THE DALAI-LAMAS AND REGENTS OF TIBET:  
A CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY  

BY  

LUCIANO PETECH  

INTRODUCTION  

Modern Tibetan history, and chiefly that of the 19th century, 
suffers from a general vagueness and uncertainty about dates. The 
usual accounts ¹ rely on second-hand information and on the 
Chinese texts, whose data after 1750 are meagre and insufficient 
the nearer one comes to our times: the one vital exception is the 
Gurkha war of 1791-2. The fact is that the 19th century can be 
defined as the colonial period of Tibetan history: a time of peace 
but not of prosperity, drab and uninteresting by all standards. 
Accordingly, the official lives of the Dalai-Lamas, who always 
died quite young, give only details of their education, studies, 
audiences etc. For the Chinese, Tibet had become an uninteresting 
protectorate, whose affairs were handled directly by the two 
Manchu residents in Lhasa (amban) with scanty reference to the 
Peking government, and therefore very little material on Tibet 
can be found in the enormous collection of the Veritable Docu-
ments (Shih-lu) of the late Ch'ing dynasty. 

It is my purpose to place on a sounder footing the chronology 
of the Dalai-Lamas and above all of the regents, who in fact were 
almost invariably the actual rulers of Tibet in the 18th and 19th 
centuries. It is not my intention to write a history of Tibet during

¹) W. W. Rockhill, The Dalai Lamas of Lhasa and their relations with the Manchu 
emperors of China, in T'oung Pao XI (1910), pp. 1-104; G. Schulemann, Geschichte der 
the last two centuries, and historical material as such is not to be sought for in this article, although it will be noticed that in some points closely connected with chronological problems I have departed from this rule and allowed myself to expatiate somewhat. This is particularly the case for the late 19th century, a period about which hitherto nothing was known, or nearly so.

A word of caution about dates. It is well known that in Tibetan chronology the so-called Hor months indicate Chinese moons, although the name itself refers to the Uigur calendar. Whenever in a Tibetan text the month is marked as hor-sla, I have treated it as a Chinese month and given its European equivalence accordingly 1). When this is not the case, it may (or may not) mean that the older, purely Tibetan calendar was followed, about which we know almost nothing. In these dates I have given the European equivalent of the Chinese date preceded by the word “about”; this is merely tentative, and the reader is warned that there may be a discrepancy as large as a month or more. A thorough scientific study of the calendar is one of the most urgent desiderata in the field of Tibetan historical studies.

The following abbreviations will be used:


1) In the present article Chinese and Tibetan months are indicated by Roman numerals, while European months are written out in full.


Life 13th DL = Life of the 13th Dalai-Lama (Lhar-bcas-srid-li'am-gtsug-rgyans-go-nam-sku-p'ren-sku-pa-c'en-po-ni-rnam-par-t'ar-rgya-mt's'o-la-bu-las-mdos-brjod-pa-no-mt'sar-rin-po-c'e'i-p'ren-ba. Printed 1940 at the Zol Par-k'han, and thus no particulars about its author or sponsor can be elicited.

Lon-ba'i-dmigs-bu = gZun-labs-rnas-la-nc-bar-mk'o-ba-bla-dpon-ri-byon-gyi-lo-rgyus-t'am-deb-lo'n-ba'i-dmigs-bu 2). Modern copy in my possession.

I have to thank Professor Tucci for putting at my disposal most of the Tibetan texts utilized in this article.

THE DALAI-LAMAS

I. dGe-dun-grub, who is postumously considered as the first Dalai-Lama, was born in the Iron-Sheep year 1391 in a small farm in the Srad valley not far from Sa-skya 3). Klo'n-rdol calls the place Ngarmts'o in gTsa Sab-stod 4), i.e., in the upper Sab (Shap) valley, south-west of Shigatse 5). He died at bKra-sis-lhun-po on the 4th day of dgun-zla 'brin-po (the 12th month) of the Wood Horse year, i.e., about 11th January, 1475 6).

1) The copy of this book in Professor Tucci's library lacks the last leaf, and thus no particulars about its author or sponsor can be elicited.

2) On this work see J. Bacot, Titres et colophons d'ouvrages non canoniques tibétains, in BFEEO 44 (1954), p. 328 n. 64.


4) Klo'n-rdol, f. 20a; Lon-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 2.

5) These local names in Central Tibet, and others to be mentioned later on, can be looked up in the maps in A. Ferrari, mK'ye-brtse's Guide to the holy places of Central Tibet, Rome 1958.

6) Life of dGe-dun-grub, ff. 55a, 60a. Klo'n-rdol, f. 20a, gives the 8th day of rgyal-zla (Pausya), i.e. about the 15th January, 1475. It is noteworthy that Klo'n-rdol's dates of the early Dalai-Lamas mostly differ from the usual ones. I am unable to account for this discrepancy.
II. dGe-'dun-rgya-mtso, postumously considered as the second Dalai-Lama, was born on the 3rd day of rgyal-zla (the 12th month) of the Tibetan Fire-Monkey year and of the Hor Wood-Sheep year\(^1\), i.e., about 30th December, 1475, near rTa-nag rDo-rje-gdan; his family name was Sreg-mi \(^2\). He died in the dGa'ldan P'o-bran at 'Bras-spuns \(^3\) on the 8th day of nag-pa (Caitra; 3rd month) of the Water-Tiger year (about 23rd March, 1542) \(^4\).

III. bSod-nams-rgya-mtso was born on the 25th day of the first spring moon (dpyid-ra dan-po; the 2nd month) of the Water-Hare year (about 29th March, 1543) \(^5\). His birth place was mDa'-rtse dGa'-k^n-gsar-gon in the sTod-luñ valley west of Lhasa \(^6\). His first meeting with Altan Khan, who granted him the title Dalai-Lama, took place on 15/V (Hor)/Earth-Tiger (19th June, 1578) \(^7\). He died in Mongolia on the 26th day of nag-pa (3rd month) of the Earth-Mouse year (about 20th April, 1588) \(^8\).

---

\(^1\) Klo'n-rdol f. 20a, Vaidūrya-ser-po (Lokesh Chandra edition) I, pp. 96-97 and Re'u-mig (Lokesh Chandra edition) p. 51 give the year as Wood-Sheep. The variance is due to a different beginning of the year. In the modern "Hor" calendar the year begins with the third winter month. The ancient Tibetan year started apparently with the second winter month. As late as the times of S. Ch. Das (Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet, London 1904, p. 145) "the New Year of the working class" was celebrated one month earlier than the official New Year.

\(^2\) Autobiography of dGe-'dun-rgya-mtso (rJe-btsun-fams-cad-mkhyung-pa'gi-gsum-thbum tor bu-las-rje-sdik-kyi-rnam-par; vol. KA of his gsum-thbum), ff. 2a-3a; Klo'n-rdol, f. 20a; Lo'n-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 2. rTa-nag is the valley of a left-bank tributary of the gTsang-po, north-west of Shigatse.

\(^3\) This palace was the residence of the Dalai-Lamas until the Great Fifth shifted it to the Potala.

\(^4\) Life of the 3rd Dalai-Lama (see below), f. 6a; dPag-bsam-ljon-bsan, p. 302; Klo'n-rdol, f. 20b; Lo'n-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 2.

