-nag-pa was Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje and in the year of his birth there succeeded to the Chinese throne the Emperor Wu Tsung (Chêng Tê, 1506–1521) who, after a hostile start, gradually became devoted to Buddhism and very indulgent towards Tibetan Lamas. He gave himself a title "equivalent to Dharma Raja" and he sent a mission to Tibet to invite to his court a man who, he was told, was
a living Buddha. The party was attacked and robbed en route and failed to achieve its object. That, in brief, is the story from Chinese sources as presented by Mr. Li Tieh-tseng (op. cit., p. 27). Both Mr. Li and Professor Tucci (TPS, p. 255, n. 97) assume that the Emperor’s mission was aimed at the second Dalai Lama,1 dGe’-dun-rgya-mtsho (1475–1543) and this is supported by Père L. Wieger (Textes Historiques, vol. ii, pp. 1760–1); but the Karma-pa rNam-thar and dPa-bo Gtsug-lag’s history leave no doubt that it was actually sent to invite the eighth Žva-nag Lama. Moreover, the original letter of invitation in Chinese and Tibetan has survived at mTshur-phu and I was allowed to study and photograph it (see Appendices).

The incident proves to have been even more strange than has hitherto been thought. The rNam-thar (f. 152) and dPa-bo Gtsug-lag (vol. Pa, f. 205) show that the Tibetans believed that the Emperor considered himself to be in some way an incarnation of the seventh Žva-nag Lama and that this caused them so much concern that they postponed the enthronement of Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje. Apart from the difficulty that the Emperor was born a long time before the death of the seventh Žva-nag-pa his claim could be covered by the practice, prevalent especially in the bKa’-rgyud-pa sect, of a deceased Lama reincarnating in at least two successors at the same time, one representing his gsun or speech and the other his thugs or intellect. What the Emperor had in mind is shown to some extent in the letter of invitation. He gives himself the title “Fa Wang”, which is the equivalent of Dharma Raja or Chos-rje—in which form it was borne by several high-ranking Tibetan Lamas. He also takes the name Rin-chen-dpal-lidan. His language is almost fulsomely respectful and he refers to the Lama’s visit to China in a previous incarnation. There is no hint of a challenge to the position of Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje as the rightful eighth Žva-nag incarnation; all the Emperor appears to claim is that the coincidence of the dates of his own accession to the throne and the birth of the Lama constitute a link in their destiny.

The letter, which was entrusted to the Eunuch Liu Yun, was written in the ninth month of the eleventh year of Chêng Tê, i.e. 1516.

1 Strictly speaking, the first Dalai Lama was bSod-nams-rgya-mtsho, on whom the title was conferred in 1577 by Altan Khan, but it is the accepted practice in Tibet to attribute the title retrospectively to his two previous incarnations, thus treating bSod-nams-rgya-mtsho as the third Dalai Lama. At the time of the incident in question the Karma-pa hierarch was a figure of greater importance than the dGe-lugs-pa and therefore more likely to attract the Emperor’s attention.
This disagrees with the information in Wieger's *Textes Historiques*, where the invitation is attributed to 1515, but Dr. H. H. Frankel, of the University of California, Berkeley, has kindly informed me, after reference to the Ming Shih, that the event may be placed later than 1515. The Karma-pa rNam-thar states that the invitation was declined on account of inauspicious omens foreboding the death of the Emperor, which occurred shortly afterwards. It is known that the Emperor died late in 1521 and so the party appear to have taken several years to make their preparations and to reach their destination—which was not Central Tibet but the Lama's monastery in Khams. Although the Emperor's invitation may have been inspired only by a somewhat eccentric devotion and although his intentions may have been misunderstood, the ostentatious size, luxury, and military strength of the mission, which are described by dPa'-bo Gtsug-lag (*Pa* 205, 206), must have increased Tibetan anxieties. At all events, no risks were taken; a polite refusal was communicated and the young Lama was hurriedly removed to Central Tibet. Tibetan and Chinese sources disagree about what happened next. The Tibetans say that the envoys withdrew in anger, taking with them the presents they had brought for the Lama and, on the way back, the presents were looted "by others" (*NT*, 152). In dPa'-bo Gtsug-lag the suggestion is that members of the Chinese mission themselves appropriated the valuables. The story in the Ming Shih (Tucci, *TPS.*, p. 255) is that the Living Buddha took alarm and went into hiding, whereupon the Chinese officials were angry and tried to get hold of him by force. The "barbarians" attacked by night, killing 100 Chinese and wounding more. The leader of the mission, Yun, escaped and later sent a false report which arrived after the Emperor had died. It seems, therefore, that the Chinese account may contain some confusion and prevarication and the Tibetan some reticence.

When Wu Tsung was succeeded by his cousin Shih Tsung, a violent opponent of Buddhism, the Karma-pa Lamas were spared the embarrassment of further invitations to Peking. The so-called "tribute missions" continued but, as already mentioned, these were little more than commercial ventures.

The eighth Žva-nag-pa, Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje, had some contact with Mongolia, where the principal figure was then Dayan Khan (1465–1543), but it seems to have been only formal (*PT*, *Pa*, f. 208). Like his predecessors, he travelled widely in Tibet and there is an
interesting story in the *rNam-thar* (f. 155) that, on a visit to Rva-sgren he studied books belonging to Ša-ra-ba which are described as being kept in leather covers with metal fastenings. When I was at Rva-sgren in 1950 I saw a large collection of books similarly wrapped and fastened with chains. I was told they had belonged to Pandit Atiśa. Unfortunately it was not possible to examine them because they had been sealed by the thirteenth Dalai Lama and could not be opened until his successor came of age. Perhaps the attribution of the books to Atiśa was mistaken but part of his remains are said to have been taken to Rva-sgren soon after its foundation in 1056; and Ša-ra-ba was a pupil of Atiśa’s personal disciple, Po-to-pa, so the library at Rva-sgren may well contain books of exceptional importance.

One contemporary of the eighth Žva-nag-pa was the historian dPa-bo Gtsug-lag-'phren-ba, who was slightly older and lived some ten years longer. Another was the fifth Žva-dmar-pa, dKon-mchog-yon-lag, over twenty years younger but very early active in political affairs; he allied himself in 1537 with the gTsaṅ Sde-srid and the ’Bri-khuṅ hierarchy in an attempt to suppress the dGa’ldan princes, who were the strongest lay champions of the dGe-lugs-pa.

The successor to Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje, who died in 1554, was dBaṅ-phyug-rdo-rje (1556–1603). Presents were exchanged by him with the Emperor Shên Tsung (Wan Li, 1573–1619) and with an unidentified Mongol chief (*NT*, f. 164). The old-standing relationship with the king of ’Jaṅ Sa-tham (Likiang) was further cultivated. But these friendly connections were of little account when compared with the strong tide of dGe-lugs-pa influence, which began to flow through Mongolia in the lifetime of this incarnation and which was to sweep away the Karma-pa supremacy in the time of his successor.

It may be convenient to recall that about 1435 hegemony among the Mongols fell into the hands of the Oirats, a confederacy of tribes unconnected with the original ruling line of Genghiz and consisting of four main sections—the Torgut; the Choros (later better known as the “Dzungar” invaders of Tibet); the Dörbot; and the Qošot. After some fifty years Dayan Khan, the twenty-ninth successor of Genghiz and a direct descendant of Kublai, succeeded in overcoming the fissiparous tendency of the Mongol system and in reunifying under his leadership the several tribes of Genghizid descent. He was thus able to recover supremacy from the Oirats and to drive them westward out of the territories on which they had
encroached. On Dayan’s death in 1543 the unity imposed by his forceful character dissolved and once more the Genghizid tribes went their different ways. These tribes consisted of the Chahar, the tribe of the legitimate successor of Genghiz; the Kharachin; Ördos; Tumed; and the Khalkha confederacy made up of five sub-tribes each led by a descendant of Geresandza, one of Dayan’s sons. On the death of Dayan the most powerful were the Ördos and the Tumed.

Although the dGe-lugs-pa may first have gained a footing in Mongolia when the Ördos Khan, Khutuktai Sechen Kong Taiji, captured some of their monks in the course of a raid into north-east Tibet in 1566, it was the exceptional ability and missionary zeal of Lama bSod-nams-rhya-mtsho that effectively laid the foundations of their greatness. In 1577 he converted the Tumed ruler Altan Khan, at that time the most vigorous of Dayan’s descendants. Altan bestowed on bSod-nams-rhya-mtsho the title “Dalai Lama” and gave active support to the dGe-lugs-pa faith. The connection was further enhanced by the discovery of bSod-nams-rhya-mtsho’s reincarnation in the person of Yon-tan-rhya-mtsho, a child born to Altan’s own son and successor, Senge Dugurun. With these favourable auspices the dGe-lugs-pa teaching spread rapidly and its converts soon included the Chahar chief, Tumen Sasaktu, and the leaders of most of the five Khalkha tribes; it also found its way to the Khans of the Oirat confederacy—the Torgut Khu Orluk; the Dörbot Karakulla; and to the Qošot Khan Boibegus and his brother Gusri who, in 1642, was to conquer Tibet for the dGe-lugs-pa cause.

The Karma-pa had little to set against that accession of strength by the dGe-lugs-pa and they had no leader to compare with bSod-nams rgya-mtsho. The tenth Žva-nag-pa, rGyal-mchog-chos-dbyin-rdo-rje, who was born in 1604, received an invitation in 1610 to visit “King Kho lo ji”, who appears to have been a Mongol chief of the Koko Nor country (Tucci, TPS., p. 51) and a grand-nephew of Altan Khan (E. H. Parker, “Mongolia after the Genghizides,” JRAS. (China), xlv, 1913, p. 97). The guardians of the young Lama feared that he might be kidnapped and they refused the invitation (NT, f. 169); but in 1614, on another invitation, the Lama went to Mongolia, where he converted “King Da’i Ching” (¿ Tsai Seng—a title held by some Tumed, Kharachin, and Khalkha leaders). In 1620 there is mention of presents being sent by the Chahar and Khalkha Khans—presumably Legdan and Alty (NT, f. 174).
Legdan seems to have been for a time a dGe-lugs-pa supporter but his later history shows that he was unreliable.

