

LUCIANO PETECH

通 報

T'OUNG PAO

ARCHIVES

CONCERNANT L'HISTOIRE, LES LANGUES, LA GÉOGRAPHIE,
L'ETHNOGRAPHIE ET LES ARTS DE L'ASIE ORIENTALE

REVUE DIRIGÉE PAR

PAUL DEMIÉVILLE

Membre de l'Institut
Professeur honoraire au Collège de France

ET

A. F. P. HULSEWÉ

Professeur à l'Université de Leiden

ET PUBLIÉE AVEC LE CONCOURS
DU CENTRE NATIONAL FRANÇAIS DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE

ET

DE L'ORGANISATION NÉERLANDAISE
POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT DE LA RECHERCHE PURE (Z.W.O.)

VOL. LII

Livr. 4-5



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1966

SOMMAIRE

	Page
ULRICH UNGER, Chou-König oder Usurpator?	233
W. A. C. H. DOBSON, Studies in the grammar of Early Archaic Chinese	247
SIAN LIN YEN, Notes on the initials <i>ying</i> and <i>yü</i> in ancient Chinese	254
LUCIANO PETECH, Notes on Tibetan history of the 18th century	261
TSUDA SÖKICHI, The idea of <i>kami</i> in ancient Japanese classics	293
J. W. DE JONG, L'auteur de l' <i>Abhidharmadīpa</i>	305

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

W. A. C. H. Dobson, <i>Late Han Chinese, A Study of the Archaic-Han Shift</i> , par Mieczyslaw Jerzy Küntler	308
Liu Mau-tsai, <i>Deutsch-Chinesische Syntax</i> , par D. R. Jonker	320
Max Kaltenmark, <i>Lao tseu et le taoïsme</i> , par Holmes Welch	323
William Samolin, <i>East Turkistan to the Twelfth Century. A Brief Political Survey</i> , par J. Hamilton	325
Louis Dermigny, <i>La Chine et l'Occident: Le commerce à Canton au XVIII^e siècle</i> , par Michel Cartier	327
Ellis Joffe, <i>Party and Army. Professionalism and Political Control in the Chinese Officer Corps</i> , par P. Bourgeois	341
<i>Malayan and Indonesian Studies</i> , par G. W. J. Drewes	347
LIVRES REÇUS	353
CORRIGENDA du vol. LII	383

Le prix de souscription au volume en cours est de fl. holl 45.—, frais de port en plus.

S'adresser :

Pour les *abonnements*, à la maison E. J. BRILL, 33a Oude Rijn, Leiden, à laquelle doivent être envoyés les mandats postaux ou les chèques.

Pour la *rédaction*, à M. PAUL DEMIÉVILLE, membre de l'Institut, 234 boulevard Raspail, Paris XIV^e, ou à M. A. F. P. HULSEWÉ, professeur à l'Université de Leiden, Sinologisch Instituut, 1^e Binnenvestgracht 33, Leiden (Hollande).

NOTES ON TIBETAN HISTORY OF THE 18TH CENTURY

BY

LUCIANO PETECH

Contents

§ 1.	The so-called abdication of the Sixth Dalai-Lama.	262
§ 2.	Lajang Khan's rise	266
§ 3.	The end of the Qošot of Tibet	276
§ 4.	The Köke-nör Qošot and the Seventh Dalai-Lama	281
§ 5.	The Tibetan rising against the Dsungars.	290

I offer here a series of disjointed notes ¹⁾, which arose from the

1) The following abbreviations are used:

<i>A5DL</i>	Autobiography of the Fifth Dalai-Lama (<i>Za hor gyi ban de ñag dbaṅ blo bzañ rgya mts'o'i 'di snañ 'k'rul pa'i rol rtsad rtogs brjod kyi ts'ul du bkod pa du ku la'i gos bzañ</i>); vols. Ca, C'a, Ja of the <i>gsuñ-'bum</i> ; Tōhoku 5588. The inner numeration of the three volumes (followed here) is Ka, K'a, Ga.
<i>A6DL</i>	Autobiography of the Sixth Dalai-Lama (<i>T'ams cad mk'yen pa drug pa blo bzañ rin c'en ts'añs dbyaṅs rgya mts'o'i t'un mañ p'yi rnam par t'ar pa dukūla'i 'p'ro 't'ud rab gsal gser gyi sñe mo</i>); Tōhoku 5823.
<i>A2PC</i>	Autobiography of the Second Paṅ-c'en Rin-po-c'e (<i>Śākya'i dge slon blo bzañ ye śes kyi spyod ts'ul gsal bar byed pa ñor dkar can gyi p'reñ ba</i>); vol. Ka of the <i>gsuñ-'bum</i> .
<i>CT</i>	L. Petech, <i>China and Tibet in the early 18th century</i> , Leiden 1950.
<i>Ferrari</i>	A. Ferrari, <i>mK'yen-brtse's guide to the holy places of Central Tibet</i> , Rome 1958.
<i>FPYL</i>	<i>Huang-ch'ao Fan-pu yao-lüeh</i> 皇朝藩部要略, 1884 edition.
<i>Galdan</i>	<i>Oyirod-un Galdan Bošwytu qaγan-u teüke</i> , edited and translated by W. Heissig, "Ein mongolisches Textfragment über den Ölötenfürsten Galdan", in <i>Sinologische Arbeiten</i> , 2 (1944), pp. 92-160.
<i>Haenisch</i>	Documents from the Manchu version of the <i>Chun-k'o-érh fang-lüeh</i> , translated by E. Haenisch, "Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte Chinas unter der gegenwärtigen Dynastie, I: Die Eroberung von Tibet", in <i>T'oung Pao</i> , XII (1911), pp. 197-235, 375-424.
<i>J.As.</i>	<i>Journal Asiatique</i> .
<i>K.Ann.</i>	Annals of Kokonor, by Sum-pa mK'an-po (<i>mTs'o sñon gyi lo rgyus sogs bkod pa'i ts'añs glu gsar sñan žes bya ba</i>); published

accumulation of new material in the course of my readings. The subjects are mostly related to those which I treated many years ago in my book *China and Tibet in the early 18th century*, Monographies du *T'oung Pao*, vol. I, Leiden 1950; its connected narrative may serve as a background to the present studies.

§ 1. *The so-called abdication of the Sixth Dalai-Lama*

Let us summarize the Tibetan situation at the beginning of the 18th century. Since 1679 the regent (*sde-srid*) Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o (1653-1705) was head of the government. In order to secure and prolong his absolute power, he concealed the death of the Fifth Dalai-Lama (1682). Only in 1697 he officially communicated

-
- by Lokesh Chandra as an appendix to *Vaidūrya ser po*, II, New Delhi 1960, pp. 425-458.
- Kraft** E. Kraft, *Zum Dsungarenkrieg im 18. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1953.
- L7DL** Life of the Seventh Dalai-Lama, by the lCañ-skya Qutuqtu Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje (*rGyal ba'i dbaṅ po t'ams cad mk'yen gzigs rdo rje 'c'aṅ blo bzaṅ bskal bzaṅ rgya mts'o'i žal sna nas kyi rnam par t'ar pa mdo tsam brjod pa dpag bsam rin po c'e'i sne ma*); vol. Ka of the *gsuñ-'bum*; Tōhoku 5824.
- L8DL** Life of the Eighth Dalai-Lama, by the De-mo Qutuqtu (*rGyal ba'i dbaṅ po t'ams cad mk'yen gzigs c'en po rje bisun blo bzaṅ bstan pa'i dbaṅ p'yug 'jam dpal rgya mts'o dpal bzaṅ po'i žal sna nas kyi rnam par t'ar pa mdo tsam brjod pa 'dzam glin t'a gru yaṅs pa'i rgyan*); vol. Ka of the *gsuñ-'bum*.
- LM** *Loṅ ba'i dmigs bu*, a manual of the official seals of the Tibetan government (*gZuñ žabs rnam la ñe bar mk'o ba bla dpon rim byon gyi lo rgyus t'am deb loṅ ba'i dmigs bu žes bya ba*); published by G. Tharchin, in *Yik-bskur rnam gshag*, Kalimpong 1956, pp. 173-216.
- MBTJ** Life of Mi-dbaṅ P'o-lha-nas, by mDo-mk'ar Ts'e-riñ-dbaṅ-rgyal (*dPal mi'i dbaṅ po'i rtogs brjod pa 'jig rten kun tu dga' ba'i gtam*).
- MITN** L. Petech, *I missionari italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal* (7 vols.), Rome 1952-1956.
- Pelliot** P. Pelliot, *Notes critiques d'histoire kalmouke*, Paris 1960.
- PSJZ2 and PSJZ3** *dPag bsam ljon bzaṅ*, by Sum-pa mK'an-po; part II, edited by S. Ch. Das, Calcutta 1908; part III, edited by Lokesh Chandra, New Delhi 1959.
- Re'u-mig** Chapter *Re'u-mig* of *PSJZ3*, pp. 7-79. I prefer not to quote the translation of S. Ch. Das, Life of Sum-pa Khan-po, in *JASB* 1889, pp. 37-84.
- TWC** *Ch'in-ting Hsi-yü t'ung-wên-chih* 欽定西域同文志, 3 vols., Tokyo 1963.
- Wylie** T. V. Wylie, *The geography of Tibet according to the 'Dzam-gling -rgyas-bshad*, Rome 1962.
- ZDMG** *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