\(^5\) Life of the 3rd Dalai-Lama (rJe-btsun-fams-cad-mkhyung-pa-bSod-nams-rgya-mtso'yi-rnam-par-dchos-grub-rgya-mtso'yi-si-n-rtas) composed by the 5th Dalai-Lama (vol. NA, 3, of the latter's gsum-thbum), f. 12a; also G. Huth, Geschichte des Buddhismus in der Mongolei, Strassburg 1896, p. 201. Klo'n-rdol, f. 20b, gives another date: 11th day of nag-pa (3rd month), i.e. about 14th April, 1543.

\(^6\) Life of the 3rd Dalai-Lama, f. 10a; Klo'n-rdol, f. 20b; Lo'n-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 3.

\(^7\) Life of the 3rd Dalai-Lama, f. 94b; G. Huth, op. cit., p. 217.

\(^8\) Life of the 3rd Dalai-Lama, f. 107a; Life of the 4th Dalai-Lama (see below), f. 7a; dPag-bsam-ljon-bsan, p. 302; G. Huth, op. cit., p. 231. Klo'n-rdol, f. 20b, gives another date: 6/nag-pa, i.e. about 31st March.
IV. The fourth Dalai-Lama Yon-tan-rgya-mts’o was born on 1/I (Hor)/Earth-Ox (about 15th February, 1589) in the Kukunor region 1). He died on the 15th day of rgyal-zla (Pausya; 12th month) of the Fire-Dragon year (about 21st January, 1617) in the dGa’-ldan P’o-brañ at ’Bras-spuñs 2).

V. The fifth Dalai-Lama Nag-dbañ-blo-bzañ-rgya-mts’o (often called the Great Fifth, lNa-pa-c’en-po) was born on 23/IX (Hor)/Fire-Serpent (22nd October, 1617) at P’yins-pa sTag-rtse in ’P’yons-rgyas 3). In 1642 he became temporal ruler of Tibet. He died on 25/II/Water-Dog (about 2nd April, 1682) 4).

VI. The sixth Dalai-Lama Ts’ans-dbyañs-rgya-mts’o was born on the first day of nag-pa (3rd month) of the Water-Pig year (about 28th March, 1683) at Mon mTs’o-sna, also called La’og Yul-gsum near sBas-yul mK’an-an-steñs 5). He was solemnly enthroned on 25/X/Fire-Ox (about 8th December 1697) 6).

1) Life of the 4th Dalai-Lama (?Jig-rten~dban-pcyug-’ams-cad-mk’yen-pa-Yon-tan-rgya-mts’o-dpal-bzan-poH-’rnyM-par-tcar-pa-nor-buH-p*ten-ba), composed by the 5th Dalai-Lama (vol. ŠA, 2, of the latter’s gsun-*bum), f. 9b; also G. Huth, op. cit., p. 233, and Lion-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 4. Once more Kloñ-rdol, f. 20b, gives another date: 7/VII (about 17th August, 1589).

2) Life of the 4th Dalai-Lama, f. 50b; also G. Huth, op. cit., p. 246. Kloñ-rdol, f. 20b, gives the 3/XII (Hor) (nth January, 1617); Lion-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 4, has 25/XII (31st January), but this seems to be a clerical error.


4) Life of the 6th Dalai-Lama (see below), f. 98a; Vaidurya-ser-po (woodprint), f. 416a; Kloñ-rdol, f. 20b. Lion-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 8, has 15/II, which must be a scribal error.

5) Life of the 6th Dalai-Lama (T’ams-cad-mk’yen-pa-drug-pa-Blo-bzan-rin-c’en-Ts’ans-dbyañs-rgya-mts’o ‘i4-’un-man-p’yi-nram-par-t’ar-pa-daküla’i?-p’ro- ‘tud-rab-gsal-gser-gyi-sné-mo), f. 87a-b. Only the first volume of this work was ever written. It is the first (Ka) and only volume of the gsun-*bum of the 6th Dalai-Lama, although the Tōhoku Catalogue wrongly lists it as the first item of the gsun-*bum of the 7th Dalai-Lama. It was compiled by order of Ts’ans-dbyañs-rgya-mts’o himself, and the last event mentioned (f. 514a) belongs to the middle of 1701. — See also rGyal-ba-shu-lha-pa-drug-par-p’tos-bshor-gyi-gsam-rna-ba’i-bshud-ten-yid-kyi-kun-dga’, f. 99b. I owe many thanks to Professor R. A. Stein for giving me details about this very rare work, which is said to have been composed by the regent Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts’o in 1696.—See also Kloñ-rdol, ff. 20b-21a, and cf. Lion-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 9.

6) Lion-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 9.
deposed on 17/V/Fire-Dog (27th June, 1706) and died near the Gongga-nör on his way to China on 10/X (14th November, 1706). Pad-dkar-'dsin-pa Nag-dba-ye-ses-rgya-mtso, born in 1686 most probably as a natural son of Lha-bzañ Khan, was installed by his father in 1707 and was confirmed by the emperor on the 10th April, 1710. But he was regarded by the vast majority of the Tibetans and Mongols as an usurper and was never recognized by the clergy; he is not included in the official list of the Dalai-Lamas. In 1717 he was deposed by the Dsungars and in 1720 was deported by the imperial commanders to China, where he died in 1725.

VII. The seventh Dalai-Lama Blo-bzañ-bskal-bsran-rgya-mtso was born on 19/VII/Earth-Mouse (about 3rd September, 1708) in the hamlet (zol) below the Li-t’añ monastery in K’ams, was enthroned in the Potala on 15/IX/Iron-Mouse (16th October, 1720) and died on 3/II (Hor)/Fire-Ox (22nd March, 1757).

VIII. The eighth Dalai-Lama 'Jam-dpal-rgya-mtso was born on 25/VI/Earth-Tiger (about 29th July, 1758) at T’ob-rgyal in upper gTsan. On 10/VII/Water-Horse (about 28th August, 1762) he was solemnly enthroned in the Potala. Except for the years between 1786 and 1788 he never actually ruled; and even during

---

1) Life of the 7th Dalai-Lama (see below), ff. 10a-11b; Klo-řdol, f. 21a; Lon-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 10.


4) Life of the 7th Dalai-Lama, f. 66b; Klo-řdol Bla-ma, bsTan-pa'i-sbyin-bdag-byun-tsul-gyi-min-gi-grans (vol. A of his gsun-bum), f. 11b.

5) Life of the 7th Dalai-Lama, f. 536a; Klo-řdol, f. 21a; Lon-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 17. On the last day of the 2nd month (17th April, 1757) the governor of Szechwan informed the emperor that the Dalai-Lama had died in the same month; Kao tsung-Shih-lu, ch. 533, f. 3oa-b.

6) Life 8th DL, ff. 10b-11a and 14a-b. Klo-řdol, f. 21a, gives the year only. Lon-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 17, gives 2/VI (about 6th July).

7) Life 8th DL, f. 27a-b; Lon-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 17.
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that short period his administration was by no means a success (see below). He died on 18/X/Wood-Mouse (about 19th November, 1804) 1).

IX. The ninth Dalai-Lama Luṅ-rtogs-rgya-mts'o was born on I/XII (Hor)/Wood-Ox (20th January, 1806) at IDan-ma t'ub-bstan-c'os-k'or on the banks of the Bri-c'u (upper Yangtzekiang) 2). Having been confirmed by the emperor on the 5th March, 1808 3), he was formally enthroned in the Potala on 22/IX (Hor)/Earth-Dragon (10th November, 1808) 4). He died, still a minor, on 16/II (Hor)/Wood-Pig (26th March, 1815) 5).