It appears, therefore, that the Karma-pa Lamas did not neglect nor were neglected by the Mongols but they lacked the missionary fervour of their rivals; moreover their influence and energy were impaired at this time by various internal dissensions. The Žva-nag-pa rGyal-mchog-chos-dbyiṅs-rdo-rje, who was born in 'Gu-log [sic] country, came from his childhood under the control of the two lCags-mo Lamas, who displayed open enmity towards the Žva-dmar-pa Chos-kyi-dbaṅ-phyug and the gTsan sDe-srid Phun-tshogs-nam-rgyal (NT, ff. 168, 171). The latter succeeded in breaking the power of the lCags-mo Lamas about 1620 but his relations with the Žva-nag-pa continued to be strained and almost hostile (NT, ff. 173, 174). This rupture was still apparent more than twenty years later at the time of Gusri’s invasion when, in spite of the common danger, the Žva-nag-pa expressed disapproval of the misdeeds of the then sDe-srid, Karma Bstan-skyon. It may also be noticed that in 1640, when representations were made by various parties in Tibet to the newly-risen power of the Manchus, the gTsan ruler commended to their favour only the Žva-dmar-pa and made no mention of the Žva-nag-pa.

These disagreements weakened the moral authority of the Karma-pa to the advantage of the dGe-lugs-pa and also made inroads on their material position, which depended on the ability of the gTsan sDe-rid to maintain his hold over the greater part of Tibet. That hold had for some time been subject to attrition. The dGe-lugs-pa connection brought many Mongol supporters into Central Tibet. There was some sort of armed incursion in 1621 and further threatening gestures in 1625 (Tucci, TPS., pp. 58, 59). dGe-lugs-pa writers gloss over the fact that their eventual triumph was secured by a foreign invasion; but too much should not be made of any claim that the opposite side were nationalists defending Tibetan independence for the Karma-pa would have used the Mongol troops of Arslan Khan against their enemies if they could. The story is rather obscure. Arslan’s father Chogtu (Dzasaktu ?), a Khalkha khan of the Koko Nor, was a supporter of the Žva-dmar-pa. It is possible that he sent his son to help the Karma-pa to maintain their position; or Arslan may have set out on a private adventure; but whatever prompted his invasion of Tibet, Arslan proved himself an unscrupulous opportunist with an eye only for
loot. The Karma-pa were his first victims. It appears that Arslan killed
the sixth Žva-dmar-pa in an engagement near 'Dam in 1635 and that the Žva-nag-pa had to flee from mTshur-phu. That is what I take to be the meaning of the references to "Karma chuň ba" and "Karma che-ba" in f. 79 of vol. Ja of the fifth Dalai Lama's rNam-thar which Professor Tucci kindly allowed me to consult in his fine private library at Rome. The Karma-pa rNam-thar, although mentioning that the Žva-dmar-pa died about this time, conceals the circumstances. After this disaster the Karma-pa succeeded in directing Arslan's violence against the dGe-lugs-pa. The dGe-lugs-pa, after suffering some damage, were able to play the same game. They won over Arslan, who again turned his hostility against Karma-pa possessions. The late Žva-dmar-pa's principal official, known as Žva-dmar Rab-byams-pa, sent a hurried protest to Chogtu who, seemingly without compunction, arranged for the execution of his own son Arslan.

About the same time Legdan, Khan of the Chahar, was won over by Chogtu to the Karma-pa side and set out for the Koko Nor area to do battle for them but was killed there by the Qošot Gusri Khan, who was then beginning his career as a dGe-lugs-pa champion. The Karma-pa were thus deprived of their effective allies among the Mongols and Gusri, after clearing up opposition in Koko Nor and Khams, proceeded in 1642 to the invasion of Tibet, the defeat and execution of the gTsaň sDe-srid, and the establishment of the supremacy of the dGe-lugs-pa church.

The problem of tiding over this reversal of power fell to the lot of the tenth Žva-nag-pa, whose uneasy relations with the gTsaň kings have been mentioned earlier. When he was eight and again some six or seven years later there had been an exchange of formal messages with the Emperor Shên Tsung (Wan Li), but there is no further record of correspondence between the Karma-pa and the Chinese court until 1640, when rival parties in Tibet sent letters to the newly-established Ch‘ing Emperor seeking to win his support. It was on this occasion that the gTsaň sDe-srid specially commended the Žva-dmar-pa to the Emperor. It appears that in reply the Emperor addressed a letter to the Žva-dmar-pa (W. W. Rockhill, The Dalai Lamas of Lhasa, 1910, p. 12), but perhaps this is a misinterpretation. The sixth Žva-dmar-pa, as mentioned above, died or was killed about 1635; and there was some delay in finding his successor. I wonder, therefore, whether the Emperor's letter may have been intended for
the Žva-nag-pa and whether the latter also had addressed the Emperor. At all events, before the Imperial letters were received the issue in Tibet had been decided in favour of the dGe-lugs-pa.

rGyal-mchog-chos-dbyins-rdo-rje was a quietist in the tradition of many of his predecessors and he does not appear in dGe-lugs-pa records as a figure of any personal importance in their estimation. Through the mediation of the Panchen Lama he quickly reached an agreement with the Dalai Lama by which the Karma-pa, in return for acknowledging the supremacy of the Dalai Lama, were to be left undisturbed in their doctrine and in possession of most of their monasteries (NT, f. 177). But this settlement was soon upset by "ill-disposed persons" and the Žva-nag-pa became involved, perhaps almost accidentally, in the rebellion by the sGar-pa against the new regime. The sGar-pa were an East Tibetan clan, perhaps originating in the neighbourhood of Karma gDan-sa, from which sprang the line of Rin-spuns princes. Before their rise to power in gTsan they had been in close relations with the Karma-pa through that sect's monasteries in Khams. It was inevitable that the Žva-nag-pa should fall under suspicion, although the rNam-thar suggests that this was a mistake (f. 179). He was besieged in sGar-chen by sKyi-šod and Mongol troops. It is not clear what place is meant here by sGar-chen, a term apparently used with the general meaning of "Headquarters" or "Principal Seat". It might refer to the Karma-pa's own monastery of mTshur-phu, or to the sGar-pa's castle at Rin-spuns or even to some stronghold in rKon-po, in which area the sGar-pa's rebellion was finally crushed (Tucci, TPS., p. 67). The Lama escaped with difficulty from scenes of slaughter and destruction and eventually found refuge with the king of Sa-tham, whose family had long been devout supporters of the Karma-pa Lamas. He soon became dissatisfied with the bustle and luxury of the Sa-tham court. First he withdrew to a quiet monastery and then, displaying his unusual character, he set out into the dangerous Gu-log country, entirely alone and taking the barest necessities, declaring that he intended to visit the new reincarnation of the Žva-dmar Lama. He fell among thieves and was robbed of his horse and all the rest of his possessions; but he went on bare-footed and in rags, imperturbably begging food and shelter until search parties of his own followers and those of the Žva-dmar-pa succeeded in rescuing him (NT, f. 182).

In spite of the reduction in his position the Žva-nag-pa was still
considered of sufficient importance to be invited to China by the Emperor in 1653, the year in which the Dalai Lama returned from a visit there. He did not accept; but from Sa-tham, where he had settled once more after his solitary adventure, he kept up a correspondence with the Imperial court. In 1659 he appears to have sent a mission to the Emperor (Rockhill, JRAS., 1891, p. 204) and in 1660 this was followed up by the Emperor "Shun-rtsi" (Shun Che: Shih Tsu, 1644-1662), who may have welcomed an opportunity of extending his own influence among the Tibetans in order to offset the power of the Qosot Mongols. "Shun-rtsi" sent a letter and offered to the Lama a seal, referring to the precedent of the Ming dynasty and seeking to establish himself as the successor to their relations with the Tibetan church. The Lama was not to be led into any bargaining with temporal powers and returned the typically Tibetan answer that "no change appeared necessary" (NT, f. 184).

While rGyal-mchog-chos-dbyin-rdo-rje was in virtual exile at Sa-tham, Karma-pa interests in Central Tibet and gTsang were in the hands of a young and able deputy, the rGyal-tshab Chen-po Grags-pa-mchog-dbyan (1617–1658). Accompanied by the Žabs-dru Rin-po-che of sTag-luṅ, who frequently acted as intermediary between the Dalai Lama and the old sects, he visited Lhasa in 1653 to plead for the return of Karma-pa monasteries sequestered after the sGar-pa’s rebellion. He succeeded in recovering most of them but not all, for at Lha-luṅ and sMra-bo-mchog-pa, in Lho-brag, I was told that those monasteries had formerly been Karma-pa but were taken over by the fifth Dalai Lama. Some degree of dGe-lugs-pa control was retained even at mTshur-phu and there is still a permanent official of the Yig-tsaṅ (Ecclesiastical Court) stationed there, although his duties now appear to be nominal.

Before his death in 1674 the tenth Žva-nag-pa visited Lhasa and made his peace with the Dalai Lama. Nag-dban-blo-bzan, "The Great Fifth" Dalai Lama, was born in a rNiṅ-ma-pa family and is widely believed in Tibet to have been for all his life a secret supporter of the unreformed sects. This reputation perhaps reflects the moderation and tact with which he assumed authority over his religious rivals; and it is one good reason for his title "The Great" that in his dealings with other sects he was free from bigotry and iconoclasm, such as marked the activities of the Dzungars during their brief domination of Tibet in 1717 or such as the Chinese sought to impose in 1726.
The eleventh Žva-nag-pa, Ye-ses-rgya-mtsho (1676–1702), had a short and uneventful life. A visit to mTshur-phu by the famous Regent Sañsrgyas-rgya-mtsho in 1686 suggests a growing rapprochement between Lhasa and the Karma-pas after the death of the fifth Dalai Lama.