it to the K'ang-hsi emperor, informing him at the same time that he had long ago found and brought up the new incarnation, who was now enthroned in the presence of imperial representatives as the Sixth Dalai-Lama Ts'añs-dbyañs-rgya-mts'o¹⁾. But the new Dalai-Lama was a profligate youth (and a gifted poet besides), whose ways of life soon aroused protests from many quarters.

Most of the Western writers mention at this point a sort of abdication of the Dalai-Lama from his spiritual position. This statement goes back to one single authority, viz. Giorgi, a late and second-hand writer, who never went to Tibet but merely repeated (not without mistakes) what the last Capuchin missionaries to Lhasa had told him²⁾; and those missionaries themselves, chiefly Cassiano da Macerata, were not eye-witnesses, nor even contemporaries.

Giorgi's narrative is as follows:

Itaque solemniter inauguratus, omnique disciplinarum genere egregie instructus, Supremi Lhamae dignitatem ac munus obibat, quum ecce anno circiter aetatis XX a duobus Tartarorum Jungaricorum et Sinarum regibus epistolas accipit, quibus intelligit signa renati Lhamae in controversiam verti, nec haberi se pro vero ac legitimo principe, in quem iterum natus transmigravit decessor.

Qua re vehementer commotus regum audaciam comprimere et quasi pudefacere statuit. Coram Magnum Lhamam Shigathzé publice profitetur nuncium se remittere religionis proposito; unoque regio diademate atque imperio contentum, nihili pendere quicquid praeterea splendidi Lhamaica sibi dignitas et excellentia offerret.

Tum omni se voluptatum et libidinum gurgiti impudicissimus iuvenis publice privatimque immergere coepit; ejusque scelerum fama tam longe lateque brevi pervasit, ut impellentibus regibus Jongar et Kokonor et ipso cum primis imperatore Sinarum, Lhamae et Ciokhiongii [*c'os-skyon*, oracles] fere universi in concilium convenerint, sententiamque dixerint: aut animam aut certe spiritum Ciangciub [*byañ-c'ub*, *bodhi*] e corpore huius supremi Lhamae discessisse, altera proculdubio superstite, quae peccaret. Sed e gradu deicere non sunt ausi.

Monebatur a suis modum tam effraenè vivendi licentiae imponere. Monitis cessit ad horam. Nam auctis deinceps sine pudore flagitiis ita succendit indignationem et iram Regis Tartari, ut eum aut morti tradere, aut rapere, et ad se ultro transferre decreverit. Itaque variis usus machinamentis sic negotium instruxit, ut idem ipse Lhama occasionem sibi praebuerit adeundi Lhassam eumque in aedibus Potala conveniendi. Ibi capitur Lhama. . .³⁾.

¹⁾ *CT*, p. 9.

²⁾ On Giorgi's work see *MITN*, I, pp. xcix-cii.

³⁾ A. Giorgi, *Alphabetum Tibetanum*, Rome 1761, pp. 250-251.

No date is given anywhere. The first paragraph ¹⁾ is incredible as it stands; a letter from the K'ang-hsi emperor of such grave import as the practical denial of the legitimacy of the Dalai-Lama, would certainly be included, or at least mentioned in the *Shih-lu*; but neither the *Shih-lu* nor the Tibetan and Mongol sources contain the slightest hint about it. I think we can safely assume that no such letters were ever sent.

The second paragraph has a basis of fact, since the only Tibetan source available for these years relates something of that sort. The regent, who could no longer ignore the scandal, in the 4th month (May) of 1702 wrote to the Paṅ-c'en a long letter, couched in diplomatic expressions of respect for the young Dalai-Lama. He stated that the behaviour of the young man and specially his spoken words were beyond the understanding of the people; above all, the Dalai-Lama had delayed under various pretexts an act of the utmost importance: his final initiation and consecration (*t'ugs-rdzogs*). To the remonstrances of the *sde-srid* he had replied that he felt himself unfit to hold the place of his predecessors. Therefore, Saṅs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o asked for the intervention of the revered Paṅ-c'en ²⁾. It was arranged that the Dalai-Lama should visit the Paṅ-c'en; and the latter, although in indifferent health, traveled for some stages from bKra-śis-lhun-po in order to meet his pupil and to escort him to the great monastery. The Dalai-Lama took his residence in the *gzims-k'añ* rGyal-mts'an-mt'on-po in nearby gZis-ka-rtse.

The two met repeatedly, and the Paṅ-c'en tried earnestly to persuade the young man to do what was his plain duty "toward the religion and the living beings" ³⁾. He was supported by a group of influential churchmen and nobles, sent by the regent as advisers; this group included the De-mo and the Sems-dpa' incarnates, the sTag-rtse *žabs-drun* ⁴⁾, prince Lajang (the brother of Vangjal, the

¹⁾ The division into paragraphs is mine.

²⁾ *A2PC*, f. 209a-b.

³⁾ *A2PC*, ff. 210b-211a.

⁴⁾ Lha-rgyal-rab-brtan of sTag-rtse (Taktse-dzong on the right hand of the sKyi-c'u to the east of Lhasa) is first mentioned with the Mongol title of *taiji* in 1678; *A5DL*, Ga, f. 92a. His father, the *žabs-drun* rDo-rje-rnam-rgyal, was still alive in 1683, but in 1697 he was dead and his son was already styled sTag-rtse-nas; *A2PC*, ff. 82a and 176b. He was a prominent nobleman under Lajang Khan, as shown by sundry mentions in *A2PC*. But he played traitor to Lajang's family in 1717 and became the head of the Tibetan puppet government under the Dsungar invaders. He was sentenced to death and executed by the Chinese in December 1720. See *CT*, Index.

then ruling Qośot chief) and the head teachers of Se-ra, 'Bras-spuñs and dGa'-ldan¹⁾. But the Dalai-Lama was adamant. In the end the Paṅ-c'en and his council admonished him to undergo the initiation as soon as possible, and informed the regent of their failure²⁾.

Thus far the account of the Paṅ-c'en. What he chooses to pass over in silence is the fact, attested by Tibetan and Mongol texts under that same date of 1702, that the Dalai-Lama not only refused to be initiated, but renounced his monastic vows in the hands of the Paṅ-c'en, returning thus to the lay state, but maintaining his temporal prerogatives, such as they were³⁾. Giorgi's second paragraph, therefore, is confirmed in all its points by independent evidence.

The situation did not change in the following years. Once more, when in the sixth month (July) of 1704 the Dalai-Lama intended to travel to Zab-p'u (?), the Paṅ-c'en decided to invite him to bKra-śis-lhun-po in the hope to prevail upon him to resume the vows of the *prātimokṣa* (*so-t'ar-gyi-sdom-pa*). He wrote to him accordingly and even made some preparations. But the Dalai-Lama travelled directly from the ferry on the Ñaṅ-c'u to beyond the fortress of gŽis-ka-rtse without meeting his former teacher; and the Paṅ-c'en had to be content with sending a good horse with all accoutrements to him at rGyal-rtse⁴⁾.

Giorgi's third paragraph, too, may have a slender basis of fact. No "council" sponsored by the Dsungar, Qośot and Manchu rulers was convened and no declaration of loss of the *bodhi*, i.e. of the character as an incarnation, was issued by the chief Lamas; there is no trace of this in the texts. But the oracles (*c'os-skyoñ*)⁵⁾ actually did deliver a declaration on the subject; in 1706, before taking action against the Dalai-Lama, Lajang addressed enquiries (*žu-luñ*) to the *c'os-skyoñ*, and on the basis of their replies was

1) *A2PC*, f. 211a.