X. The tenth Dalai-Lama Ts'ul-k'rim-rgya-mts'o was born on 29/III (Hor)/Fire-Mouse (25th April, 1816) at gNas-stod Norbu-gron near Li-t'an 6). He was selected by drawing lots from a golden cup, under the new procedure prescribed by the Chinese government, on 15/I/Water-Horse (about 6th February, 1822) in the presence of the Pan-c'en Rin-po-c'e and of the Manchu residents 7). Being confirmed by the emperor, he was installed in the Potala on 8/VIII (Hor)/Water-Horse 8). Although he reached majority and was duly given full ordination by the Pan-c'en Rin-po-c'e on 7/IV/Wood-Horse (about 15th May, 1834) 9), his

1) Life 8th DL, f. 351b; Loṅ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, pp. 20-21. The Shih-lu for 1804 and 1805 contain no document bearing on this event.
2) Life 9th DL, ff. 13b and 16a.
3) I-hai|II/13. Chia-ch'ing; Jen-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 191, ff. 11a-12a.
4) Life 9th DL, ff. 66a-72b. Loṅ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 21, has the wrong date 22/VII (about 12th September).
5) Life 9th DL, ff. 181a-b, 185a; Life 10th DL, f. 19b. In this case too nothing is to be found in the Shih-lu of 1815.
6) Life 10th DL, f. 16b, 20b, 22a.
7) Life 10th DL, ff. 59a-60b. As I am kindly informed by Professor R. A. Stein, the circumstances of the election of the 10th and 11th Dalai-Lamas, as seen from the Chinese angle, are described in the Hsi-tsang pei-wên 西藏碑文, which is found at the end of the Hsi-tsang tsou-wên 西藏奏文.
8) I-hai|II/22. Tao-kuang, Hsian-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 32, f. 41a; also ch. 32, ff. 6a-8b. The ceremony is very fully described in Life 10th DL, ff. 93b-117a.
9) Life 10th DL, f. 283a. The same work, f. 289a, translates an imperial edict dated
biography does not mention his ever having been given ruling powers. He died after a long illness on 1/IX/Fire-Bird (about 30th September, 1837).  

XI. The eleventh Dalai-Lama mK'as-grub-rgya-mts'o was born on 1/IX (Hor)/Earth-Dog (18th October, 1838) at dKon-brtsegs-gsis, close to the east of mGar-t'ar in K'ams. On 23/VII/Iron-Ox (about 8th September, 1841) his name was drawn from the golden cup, and according to an imperial decree of the 29th September 1841, he was enthroned in the Potala on the 16/IV (Hor)/Water-Tiger (25th May, 1842), in the presence of the ICa?n-skya Qutuqtu. Having reached full age, on the 13/I/Wood-Hare (about 1st March, 1855) he was granted by imperial order the seals of office and the ruling powers. He was thus the first Dalai-Lama for a long time to enjoy a spell of power; this fact was hitherto unknown. But his rule was not to last for long. Already in the 6th month his health broke down, and on 24/XII/Wood-Hare (about 31st January, 1856) the young Dalai-Lama died, after having governed the country for a few months only.

XII. The twelfth Dalai-Lama P rin-las-rgya-mts'o was born on the 1/XII (Hor)/Fire-Dragon (27th December, 1856) near

---

1) Life 10th DL, ff. 328a-329a. On the 8th December, 1837, the ambans were ordered to express the condolences of the emperor for the death of the Dalai-Lama; I-yw/XI/17. Tao-kuang; Hsüan-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 303, f. 13a.

2) Life 11th DL, f. 5a, 8a-b.


5) Life 11th DL, f. 252a.

6) Life 11th DL, f. 261a. The text is rather confused and gives the impression that the 7th month is intended. This is, however, impossible, because Lo?ba-H-dmigs-bu, p. 24, gives the date 25/XII, and because the news of the decease, which reached Peking on the 10th March 1856 (Jen-ch'en/II/6. Hsien-feng, Wen-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 190, f. 6a-b) cannot have been delayed overmuch.

---
rDsin-p’yi in ‘Ol-dga’ 1). On the 13/I/Earth-Horse (26th February, 1858) he was chosen by lot 2), and on the 3/VII/Fire-Monkey (19th August, 1860) he was enthroned in the Potala 3). When the regent died, the emperor decreed that the Dalai-Lama, who was by then nearly 18 years old (counting in the Chinese fashion), should take over the administration. The ceremony of the assumption of ruling powers took place on the 14/II (Hor)/Water-Bird (12th Masch, 1873) 4). We have thus the same surprising information as in the case of the 11th Dalai-Lama. The assertion, so often repeated, that no Dalai-Lama after the 8th and before the 13th assumed power, falls therefore to the ground. Of course we can safely assume that his rule was merely a nominal one, the more so as no particular political activity is mentioned in the biography. Between the fifth and the ninth month of 1874 the sickly young man undertook the fatiguing journey to the C‘os-‘k’or-rgyal lake, which every Dalai-Lama must make once in his life 5). It proved fatal to the young ruler, who fell ill and died on the 20/III/Wood-Pig (about 25th April, 1875) 6).

XIII. The thirteenth Dalai-Lama T‘ub-bstan-rgya-mts‘o was born on the 5/V/Fire-Mouse (27th May, 1876) at Glañ-mdun K‘an-steñ in Dvags-po. 7) On the 11/I/Earth-Tiger (12th February, 1878) he was recognized as the Dalai-Lama, without going through the formality of the choice from the golden cup (the Tibetan text is

formal on this point) 1). On the 14/VI/Earth-Hare (about 1st August, 1879) he was enthroned in the Potala. 2) On the 8/VIII/Wood-Sheep (26th September 1895), he assumed power 3), and since then he ruled the country as only the Great Fifth had done before him, giving Tibet her one spell of independence during the last two and a half centuries. He died on the 30/X/Water-Bird (17th December 1933). 4)

XIV. The fourteenth Dalai-Lama bsTan-'dshin-rgya-mtso was born on the 6th June 1935 at sTag-'ts'er near the Sar-rdsoṅ (or Sar-sdoṅ) monastery south-west of sKu-'bum in Amdo; on the 22nd February 1940 he was solemnly enthroned in the Potala 5). On the 17th November 1950 he took over the government, although he was still a mere boy, and on the 23rd May 1951 he signed the treaty with China that spelt the end of old Tibet. After the collapse of the Tibetan rising, he crossed the Indian border on the 31st March 1959; and since then he has been living in exile at Mussoorie in the Panjab.

THE REGENTS

The office of a regent (sde-srid, sde-pa, srid-skhyon) was created about 1642. If we define the regent as the caretaker of the spiritual and temporal rights of the Dalai-Lamas, we can distinguish three separate periods in the development of this office.