The twelfth incarnation, Byan-chub-rdo-rje (1703–1732) also died quite young but the rNam-thar has more to record about him. In 1718 he was taken to Lhasa, where he met the Dzungar leader Tshe-rin-don-grub. He was present later when the seventh Dalai Lama, bsKal-bzan-rgya-mtsho, arrived at Lhasa in 1720 and he met all the leading men of the day—the sDe-srid Stag-rtse-pa; bKra-sis-rtse-pa; Mongol and Chinese generals; the Minister Khana-chen and Pho-la Mi-dbañ. The last-named was a friend worth having for he became one of the best rulers Tibet has known; and, although he was a sincere follower of the dGe-lugs-pa, he is still spoken of with affection by adherents of the older sects for his noble and enlightened defence of their freedom against the Chinese Imperial edict enjoining persecution of the unreformed church (L. Petech, China and Tibet in the Early Eighteenth Century, Leiden, 1950, p. 94). The rNam-thar records that Pho-la sent presents to the Žva-nag-pa on several occasions. The Karma-pa Lama was also one of those who mediated a settlement when Pho-la invaded Bhutan in 1730 (Petech, op. cit., p. 146). In 1728 the Lama had accepted an invitation to visit the Emperor, but before going to China he, together with the Žva-dmar-pa, the Si-tu Rin-po-che, and other Karma-pa Lamas, went on a pilgrimage to Nepal and India. In 1731 the Žva-nag and Žva-dmar Lamas proceeded to Peking. It was an ill-starred visit. Both the Lamas, who had been close friends and companions for most of their life, died there in 1732 within a month of one another.

The thirteenth Incarnation, bDud’-dul-rdo-rje (1733–1797), is reputed to have been a famous gter-ston and to have understood the language of animals. Most of the space assigned to him in the rNam-thar is devoted to his conversations with beasts and birds. There is nothing of any political significance; no reference to important lay officials or to relations with China. From this account it would seem that the sect was settling into a staid and venerable respectability; but that assumption would be premature for the rNam-thar, with excessive caution, suppresses all mention of the
one notorious and disturbing Karma-pa of the day—the last Žva-dmar-pa.

The ninth incarnation of that line, who was born about 1734, was an elder brother of the third Panchen Lama, Blo-bzān-dpal-lidan ye-ses (1738–1780).¹ I have not yet been able to discover his personal name.² The eldest brother in the family was the Panchen Lama’s Phyag-mdzod or Treasurer—the “Chanzo Cusho” whom Bogle knew well at Shigatse in 1775 and Turner in 1783. He also was an incarnate Lama and is mentioned in the rnam-thar of the third Panchen Lama, which I have seen by the kindness of Professor Tucci, as Phyag-mdzod Chen-mo Dru-ja Hu-tuk-tu Blo-bzān-byin-pa. In Chinese sources he is called Chungpa Hutuktu (S. Cammann, Trade Through the Himalayas, Princeton, 1951, p. 73, n. 81). Bogle says that the Chanzo Cusho was a half-brother of the Panchen Lama, being a son of the same mother by a different father. The mother was a member of the royal family of Ladakh (Bogle and Manning, C. Markham, 1859, pp. 139, 84). It is possible that the Žva-dmar-pa, too, was a half-brother. The Panchen Lama’s nephews, whom Bogle calls the “Pyn (spun) Cushos”, were, so he says, the sons of another brother who also was a Lama. One of this Lama’s daughters, by another wife, was the incarnation of rDo-rje Phag-mo (Markham, op. cit., pp. 108, 109). According to Bogle, this brother died before 1775. As he had two acknowledged wives he may have been a monk of one of the unformed sects; perhaps he was, in fact, the Žva-dmar-pa whom Bogle may have been mistaken in understanding to be dead.

The discovery of so many important incarnations in the same well-connected family helps to explain the Chinese Imperial Edict of 1793 which sought to regulate the selection of incarnate Lamas (Rockhill, Dalai Lamas, p. 55). In this instance it is particularly surprising to find one family providing at the same time important figures in both the reform ed and unformed sects.

¹ Often described by western and Chinese writers as the sixth Panchen Lama. There is no question, even at bkra-śis-lhun-po, that he was actually third in succession from Blo-bzān-chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan (1569–1662) whom his pupil, the fifth Dalai Lama pronounced to have been an incarnation of ’Od-dpal-med. The ascription to the Panchen Lamas of an extended spiritual lineage, including Indian teachers and the Pandita of the Sa-skya sect, is simply a subsequent attempt to enhance their prestige vis-à-vis the Dalai Lamas for political ends.

² Professor Tucci has informed me that there is a religious work, written apparently in the eighteenth century, by a “Žva-dmar dGe-dun-bstan’dzin-rgya-mtsho”; but it has not yet been possible to establish that this was the name of the ninth Žva-dmar-pa Incarnation.
The death of the third Panchen Lama at Peking in 1780 set off a train of incidents. According to a report written at Kathmandu in 1792 by a Muslim agent of the East India Company the Žva-dmar-pa immediately fled to Nepal, taking much treasure with him (W. Kirkpatrick, *An Account of the Kingdom of Nepaul*, 1811, App. II). It is suggested that he had reason to fear the Chinese and suspicions were voiced that the Panchen Lama had been poisoned because the Emperor disliked his great authority in Tibet, his independent attitude towards his Chinese suzerain, and his relations with the British in India. The invitation to Peking may have been intended to remove him temporarily from Tibet and to let him understand what the Emperor thought of his activities. The Chinese official account of his death, which is accepted in the Lama’s *rnam-thar* and in a letter from his brother the Phyag-mdzod to Warren Hastings, is that he died of smallpox. There is no reason to doubt that. This is not the place for a discussion whether the Panchen Lama might have been deliberately infected with the disease, for even if he had been murdered—which is improbable—there is no clear reason why the Žva-dmar-pa should consider himself endangered.

Chinese sources explain the Žva-dmar-pa’s flight as due to a quarrel with his elder brother when the latter returned from China and treated him unfairly by withholding his just share of the late Panchen Lama’s wealth and by persecuting him on account of his position as a Lama of the unreformed church. Some such motive is indicated by the vindictive hatred directed by the Žva-dmar-pa against bKra-sis-lhun-po; and when distributing punishments later the Chinese clearly held the Phyag-mdzod to be largely responsible, for they took him captive to China and confiscated his property as well as that of the Žva-dmar-pa. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the Chinese had other reasons for disliking the Phyag-mdzod, who had taken the leading part in the negotiations with Bogle.

The origin and course of the whole affair are well examined by Professor S. Cammann in his work already mentioned; and as all the principal references are given there I shall not quote them here.

In Nepal the Žva-dmar-pa was welcomed by the Raja, into whose ear he poured incitement against Tibet, recounting in particular the wealth of bKra-sis-lhun-po. The Raja was not unwilling to be incited. Relations between Tibet and Nepal had been strained since the seizure of power by the Gorkhas in 1769; and so, in 1788, on the
pretext that the Tibetan Government was behaving improperly in matters of currency and frontier dues, a Nepalese army was sent into Tibet. It occupied Šel-dkar rdzoṅ and the frontier districts of Skyid-groṅ, Ñe-lam, and rDzoṅ-kha. Tibetan and Chinese officials negotiated an agreement by which the Nepalese were bought off with the promise of a yearly tribute. The Žva-dmar-pa appeared at these negotiations as a representative of Nepal; and on the Lhasa side the representatives included Lamas from Sa-skya and bKra-šis-lhun-po as well as the Minister Bstan-'dzin-dpal-'byor, of the dGa'-bži family, who was married to a niece of the Žva-dmar-pa (Rockhill, *Dalai Lamas*, p. 56). The agreement, reached in 1789, broke down when the Tibetans failed to pay more than one instalment of the tribute; and in 1791 the Nepalese launched a fresh invasion. The dGa'-bži Minister, who was sent to protest, was taken prisoner and a Chinese envoy at Kathmandu, who demanded reparation, was treated with contempt. The Chinese Government, by now aware of the mishandling of affairs by local authorities, dispatched a strong force preceded by renewed demands for reparation and for the surrender of the Žva-dmar-pa. To this last the Raja replied that “the Lama was the same as himself”. Later, when the Chinese had routed the Nepalese and had thrown their country into alarm and confusion, the Raja decided that he would have to give up the Lama, but the latter took his own life by poison. That is the story reported from Kathmandu while the invasion was still in progress (Kirkpatrick, loc. cit.). Chinese sources raise a doubt whether the Žva-dmar-pa’s death was due to poison or to natural causes (Li Tieh-tseng, op. cit., p. 244, n. 153); but there is no good reason to question the account written from Kathmandu at the time. At all events, the Žva-dmar-pa escaped the vengeance of his enemies; but his dead body and his followers were handed over to the Chinese. Professor Cammann also says (op. cit., p. 131) that the Žva-dmar-pa’s Tibetan wife was handed over. C. Imbault Huart, quoting from the same sources in *Journal Asiatique*, 1878, does not mention this.

After the Žva-dmar-pa’s death the Chinese brought a curious charge against him in the Edict of 1793 already mentioned, where it is said: “Quite recently Dza-marpa (Hutuketu) took advantage of the internal condition of Tibet to conspire to seize the office of Panchen Lama and he stirred up the Gorkhas to take by force of arms Tashilhunpo . . .” (Rockhill, *Dalai Lamas*, p. 56). If Rockhill’s translation is correct, this improbable allegation casts some doubt on
other Chinese statements about the affair. But whatever the causes of his action, the Žva-dmar-pa was clearly guilty of treasonable behaviour against Tibet and it is not surprising that the Dalai Lama forbade any further reincarnation of that line and also confiscated the Žva-dmar-pa’s property, including the monastery of Yaňs-pa-can, which was conveyed to the dGe-lugs-pa monastery of Kun-bde-glin.

I understand that the memory of the Žva-dmar-pa is kept alive by a distinguished family at Kathmandu which looks on him as a generous benefactor and recounts the tradition that he disappeared from earth leaving behind him only one leg, the bones of which, together with his boot, are preserved as relics in their house.