2) *A2PC*, f. 211a-b. The stay of the Dalai-Lama in gŽis-ka-rtse lasted for seventeen days; before leaving he exchanged precious gifts with the Paṅ-c'en.

3) "He gave back his vows to the Paṅ-c'en and did not keep them any more; he adopted the way of life of a temporal ruler" (*Ts'añs dbyañs rgya mts'os bstan pa'i mña' bdag rin po c'e Blo bzañ ye śes la 'dul sdom p'ul nas ma bžes, mi dbañ gi ts'ul bzun*); *K. Ann.*, p. 438. Also *Re'u-mig*, p. 75; *Galdan*, p. 125.

4) *A2PC*, ff. 216b-217a.

5) At that time the foremost oracles were the gNas-c'uñ and the La-mo *c'os-skyoñ*.

satisfied that Ts'añs-dbyañs-rgya-mts'o was not the rebirth of the fifth Dalai-Lama.¹⁾ We may, therefore, conclude that Giorgi's account, although impossible as it stands, may go back to a hazy recollection of the Paṅ-c'en's advising body (1704) and of the declaration of the oracles (1706).

The fourth paragraph relates the deposition and exile of the Dalai-Lama by Lajang Khan. It is strange, however, that Giorgi wholly ignores the tragic end of the regent which preceded that event.

Summing up, the only historically proved facts are the refusal of the Sixth Dalai-Lama to take the final initiation and his renunciation of the monastic vows in the hands of the Paṅ-c'en. All the rest seems to be embellishments by the oral tradition of the Capuchins, as preserved by Giorgi.

The causes and consequences of the fact are difficult to appraise. In any case, let me stress the point that the whole business was transacted between the *sde-srid*, the Paṅ-c'en and the high lamas and nobles sent from Lhasa; the Qošot ruler, who was the pupil, patron and protector of both Dalai-Lama and Paṅ-c'en, had no part in it, at least none can be deduced from the available sources. In the same way, we ignore whether the formal retirement of the *sde-srid* in the following year was a sort of aftermath to the event.

§ 2. *Lajang Khan's rise*

The paramountcy of the Qošot Mongols over Tibet had been established by Gušri Khan in 1642. Upon his death on the 14th January, 1655²⁾, he left ten sons³⁾, who after some time, perhaps in accordance with the will of their dead father, carried out a partition, which apparently followed the provisions of Gengis Khan's *jasag* on this subject⁴⁾. The pastures in the ancestral domains of Köke-nör were distributed among nine of the sons, whose formal head, as *primus inter pares*, was the youngest Daši (bKra-sis)

¹⁾ *A2PC*, f. 231b.

²⁾ On 7/XII(Hor)/Wood-Horse; *A5DL*, Ka, f. 233a. His bones were enshrined in the dGa'-ldan K'añ-gsar on 26; XI/Wood-Sheep (23rd December, 1655); *A5DL*, Ka, ff. 244b, 247a-b.

³⁾ On their names see Pelliot, Table II.

⁴⁾ On the institutions that lay at the basis of this settlement see B. I. Vladimirtsov, *Le régime social des Mongols*, Paris 1948, pp. 60 and 67.

Bātur in his quality as *otčigin* or guardian of the hearth ¹⁾). But in practice the sixth son Dalai Bātur, who on the 4th December, 1658, was given the style of Dalai Qungtaiji ²⁾, was the actual head of this line, acting in close contact with the first-born and with the Dalai-Lama, as it appears from his frequent visits to Lhasa and from the Chinese documents ³⁾. The new territories, i.e. the foreign conquests farthest away from home, were entrusted to the eldest brother Dayan. This meant that he inherited the Qošot rights in Tibet, consisting of the military protection of the Dalai-Lama and of the country, the appointment of the civil administrator or regent (*sde-srid* or *sde-pa*), the property of the 'Dam pastures to the south of the Tengri-nōr as dwellings for Dayan's *ulus*, and the ownership of the dGa'-ldan K'añ-gsar in Lhasa ⁴⁾. The normal Tibetan title of the Mongol "Defender of the Faith" seems to have been *rgyal-po k'ri-pa* ⁵⁾.

On the 7th February, 1658, Dayan was formally enthroned in Lhasa by the Fifth Dalai-Lama, who granted him the title and seal of bsTan-'dzin rDo-rje rGyal-po ⁶⁾; and under its Mongol equivalent Očir Khan ⁷⁾ he was henceforward known among his countrymen. We may add that the title bsTan-'dzin ("Upholder of the [Buddhist] Teaching") was borne by all his successors. Under this easy-going chieftain, control over Tibetan affairs passed almost entirely in the hands of the Fifth Dalai-Lama and of the regents appointed in succession by him, the rights of the Qošot chief dwindling to a mere formal confirmation.

Očir Khan died on the 22nd April, 1668 ⁸⁾, and was succeeded by his eldest son Güncük (dKon-mc'og) or bSod-nams-dbañ-rgyal, who was enthroned by the Dalai-Lama with the style of bsTan-'dzin

¹⁾ *Hor C'os-byun*, transl. G. Huth, *Geschichte des Buddhismus in der Mongolei*, Strassburg 1896, p. 64.

²⁾ On 10/XI/Earth-Dog; *A5DL*, Ka, f. 267a.

³⁾ He died in 1690 and his funeral was conducted by the first lCañ-skya Qutuqtu; *Subud erike*, ff. 65a-66a, summarized by K. Sagaster, *Leben und historische Bedeutung des I. lCañ skya Khutukhtu* (polygraphied thesis), Bonn 1960, pp. 2 and 128-129. Funeral rites were performed at bKra-sis-lhun-po during the New Year festival of 1691; *A2PC*, f. 118a. The Dalai-Lama performed them only in 1696; *A6DL*, f. 142a. But he could hardly do so before his public recognition, which happened in that same year.

⁴⁾ The *Ragguaglio* of Francesco Orazio della Penna, in *MITN*, III, p. 60.

⁵⁾ So *passim* in *A2PC*.

⁶⁾ On 6/I(Hor)/Earth-Dog; *A5DL*, Ka, f. 258b.

⁷⁾ Tib. *rdo-rje* = Mong. *očir* = Sanskr. *vajra*.

⁸⁾ On 12/III(Hor)/Earth-Monkey; *A5DL*, K'a, f. 47b.

Dalai Khan on the 11th April, 1671¹⁾. He was a quite shadowy figure and played no role at all in the tortuous politics of the Tibetan regent, who aimed at supporting secretly the Dsungars without openly breaking with the Manchu emperor.

Dalai Khan had from his wife Daši (bKra-śis)²⁾ two sons; the elder was called Vangjal (bsTan-'dzin dBaṅ-rgyal) and the younger Lajang (Lha-bzaṅ)³⁾. Lajang, born about 1658⁴⁾, was by far the stronger character of the two, and started playing a political role already during the lifetime of his father. At first he seems to have resided partly in Lhasa and partly in Köke-nör⁵⁾. In 1697 Dalai Khan sent messengers to Ning-hsia, to congratulate the K'ang-hsi emperor upon his victory over the Dsungar ruler Galdan. On this occasion Lajang went to Köke-nör, "to build a Dalai-Lama temple"⁶⁾. His journey caused a fluster among his relatives there. The Köke nör princes had gathered at Caṅan Toloṅai⁷⁾ on 29/1 (20th February)⁸⁾, and there the foremost churchman of the territory, the Caṅan Nomun Qān, brought them the greetings of the emperor and his invitation to present themselves to audience. He summoned also Gümbü, the son of Gušri Khan's third son Dalantai. The latter, being also busy "in building a Dalai-Lama's temple", sent in his stead to Caṅan Toloṅai his elder son Erdeni Erke Toq-tonai. On his way he heard that Lajang was going to make a surprise attack on him, took fear and turned back. Gümbü then sent his second son Pünsük, and Lajang met him courteously and said: "Your father is secretly sending envoys to the imperial residence. Will he not double-cross Köke-nör? I am raising troops and shall

¹⁾ On 3/III(Hor)/Iron-Pig; *A5DL*, K'a, f. 109a.

²⁾ She is mentioned in *A2PC*, f. 164a.