From 1642 to 1706 the regent was the head of the civil and political (but not of the military) administration, and exercised the temporal rights which belonged to the Dalai-Lama, but could not be

---

1) Life 13th DL, Ka, f. 48a-b.
2) Life 13th DL, Ka, ff. 55b seqq. Imperial gifts for the occasion had been sent to him on i-ch'ou/III/5. Kuang-hsi (12th April, 1879); Te-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 90, f. 7a, and Life 13th DL, Ka, f. 253a.
3) Life 13th DL, Ka, f. 256b.

wielded personally by him. At first he was appointed by the Qoṣot Khan, but soon the choice fell practically in the hands of the 5th Dalai-Lama.

After an interval marked by the personal rule of Lha-bzaṅ Khan (1706-1717), there was no regent in the sense defined above, but a head of the state who acknowledged only the suzerainty of the Manchu emperor, without any notice being taken of secular rights of the Dalai-Lama 1). Only during the exile of the 7th Dalai-Lama (1728-1735) a spiritual and disciplinary representative was appointed.

The third period begins with 1757. As a matter of principle, the regent is only the vicegerent exercising the secular and disciplinary rights of the Dalai-Lama during the latter's minority. He can be only a monk and may be chosen only within a narrow circle of ecclesiastical dignitaries.

We give now a list of the regents of the first period.

The treasurer (p‘yang-mdsod) of the Dalai-Lama, bSod-nams-rab-brtan, alias bSod-nams-c’os-p’el, was installed by Guṣri Khan as regent on or even before his grant of the sovereignty of Tibet to the Dalai-Lama (1642) 2). He died in the Bla-braṅ on the 3/III/Earth-Dog (about 5th April, 1658) 3). After his death, the Dalai-Lama conducted personally the administration during two years.

On the 13/VII/Iron-Mouse (about 18th August, 1660) the Jaisang sDe-pa (or ṇa-p’ran sDe-pa) ṇPrin-las-rgya-mts‘o was installed as regent in the presence of Guṣri Khan’s two sons bKra-sis Batur and Dayan Khan, who on this occasion divided between them-

1) This point was already made by me in China and Tibet in the early 18th century, pp. 221-223.
2) The exact date is not to be found in the Life 5th DL. Loṅ-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 5, gives 1642. The Re’u-mig, p. 69, places the event in the previous year (lo-ṭa-ma), and this statement is corroborated by Kloṣ-rdol Bla-ma, vol. 2A of the gsun-‘bum, f. 16a, according to whom bSod-nams-rab-brtan governed for 18 years, i.e. 1641-1658.
3) Life 5th DL, CA, ff. 261b-262a; Loṅ-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 6. The Bla-braṅ is the complex of official buildings near and around the gTsug-lag-k’aṅ, the main temple of Lhasa.
selves the territories inherited from their father\(^1\)). He died on the 17/II/Earth-Monkey (about 29th March, 1668)\(^2\), and once more the Dalai-Lama took over the administration during one and a half year.

On the 1/VIIIbis/Earth-Bird (August or September 1669)\(^3\) the mc'od-dpon Blo-bzan-mt'u-stobs was formally appointed to office\(^4\).

In the third month of 1675 he was involved in a scandal concerning a Sa-skya-pa nun (btsun-mo) called bKra-sis-lags, and his hurried departure for Za'ns-ri made the matter even more delicate. The Sa-skya authorities tried to whitewash him, but public opinion was convinced of his guilt\(^5\). He was dismissed, but upon the earnest representations of the monks of Se-ra and 'Bras-spu'ns, as well as of the whole officialdom, he was granted the title of an ex-regent (sde-srid-zur-pa) and the fief of Za'ns-ri, from which he took his name\(^6\). At the end of the year he was honourably entertained by the Qo'sot Khan, and on the 12/I/Fire-Dragon (about 25th February 1676) he departed for Za'ns-ri\(^7\).

On the 27/VIII/Wood-Hare (about 15th October 1675) the office was given to Blo-bzan-sbyin-pa of 6P yo's-rgyas gZims-kca?, hitherto steward of the rNam-rgyal-grva-ts'an monastery in the Potala\(^8\). But four years later, on the 13/V/Earth-Sheep (about 20th June, 1679), he resigned and retired to meditation, on which

---

\(^1\) Life 5th DL, CA, f. 297b; Klo'n-rdol Bla-ma, vol. 2A of the gsu'n-bum, f. 16a; Lon-ba'i-dnings-bu, p. 7.

\(^2\) Life 5th DL, CA, f. 44b. In the Lon-ba'i-dnings-bu, p. 7 (at least in my copy), the date is wrongly written as 17/V.

\(^3\) There is no intercalary month in that year according to the Chinese calendar.

\(^4\) Life 5th DL, CA, f. 84b; Lon-ba'i-dnings-bu, p. 7.

\(^5\) Life 5th DL, CA, ff. 241a, 243a.

\(^6\) Lon-ba'i-dnings-bu, pp. 7-8, where the event, however, is mistakenly shifted back to the third month of 1674.

\(^7\) Life 5th DL, CA, ff. 270a, 274a, 278b.

\(^8\) Life 5th DL, CA, f. 261b; Klo'n-rdol Bla-ma, vol. 2A of the gsu'n-bum, f. 16a; Lon-ba'i-dnings-bu, p. 8. The Re'u-mig, p. 72, wavers between 1675 and 1676.
occasion he was granted the fief of sNe’u-gdoñ (hence his name sNe’u-gdoñ-pa sDe-srid) 1).

He was succeeded by A-bar Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts’o, born 1653 2) and a nephew (sku-ts’a) of the former regent ’P’rin-las-rgya-mts’o 3). He was installed on the 6/VII/Earth-Sheep (about 13th July, 1679) 4) and ruled Tibet during a generation, concealing for a long time the death of the 5th Dalai-Lama and trying not without success to steer a safe course between Manchu and Dsungars. His doom came at the hands of the new Qošot ruler Lha-bzañ Khan, whom he had tried to poison. Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts’o, surprised in Lhasa by a sudden attack, fled to sNañ-rtse in the sTod-luñ valley, but surrendered after a short resistance, being compelled thereto by the heads of the clergy. He was handed over to the custody of Lha-bzañ Khan’s wife Jerinrași (Ts’e-riñ-bkra-šis), who on the 29/VII (16th September) 1705 caused him to be put to death 5).

Legally speaking, at the time of his death Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts’o was no longer in office. In 1702 the profligate young Dalai-Lama had “given back his vows” to the Pañ-c’en Rin-po-c’e (i.e., was unfrocked). Perhaps this was felt to be a blow to the prestige of the man who had been practically responsible for selecting him; anyhow, the fact is that in the Water-Sheep year 1703 he resigned his post and installed one Ng-dbañ-rin-c’en as regent, although

---

2) Re’u-mig, p. 70.
3) *Life* 5th DL, JA, f. 132b. A. Csoma de Körös; *A grammar of the Tibetan Language*, Calcutta 1834, p. 191, says that “he is generally believed, in Tibet, to have been the natural son of” the 5th Dalai-Lama. This statement has been often repeated by modern authors, but seems to be due to a misunderstanding (spiritual son ?); no Chinese or Tibetan text, and not even the contemporary accounts of the Italian missionaries, so full of gossip, know anything about it.
actual power remained in his hands as before 1). The new regent kept the empty and meaningless title for some months after the death of his protector; then (1706) he was dismissed by Lha-bzañ Khan and we are left in the dark about his further destinies 2).