It is not entirely inappropriate that the Žva-dmar-pa hierarchy should end in a blaze of violence. In contrast, the Žva-nag-pa Lamas, after they had been displaced from their eminent position by the victorious dGe-lugs-pa, continued to live a succession of quiet and gentle lives remote from politics and devoted only to matters of religion. Their reputation and moral influence are still high in Khams, Sikkim, Bhutan, Nepal, and Ladakh, as well as among the nomads of the Byaň-thaň. The sixteenth Incarnation, Raň-byuň-rig-pa’i-rdo-rje, was born in Khams about 1927. He exemplifies the religious calm and the love of wild animals common to many of his predecessors; and he is held in veneration for his powers as a gter-ston, by which he discovered a store of silver hidden by a former incarnation and which he used to build a new chapel. In addition to his kindness in entertaining me and showing me the treasures of his monastery of mTshur-phu, he conducted for my benefit the ceremony of wearing the magical black hat of Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa, which confers “Deliverance on Sight”. The Lama seated himself on his throne and the hat was brought in a silk-covered box. Two monks took it out, holding it firmly all the time, for they say that if it is let go it will fly away by itself. They placed it on the Lama’s head and he grasped it with one hand and held it for the time it took to count the beads of his rosary as he recited the special prayer for the occasion. When the hat was restored to its box the ceremony ended with a blessing from the Lama.

Mention of the black mitre woven for Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa from the hair of the Mňha’gro-ma some 800 years ago serves to link the present day with the origin of the Karma-pa sect and provides a suitable conclusion for these notes.

1 Although there is now no Žva-dmar-pa Lama, Karma-pa’s like to believe that he continues to reincarnate in the person of the Si-tu Rinpoche of dPal-spūns.
THE KARMA-PA SECT. A HISTORICAL NOTE

By H. E. Richardson

PART II

APPENDIX A


Passages in small capitals are in red in the original.

THE WONDERFUL DECREES “DELIVERANCE AT SIGHT”

By the Great Ming Emperor the Karma-pa gZh'u'u la'i ta'i ba'u hva wan ta'i sin rtsi tsa'i hu'o was invited and was made chief of all the ban-dhe (Buddhist monks) in the Empire. At Li'n-gu svi-sde (temple) he performed a great service of prayers for the Great Imperial Father, Tha'i Ju, and the loving Queen-mother in order to deliver all creatures in the world from the round of transmigration and from hell. The service began on the fifth day of the second month of the fifth year of Yun Lo. On the first day there appeared an iridescent cloud of five colours, beautiful to see, expanding and contracting in various ways, in BRILLIANCE LIKE THE WISH-GRANTING GEM. Also, above the mchod-rten (stupa) of Relics a ray of light, like the full moon, shone out unblemished and flickering a little. Also, two bands of golden rays rose above the dwelling place of the Precious Essence of all Bygone Buddhas, the Religious King, Powerful through Great Compassion, the Karma-pa gZh'u'i la'i ba'u hva wa'n zi then ta'i sin tsi tsa'i hu'o, the place where he performed the ceremony after having made the dkyil-'khor (mandala).

On the sixth day of the month there was seen a large number of iridescent clouds, shaped like begging-bowls, which filled the whole sky. And on the clouds in the south-west many figures of the gNas-brtan (Sthavira) appeared, each followed by a large retinue. Some of them could be very clearly discerned and others not so clearly.

1 The rNam-thar (f. 110) quotes the title gZh'u'u la'i, etc., in a slightly different spelling and apparently from a different source. It translates the title into Tibetan as follows: “De-bzin-gseg-pa rin-po-che chos-kyi-rgyal-po nub-phyogs kyi byams-pa chen-po zi-ba-dba-'phyug-gi sa'n srgyas—Precious Tathagata, Religious King, Great Loving One from the West, Buddha of Imperturbable Power.” PT, f. 81, has a similar translation. This shows that the epithets “Precious Essence”, etc., here intended to be a translation of the title.

From the Tibetan Grammar of S. C. Das it appears that the title was borne by the Zva-nag-pa Lamas at least down to the time of the fourteenth Incarnation, rGyal-dba-theg-mchog-rdo-rje (1797-1845). I understand it is not applied to the present (sixteenth) Incarnation. Perhaps it ceased to be used after the end of the Chinese Empire.

2 It might seem from the Tibetan text that only one dkyil-'khor was made but the rNam-thar mentions at least nine.
For a short time flowers fell from the sky, some fully blown, others in bud; their stems and upper parts were all like crystal and they floated everywhere, both high up and low down. After that, a five-coloured rainbow shone above the chapel containing the dkyil-khor made by De-bzin-gshegs-pa. Then after a time there appeared in the rainbow more than ten gNas-brtan carrying begging-bowls and pilgrim staffs; some were wearing hats, others held yak-tail fans in their hands and they moved about among the clouds.

On the seventh day of the month there dropped from the sky sweet-flavoured, sweet-scented nectar that looked red and white in colour. Also, after a time, in a cloud of many colours there appeared very clearly a tree seemingly of gold and on its branches were flowers like glass, radiating light.

On the eighth day of the month many-coloured rays of light streamed from the south-west quarter to the north-east and flowers floated and danced in the sky. Five-coloured rays shone over the upper room of De-bzin-gshegs-pa Rin-po-che and then vanished into space.

On the ninth day of the month there was a shower of heavenly flowers and nectar; and in the upper air were seen many canopies, banners of victory, silken streamers, and so on. Also, a rainbow-hued light of five colours rose from the roof of De-bzin-gshegs-pa’s upper room and vanished into the sky.

On the tenth day of the month there fell nectar as sweet as honey both to smell and to taste. A five-coloured ray of light flashed to the opposite ends of the sky; and over the mchod-rten there rose three sacred relics like, for example, the moonlight gleaming on a jewel or the sun’s rays on the waves of the sea. Those three bright globes moved up and down the mchod-rten and the circling light spread its radiance over all the ten directions. And again, after many men had seen innumerable dGra-boom-pa (Arhats) moving in the sky, there appeared more than ten Ban-dhe with bundles on their heads and staffs in their hands, who were seen approaching the street. On being questioned they said: “We are going to Liṅ-gu-svi-sde to take breakfast.” The men in the street, seeing that they had long eyebrows and broad foreheads and were very handsome, began to wonder and followed them to inquire who they were; but on reaching the great main gate of Liṅ-gu-svi-sde they could not discover where the Ban-dhe had gone.

On the eleventh day of the month an iridescent cloud of five colours arose and heavenly flowers fell from all sides. Nectar also fell; and on a juniper tree blossomed a flower like a golden lotus with a thousand petals, compactly shaped and of surpassing natural

1 gnam khan, which is found frequently in the text, is perhaps the translation of a Chinese word. It does not seem to be common in Tibetan but I am told it means “a room for meditation, an upper room”.
beauty. From De-bzin-gseg-pa’s dkyil-khor a five-coloured ray shone out.

On the twelfth day of the month heavenly flowers, each as big as a don-rtse (coin) filled the sky above the chapel in every direction and began to fall all around. On that night there could be seen above the head of the (image of the) deity a ray of red light like a rainbow, compact and very bright, illuminating everything. Also, a five-coloured ray of light shone above De-bzin-gseg-pa’s dkyil-khor; and over the mchod-rtsen a single relic rose as brightly as the sun, shining everywhere both above and below, so that the grass and trees were all seen clearly in its light. After a time this brightness appeared again.

On the thirteenth day of the month two Lamps of Perfect Intellect appeared. One came to rest on the tomb and one on the Palace. Also a circular light of five colours moved around the chapel where the dkyil-khor was and shone above the upper room where De-bzin-gseg-pa was staying. At the same time there was a shower of flowers which circled round the Emperor’s apartments as they fell. At midday (when the sun was warm) there was a snowfall of good omen. On that night a brilliance like a jewel appeared above the building where the mchod-rtsen was and in its light the shape of the mchod-rtsen was clearly visible. A barefooted Ban-dhe, in appearance quite unlike any other, was seen wearing a ragged woollen robe the skirt of which he held in his left hand and his shoes in his right hand. As he went along he seemed to fly. People followed him to inquire who he might be and, although they were watching him, when he reached the front of the chapel they could not see where he had gone. Even though they searched they could not find him; but after a little they saw him sitting in a cloud.

On the fourteenth day of the month a blue Khyun (Garuda) and a white crane were seen to fly up into the sky and dance around in it. A five-coloured rainbow cloud encircled the sun; and after a time another rainbow cloud split off from it and encircled the chapel, moving round it. Various phantom shapes, also circular lights, surrounded the upper room of De-bzin-gseg pa Rin-poche. Then after a little while a golden ray appeared and vanished to the opposite end of the sky. Then a crimson ray shone out. It did not fade for a long time. And on that night, in a ray of five-coloured light, there was seen the form of a dkyil-khor, while more than ten images of Bodhisattva (byan-chub-sens-dpa’) appeared, crossing from east to west as they came and went. Golden light shone from the four decorated prayer-masts (’phan sin).

On the fifteenth day of the month a five-coloured ray of light

1 gzim ther, meaning not clear. Jäsche gives “gzim ter”, “lamp”; but the reference here seems to be to part of the Imperial Palace.

shone over the chapel of De-bzìn-ṣegs-pa (the Buddha) and also over the upper room of the living incarnation, the De-bzìn-ṣegs-pa Rin-po-che. After a time it separated into pieces shaped like lotus flowers and became very bright; then after a considerable time it again reformed and shone as a five-coloured ray. In an auspicious cloud there was seen a hermit-saint (dɹan-sroṅ) of golden complexion. A white crane flew up into the sky and circled round dancing. After a while a white ray of light shone from the roof of De-bzìn-ṣegs-pa’s upper room and disappeared into the east. That night over the mchod-rten, the chapel, and the dwelling of the Emperor a rainbow shone; also two circular rays of light each illuminating the other.

On the sixteenth day of the month over the chapel of the mchod-rten and De-bzìn-ṣegs-pa Rin-po-che’s upper room a five-coloured ray of light and a rainbow appeared. A shower of heavenly flowers filled the sky and fell on the royal tomb and the palace.

On the seventeenth day of the month innumerable rays of five-coloured light glowed over the Precious mchod-rten and spread out so as to reach the roof of the chapel. On that night two men were seen standing on top of the prayer-masts; and after that in the south-west many auspicious rainbow-hued clouds appeared on top of which were seen two Ban-dhe, high above the ground, with their hands joined in the attitude of reverence; and on another small cloud one Ban-dhe with his hands joined was seen following after the other two. They all moved in the direction of the chapel and there they descended. Then they ascended again and, on the instant, vanished. Also, on the south-west horizon there appeared three five-coloured rays of light which travelled in a north-easterly direction towards the chapel of the mchod-rten. Opposite them in the east a white ray shone and five-coloured rays shone over De-bzìn-ṣegs-pa Rin-po-che’s upper room.