³⁾ This is the correct order of birth, found in *PSJZ2*, p. 165, in the *Hov C'os-'byun*, transl. G. Huth, p. 64, and in the Mongol document edited and translated by W. Heissig, "Ein mongolischer zeitgenössischer Bericht über den Ölöteneinfall in Tibet und die Plünderung von Lhasa 1717", in *ZDMG* 1954, p. 404. Pelliot's table is mistaken in inverting the order. Lajang's full name was Lha-bzaṅ Klu-dbaṅ; *A5DL*, K'a, f. 140a.

⁴⁾ In 1713 he was about 55 years old; Domenico da Fano's *Breve Relazione*, in *MITN*, III, p. 7.

⁵⁾ On 12/VI/Iron-Sheep (7th July, 1691) he sent from mTs'o-k'a (Köke-nör) messengers to the Paṅ-c'en Rin-po-c'e; *A2PC*, f. 120b.

⁶⁾ *FPYL*, ch. 17, f. 12a.

⁷⁾ Modern Ch'a-han ch'êng, South-East of the Köke-nör.

⁸⁾ The date is found in *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 182, f. 2b.

contend with your father". Pünsük rode back and related these words. Gümbü took up arms and waited ¹⁾).

Thus it was a case of petty jealousy among the members of the widespread Qošot clan. The uncertainty rose to the point that the princes wavered and almost decided not to go to court. The decision was reversed in the nick of time due to the energetic intervention of the respected lCañ-skyā Qutuqtu ²⁾. Lajang too contributed to the easing of the situation sending word to Gümbü: "You try to court favour, you alone, with the emperor, and this is not just. I shall accompany the Köke-nör *taiji* to the imperial residence. Therefore draw back your troops". The last word lay with Daši Bātur as the only surviving son of Gušri Khan and the head of the clan. Although at first he would have preferred to send two kinsmen as his representatives, he then took personally the chair and in the end the assembly of Caγan toloyai, in which Lajang also participated, decided to pay their homage to the emperor in Ning-hsia in the fourth month ³⁾. K'ang-hsi, however, preferred to summon them to Peking for the ninth or tenth month ⁴⁾. Accordingly, several Qošot chiefs, led by Daši Bātur, made the journey to the capital, where at the beginning of 1698 they were received in audience by the emperor ⁵⁾. The representative of the Qošot of Tibet on this occasion was not Lajang, but a senior member of the family, viz. Dalai Khan's younger brother Püngsük ⁶⁾. He was granted the title of *beise* ⁷⁾, and remained in favour with the emperor, being promoted to *beile* in 1703 ⁸⁾; he died in 1706 ⁹⁾. Incidentally, this audience of 1698, followed by another in December 1703 ¹⁰⁾, meant the establishment of Manchu suzerainty over the Köke-nör Qošot.

¹⁾ *FPYL*, ch. 10, ff. 11b-12a.

²⁾ On the whole affair see the interesting account of the *Subud erike*, ff. 84a-86a, summarized by K. Sagaster, op. cit., pp. 73 and 140-145.

³⁾ *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 12a-b. See also *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 182, f. 27a-b.

⁴⁾ Order of *i-ssü*/III interc., (15th May), 1697; *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 182, f. 31a-b.

⁵⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 186, ff. 7b-8a. K. Sagaster, Op. cit., p. 146.

⁶⁾ This Pên-su-k'e is described as Dalai Khan's brother in a gloss of the *FPYL* and in the document of 1703 quoted above (p. 00 n. 0). This prevents a confusion with the above-mentioned Püngsük, the younger son of Gümbü.

⁷⁾ *Hsin-ssü*/I (15th February), 1698; *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 187, f. 2a; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 20b.

⁸⁾ *Chi-wei*/XI (25th December), 1703; *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 214, f. 10a.

⁹⁾ The emperor sent an official to represent him at Püngsük's funeral on *jên-tzu*/II (6th April), 1706; *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 224, f. 16a.

¹⁰⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 214, ff. 5b, 8b-9b, 10a, 10b.

As to Lajang, in 1698 he went back from Ba-ro C'u-'gag¹⁰) to Central Tibet and settled in the residence of the Mongol rulers there, the dGa'-ldan K'an-gsar¹).

After a couple of uneventful years, Dalai Khan died on 22nd January, 1701²). Vangjal succeeded him; but he is hardly mentioned in the *A6DL*, which ends abruptly with the 9th month of 1701; the *A2PC* too has not a single word about him. Thus we know practically nothing of his short reign. He met with a tragic end, being poisoned by his brother³); this event happened shortly before 16/VI (29th July), 1703, because on that date the Paṅ-c'en sent a *mgron-gñer* to offer his gratulations and presents to the new ruler⁴). Vangjal's sons and descendants are known solely from the genealogical tables; but they never played a political role.⁵)

After his succession to the chiefship, Lajang Khan began to evince an activity and interest in Tibetan affairs, which portended a revival of the almost obsolete Qoṣot paramountcy. He was considerably helped by the rather complicated situation that had arisen in Lhasa after the "abdication" of the Sixth Dalai-Lama. Lajang's accession was accompanied by a change in the Tibetan government; Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o retired and was formally succeeded as *sde-srid* by his eldest son Nag-dbañ-rin-c'en⁶). We do not know whether this step was connected with the tragic end of Vangjal and was due to pressure from the Qoṣot side. In any case, it was a mere formal gesture, because in practice actual power continued with the ex-

¹⁰) I.e. the river-barrage (*c'u-'gag*) of Ba-ro. We may suppose a scribal error for 'Bo-ra, in which case we may localize it in the neighbourhood of 'Bo-ra dGon-pa on the rDog-c'u, c. 102°40' long. E, 34°50' lat. N. Cf. J. F. Rock, *The Amnye Ma-chhen range and adjacent regions*, Rome 1956, pp. 26-27 and Map 3.

¹) *K. Ann.*, p. 438; *A6DL*, ff. 312a, 314b. In the 10th month he visited the Paṅ-c'en at bKra-sis-lhun-po; *A2PC*, f. 192b.

²) On 14/(Hor)/Iron-Dragon; *A6DL*, f. 439a. It is rather strange that no funeral services were held by the Paṅ-c'en; the *A2PC* does not mention the event at all. The date 1697 in the *Shêng-wu-chi*, ch. 5, f. 6a, is definitely incorrect.

³) *PSJZ2*, p. 165.

⁴) *A2PC*, f. 214a. The date of 1703, without a month, is given also by the *Re'u-mig*, p. 75, *K. Ann.*, p. 438, and *LM*, p. 208.

⁵) The widow and two daughters of Vangjal were brought to Ili in 1718; W. Heissig, in *ZDMG* 1954, pp. 404-405.

⁶) *Re'u-mig*, p. 75; *LM*, p. 178. On the 16/VI, 1703, the Paṅ-c'en sent his gratulations for their accession to Lajang and Nag-dbañ-rin-c'en together; *A2PC*, f. 214a; see above. The *K. Ann.*, p. 438, register the event in 1702.

regent as before ¹). So Tibet had a Dalai-Lama who was no longer a churchman, a regent without power, and an ex-regent who was still the head of the government; and this anomalous situation could not but play into the hands of the Qošot ruler.

An antagonism between Lajang and Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o arose since the very beginning. In that same year 1703 they were already at loggerheads, and it was in this period that we have to place the attempt of the ex-regent to poison Lajang and his chief minister ²). According to a Mongol text, they were saved by the blessing and the holy water of the head of the sGo-maṅs college in 'Bras-spuñs, 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bśad-pa (1648-1721) ³). In 1716 Desideri found the Qošot ruler and his minister "Targum Treëscij" still suffering from the aftermaths of this poisoning ⁴).

The quarrel flared out in the open during the *smon-lam* festival after New Year's day of 1705. In a great gathering of the clergy Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o proposed to seize and kill the Khan. But 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bśad-pa opposed the plot, and nothing came of it ⁵). Thereupon the monks, and above all the La-mo *c'os-skyoṅ* ⁶),

¹) According to *LM*, pp. 196, 206, Nag-dbañ-rin-c'en was merely associated with his father.

²) The emperor alludes to the fact in his edict dated *ting-hai/XI* (6th January, 1707); *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 227, pp. 24a-25a. The Paṅ-c'en too mentions it in passing under the date of the 6th month (July) of 1704, when he sent two envoys to attempt a mediation between the ex-regent and the Qošot ruler; he was moved by the rumors among the clergy and nobility concerning the behaviour of the Dalai-Lama and the poisoning of the king (*rgyal por gyur dug gi glen*); *A2PC*, f. 220a.