During the second period there was no regent in the real sense of the term, since the Dalai-Lama was not considered as the temporal ruler of Tibet. A list of the Tibetan heads of state during those years can be found in China and Tibet in the early 18th century, p. 268. The Dalai-Lama was limited to the ecclesiastical field, where he of course exercised his powers directly. Only when, on the 23rd October, 1728, he was compelled to leave Lhasa for his exile at mGar-t'ar in K'ams, he appointed a vicegerent for his spiritual-disciplinary rights. This was not the K'ri Rin-po-c'e, as it is often (and wrongly) supposed 3). The Italian missionaries, who resided at that time in Lhasa, call the new regent "Chiesé, abbot of Ciotin’; and the correct state of affairs is described in the Life 5th DL. The churchman concerned was the rGyal-sras ("Chiesé") Rin-po-c'e 'Jigs-med-ye-ses-grags-pa (1696-1740), abbot of C’os-lðin ("Ciotin") in 'On, who enjoyed great influence at the court in the Potala and was on this occasion entrusted with the care of the spiritual rights and interests of the Dalai-Lama. He did not, however, assume the title of a regent, but only that of an acting abbot of 'Bras-spuñs. He kept his office till the Dalai-Lama came back to Lhasa on the 3rd September 1735 4).

After the murder of the last lay "king" 'Jigs-med-rnam-rgyal (11th November, 1750), the Dalai-Lama entrusted dGa'-bźi Pándita with the provisional conduct of the administration; but this

2) Loñ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 10.
3) This was also my mistake in China and Tibet in the early 18th century, p. 138. The same error still occurs in the recent, rather badly informed work of G. Schulemann, Geschichte der Dalai-Lamas 9, Leipzig 1958, p. 306.
appointment was not recognized in Peking, and on the 23rd April, 1751, an imperial edict laid down that the Dalai-Lama himself should govern Tibet, with the help of a council of four ministers.

We give now the list of the regents of the third period.

During the last years of the 7th Dalai-Lama, the De-mo Qutuqtu ṇag-dbaṅ-’jam-dpal-bde-legs-rgya-mtsho ¹) had obtained a position of great influence at his court, and perhaps enjoyed already at that time an official status ²). When the Dalai-Lama died (22nd March, 1757), the administration was provisionally carried on by the council of ministers ³). The emperor was confronted with the problem (for which there was as yet no precedent to be followed) of organizing the government of Tibet during the vacancy of the see and the long minority of the future Dalai-Lama. His decision was taken swiftly enough. Already on the 29th April, 1757, twelve days after the news of the death of the Dalai-Lama had reached Peking, the De-mo Qutuqtu was appointed regent of Tibet and the Ican-skya Qutuqtu was sent to Lhasa to supervise the change-over in the government ⁴). The imperial document reached Lhasa on the 1/V (about 16th June) ⁵). But the official seal was granted only in 1759. Thus began the long rule of the De-mo Qutuqtu, whose monastery De-mo Mes in Koṅ-po on the left bank of the gTsan-po, but whose actual residence was always the royal monastery of

¹) The series of the De-mo Qutuqtu can be found in Kloṅ-rdol, ff. 21b-22a.
²) W. W. Rockhill, "The Dalai-Lamas of Lhasa", in T'oung Pao XI (1910), p. 46n, quotes the Ta-Ch'ing hui-tien, ch. 737, f. 13b, to the effect that "the De-mo Qutuqtu was appointed by the Emperor Comptroller ( 管理 ) of the Treasury (尚上 ) and of ecclesiastical and lay affairs in 1751. The following year he was given the title of Paldan Nomenhan, and in 1753 he was made "Comptroller of Tibetan Affairs" ( 管理 西藏事務 ). It is strange that no document concerning these appointments can be found in the Shih-lu.
³) Loṅ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 17.
⁵) Loṅ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 17. According to the Life 8th DL, the official title of the De-mo Qutuqtu was ˌp rin-las-pa rgyal-tse’ab, something like chargé d'affaires and regent.
bsTan-rgyas-gliṅ in Lhasa. It is indeed a pity that we know so little about the life of this churchman; no biography of him seems to be extant. He remained in office till his death, which happened on the 22/I/Fire-Bird (about 1st March, 1777).

We are much better informed about his successor, whose biography (of 39 leaves) is included in the collection of the lives of the K'ri Rin-po-c'e. ṇag-dbañ-ts'ul-k'rim was born 1721 in the neighbourhood of Co-ne in Amdo and had a brilliant scholarly career. When the emperor asked for a private tutor in theology (ti-shih 帝師), he was unanimously proposed for the task by the authorities of the three great monasteries of 'bras-spuns, Se-ra and dGa'-ldan, and received the appointment from the Dalai Lama, the Pañ-c'en Rin-po-c'e and the De-mo Qutuqtu; on the 5/IX (Hor)/Water-Horse (21st October, 1762) he arrived in Peking.

During fifteen years of activity as imperial preceptor he became one of the intimates of the emperor, whose full confidence he enjoyed. Thus it is not surprising that after the death of the De-mo Qutuqtu he was appointed as regent with the title Erdeni Nomun Khan.

Until his arrival, the ministers (za-bzigs) conducted provisionally the administration. On 5/VII/Fire-Bird (about 7th August, 1777) he reached Lhasa, and on the 14/VII or 15/VIII took formally office. In the next year he, the imperial favorite, was selected by the clergy as the 61st K'ri Rin-po-c'e of dGa'-ldan, the third

---

1) Life 8th DL, f. 79a.
2) dGe-ltan-gser-k'ri-rin-po-c'er-dbañ-sgyur-ba'i-skyes-mc'og-dam-pa-k'ri-c'en-rim-byon-rnam-hyi-rnam-ltar-rmad-byun-nor-bu'i-p'ren-ba. It includes the lives of the 47th to the 71st K'ri Rin-po-c'e, covering the period 1699-1829, and was compiled between 1810 and 1831. The life of the 61st K'ri Rin-po-c'e will be quoted here simply as Biography.
3) Biography, f. 5a.
4) The appointment was intimated in Lhasa on the 7/III (about 14th April, 1777); Life 8th DL, f. 80a.
5) Loñ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 18.
6) Biography, f. 8a.
7) Life 8th DL, f. 82b.
8) Biography, f. 12b; Loñ-ba'i-dmigs-bu, p. 18.
highest ecclesiastical rank in Tibet ¹). He occupied this dignity during the seven years prescribed by the law, till 1785 ²).

The Dalai-Lama had in the meantime reached full age, and his long-delayed assumption of full powers could not be postponed any longer. By imperial order the ceremony, consisting mainly in the handing over of the office seals, was performed on 1/VI/Earth-Ox (about 21st July, 1781) ³). Now the Dalai-Lama ruled over Tibet, not however autocratically, but in close collaboration with the former regent. The latter, however, had wished for a long time to return to Peking, and his imperial pupil too desired it. Thus on the 2nd May 1786 he was recalled to court, taking advantage of the death of the lCan-skya Rin-po-c'e Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje and of the need of an influential churchman to lead the search for his reincarnation ⁴). Upon his arrival he received the title of a Samati Bakśi, to which we shall return presently.

The Dalai-Lama remained now alone at the helm and conducted personally the government of Tibet during three years.