On the eighteenth day of the month, on which the ceremony was concluded, came flocks of blue ḷhyuṅ and white cranes which danced as they flew. There was a shower of flowers; and in all directions there appeared iridescent clouds of many colours shaped like innumerable auspicious signs of good omen; pearl-like drops of nectar fell and there were breezes of good omen. Many assemblies of innumerable deities of this world were clearly seen. Rainbow clouds formed in the shape of dragons, ḷhyuṅ, lions, elephants, and of precious mchod-rtens. That night, on the tall prayer-masts which stood outside the main door, there appeared two heavenly lamps, of very intense red, and other lights, too, of different kinds which lit up the ten directions and by that light could be seen in the brilliant upper sky, even from a great distance, gods adorned with precious jewels riding on blue lions and white elephants. After some time there shone over the mchod-rten a globe of light of intense brightness
with the form of a sacred relic. It merged into the heavenly lamps and an even more brilliant light flashed forth. Heavenly music of many sorts of stringed instruments caused the foundations of the house and of the dkyil-'khor to tremble. Those who were in the house of the dkyil-'khor and who heard it thought that the sound was in the sky. It continued a long time in the upper air; and after a little the whole of the dkyil-'khor appeared to have been transformed into a golden Paradise (Zin-khams).

On the third day of the third month took place the presentation of the laudatory title Gžu'u la'i ta'i ba'u hva wañ žin then ta'i śin tsi tsai hu'o. On that day more than 2,000 Ban-dhe of the kingdom were bidden to a midday repast at which time a five-coloured rainbow ray arose to the west of Lin-gu-svi-sde and travelled towards the east. The light was like a bridge, extending the length of the sky. Then a five-coloured iridescent cloud, of intense brightness, arose and changed fleetingly into different miraculous appearances. Heavenly flowers fell one after another. Then rosy clouds with rainbow tints spread over the mchod-rt'en and over De-bzin-gṣegs-pa Rin-po-che's upper room; over the upper room shone three bands of five-coloured rays and while they were still visible a single ray of white light and three bands of golden rays shone forth.

On the fourth day of the month De-bzin-gṣegs-pa went to the Palace, to the Skyil Ńin (Lake ?). On that day a rainbow of blue and white colour in five bands appeared and five-coloured rays of light covered De-bzin-gṣegs-pa's upper room and from the Rin-po-che's upper room two white rays of light shone. Also a ray of five-coloured light glowed above the chapel of the mchod-rt'en and two white cranes flew up from the roof and danced in the sky.

On the fifth day of the month the Emperor's retinue went to Lin-gu-sde for a banquet. On that day there shone a ray of five-coloured light, iridescent clouds of five-colours and a ray of golden light. Below the sun there was a very bright radiance. Above De-bzin-gṣegs-pa Rin-po-che's upper room five rays of light shone, also a golden ray. On that night a ray of crimson light rose in the south and glowed on the chapel, illuminating it very brightly.

On the thirteenth of the month, the day when De-bzin-gṣegs-pa set out for Ri-bo-tse-lna on a pilgrimage to 'Jam-dbyangs' holy place, as he took his departure from Lin-gu-sde a five-coloured ray of light rose in the north-west and a crimson ray shone on the upper room of De-bzin-gṣegs-pa Rin-po-che. On the pinnacle of the mchod-rt'en flashed a single ray of light, in colour like gold; also three bands of five-coloured light flashed above the roof of the chapel.

On the fifteenth day of the month all the Ban-dhe performed the ceremony of purification and offered their prayers to De-bzin-gṣegs-pa. On that day a five-coloured iridescent cloud appeared and
flowers fell, filling all the sky. Two white cranes flew into the sky and danced and a jewel of many coloured light flashed. That night the sound of cymbals rang out first on one side then on the other. This lasted for a considerable time and then ceased.

On the sixteenth day of the month the semblance of two mchod-rt'en, one large and one small, appeared in the western chapel. The larger had five stories and measured two 'dom-pa (fathoms) and one hand's breadth up to the top of the finial spire. The smaller phantom mchod-rt'en had five stories. In height it was rather more than five hand's breadths between the base and the pinnacle. There was a very bright light and a golden ray which changed shape and moved about. Nectar dropped from the top of a Zo-lo incense tree and rays of light suffused everything.

On the seventeenth day of the month eight bands of five-coloured light rays shone; then a single ray each of blue, white, and red light which rose in the north-east. A golden light glowed over the chapel of the mchod-rt'en and a rainbow of five colours shone upon the roof of De-bzin-gsegs-pa Rin-po-che's upper room.

On the eighteenth day of the month a ray of blue light shone from the south-west; and a golden ray shone over De-bzin-gsegs-pa Rin-po-che's upper room; then a rainbow brilliance and iridescent clouds just like gold.

2. Translation of Tibetan text of the letter of invitation from the Emperor Wu Tsung to Žva-nag-pa Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje referred to at p. 152. The Tibetan is in Appendix B, no. 7.

Many points have been clarified by translations of the Chinese text generously made for me by Professor V. V. Gokhale, Ferguson College, Poona, and Mr. D. C. Lau, of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

"Ta'i Hva Wan ¹ Rin-chen-dpal-ladan, with single-minded devotion and after washing in scented water, offers this petition.

A humble request to the present Lord of Religion come, self-born, from the West to guide the world.

The fulness of your excellent nature like the all-knowing Heaven is wholly perfected by the experience of countless former lives. Unlimited in the impartial bestowing of divine benefits and blessing,² great in compassionate affection, diffusing religion to all quarters, you have now appeared to the world in bodily form.

In the reign of my ancestor you conferred a boon even to the

¹ The Chinese has "Ta Ch'ing Fa Wang", translated as Greatly Rejoicing, or Greatly Blessed, Prince of the Law. This is the religious title assumed by the Emperor. The Karma-pa Lamas bore the title Ta Pao Fa Wang, Very Precious Prince of the Law.

² The Chinese has here something about expounding the Law in heavenly assemblies. This seems to have dropped out of the Tibetan or the translator has gone astray.
present time through the teaching of the mystic religion in this eastern country when you came at his invitation to this realm.\footnote{1}

My mind has long been humbly devoted to this doctrine and in my thoughts the holy scriptures are of great profundity. In the winter of last year the venerable monk whom you sent, Kvon Tin Ta' i Gvo Sri Bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzañ-po, honoured me by presenting gifts, coming here to the Palace.

Since your compassionate kindness, Lord of Religion, has ordained that you should be reborn in bodily form I rejoice at the auspicious conjunction \footnote{2} that links your destiny and mine. I have now provided presents of gold, silver, sacred images, and ritual vessels, with a principal offering of pearls and monastic robes; and having recently promoted the venerable monk Bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzan-po to the rank of Great Son \footnote{3} (of the Buddha) I send him together with my envoy from here, the Eunuch Le’u Yun of the Zi’ Che’ Kyen,\footnote{4} at the head of some lesser officials; also principal officers of this place with their servants; \footnote{5} and monks with the rank of Gvo Sri, Chen Sri, Gyo’i, Du Gañ, and so on,\footnote{7} bearing presents from this distant land with dutiful and pious affection to invite you here desiring this only, Precious Lord of Religion, that you will show affectionate compassion and for the benefit of living creatures will speedily exert your miraculous powers and travel over the long journey, the hills and the valleys, taking no account of great rivers and the like. Come here I beseech you.

When you are come here it will be like a draught of water when I am thirsty. Be pleased to perform that infinitely miraculous transformation. Do not hesitate but come here and fulfil my wish.

I cannot write in detail of all that is in my mind.”\footnote{8}

\footnote{1}{The earlier visit must be that of De-bzìn-gégs-pa in 1407, as is shown by mention in the Chinese of the Southern Capital. The Emperor Ch’eng Teu transferred the capital from Nanking to Peking, but this was not done until 1414–1420. Wieger (op. cit., p. 1751) states that the monk Ha li ma (Karma-pa) was received at Ling-kouo-seu (Lih gu svi), in Nanking.}

\footnote{2}{The Tibetan has the obscure phrase ‘jal phrad ka bas, but the Chinese confirms my translation. Ka bas must stand for dga’bas, or less probably bkra-bas.}

\footnote{3}{The Tibetan is rGya-sras. The Chinese has Son of the Buddha, which is a title given to high-ranking monks.}

\footnote{4}{Zi’ Che’ Kyen represents the office Ch’i ssu shé chien in the Chinese. The Eunuch Liu Yun is named in the Ming Shih as leader of the expedition.}

\footnote{5}{The Tibetan is bra kyi bgo’ byas, which might conceivably refer to some sort of official dress (bra = marmot; bgo’ = wear). The Chinese gives no help here, but I take the phrase to be a mistake for phra kyi mgo’ byas (phra = ordinary; mgo’ = head, leader), which occurs elsewhere in the letter.}

\footnote{6}{The Chinese is translated: “together with officials of the capital and retainers.”}

\footnote{7}{The words Gvo Sri, etc., represent the monastic titles Kuo Shih, Chan Shih, Chüeh-i, and Tu Kang.}

\footnote{8}{A more literal translation of the closing sentence would be “I have not finished writing all the circumstances in detail”; but the Chinese, as translated by Mr. Lao, reads more graciously—“Faced with the task of writing this letter I am unable to say all I want to say and I hope you will give me your indulgence.”}
The fifteenth day of the ninth month of the eleventh year of Ta’i Miñ Ciñ De.”

The letter consists of a silk-wrapped scroll some 5 feet broad by 2 feet high. The Tibetan is on the right, the Chinese on the left and the date in both languages, together with the imperial seal, are on the left of the Chinese text. The Tibetan is in the ’bam yig script. The text in transliteration and some textual notes will be found in Appendix B (Plates X and XI). It is apparently the work of a Chinese translator. There are so many inaccuracies in spelling and the construction is so ambiguous that without the invaluable guidance of the translations from the Chinese text by Professor Gokhale and Mr. Lau the meaning of the Tibetan would be obscure. Even with that help some passages still present difficulties. The footnotes do not attempt to cover every error and obscurity but deal only with the more interesting of them.