³) *FPYL*, ch. 17, f. 12b; *Galdan*, pp. 125-126. On 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bśad-pa see J. F. Rock, *The Amnye Ma-chhen range and adjacent regions*, pp. 39-41; Lokesh Chandra, "The life and works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bśad-pa", in *CAJ*, 7 (1962), pp. 264-279; id., *Materials for a history of Tibetan literature*, I, New Delhi 1963, pp. 45-49. He acted as the head of the sGo-maṅs college from 1700 to 1708; in 1710 he founded the famous monastery of Bla-brañ in Amdo, which is still headed by his incarnations.

⁴) I. Desideri, *Relazione del Tibet*, in *MITN*, V, pp. 189-190, and VI, p. 39.

⁵) *Galdan*, p. 126.

⁶) La-mo, wrongly transliterated by Heissig as Lha-mo, is to the North-East of dGa'-ldan; Ferrari, p. 109 n. 111. Its *c'os-skyoṅ* (oracle) is supposed to be inspired by Ts'aṅs-pa dkar-po, a form of Brahmā; R. de Nebesky-Wojkowitz, *Oracles and demons of Tibet*, Den Haag 1956, p. 145. It may be identical with the Pel-Lamo oracle of the missionaries (*MITN*, II, p. 261); but, in any case, R. A. Stein in *J.As.* 1956, pp. 342-343, has shown that the goddess dPal-ldan Lha-mo is not concerned here. The La-mo oracle was particularly connected (at least in this period) with the Paṅ-c'en. Not only

advised Lajang to leave for Kōke-nōr. This was probably more an order than a piece of advice; apparently they saw in this a means for avoiding an armed clash, and at the same time getting rid of their Mongol protector.

Lajang Khan seemed to comply and started for the north. But when he arrived at the banks of the Nag-c'u, he halted, gathered his tribesmen and in the 6th month of 1705 marched on Lhasa. The monks of the three great monasteries ('Bras-spuñs, Se-ra, dGa'-ldan) tried to mediate, and the Pañ-c'en also sent a letter entreating the Khan not to cause damage to living beings. But Lajang, although not opposing a flat denial, announced his decision to advance in any case as far as Glañ-t'añ¹⁾. The ex-regent, on the other side, rejected any compromise and concentrated the troops of Central Tibet, K'ams and mÑa'-ris near Lhasa. This of course left Lajang free to continue his advance. He reached his private domain of 'Dam, south of the Tengri-nōr, and hence the 'P'an-yul valley, where Glañ-t'añ is situated. Then the Qošot army crossed the mountains that lie to the north of Lhasa, marching in three columns. The left column, led by the Khan himself, passed through the rGad-mo défilé ('p'ran)²⁾; the centre, led by Tügüs (T'u-gwus) Jaisang, through the rGo pass³⁾; the right column, under the Khan's wife Ĵerinraši (Ts'e-riñ-bkra-śis), through the sTod-luñ valley⁴⁾. The regent offered battle, but was defeated with the loss of 400 men; the decisive fighting seems to have taken place on the rGo pass, where Tügüs Jaisang fought and killed the Tibetan commander rDo-rje-rab-brtan⁵⁾.

he gave the general indications for the search of the second incarnation of the Pañ-c'en (*A2PC*, ff. 8b-9a), but it was the only oracle whom the latter regularly consulted during the whole of his life, as shown by numerous entries in the *A2PC*.

1) On Glañ-t'añ (Langdong of the maps) see Ferrari, p. 84, n. 31.

2) The same as the dGa'-mo p'ran on the sKyid-c'u, to the east of Lhasa, which played a similar role in the civil war of 1727-1728; *CT*, p. 123.

3) The Penbogo-la ('P'an-po sGo-la) of the maps, to the north of Lhasa; Ferrari, p. 39 and n. 36.

4) The Tolung valley of the maps, to the West of Lhasa; Ferrari, p. 73; Wylie, p. 77.

5) This account of the events that led to the war, and of the Qošot march on Lhasa is based mainly on *K. Ann.*, p. 438; also on *A2PC*, f. 223a, and on the *Bolur toli*, where the passage concerning the events of 1705 was edited and translated by W. Heissig, "Ergänzungen zu einem mongolischen Textfragment über Galdan", in *Sinologische Arbeiten* 3 (1945), pp. 173-175.

At this point the clergy intervened once more; the Paṅ-c'en even started for the theatre of war, but he had barely reached a couple of stages from bKra-sis-lhun-po, when he heard that the matter had been settled. The position of Saṅs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o was hopeless and he had to agree to the new proposals, which amounted to a capitulation: he laid down his powers upon an assurance of safety and was sent to live at Goñ-dkar-rdzoñ ¹⁾, while Lajang took over the government of the country ²⁾.

The new ruler remained for the moment encamped at Jarbusib(?); but his wife Ĵerinraši, who seemed to harbour a personal hatred against the fallen regent, had him arrested at Goñ-dkar-rdzoñ and brought to the sTod-luñ valley. The monks of 'Bras-spuñs tried to intercede for him; but before their spokesman arrived, the princess caused Saṅs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o to be put to death on the slopes of the hill where the sKyor-mo-luñ monastery ³⁾ is built ⁴⁾. The actual killer was one Bar-c'o-k'a Qošōči and the date of the event was probably the 19/VII, i.e. the 6th September, 1705 ⁵⁾. Common opinion attributed the deed to the suggestions of wicked ministers and later considered the tragic end of Lajang in 1717 as a fitting retribution for the break of his pledge and the murder ⁶⁾.

After this, Lajang was recognized as *rgyal-po k'ri-pa*, apparently with the title of bsTan-'dzin Jiñ-gir rGyal-po ⁷⁾. This courtesy title

¹⁾ Kongka Dzong of the maps; Ferrari, pp. 134-135; Wylie, p. 166. It was the customary place of banishment.

²⁾ *Bolur toli*, Op. cit., p. 175.

³⁾ On sKyor-mo-luñ, now almost deserted, see Ferrari, p. 167, n. 690; Wylie, p. 149, n. 320.

⁴⁾ The authorities for Saṅs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o's end are chiefly *K. Ann.*, p. 438; *Bolur toli*, Op. cit., pp. 175-176; *A2PC*, ff. 223b, 224b; and *MBTJ*, f. 55a. The *Re'u-mig*, p. 75, and *FPYL*, ch. 17, f. 12b, mention the fact in a few words. *LM*, p. 179, places the murder at sTod-luñ sNañ-rtse (locality unknown). Desideri, in *MITN*, VI, pp. 39-40, gives a more romantic tale; the ex-regent was persuaded to surrender by a falsified order (*bka'-śog*) on which the seal of the Dalai-Lama was affixed while the latter was dead drunk. This account, although much embellished, may be substantially true, because the *bka'-śog* is mentioned also in *A2PC*, f. 223b.

⁵⁾ Date given in the biography (vol. K'a of the collection) of the 48th K'ri Rin-po-c'e Don-grub-rgya-mts'o (1665-1727; on the see of dGa'-ldan 1702-1709), f. 5b. *LM*, pp. 178, 206, 208, has the date 29/VII (16th September); but this work is late (early 20th century) and carries less weight.

⁶⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 55a; *K. Ann.*, pp. 438-439.

⁷⁾ Actually this title occurs only once in the Tibetan texts, under the date of the 9th month of 1705; *A2PC*, f. 227b. Let us also remark that the *A2PC*

of Jingis Khan was normally used by foreigners; the Italian missionaries in Tibet and Unkovskij, the Russian envoy to Dsungaria, knew no other name.

The beginning of his reign was characterized by some acts of harshness and oppression. During the advance to Lhasa he had put to death the head of the Se-ra sMad college, and 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bśad-pa restrained him with difficulty from destroying that establishment, which had dared to show hostility to him ¹⁾. Many acts of cruelty, such as flogging and imprisonment, took place in gTsañ ²⁾.

This severity may be a sign of the unstable position in which Lajang found himself at first. His success against the regent had been complete. But his victory placed him in direct opposition to the Dalai-Lama, whose position was nearly inassailable. However personally unworthy, for the clergy and the populace he was the embodiment of sPyan-ras-gzigs and thus the spiritual head of the country. To tackle this delicate proposition, the Qoṣot Khan first of all conciliated the Paṅ-c'en, whom his wife visited in the 9th month of 1705, bringing him costly presents ³⁾. He also made some friendly advances toward the great monasteries; thus he donated to Se-ra the Gron-smad estate (*gzis-ka*), which had belonged to Saṅs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o and from whom the late regent had sometimes got his name ⁴⁾.