But faced with the crisis of the first Gurkha invasion (July-August 1788), the unworldly and weak Dala-Lama failed to rise to the occasion; the Chinese documents of this period register many complaints of imperial officers and officials in Tibet about his incapacity and indecision. Once the tension had decreased, the

---

¹) Biography, f. 15a; Life 8th DL, f. 84b.
²) Life 8th DL, f. 149b.
³) Life 8th DL, ff. 118a-119b. We may surmise that this long delay in, and sudden decision of, installing the Dalai-Lama was due to the fact that Chinese politics in Tibet had hitherto banked chiefly on the 3rd Pan-c'en Rin-po-c'e, who was cherished and honoured by the emperor as no Tibetan churchman before him. It is significant that only after the death of the Pan-c'en at Peking in November 1780 the imperial governent "remembered" that the granting of full powers to the Dalai-Lama was long overdue, and consented to have it carried out. The only document of this period in the Shih-lu concerning Tibet is in the main an announcement to the religious authorities of the death of the Pan-c'en; huai-wei I/46. Ch'ien-lung (2nd February, 1781), Kao-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 1122, ff. 9a-10b.
emperor decreed that "affairs of state in Tibet needed an active grand Lama, to conduct the administration in agreement with the Dalai-Lama; this would result in a blessing for the country". On the 26th May 1789 he appointed to this office the rTa-ts'ag sPrul-skU Ye-ses-blo-bzan-bstan-pa'i-mgon-po, of the royal monastery Kun-bde-glin in Lhasa; in the Chinese documents he is called the Chi-lung 濟隆 (rJe-druñ) Qutuqtu. On this occasion he received the title Biliqtu and the rank of a jasaq. The ministers (bka'-blon) were ordered to follow his instructions, which meant a practical supersession of the authority of the Dalai-Lama. This position as a collaborator of the Dalai-Lama and prime minister was later coupled (at least for a time) with the Mongolian title Samati Bakši, corresponding to the Tibetan bSam-gtan mK'an-po. He resided in the Lhasa K'an-gsar palace.

The situation did not improve at first. The Dalai-Lama was "very pious and well read in the sacred texts, but too credulous in front of others and without authority and wisdom". Moreover, his younger brother Blo-bzan-dge-'dun-grags-pa and other men of his entourage harassed and cheated the merchant class and unmercifully exploited the pilgrims. The rJe-druñ Qutuqtu soon was hand in glove with them and supported them in front of the Chinese government. When their behaviour at last grew too outrageous, the emperor exiled the mischiefmakers to Peking; the rJe-druñ Qutuqtu too was summoned thither (28th September, 1790).

The former regent and K'ri Rin-po-c'e was again sent to Lhasa.

---

1) The series of the Guñ-ru rTa-ts'ag rJe-druñ sPrul-skU is found in Kloñ-rdol, f. 22a. They existed at least since the middle of the 17th century and are repeatedly mentioned in the Life 5th DL.


3) Hsin-ch'ou/V/55, Ch'ien-lung (3rd July, 1790), Kao-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 1355, ff. 9b-10b. This state of affairs was known in Peking already in August 1789; Kao-tsung Shih-lu ch. 1333, f. 12a-b.

In this period the *Shih-lu* call him by the Mongolian title Galdan Širegetü (a translation of dGa'-'Idan K'ri), to which the Chinese title ch' an-shih 禪師 is added. He was endowed with special powers and received instructions concerning his relations with the Dalai-Lama, the ministers and the amban 1). On 9/XII (about 13th January 1791) he arrived in Lhasa 2), but died already on 27/III/Iron-Hog (about 29th April 1791) in the Potala 3).

The rJe-druñ Qutuqtu had left Lhasa shortly before and had not yet arrived in Peking 4). In spite of his misbehaviour, his influence at court was such that the emperor, as soon as he received the news of the death of the old Samati Bakşi, at once decided that the rJe druñ Qutuqtu should return to Peking and take over the government in concurrence with the Dalai-Lama (7th June, 1791) 5). The new administrator arrived in Lhasa on 8/VIII (about 5th September, 1791). The situation at once improved, the Dalai-Lama seemed to take a grip of himself, and on the 17th October 1791 the emperor was able to allow his brother to return to Lhasa 6). On the 31st March, 1792, the rJe-druñ Qutuqtu received the title of Hui-t'ung Ch' an-shih 慧通禪師, which appears in the Tibetan texts as Hu-t'ung Žan-je 7). Working in close agreement with the Chinese authorities, he steered Tibet through the delicate period of the Gurkha war, and remained at the helm also after the reorganisation of 1793, which limited the powers of his office, and of

2) *Life 8th DL*, f. 186b.
3) *Biography*, f. 39a; *Life 8th DL*, ff. 188b, 192b. He was the abbot of the royal monastery of mTs'o-smon-glin; *Loñ-ba'yi-dmigs-bu*, p. 19; A. Ferrari, *mK'yen-brtse*s Guide to the holy places of Central Tibet*, p. 94.
the Tibetan government generally, in favour of the *ambans* 1). As a matter of fact, his twenty-years' rule meant a substantial strengthening of Chinese influence and the beginning of the semi-colonial epoch corresponding to the 19th century. After the death of the eighth Dalai-Lama, the *rJe-druṅ* Qutuqtu became regent. He died at Kun-bde-gliṅ in the Iron-Horse year 1810 2).

His successor was De-mo Blo-bzan-t’ub-bstan-jigs-med-rgya-mts’o 3), abbot of bsTan-rgyas-gliṅ and a rebirth of the first De-mo regent; he was born in 1778. On 16/III/Iron-Sheep (about 9th April 1811) he received the imperial appointment 4). After the death of the minor 9th Dalai-Lama he was confirmed as regent on 2/X (about 2nd November, 1815) 5). But later he came into conflict with Peking, because he did not want to follow the regulations of the Ch’ien-lung emperor concerning the selection by lot of the Dalai-Lama, and insisted, along with the *ambaṅ* Yū-lin, on the immediate and unconditional recognition of the Li-t’an boy (who later indeed became the 10th Dalai-Lama). On the 10th April, 1819, he was sharply rebuked by the emperor; in case he dared to go unauthorized to Peking in order to present his petition directly to the emperor, he was threatened with inquiry, arrest and punishment 6). The threat was gratuitous, because the regent had died of smallpox shortly before at bsTan-rgyas-gliṅ, on 3/III/Earth-Hare

---

1) W. W. Rockhill, in *JRAS* 1891, pp. 7-13, and in *T’oung Pao* XI (1910), p. 53. I remark in passing that Rockhill’s *p’yi-blon* is a wrong reconstruction of Ch’i-lung, the Chinese transcription of *rJe-druṅ*.

2) *Life 9th DL*, ff. 116b-117; Lon-ba’i-dmigs-bu, p. 19. The Tibetan texts give only the year, not the day and month.

3) G. Schulemann, *Geschichte der Dalai-Lamas*, p. 348, speaks of an interim administration by the K’tri Rin-po-c’e, but the Tibetan and Chinese texts seem to know nothing about it.

4) *Life 9th DL*, t. 123a.

5) Lon-ba’i-dmigs-bu, pp. 21-22bis.

(about 28th March, 1819), but this event could not yet be known in Peking.