APPENDIX B

Transliterations of letters, etc., in Tibetan from Chinese Emperors to Karma-pa Lamas.


Phrases in the Tibetan are separated by šad; in transliteration I have shown the divisions by a full stop followed by a capital letter.

“dKon mchog gsum byi byin rlas kyis bsod nams chen po’i dpal la brten nas rgyal po ņed kyi luñ Rañ-byuñ rdo rje la gsol ba. bDe bar gség pa’i bstan pa byañ phyogs kyi rgyal po rnams la dar ba ’gyur ba luñ bstan pa’i stobs kyis sañs rgyas kyi chos lugs kyiăn ci riggs pa rtogs par yod ’dug. De rjes nas se chen rgyal po kyan bla ma dge ba’i bsês gêñen rab tu mañ po brten ŋin bkur bas sañs rgyas kyi bstan pa sa cha ’dir dar byar byas ’dug pa kun la gsal mod. ņed kyis kyan bstan pa’i skyoñ bran legs par byed pa’i ’dod pa dañ khyed thos pa mañ po dañ yon tan kh Yad par du ’phags šin bzañ po du ma dañ yañ ldan žer ba thos pas mgon po la sogs pa’i gser yig pa rtogs par yod ’dug pa rnas khyed len du btañ pa yin. Gal te khyed šñad gžan byas nas mi yon bar gyur na. Dad pa can gyi sems sun ’byin pa’i ņes pa dañ rnal ’byor pa rañ gi yul spoñ ma thub pa’i bag chags sa bon dri ꞑ a ba dañ gžan don phyogs med du byed par ’dod pa’i lhag bsam ’jig par ’gyur pa’i skyon dañ. Bstan pa la ma bsam par ’gyur ba’i sdig pa dañ. Sems can rnas kyi dka’ thub sþug bsñał la ji mi šñam pa’i sgrìb pa dañ ņed kyi khrims lugs chen po’i ’jva’ sa la log pa byas pa’i sgyo nas ņed kyi sems ma rañs par byas pa’i stobs kyis bstan pa byin po la gnod pa byas par mi ’gyur ba e yin debs na ņed kyis mgo byas byas sems can thams cad kyi don la bsams nas mgyogs par byon. ”Dir phebs nas bstan pa’i bya ba
khyed kyi ’dod pa dañ mthun par sgrub pa yin. Lug lo dbyid zla tha chuñ gi tshes bcu gsum la ta’i tu na yod dus bris.”


”rGyal po’i luṅ gi. dGe ba’i bses gñen rañ byuñ rdo rje la gsol ba. Ćed kyis mgon po mňas nas khyed len du btañ ba yin pa la. Ćed kyi luṅ la log ma byas par yon gi yod ŋer ba thos pa’i don la. Ra dza ta tshe dben dañ zam bh’o gñis mňas nas yi ge rten dañ bcas pa bkur yod. Siṅ kun tu ma bzugs par zla ba gñis pa’i tshes ŋi ŋu’i khoṅs su tho braṅ du slebs par byon. Spre’u lo zla ba dañ po’i tshes gñis kyi ŋin ta’i tu na yod dus bris.”


dKon mchog gsum gyi byin rlabs la brten nas. Tha’i hor tha’i tsu ņed kyi e ji. Chos rje riṅ po che karma pa’i druṅ du. Na niṅ bla ma yar byon dus thugs dgoñs bzañ po’i sgo nas rañ re la phan pa’ai bya ba bzañ po sgrubs nas myur du phyir ’byon par žal gys bzes šiṅ. Bla ma byon nas lo gñis soṅ ba la. Bla mas gusins pa’i chos dran ciṅ. Bla ma la mos gus dañ dad pa yod pa’i don la. Šnar yaṅ gdan ’dren gyi gser yig pa btañ na ’an. De bar du ’dir nam chags phebs kyi tshigs gsal ma thos pa’i don la. Yaṅ bla ma gdan ’dren pa la dge bses don rin gi gmo byas gser yig pa rnams btañ yod pas. Rañ re la bsams nas bstan pa’ai žabs thog la gdoṅs te myur du ’byon pa bla ma mkhyen. Gal te myur du ma byon par gsuñ thog tu ma phebs na. Dad pa dañ ldan pa’ai bu slob rnams kyi yi chad pa dañ. gZan yaṅ chos la log pa rnams kyis thos nas. Khöṅ lta bu gsuñ thog tu ma phebs na gżan rnams gaṅ na bden zer ciṅ bstan pa la gnod pas. gSer yig ’di rnams sleg pa dañ ņed la bsams nas bstan pa’ai žabs thog dañ sems can gyi don la gdoṅs nas myur du ’byon pa bla ma mkhyen. Yi ge gžigs pa’i rten. Nam bza’ cha tshaṅ ma gcig. gSer bre chen gcig. mChod pa’i chas bskur bdog. Byi lo zla ba dañ po’i tshes bcu’i ŋin ta ’i tu nas bris.”

4. Letter from Togh Temur to the Lama Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje dated 1356, quoted in NT, f. 88. See p. 147, ib.

”Tshe riṅ gnam gyi še moṅ la bsod nams chen po’i dpal la brten nas rgyal po ņed kyi luṅ. Rol pa’i rdo rje la gsol ba. ņed kyi mga byas gdul bya maṅ po la dgoñs te. Khyed bod phyogs su skye ba bžes nas mtshur phu’i dgon par bžugs žes thos. De’i don la snar gyi yon tan dañ phrin las la bsam nas. Sems can maṅ po’i don la tin ju dañ dkon mchog rgyal mtshan gys mga byas gser yig pa rnams gdan ’dren du btañ yod pas. Da lta sñigs ma’i dus ’dir sdug bṣal gys gzir ba’i sems can la dgoñs te. ’Di phyogs kyi skal pa dañ ldan pa’i gdul bya rnams la chos kyi bdud rtsis tshim par mdzad pa dañ. Lam gol lam stor pa’i sems can rnams kyi ’dren pa mdzad pa’i don
THE KARMA-PA SECT. A HISTORICAL NOTE:

1. Ran yul spans nas sku lus kyi tshigs la mi lta bar myur du 'byon par ŋu žin. Yaŋ thub pas gzan don du dgonbs nas sdbus snał dan du blaṅs te yul khambs pa dad du sems can gyi don mdzad pa thugs la gsal mod. {Sk}u khambs kyi 'tsho skyon. Chos kyi bṣad ŋan. Bod phyogs rkyan pa la žen par ma mdzad pa. 'Di nas mñas pa'i gsers yig par der sgeb pa'i 'thad du ņed la bsam nas. 'Di phyogs su mjal dus saṅs rgyas kyi bstan pa rgya cher ci nus su dar bar byed ciṅ sems can maṅ po thar lam la 'god pa la dgoṅs la snaṅ ma mdzad pa myur du 'byon pa slob dpon chen po rol pa'i rdo rje mkhyen. mChod pa'i chas dan 'jva' sa'i rten la gser bre geig. dNul bre gsum. Gos phyi naṅ dgu tshan gnis yod. Sprel lo zla ba bceu pa'i tshes bceu'i ŋin la ta'i tu nas bris pa'i 'jva' sa' bkra sis par gyur cig.'

5. Letter from the Emperor Ch'eng Tsu (Yung Lo) to the Lama De-bzin-gsegs-pa quoted in PT, f. 77. See p. 147, ib.

"Bla ma khyped kyis. De-bzin gsegs pa'i chos zab mo mkhyen pa'i don la nub phyogs kyi sems can thams cad kyi don byed pa kun gyis skyabs su 'gro pa daṅ gus par saṅs rgyas 'jig rten du 'byon pa lta bu'i. Khyed thabs šes rab yon tan phrin las mhoch gi dños grub ma thob na de bzin du sems can thams cad la phan pa rgya chen po ga la 'byuṅ. Ńed snaṅ byaṅ phyogs su yod pa'i dus su khyed kyi mtshan bzaṅ po thos nas lan geig mjal bsam pa'i sems bzin da lta go sa chen po la bžugs. Yul dbus kyi rgyal khams kun bde bar 'dug. Yun riṅ du bsams pa la mun pa bsal ba lta bu drin mpañam pa ŋud phan yon thun moṅ du mdzad dgos. Snaṅ Ša' kya thub pas thugs rjes bzun nas sems can thams cad kyi don byed. Thub pa'i chos kyi dños grub zab mo thob pa'i don la khyed thub pa'i thugs daṅ gnis su med par 'dug pas yul dbus 'dir byon nas Saṅs rgyas kyi bstan pa dan ba daṅ rgyal khams kyi phan bde la dgoṅs nas. Ńed kyis snaṅ bsams pa bzin rjes su 'breṅs nas bla ma khyed cis kyaṅ 'byon par mdzod. Snaṅ gyi rgyal pos yul dbus kyi rgyal khams bde ba'i sgo nas bcos pa yin. Saṅs rgyas kyi bstan pa la yaṅ dad pa snon du 'gro ba. Ńed kyi yab Tha'i rgyal po hu haṅ daṅ dad pa can gyi btsun mo Hu haṅ bu gnal la gsegs nas yun riṅ. Drin bsab dgos pa thabs gaṅ yaṅ ma rṇed. Bla ma khyed thabs šes phrin las kyi sgo nas mhoch gi dños grub thob pa'i don gyis Saṅs rgyas gyi no bo ŋid yin par 'dug. Cis kyaṅ myur par byon nas 'das pa rṁams la sgrul pa'i cho ga sgrub pa'i don la da lta'i li skyam. Ša'u skyam. Hu'u rkyen la sogs pa mnags nas yi ge'i rten bskur gdan 'dren soṅ yod. Bla ma thugs rjes bzuṅ la mṅes par mdzod la myur du 'byon pa ŋu. Yi ge'i rten gyi dṅul bre chen gsum la sraṅ bgryaṅ daṅ lna bceu. Gos yug mdog mi 'dra ba phyi bceu. Naṅ dar mdog mi 'dra ba bceu. Tsandan dum geig. Spos dkar rgya ma bceu. Zu'u haṅ spos rgya ma gaṅ. Ja dkar rgya ma bgrya daṅ lna bceu. Sna drug yun lo zla ba gnis pa'i tshes bco bgryaṅ la pho braṅ chen po nas bris."
has gone wrong in the copying by dPa’-bo-Gtsug-lag. The date of the letter is probably not later than the fourth year of Yung Lo—1406—as the visit of De-bzing-gsogs-pa took place at the beginning of the fifth year.