But these conciliatory gestures were not enough. Lajang's military power was very limited, and thus he needed external support. This he sought and found in the K'ang-hsi emperor, to whom he reported the elimination of the *sde-srid*. The emperor, glad of the disappearance of an inveterate supporter of the Dsungars, heartily approved of his action and sent to Tibet the Manchu lieutenant-colonel Hsi-chu 席柱 to bestow on Lajang the title of I-fa-kung-shun-han 翊法恭順汗 and to support him in any action that would be deemed advisable against the Dalai-Lama.

Lajang was thus sure that the ideas of the emperor concurred with his own and that he could count on the latter's friendship and moral support. He then proceeded to the next step, the elimination

drops henceforward the style of *rgyal-svas* and the name Lha-bzañ and employs only the title of king (*rgyal-po*) or of bsTan-'dzin C'os-kyi-rgyal-po.

¹⁾ *Bolur toli*, Op. cit., p. 75.

²⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 55a-b.

³⁾ *A2PC*, ff. 227b-228b.

⁴⁾ *Dad pa'i 'dab rgyas* (Life of Bla-ma Naḡ-dbañ-byams-pa, 1682-1762, by the Third Paṅ-c'en; in vol. Ga of the latter's complete works), f. 21a.

of the Sixth Dalai-Lama. The tale has been narrated in *CT*, pp. 10-13, to which very little could be added today. I shall only remark that on this occasion (June 1706) Lajang got rid also of Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o's eldest son Nag-dbañ-rin-c'en, who had continued till then as the titular *sde-srid*, devoid of any power or political importance; he was deposed and sent to China along with his brothers, in the train of the exiled Dalai-Lama. But, more lucky than the latter, he actually reached Peking and was then settled at Dolon-nör in Chahar ¹⁾. In 1717 he was received at sKu'bum by the Li-t'ang pretender ²⁾; and that is the last information we have about him.

In 1707 Lajang enthroned as puppet Dalai-Lama an obscure monk, who till then had bore the title of Mon-pa Pad-dkar-'dzin-pa; he now became the rGyal-ba Rin-po-c'e Nag-dbañ-ye-śes-rgya-mts'o. Very little is known about him. He was rumoured to be the natural son of Lajang ³⁾. He was born in 1686 at Ts'a-roñ in K'ams ⁴⁾, and in 1699 he had been admitted as a novice to 'Bras-spuñs ⁵⁾; later he became a monk in the lCags-po-ri medical college, opposite the Potala. After his unhappy ten years on the see of the Potala, he was deposed by the Dsungars and relegated in the lCags-po-ri (1717). On their arrival, the Manchu took him out of that college and sent him to Peking; upon his arrival, the imperial government exiled him to gŚe-hor (?) in Mongolia ⁶⁾. He must have died there; but whether the bsTan pa'i gsal byed Dam-pa mK'an-po Qutuqtu Nag-dbañ-ye-śes-rgya-mts'o, whose death ceremonies were performed by the Dalai-Lama on New Year's day of 1726 ⁷⁾, was identical with him, is a point on which serious doubts are allowed ⁸⁾. In any case, the puppet Dalai-Lama was reincarnated in K'ams, but the boy died of smallpox, and apparently the matter rested there.

¹⁾ *K. Ann.*, p. 439.

²⁾ *L7DL*, f. 41a. This text gives no names, but speaks only of the two elder sons of the *sde-srid* Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o. In 1718 the two younger sons also paid their respects; *L7DL*, f. 47b.

³⁾ *LM*, p. 179; Domenico da Fano, in *MITN*, III, p. 6.

⁴⁾ See the authorities quoted in *CT*, p. 13 n. 6, to which we can now add *K. Ann.*, p. 437.

⁵⁾ *Re'u-mig*, p. 74.

⁶⁾ *A2PC*, f. 302b; *K. Ann.*, p. 440. Cf. *CT*, p. 64.

⁷⁾ *L7DL*, f. 115a.

⁸⁾ In *CT*, p. 91, I took this identification as granted. But actually there is nothing in its favour except the identity of the name; the titles are different.

§ 3. *The end of the Qošot of Tibet*

This subject was treated in *CT*, pp. 25-41; but some new facts have come to light that are worth pointing out.

Lajang Khan's relations with the Dsungar ruler Cewang Arabtan (Ts'e-dbañ-rab-brtan; 1697-1727) were at first cordial. The latter had married Lajang's sister, and his son and successor Galdan Cering (dGa'-ldan-ts'e-riñ) was born from this marriage ¹). The ties of kinship were further strengthened by the marriage of Lajang's eldest son Galdan Danjin (dGa'-ldan-bstan-'dzin) with Boitalaq, a daughter of the Dsungar ruler (1714); the wedding took place in Ili and the married couple remained there. It is well known how the name of Galdan Danjin was used by the Dsungars as a cover for their invasion of Tibet ²). The unfortunate prince remained in Ili during the war; he was treated as a guest and resided in the neighbourhood of the Dsungar royal camp. At one time he was placed under surveillance, but not otherwise molested. But in 1721, after the disaster of the Dsungar army in Tibet, he was imprisoned and Boitalaq was given to Cewangjambu, a chief of the Qoit ³). He was charged with hostile magic and was done to death by pressing him between two red-hot cauldrons ⁴).

Under the pretext of bringing Galdan Danjin to visit his father, the Dsungars invaded Tibet. They numbered 6000 and were led by Cering Donduk (Ts'e-riñ-don-grub) the elder, a cousin of Cewang Arabtan; under him served four generals, the *jaisang* Dugar⁵), ⁶Tobci),

¹) *PSJZ3*, p. 158.

²) *CT*, p. 26.

³) Kraft, pp. 54, 72, 83-84. This unimpeachable evidence (statements of Dsungar officers taken prisoner by the Manchu) disposes of the contention of the Ch'ien-lung emperor and of Desideri that the Dsungars put the prince to death in 1717, as soon as his usefulness as a decoy was at an end.

⁴) *TWC*, ch. 24, f. 2a-b. Unkovskij, pp. 190-191, 257-258. Pelliot, p. 10, where this event is wrongly supposed to have taken place before the invasion of Tibet.

⁵) Dugar Sanduk in the Manchu text of Haenisch and in *FPYL*, ch. 17, f. 14b; gDugs-dkar 'Je-sañs of *A2PC*, ff. 278b and 284b, of *PSJZ3*, p. 304, and of *K. Ann.*, p. 439. He died of illness, probably still in Tibet; Kraft, p. 83.

⁶) T'ob-c'i in *A2PC* and *K. Ann.*, loc. cit.; Cobči in *FPYL*, loc. cit. In July 1718 he accompanied Cering Donduk on his visit to bKra-śis-lhun-po, and in May 1720 he was again there; *A2PC*, ff. 285a and 294b. He was killed on the retreat from Tibet with 500 men; Kraft, loc. cit.

Compel¹⁾, and Sanji²⁾). At the same time a smaller division (only 300 men) was sent to the sKu-'bum monastery to get hold of the Li-t'ang boy, whom the Köke-nör princes maintained to be the rightful incarnation of the Sixth Dalai-Lama; the Dsungars intended to enthrone him in Lhasa. But the raid, undertaken with insufficient forces, failed miserably³⁾.

The Dsungar army defeated Lajang Khan in 'Dam, pressed him back on Lhasa and stormed the city on November 21st, 1717⁴⁾, being aided from the inside by one of the ministers (*γabulun, bka'-blon*) of the Khan, a Qošot called Šakdurjab (P'yag-rdor-skyabs), and by the Tibetan *taifi* rNam-rgyal⁵⁾.

As is well known, Lajang Khan was killed during the flight from the Potala, fighting manly to the bitter end. A short account of the destinies of the Qošot royal family will not be amiss at this point.