On the 5/III (about 30th March) the ambans appointed as regent the sprul-skhu of mTs‘o-smon-gliṅ, Ṇag-dbaṅ-‘jam-dpal-ts‘ul-k‘rims. He was the rebirth of the Galdan Śiregetī Samati Bakṣī that had died in 1791, and is given the same titles by the Chinese documents. Having been born in 1792, he was still quite young. On 13/VIII (about 1st October, 1819) he received the office seal, and after the election of the 10th Dalai-Lama he was confirmed in office on the 25th April, 1822. He was by far the most forceful character in 19th-century Tibet. By dint of astuce, energy and glibness he maintained himself in power throughout a generation, but we know too little of the Tibetan history of those years, since all the sources seem to leave us in the lurch. His end was tragic. His enemies in the council of ministers formally accused him to the emperor, who in the first instance sent out Ch‘i-shan 琦善 as amban. On the 21st July, 1844, the latter was charged with the summoning of a sort of committee of inquiry, composed of the Paṅ-c‘en Rin-po-c‘é as chairman, and the De-mo (Ti-mu), rJe-drum (Chi-lung) and Rva-sgreñ (Lieh-chêng) Qutuqtus as members, in order to investigate the official activity of the Samati Bakṣī. The Paṅ-c‘en was to take over the administration at once, and later on he was to find, in agreement with Ch‘i-shan, a suitable successor to the regency. The verdict of the committee, which declared the Samati Bakṣī guilty, was received in Peking on the 16th November, 1844. But in Lhasa things did not go off so smoothly.

2) Lives 10th DL, f. 37a-b.
4) Ch‘i-mao/IIIbis/2. Tao-kuang, Hsüan-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 32, f. 7a-b.
5) D. 1854. He was the unlucky negotiator with the British at Canton in 1840-41. His life in A. W. Hummel, Eminent Chinese of the Ch‘ing Period, pp. 126-129.
7) Keng-tzu/X/24. Tao-kuang, Hsüan-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 410, ff. 6a-7a.
On 6/VIII (about 17th September) Ch'i-shan declared the regent deposed and arrested, and the Pan-c' en took over the administration. But the monks of Se-ra raised a tumult, in which several persons were killed and the former regent was freed. The latter, however, was experienced and wise enough to know that any serious resistance against the imperial troops was out of question; he allowed himself to be handed over to the amban and was sent into banishment to Manchuria, where he died somewhat later 1). Now the Pan-c' en Rin-po-c' e carried on the administration during eight and a half months 2).

On the 26/IV/Wood-Serpent (about 31st May, 1845) the sprul-skhu of Rva-sgreñ, Ṇag-dbañ-ye-ses-ts'ul-k'rim-rgyal-mtsh'an, was installed as regent, being granted the title of Ačitu Qutuqtu 3). He kept his office till the assumption of ruling powers by the Dalai Lama on 13/I/Wood-Hare (about 1st March, 1855). On 23/II (about 9th April) he took his leave from the young pontiff in order to retire to Rva-sgreñ 4). But when the Dalai Lama fell ill, he returned to Lhasa (8th month) 5); and after the demise of the Dalai Lama, the Ačitu Qutuqtu once more took charge on 26/XII (about 2nd February, 1856) 6). It appears, however, that his powers were this time more restricted. The official imperial appointment spoke only of a provisional, acting direction of the finance department, and this in dBus only; gTsan was under the administration of the gsol-dpon of bKra-sis-lhun-po, as regent during the vacancy of the see and the minority of the Pan-c' en

1) E. R. Huc, Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine, Tournai 1850, pp. 312-317; W. W. Rockhill, in T'oung Pao XI (1910), p. 67. It is odd that there is not a single word in Life 11th DL about this most important event.
2) Lon-ba'ī-dmigs-bu, p. 23.
4) Life 11th DL, f. 256b.
5) Life 11th DL, f. 259b.
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At the beginning of 1862 a conflict was delineating between the Rva-sgreñ Qutuqtu and the leading monks of dGa’-ldan and ’Bras-spuns, over a matter of alms to the colleges of ’Bras-spuñs. The prince-abbot of Sa-skya, bDag-c’en bKra-sis-rin-c’en-lha-skyod, and the regent (sku-ts’ab) of bKra-sis-lhun-po tried in vain to mediate. On account of these squabbles government activity came practically to a standstill, since the regent was unwilling or unable to carry on his official duties. A proposal was put forward from many sides, to hand over powers to the Dalai-Lama 3), although we can hardly see how the six-years old child could undertake any political responsibility. The situation grew to a head, the monks gathered together and assumed a threatening position against the regent, then dwelling in the bZi-sde monastery in Lhasa. The situation was reported to Peking, and the emperor entrusted the newly appointed amban Ching-wèng and the other amban Man-ch’ing, who was already in Lhasa, with the task of holding an inquest and of deposing the regent by taking away from him the office seals (4th June, 1862) 4).

The situation became more and more threatening; the monks armed themselves with the guns and ammunition found in the Potala, while the regent threatened to summon the wild No-log warriors from Amdo to Lhasa,—a threat that many years later the 13th Dalai-Lama was to employ more than once and always with good effect. A small-scale civil war broke out in the town, and the ambas charged the old and highly respected minister, the bSad-sgra ’abs-pad, with the task of preventing hostilities. These news

---

reached Peking on the 18th July 1). But by this time the decision in Lhasa had fallen: the Rvä-sgreñ Qutuqtu fled in all haste by the northern route to China, carrying with him the state seals; and on 21/VI (about 17th July) bSad-sgra took power 2).

When the imperial government was informed of this (on the 29th August), they took away from the fugitive regent all titles and ranks and issued a warrant of arrest against him. At the same time the former minister bSad-sgra dBañ-p'yuñ-rgyal-po was appointed regent with the title No-min Khan 3); he received the imperial letters patent on 7/IX/Water-Dog (about 29th October, 1862) 4). But he was an old man, since he appears in the texts as minister already about 1820; and thus it was not surprising that he died only two years later, on 25/VIII/Wood-Mouse (about 25th September, 1864) in the Nor-bu-gliñ palace 5).

He was followed by the former K'ri Rin-po-c'e of dGa'-ldan 6) and teacher of the Dalai-Lama (yoñś-'dzsin), Blo-bzañ-mk'yen-rab-dbañ-p'yuñ, who took over the administration on 29/IX/Wood-Mouse (about 29th October, 1864) 7). On 7/IV/Wood-Ox (about 1st May, 1865) he received the letters patent and seal of a Nomun Khan and regent, sent to him by the emperor 8). His period of office was tranquil, with the exception of an episody of those monkish squabbles that fill in modern Tibetan history. One mK'an-po

---

1) K'uei-yu/VII/1. T'ung-chih, Mu-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 32, ff. 10a-12a, 12b-13b.
2) Life 12th DL, f. 92b; Lohn-bañi-dmigs-bu, p. 25. The deposed regent betook himself at once to Peking in order to present himself before the government and to prove his innocence; but he fell ill and died immediately upon his arrival. Only on the 30th March, 1877, his memory was rehabilitated and permission was given to search for his rebirth and to instal it in his see; jen-yin'lu?3. Kuang-hsi, T'ie-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 48, f. 2a-b.
4) Life 12th DL, f. 95a.
6) His dates as K'ri Rin-po-c'e are not known. In the Life 12th DL he appears as being still in office in 1858, but as retired (zur) in 1860.
7) Life 12th DL, f. 125b. There is no mention of this in the Shih-lu.
8) Life 12th DL, f. 125b. There is no mention of this in the Shih-lu.
dPal-lidan-don-grub attained paramount influence over the monks of dGa'-'ldan and was supported also by a bka'-blon and other high officials. They planned to compel the regent to retire. But when dPal-lidan-don-grub's conspiracy was discovered, he rebelled along with the monks of dGa'-'ldan in the 4th month of 1871. The ambans intervened with great energy. The Dalai-Lama was brought into safety away from the Nor-bu-glin and a strong troop was marshalled. dGa'-'ldan monastery was attacked and taken after a vigorous defence, during which the buildings suffered not a little damage. dPal-lidan-don-grub was court-martialled and shot, his accomplices imprisoned, interrogated and punished, while the simple monks were let off unscathed. The whole episode seems to have been due to the ambition of one single man, without deeper motives or further consequences. The regent died on 18/IX/Water-Monkey (about 19th October, 1872). He received no successor, and five months later the young Dalai-Lama assumed ruling powers (see above).