6. The great scroll presented by the Emperor Ch‘éng Tsu to the Lama De-bzing-gsogs-pa. See p. 148, ib., and Appendix A, no. 1.

The text below is divided into sections, each dealing with one day, which in the original are separated by paintings illustrating the events described. In the copy which the Žva-nag Lama had made for me the phrases are marked off by a single, double, or triple šad. From photographs it appears that on the scroll itself punctuation signs are very few and that phrases are separated almost entirely by spacing. In the transliteration I have attempted to follow that model and have not used full stops and capital letters to divide the phrases as in the other transliterations. The copy also has several phrases written in red. I cannot recall whether this was so in the original but that seems probable, and I have shown those phrases in italics.

There are numerous mistakes in spelling which will be sufficiently obvious without comment. As I have not been able to check them all with the original it is possible that some may be due to the modern copyist; but the work was done under the supervision of the Lama himself and, where I have been able to check it, the copying is accurate. It is improbable that copying mistakes are frequent.

“No mtshar ’ja’ sa mthoṅ groṣ chen mo bzhugs so

Ta’i miṅ rgyal pos Gžu’u la’i ta’i ba’u hva waṅ ta’i śin tsi tsa’i hu’o dkar ma pa gdan ’dren rgyal kham s gyi ban dhe thams cad kyi gtsob mo mdzad nas lin gu svi sde nas cho ga chen po mdzad ya(b) tha’i ju rgyal po chen po byams pa’i yum btsun mo ’jig rten gyi sams can thams cad ’khor ba ṇan soṅ la sgrol ba’i don la yun lo sña pa zla ba gniś pa’i tshes lña’i ŋin cho ga ‘dbu btsug pa la żag daṅ po la sprin ’ja’ kha tog sna lña bltas na mdzes pa spro bsdu’i rnam pa sna tshogs yid bzhin nor bu’i ’od daṅ ’dra ba byuṅ yaṅ riṅ srel mchod rten gyi steṅ gu ’od zer phro ba zla ba ṇa gaṅ ba daṅ ’dra žiṅ dri ma med pa cuṅ zad g-yo ba byuṅ yaṅ gser gyi ’od zer rim pa gniś sar de bzhin gsogs pa thams cad kyi no bo rin po che chos kyi rgyal po byams pa chen po’i dbaṅ phyug kar ma pa’i gzim khaṅ gzu’i la’i ta’i ba’u hva waṅ zi then ta’i śin tsi tsa’i hu’o dkyil ’khor bzhéṅs nas cho ga bsgrub pa’i gnas.

Tshes drug gi ŋin ’ja’ sprin lhun bzo gyi rnam pa lta bu nam mkha’ gaṅ ba byuṅ yaṅ lho nub phyogs kyi sprin steṅ du gnas bṛtan gyi sku maṅ po byon re re la yaṅ ’khor maṅ po rjes su ’braṅ ba la la ni śin tu gsal ba’i rnam pa la la ni cuṅ zad mi gsal ba byuṅ nas re ŋig bar la me tog bab nas la la gaṅ la la ma
gan pa yu ba rten pa thams cad šel dkar po 'dra ba steñ 'tog thams cad la 'phur ba byuñ yan de'i rjes su 'ja' kha tog sna de bžin gséggs pas' mdzad pa'i dkyil 'khor lha khañ steñ du šar de nas re žig tsam na sprin gyi nañ na gnas brtan bu lhag tsam lhuñ bzod dañ mkhal sil bsnam pa la la ža gon pa lag na rña yab 'dzin pa sprin gyi nañ na 'gro 'oñ mdzad pa byuñ.

Tshes bdun gi ŋin nam mkha' la bdud rtsi kha tog mar dkar lta bu dri zim pa ro mnar ba bab yan re šig rtsam na kha tog sna tshogs pa'i sprin gyi nañ du gser gyi ldon po lta bu'i yal ga la me tog šel lta bu 'od zer 'phro ba dañ beas pa šin tu gsal ba byuñ.

Tshes brgyad kyi ŋin kha tog lña'i 'od zer lho nub kyi mtshams nas byañ sar 'tshams su slebs pa me tog namkha' la 'phur nas gar byed phyogs kun tu bdud rtsi bab de bžin gséggs pa rin po che'i gnam khañ steñ du 'od zer kha tog lña šar bar snañ la ston du soñ.

Tshes dgu'i ŋin yañ lha'i me tog dañ bdud rtsi bab yañ nam mkha bar snañ la bya bres dañ rgyal mtshan dañ 'phan la svogs pa du ma snañ ba yañ 'ja' 'od kha tog sna lña de bžin gséggs pa'i gnam khañ steñ nas šar nas nam mkha la soñ.

Tshes bcu'i ŋin bdud rtsi'i char bab dri zim pa ro mnar ba sbran rtsi 'dra yañ 'od zer kha tog lña nam mkha' la thad sor ston du soñ mchod rten gyi steñ du riñ srel gsum šar la la zla ba'i 'od zer kyi rin po che la 'phros pa lta bu dper na ŋi ma'i 'od zer rgya mtsho'i rlab la 'phros pa dañ 'dra 'od kyi goñ bu gsum mchod rten gyi steñ dañ 'og tu gyo žin 'khor ba 'od zer 'phros pa phyogs bcu kun tu khyab ciñ yañ dgra bcom pa dpag tu med pa nam mkha'la byon pa mi mañ pos mthon ba'i rjes la ban dhe bcu lhag tsam mgho la 'bog char khrar lag na mkhal sił bzuñ nas sran la 'gro ba mthon mi rnam kyi dris pa 'ned lín gu svi sde la 'gro zer srañ gi mis mthon b sañ ma riñ dpral ba yañs pa śin tu mdzes pa the tsom skyes ste ci 'dra yin brtag pa'i ched du phyi nas 'brañs nas soñ sog mo cher slebs pa dañ gar soñ ma mthon.

Bcu gcig gi ŋin sprin 'ja' kha tog sna lña šar žin lha'i me tog kyañ 'khor nas bab bdud rtsi yañ bab šugs pa'i sdon po la gser gyi me tog pad ma 'dab ston 'dra bar 'bril pa rañ bžin gyi śin tu mdzes pa de bžin gséggs pa dkyil 'khor gyi steñ nas 'od zer kha tog sna lña 'phro ba.

Bcu gnis kyi ŋin lha'i me tog che chuñ doñ rtse tsam lha khañ gi steñ na nam mkha' gañ ba khyab ciñ 'khor nas bab de'i nub mo lha'i dbuie steñ na 'od zer dmar po 'ja' ltar 'bril pa śin tu gsal śin kun du khyab pa yañ 'od zer kha tog lña de bžin gséggs pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi steñ du šar ba mchod rten gyis steñ na riñ srel rdog po ciñ ŋi ma šar ba dañ 'dra steñ 'og kun du 'phro žin rtsa śin thams cad de'i 'od kyis gsal byuñ re šig na yañ de 'dra gsal ba byuñ.
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Bcu gsun ningar ses rab kyi 'od zer gnis byun cig ban so la zug cig pho brañ la zug yان 'od kor sna lña yان dkyil 'khor gyi lha khan la 'khor ba yان de bzin gseg pa bžugs pa'i rin po che'i gnam khan la šar ba dañ dus mñam du me tog gi char yان bab cin gon ma'i gzim ther la bskor nas bab ンi ma dros ka la dge ltas kyi kha ba byun de'i nub mo rin po che'и 'od mchod rten gyi khan pa'i steñ du 'phros pa'i 'od kyi nañ na mchod rten gyi gzung śin tu gsal ba cig byun ban dhe rkañ rjen pa skye gzung gžan dañ mi 'dra ba bin po hrul po gon pa lag pa g-yon po ben po'i mthu ba bzuñ ba g-yas pas lham bzuñ ba 'gro na 'phur ba dañ 'dra ci 'dra yin brtag pa'i ched du phyi bzin 'brañs nas bítas kyañ lha khan gi mdun du slebs pa dañ gar soñ ma šes gar btsal kyañ ma rñed re śig tsam la sprin gyi nañ na bžugs pa mthon.

Bcu bzi ningar khyun śon po dañ bas ho'ø nam mkha' la 'phur nas 'khor gin gar byed kha tog sna lña sprin 'ja' ンi ma la bskor ba re śig tsam na yān sprin 'ja' gyes śin 'khor gin lha khan la bskor ba yān re śig tsam na gser gyi 'od zer cig šar nas tha sor nam mkha' la soñ yān 'od zer dmar po cig 'phros nas yun riñ bar la ma yal de'i nub mo yān 'od zer kha tog sna lña'i nañ na dkyil 'khor gyi rnam pa šar yān byan chubems dpa'i gzung brñen bou lhaŋ tsam šar nub la 'gro 'on byed pa mthon 'phan śin bzi'i rtse la gser gyi 'od šar.

Bco lña'i ningar kha tog sna lña'i 'od zer de bzin gseg pa'i lha khan steñ du šar yān de bzin gseg pa bžugs pa'i rin po che gnam khan steñ du yān šar re śig tsam na me tog pad ma bzin du dum bu dum bu śin tu gsal ba byun yun riñ cig lon pa dañ yān 'od zer kha tog sna lña 'gyur śin šar yān bkra śes kyi sprin gyi nañ du drañ sron gser mdog can cig yān bas ho'ø nam mkha' la 'phur śin 'khor nas gar byed re śig tsam na de bzin gseg pa'i rin po che gnam khan steñ na 'od zer dkar po cig šar nas šar phyogs su soñ de'i nub mo mchod rten dañ lha khan steñ du rgyal chen gyi khan pa'i steñ du thams cad la 'ja' 'od šar yān 'od kor gnis geig la cig 'phros pa byun.

Bcu drug gi ningar mchod rten gyi lha khan dañ de bzin gseg pa bžugs pa'i rin po che gnam khan dañ gnis kyi steñ du 'od zer kha tog sna lña šar yān sprin 'ja' šar lña'i me tog nam mkha' gañ ba bab bañ so dañ pho brañ gañ ba bab.