Lajang had two sons from his wife Jerinraši, who died in 1708⁶⁾. The elder was the unlucky Galdan Danjin, born about 1691⁷⁾. The younger was called Surja or Sorja⁸⁾; he was born about 1698⁹⁾. He was treacherously seized by sDe-pa sTag-rtse-pa and handed over to the Dsungars; they sent him to Ili, where he arrived in July 1718¹⁰⁾. His wife, who had fled from Lhasa by another route, suc-

¹⁾ C'os-'p'el in *MBTJ*, f. 122a, *A2PC*, ff. 278b and 284a, *K. Ann.*, loc. cit.; Coyimbal of the Mongol text translated by W. Heissig in *ZDMG* 1954, p. 407. In February and in June 1719 he was in bKra-sis-lhun-po; *A2PC*, ff. 287a and 290a. In the same year he was reported to be crossing the Qara-usu and marching toward Köke-nör; Haenisch, p. 387. But the rumor was probably false. In the following year he was given the task of stopping Galbi in his march from Yünnan; Haenisch, p. 404. Possibly in connection with this assignment, in March 1720 he visited again bKra-sis-lhun-po; *A2PC*, f. 294b. But we hear nothing further of the matter, and apparently he retired without risking a combat. He arrived back in Ili three months after Cering Donduk, i.e. in May 1721; Kraft, loc. cit.

²⁾ Sañs-rgyas of *A2PC*, f. 284a, and *K. Ann.*, loc. cit. The Chinese heard that he returned to Dsungaria in the 3rd month (April-May) of 1719; Haenisch, p. 392.

³⁾ Mongol document translated by W. Heissig in *ZDMG* 1954, p. 408; Desideri, in *MITN*, VI, pp. 49-50.

⁴⁾ *CT*, pp. 30-37.

⁵⁾ *Bolur toli*, quoted by W. Heissig in *ZDMG* 1954, p. 397; Haenisch, p. 225; *FPYL*, ch. 17, f. 16a.

⁶⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 88a. Cf. Domenico da Fano, in *MITN*, III, p. 8.

⁷⁾ He was 22 years old in 1713; Domenico da Fano, in *MITN*, III, p. 8.

⁸⁾ This is the normal Mongol name; W. Heissig, in *ZDMG* 1951, p. 440. The *MBTJ* spells it Surya, which is a pedantic Sanskritized form.

⁹⁾ He was 15 in 1713; Domenico da Fano, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁾ Kraft, p. 43.

ceeded in reaching the Manchu outposts in the Tsaidam region, where she gave to the imperial officers an account of the events in Lhasa ¹⁾. Surja remained in Ili ²⁾ and died there at an unknown date, but certainly before 1754, when his son Naγaca (d. 1756) was liberated by the Chinese and appointed a *beise*, and shortly afterwards a *fu-kuo kung* ³⁾.

Lajang had from Jerinraši also three daughters, who were still girls in 1713 ⁴⁾. They were brought to Ili, and one of them was to be married to Cewang Arabtan's second son Lobjang Šono. But the eldest son Galdan Cering, the future ruler of the Dsungars, helped her to elope and took her as his wife ⁵⁾.

After the death of Jerinraši, Lajang remained a widower till at least 1713 ⁶⁾. In that year or shortly afterward he married the daughter of K'u-k'ul Erke Taiji, a Torγud descended from Ayuši Khan, who had settled among the Dsungars and thence had come to Tibet ⁷⁾. From his new wife he begot a son, Sebten (Ts'e-brtan), who was but a child in 1717; he was seized in the Potala along with his mother and was brought to Ili. He too was liberated by the Chinese in 1755 and settled in Chahar. In 1783 he inherited the title of *fu-kuo kung* from the line of Surja, which had become extinct. He died in his turn in 1784 ⁸⁾. The descendants of the last Qošot Khan of Tibet may even now be living in Chahar.

The Qošot tribesmen in Tibet were always few in number, and their power was broken forever in 1717 ⁹⁾. None of their kin played a part in Tibetan history after that year. We know very little about their nobility in the times of Dalai and of Lajang Khan, and even

1) Haenisch, pp. 222-226 (= *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 278, ff. 19b-20b).

2) In 1731 the Dsungars proposed to restore him as the ruler of Tibet; but the attempt was not even made. *CT*, pp. 149-150.

3) *FPYL*, *piao* 4, f. 3a; cf. ch. 17, f. 26b.

4) Domenico da Fano, loc. cit.

5) Kraft, p. 85. Cf. *PSJZ3*, p. 161, an obscure passage which was probably corrupted and misplaced by the copyist.

6) He was still unmarried in 1713, as expressly stated by Domenico da Fano, in *MITN*, III, p. 8.

7) *MBTJ*, f. 98b. P'o-lha-nas acted as go-between on that occasion.

8) *TWC*, ch. 24, ff. 2b-3a; *FPYL*, *piao* 4, f. 3b. Cf. *FPYL*, ch. 17, f. 26b, and *LM*, p. 198.

9) At the end of 1718 the Dsungar commanders in Tibet received from their ruler the order to arrest and deport to Dsungaria all the former officials of Lajang Khan; no difference was made between Qošots and Tibetans. However, the Paṅ-c'en succeeded, by dint of serious representations, in obtaining the rescission of the order. *A2PC*, ff. 287a-b and 289b-290a.

less after the end of their rule. We have some names of officials, but they are names only. The state ministers were four in number (as always the *bka'-blon* in Tibet), all of them Qošot; apparently they bore the common Mongol title of *jaisang* ¹⁾. One of them was Bu-c'uñ Ts'e-dbañ-rdo-rje, who was a minister of the Qošot rulers already in 1681 ²⁾ and is repeatedly mentioned in the times of Lajang ³⁾. He remained in Central Tibet after the catastrophe of his clan, and later (perhaps in 1718) was eliminated by the Dsungars ⁴⁾. Another is known by the simple title of Pakši ⁵⁾. After Lajang Khan's death he took service with the Dsungars, at least in the beginning, and was sent by them to arrest the sMin-grol-gliñ incarnate ⁶⁾. A third prominent official was Tügüs (T'u-gwus or T'u-gu-su) *jaisang*, who had led the van of the Qošot army in 1705. He is mentioned by the Pañ-c'en under the dates of 1707 and 1713 ⁷⁾, but was already dead in 1717, when his son dPa'-rtul-can Durai Taiji was appointed by Lajang as a sort of inspector of the dBus and Koñ-po troops during the fighting in 'Dam ⁸⁾. We may also mention a Tibetan, the abbot of Byams-pa-gliñ, who acted as a sort of diplomatic agent in Köke-nör on behalf of the Qošot rulers of Tibet since at least 1696 ⁹⁾.

Desideri, on the other hand, has many things to tell us about two Qošot noblemen, who are alleged to have played a great role both before and after the death of Lajang. One of them he calls Targum-treêscij, which may perhaps transcribe approximately the Mongol title *terigün taiji* (first-class *taiji*), the spelling being influenced by the Tibetan *bkra-sis* ¹⁰⁾. He was the chief minister of Lajang already at the time of the strife with Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o, and he was the object, along with the Khan, of the latter's attempted

¹⁾ Domenico da Fano, in *MITN*, III, p. 16. The *MBTJ* employs the rather vague Tibetan term *bka'i-mdun-na-'don*.

²⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 19a.

³⁾ *MBTJ*, ff. 90a and 117a. He may be the same as the Bu-c'uñ Nañ-ts'an mentioned in *A2PC*, f. 241a.

⁴⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 156b.

⁵⁾ *MBTJ*, ff. 95b, 117a, 122b. *K. Ann.*, p. 439, seems to take him for a Tibetan.

⁶⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 133a-b.

⁷⁾ *A2PC*, ff. 241b and 261a.

⁸⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 127a.

⁹⁾ *MBTJ*, f. 90a; *FPYL*, ch. 10, ff. 6b, 12b. Mentioned in 1707 by *A2PC*, f. 242b.

¹⁰⁾ *MITN*, VII, p. 242. Cf. the name T'er-kun Ju-nañ T'a'i-ji in *L8DL*, f. 113a.

poisoning ¹⁾. After the death of Lajang he fled with Surja, and with him he was seized by sDe-pa sTag-rtse and handed over to the Dsungars ²⁾. But on their way to Ili the party was attacked by Dondup-zzering (on whom see later), and Targum-treêscij escaped and took refuge in Western Tibet, where he organized the local resistance against the Dsungars. He caused a Dsungar unit marching to Ili to be treacherously butchered on their way ³⁾.