After the untimely death of the 12th Dalai-Lama (about 25th July, 1871), Ting-mao. T'ung-chih (25th July, 1871), Mu-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 313, ff. 14b-16a. Hsin-mao. T'ung-chih (17th October 1871), Mu-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 319, ff. 8a-9a; Life 12th DL, ff. 184a-185a. This seems to be the real background of a confuse and wrongly dated story, which appears in C. H. Desgodins, Mission du Tibet, p. 19, and after him in G. Schulemann, Geschichte der Dala-Lamas, p. 359. In 1869 a Lama called Pe-tchi (?) is said to have gained great influence and power by promising to expel the Chinese by means of a military dictatorship. But he wanted also to abolish the dignities of Dalai-Lama and Pan-'c'en Rin-po-cê; and therefore he was soon overthrown, while the displaced regent came back in 1870. But neither the Shih-lu nor the Life 12th DL know anything about it. The latter work has nothing peculiar to register during 1869; and the next year is nearly completely occupied by the first stay of the young Dalai-Lama at dGa'-'ldan and 'Bras-spus and the ceremonies connected herewith, in which the regent always appear in a prominent place. And the only mention of Tibet in the Chinese documents is on the occasion of the imperial approval to this same proceeding; chi-wei. T'ung-chih (23rd May, 1870), Mu-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 281, f. 9b. Father Desgodins must have heard on the frontier a distorted and much exaggerated rumour centering around the events of 1871.

1) Life 12th DL, f. 188b. The Chinese documents have nothing about the decease of the regent. As late as the 23rd November, 1872, he appears in a document as the acting administrator of finance affairs; chia-hsi/X/11. T'ung-chih, Mu-tsung Shih-lu, ch. 343, ff. 13b-14b.
April, 1875), the council of ministers (bka'-sag) took care of current affairs during some months. Then the ecclesiastical general assembly (ts'ogs-pa-du) came together, apparently for the first time as no mention of this body occurs before; it nominated as regent the rTa-ts'ag rje-drung Qutuqtu of Kun-bde-glin, called Nag-dbaṅ-dpal-ldan-c'os-kyi-rgyal-mtshan (1875), who received the Chinese seal of office in 1877 only 1). He died on 8/IV/Fire-Dog (about 11th May, 1886) 2).

The ecclesiastical assembly met once more, and on the 13/V/Fire-Dog (about 14th June, 1886) chose as regent the De-mo Qutuqtu of bsTan-rgyas-glin, by name Nag-dbaṅ-blo-bzaṅ-p rin-las-rab-rgyas. He took office with solemn ceremony on 13/IX (about 10th October) 3). On the 26th September 1895 he was compelled to cede the ruling powers to the 13th Dalai-Lama; according to the official version, on repeated occasions he had tendered his resignation, and this time it was accepted 4). In 1899 the Dalai-Lama was warned of a conspiracy by the ex-Regent against his life. The De-mo Qutuqtu thereupon was placed under arrest in his own monastery of bsTan-rgyas-glin. On 3/V/Earth-Pig (about 10th June, 1899) he died there, hardly of a natural death, although the official version is at pains to tell us that no violence was done to him. At the time of his death he was 45 years old, which places his birth in about 1854 5).

---

1) Lobsang-damling, pp. 26-27. The only Chinese document that could have any bearing on the subject, is dated 7th April, 1879. But it merely transmits to the regent, whose appointment is hinted at as having taken place earlier, words of thank and gifts, as an acknowledgment from the Throne of the care and circumspection displayed by him during the search for the new rebirth of the Dalai-Lama; keng-shên/III/5. Kuang-hsun, Té-tsung Shik-lu, ch. 90, C. 2b-3a. On t'cheng/VI/5. Kuang-hsun (10th August, 1879) the emperor appointed him chief tutor of the boy Dalai-Lama; Té-tsung Shik-lu, ch. 97, f. 10b.

2) Life 13th DL, Ka, f. 138b.

3) Life 13th DL, Ka, f. 140a.

4) Life 13th DL, Ka, ff. 254b-257b.

5) Srid zur gyi dgon ba'i kyi rgyal-yi yul phyag med par dgon graññ le lha'i tshog tu bu tu te'i 'du byed 'dor ba'i tshul bstan 'dug. Life 13th DL, Ka, f. 324a; and generally ff. 321b-324a.
After the death of the thirteenth Dalai-Lama the ecclesiastical general assembly at the end of January 1934 appointed as regent the sprul-sku of Rva-sgreñ, T'ub-bstan-'jam-dpal-ye-šes-rgyal-mts’an, born about 1914; by doing so, the assembly merely gave effect to a wish expressed by the deceased Dalai-Lama. In February 1941 the regent resigned and retired to Rva-sgreñ. On the 13th April, 1947, he was arrested on account of his alleged complicity in a conspiracy, and died on the 8th May a prisoner in the Potala.

The sprul-sku of sTag-brag, Nag-dbañ-gsuñ-rab-grub-t‘ob-bstan-pa’i-rgyal-mts’an, born about 1873, was chosen in 1941 by the ecclesiastical general assembly, officially as acting regent only. He remained in office till the young Dalai-Lama took over the government on the 17th November 1950. He died at an old age not long afterward, perhaps in 1952.

1) Li Tieh-tseng, *The historical status of Tibet*, New York 1956, p. 166. Confirmed and precised by a kind communication from Mr. Hugh Richardson, the last British and first Indian agent in Lhasa, who was an eye-witness of the events and therefore ranks as a first-class authority in these matters. I wish to thank him here for his ever-ready help and unfailing patience.

2) These dates were communicated to me by Mr. Richardson. Li Tieh-tseng, *op. cit.*, p. 187, places the arrest of the ex-regent on the 14th April.

3) “sTag-brag lies about 9 miles to the west of Lhasa, across the sTod-lun-c’u in a high valley; it is an old site.” So far Mr. Richardson. The name of this monastery is hardly ever mentioned in Tibetan literature; however, one sTag-brag Blo-gros-rgya-mts’o appears under the date of 1615 in the Re’u-mig, p. 65. That sTag-brag is the correct spelling of the usual “Taktra”, is confirmed by the above cited Tibetan booklet by Sir Basil Gould, f. 21a. The spelling Brag-k’ra, occurring in G. Tucci, *To Lhasa and beyond*, Rome 1956, p. 18, is therefore to be rejected.


5) These dates too are due to the kindness of Mr. Richardson.