Bcu bduñ gi ningar rin po che mchod rten gyi steñ du 'od zer kha tog sna lña dpag med 'phros nas dkyil 'khor gyi lha khan steñ tshun chad du khyab par byun de'i nub mo 'phan śin gi steñ du mi gnis lañs pa mthon ba'i rjes la yān lho nub na bkra śes pa'i sprin 'ja' mañ po byun ba'i steñ na ban dhe gnis lañs ste gus pas thal mo sbyar ba mthon yān sprin chuñ ba cig gi steñ na ban dhe cig thal mo sbyar nas gnis po'i rjes su soñ ba mthon thams cad lha khan gi phyogs su 'oøs te mar babs
Bco brgyad cho ga rdzogs pa'i ņin khyuṅ sṇon po bas ho'o tshan pa tshan pa 'phur nas gar byed pa dañ me tog gi char bab pa byuṅ phyogs thams cad nas sprin 'ja' kha tog sna tshogs pa dge ltas kyi rten 'bral mañ po mu tig gi rdog po lta bu'i bdud rtsi mañ po bab rten 'bral bzaṅ po'i rluṅ 'jig rten pa'i lha dpag med 'tshogs pa mañ po mthoṅ ba rnam byuṅ sprin 'ja' 'brug 'dra ba khyuṅ 'dra ba sen ge 'dra ba glan po che 'dra ba rīn po che mchod rten 'dra ba de'i nub mo sgo'i phyi log na yod pa'i phan sīṅ riṅ po'i steṅ na 'hā'i mar me gniś sīṅ tu dmar bā 'od gzan daṅ mi 'dra ba phyogs bour gsal ba'i naṅ na sen ge sṇon po daṅ glan po che dkar po la bcibs pa'i lha rin po che rgyan daṅ ldn pa'od kyi bar snaṅ thag riṅ sor bltas pa'i gsal ba mthoṅ de nas re sīṅ na mchod rten gyi steṅ du reṅ srel lta bu'i 'od kyi goṅ bu sīṅ tu gsal ba sār ba byuṅ 'hā'i mar me daṅ dres sār yāṅ 'od chen por gyur 'hā'i rol mo sgra sīṅān sna tshogs pa khaṅ pa daṅ dkyil 'khor gyi sa gzi gyo ba tsam byuṅ dkyil 'khor gyi khaṅ pa'i naṅ du yod po maṃs kyi ḋān pa sgra de yāṅ nam mkha' la yod po tshor bar snaṅ la yāṅ riṅ du byuṅ ba sogs yun riṅ po ma lön par dkyil 'khor thams cad gser gyi sīṅ khams su 'gyur ro.

Zla ba gsum pa'i tshes gsum gi ņin bstod ciṅ mtshan gsol ba gzi'u la'i ta'i ba'u hva waṅ zin then ta'i šen tsi tsa'i hu'o de'i ņin par 'jig rten gyi ban dhe khrī tsho gniś lhag tsam la dro draṅs liṅ gu sde nas 'ja' 'od zer kha tog sna lña nib phyogs su byuṅ nas sār phyogs su slebs 'od zer zam pa daṅ 'dra riṅ ba gnam daṅ 'dra yāṅ kha tog lña'i sprin 'ja' šar 'od rab tu gsal ba sprul pa rigs mi 'dra ba 'gul ba 'hā'i me tog rim pa bab yāṅ sprin dmar gyi 'ja' 'od mchod rten bkab de bziṅ gṣeks pa'i rīn po che'i gnam khaṅ bkab nam khaṅ gi steṅ na 'od zer kha tog sna lña rim pa gsum sār bžugs na 'od zer dkar po ciṅ sār gser gyi 'od rim pa gsum šar.

Tshe bē zi' ņin de bziṅ gṣeks pa pho braṅ naṅ byon nas skyil ŋin la de'i ņin par 'ja' 'od sūṅ po dkar po rim pa lña šar yāṅ 'od zer kha tog lña de bziṅ gṣeks pa'i gnam khaṅ g-yogs riṅ po che'i gnam khaṅ steṅ na 'od zer dkar po gniś šar yāṅ 'od zer kha tog lña mchod rten gyi lha khaṅ la 'phros yāṅ bas ho'o gniś steṅ nas 'phur gin gar byed.

Tshes lña' ņin goṅ ma'i rgyal bcas liṅ gu sde la dro 'dren pa 'gro ba daṅ de'i ņin par 'od zer kha tog sna lña šar yāṅ sprin 'ja' kha tog sna lña'i 'od zer šar gser gyi 'od zer šar ņi ma'i 'og na 'phros pa sīṅ tu gsal de bziṅ gṣeks pa'i riṅ po che'i gnam khaṅ steṅ na 'od zer lña šar lha khaṅ la 'phros pa sīṅ tu gsal ba.
The scroll is mentioned in the history of dPa'-bo Gtsug-lag (vol. Pa, ff. 77-82) and in the Karma-pa rNam-thar. In the former there is a long account of De-biin-gdegs-pa’s visit complete with details of his reception by the Emperor, the ceremonial, entertainments, presents, and so on; there is also a summary of the miracles. Much of the information is additional to that contained in the scroll and is presumably drawn from the rNam-thar Chen-mo at mTshur-phu. The passages are too long to quote and I shall only transliterate, below, a few sentences from each work which relate to the scroll itself.

PT, f. 81 b.

... “Ño mtchar mtha’ yas pa byuñ ba rnambs ñin so so’i lín tse bkod. ... Bod rgya yu gur sogso yig rigs du ma’i žal yig dañ bcas pa dar yug chen po geig gi dkyus tsam pa’i ño mtchar ’ja’ sa žes gai than yug dril du ma da lta yod par lta.”
NT, 110 b.

"Ñin re bžin ŋo mtshar mi ’dra ba sna tshogs byun ba rnam gsön ma’i bkas ri mor bkod pa dañ rgya hor yu gur tu ruska ste yig rigs lha’i kha byaṅ btab de ’dra sgar chen du a’ñ yod par gsuṅs śīn rnam thar chen mor yaṅ byun.’"

From the last sentence it appears that there was a copy of the scroll at sGar-chen. For this name see p. 158, ib. It is unlikely that more than one copy would be made of so large and elaborate a document and the reference here is probably to mTshur-phu.

7. Letter from the Emperor Wu Tsung to the Lama Mi-bskyor-rdo-rje dated 1516. At mTshur-phu. See p. 152, ib., and Appendix A, no. 2.


Ta’i miṅ ciṅ de’i lo bcu cig zla dgu bca’ lña ŋin.”

There are many straightforward misspellings to which I need do no more than draw attention, e.g. ’jigs brtan for ’jig rten; rjni rje for sñin rje; lug for lugs; rgun for dgun; pho raṅ for pho braṅ;
sled for sleb; žam sdog for žabs rtog; sṅag for mṅag; sdzu ’phrul for rdzu ’phrul.

Some points have been mentioned in notes on the translation in Appendix A and a few more may be noted here.

1. The Tibetan would appear to mean that the monks' robes were ornamented with pearls (mo dig + mu tig), but that is manifestly improbable and the Chinese text shows that the pearls and the robes were separate offerings.

2. brtse cig is probably a mistake for rtse cig.

3. cig kyaṅ is perhaps a mistake for cis kyaṅ, meaning "somehow or other"; but in the absence of clear guidance from the Chinese I have translated what is written.

4. min mdzen pa may be a mistake for min (pa) ’dzin pa or min mdzad pa. The meaning "taking no account of" appears from the Chinese text.

5. rgyun mtshan I take to be a mistake for rgyu mtshan.

The rNam-thar (f. 151 b) has a short paraphrase of this letter as follows:—

"Tha'i can sogs gser yig pa gdan 'dren du byuṅ. 'Jva' sar. Ni ma nub'phyogs na lha raṅ byon chos rje'i druṅ du lus spos chus bkrus. Pus mos la btsugs nas žu ba. Ńed karma pa sīni nas 'dod pa la skom pa chu 'dod pa ltar. Khyed daṅ na las 'phro yod pas. La chen chu chen rnams 'ju 'prul gyis byon曙og.'"

This inadequate paraphrase need not throw doubt on the general accuracy of the other letters quoted in the rNam-thar, which are mostly of greater length and include the date of writing. They have, I think, the appearance of genuine copies.
**APPENDIX C**

Principal Incarnations of the Karma-pa Sect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vä Nag-pa</th>
<th>Vä Dmar-pa</th>
<th>Si-tu Rin-po-che</th>
<th>Dpa'-bo Rin-po-che</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Mthoñ-ba ldon-ldan</td>
<td>1416–1453</td>
<td>6. 'Phrln las rgya-mtsho</td>
<td>1639 (?–)–1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rgyal-mchog Chos-dbyaň rdo-rje</td>
<td>1604–1674</td>
<td>10. (Dge-'dun bstam-'dzin rgya-mtsho ?)</td>
<td>1733–1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rañ-byuñ rig-pa'i rdo-rje</td>
<td>c.1927</td>
<td>15. (Dge-'dun bstam-'dzin rgya-mtsho ?)</td>
<td>1733–1791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The succession is not clear. It is possible that the lama born c. 1639 died in about 1645 and was succeeded by another born in 1646.

**The first mention of this incarnation which I have seen refers to the early fifteenth century. As I have at present no exact information about the number or the dates of these Lamas I have entered them as contemporaries of the Vä-naq-pa whose pupils they were. The line continues to the present day but I have not yet secured information about the Lamas from the nineteenth century onwards.**

1. Chos-dbañ lhun-grub | 1440–1503
2. Gtsug-lag 'phreñ-ba | 1504–c.1566
3. Chos-kyi Go-cha, |
4. Gtsug-lag rgya-mtsho | 1567–1633
5. Chos-kyi rgyal-mtsho, |
6. Gtsug-lag don-grub | 1700–1765
7. Gtsug-lag gos-rbyis | 1766–c.1820
8. Gtsug-lag lhun-grub | c.1820–9

**This line continues to the present day; but I have not yet secured information about the successors to the eighth Lama.**

It is possible that the lama born c. 1639 died in about 1645 and was succeeded by another born in 1646.