This account is very consistent in itself, but cannot be reconciled with the Tibetan, Mongol and Chinese authorities, who know of no Qošot minister of this name. Targum-treêscij cannot be identical with Bu-c'un (who remained in Central Tibet and was killed there by the Dsungars) nor with Pakši (who took service with the invaders). Above all, he cannot be identified with K'an-c'en-nas, as it is usually done, because the latter was a Tibetan and not a Qošot, because he would have been mentioned by the Tibetan texts if he had been the chief minister for at least thirteen years, and because we know from Tibetan sources that he was the governor of mÑa'-ris (Western Tibet) before, during and after the war, and thus never fell in the hands of the Dsungars. Desideri has up to now enjoyed complete credit, and rightly so. But in this particular instance I think he concocted a story, starting from an actual basis of fact, such as the poisoning of 1704 and the anti-Dsungar activities of K'an-c'en-nas in 1720. His "Targum-treêscij" does not belong to actual history; and indeed he is never mentioned in the letters and accounts of the Capuchins, who were in Lhasa at the same time as Desideri.

The same can be said of his other main character of the tragedy. The Qošot Ton-drup-zze-ring was in 1716 (according to Desideri) the commander in chief of the Qošot forces ⁴⁾. After the fall of Lhasa he was spared by the invaders because he was a Dsungar by birth; but he remained loyal to the family of his dead sovereign. He attacked the Dsungar detachment which was escorting that family to Ili, succeeded in freeing Targum-treêscij, but was killed in an

¹⁾ Desideri, in *MITN*, V, pp. 189-190; VI, p. 39.

²⁾ The Mongol document translated by W. Heissig in *ZDMG* 1954, p. 405, mentions as companions of Surja only a man and a woman [of the suite] of Dewa Jaisang. Although Desideri's account cannot be reconciled with this statement, there is the possibility of a connection between this otherwise unknown Dewa Jaisang and Targum-treêscij.

³⁾ Desideri, in *MITN*, VI, pp. 64-66.

⁴⁾ Desideri, in *MITN*, V, p. 184.

attempt to liberate the queen and the two princes. His Dsungar origin might tempt us to identify him with one Don-grub-ts'e-riñ, a Qošot from Dsungaria mentioned in Chinese texts ¹⁾. But the fact remains that he is unknown to all our Asian authorities, and above all to the *MBTJ*, which mentions several Qošot commanders in the war, but never a Don-grub-ts'e-riñ; there certainly was no commander in chief of this name on that occasion. And this second instance too throws serious doubts on the accuracy of Desideri's account of the events of 1717.

§ 4. *The Köke-nör Qošot and the Seventh Dalai-Lama*

Although recognized by the K'ang-hsi emperor, Lajang's puppet Dalai-Lama was not accepted by the Tibetan clergy, who were simply compelled by superior force to tolerate him. Although unworthy, Ts'añs-dbyañs-rgya-mts'o had been the rightful Dalai-Lama, and in one of his poems he had darkly hinted that he would be reborn in Eastern Tibet. And when an unfrocked monk had a son born to him at Li-t'añ in K'ams (3rd September 1708) and the local people saw in him the marks of the reborn Dalai-Lama, the rumor spread like wildfire to Central Tibet. Lajang at first chose to ignore the affair; he could afford to do so, because his military hold on the country was absolute ²⁾.

Perhaps the matter would have rested there and the boy and his father would have sunk into oblivion, had not the rumor spread also to Köke-nör. The descendants of Gušri Khan living there had always been rather jealous of their cousins in Tibet; and, possibly prompted also by the Lamas, they saw here a possibility to lower Lajang's exalted position, in spite of Manchu protection. As usual in Lamaist countries, a political intent was clothed in religious garb. In 1712 two of the foremost Köke-nör princes declared openly that the Li-t'añ boy was the reincarnation of the Sixth Dalai-Lama. Their names are given in the Tibetan texts as Čingwang Bātur Taiji and Junwang Galdan Erdeni Ĵinong ³⁾.

Their identification is easy. Čingwang Bātor Taiji, called Bathor Tacy by the missionaries ⁴⁾, is Gušri Khan's youngest son Daši

¹⁾ *TWC*, ch. 10, f. 24b.

²⁾ *CT*, pp. 16-17.

³⁾ *L7DL*, f. 17a-b.

⁴⁾ A. Giorgi, *Alphabetum Tibetanum*, pp. 332 and 333.

Bātur. He was born in 1632 ¹⁾, and after the partition (c. 1660), he had succeeded his father as paramount chief (Khan) of the Kōke-nōr Qošot ²⁾; but he played a rather effaced role. In 1697-98 he took the decisive step of accepting the imperial summons and visiting Peking, where he was appointed a *ch'ing-wang* ³⁾. In 1703 he again had an audience with the emperor at Hsi-an fu ⁴⁾, thus confirming the final entry of the Qošot in the Manchu political system. On the other side, he had always entertained cordial relations with the Paṅ-c'en, whom he personally visited at bKra-śis-lhun-po in 1674, 1680 and 1690 ⁵⁾. In the intervals and after the last visit his envoys very often appeared at the court of the Paṅ-c'en. With the Sixth Dalai-Lama he was much more cautious, and only one mission sent by him is registered in the texts, under the date of 1698 ⁶⁾; this was in the same year as his visit to Peking, and perhaps it was intended as a sort of counterpoise. Daši Bātur died late in 1714, the emperor sending officials to condole on November 3rd of that year ⁷⁾.

Junwang Galdan Erdeni Ĵinong, called Amdomba (A-mdo-ba) by the missionaries ⁸⁾, is identical ⁹⁾ with Daičing Qošōči Caṅan Danjin (Tsa-gan-bstan-'dzin), the third son of Bošoṅtu Ĵinong (d. 1698), who in his turn was a grandson of Gušri Khan. It is clear that our Tibetan text attributes to the son the titles granted by the Fifth Dalai-Lama to his father on the 30th June, 1678; the full style was Galdan Daičing Bošoṅtu Erdeni Ĵinong ¹⁰⁾. Caṅan Danjin personally visited the Dalai-Lama in 1700 ¹¹⁾. He was much honoured by the emperors, becoming in succession a *beile* (1701), a *chün-wang* (1718), a *ch'ing-wang* (1723) and being granted a *jasag* (1725); he died in

1) He was 82 when he died; B. Szcześniak, "The description and map of Kansu by Giovanni Battista Maoletti da Serravalle", in *MS* 18 (1959), p. 302.

2) In *L7DL*, f. 22a, he is given the title of *rgyal-po k'vi-pa*, the same as that enjoyed by the Qošot sovereigns of Tibet.

3) On *hsin-ssü*/I = 15th February, 1698; *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 187, f. 2a. Also *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 20b; *A6DL*, f. 365a; *K. Ann.*, p. 438.

4) *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 214, f. 5b; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 26b.

5) *A2PC*, ff. 33a, 43a, 71b, 116b.

6) *A6DL*, ff. 375a, 384a.

7) *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 260, f. 9b.

8) Giorgi, loc. cit.

9) The identity is expressly attested in *K. Ann.*, p. 440, and *Hor C'os-'byun*, transl. G. Huth, p. 64.

10) On 12/V(Hor)/Earth-Horse; *A5DL*, Ga, f. 82. The same title occurs in *A6DL*, f. 456b. The particular devotion of Bošoṅtu Ĵinong to the Fifth Dalai-Lama is attested in *L7DL*, f. 17b.

11) *A6DL*, f. 431b, where he is called Da'i-ciñ K'o-śor-c'e.

1735 ¹⁾. This imposing series of honours is evidence not so much of his merits than of the prudence with which the Manchu had to handle him. He was always one of the foremost chieftains of his nation; but besides that, his brother Gender had married Büm, a daughter of the great Dsungar ruler Galdan (1676-1697) ²⁾, and this family connection led obviously to the possibility of Dsungar intrigues. His descendants, the Huang-ho Nan 黃河南 *ch'ing-wang*, ruled over the district around the Bla-brañ monastery, which was their religious and political centre, down to the advent of Communism in China; but in the 19th century they lost their Mongol language and mode of life and became thoroughly Tibetan ³⁾.

The two Qošot princes showed their interest in the wonderful child of Li-t'ang ⁴⁾. At this point Lajang had to do something about the matter, and despatched some of his officers there. They declared the child to be a fraud ⁵⁾.

But the Qošot princes continued to support him, and Lajang eventually sent a couple of other officers to Li-t'ang. Their intentions were only too apparent, and before their arrival the father thought it necessary to remove his son out of danger; on 17th February, 1714, they left for sDe-dge (Derge), under the protection of Mongol soldiers ⁶⁾. At this point Galdan Erdeni Jinong convened a meeting of the Qošot chiefs, in which he proposed to make war against Lajang ⁷⁾. The princes, however, were loth to go to such an extreme; they only offered hospitality to the boy and his father, and wrote to Peking to obtain the approval of the emperor ⁸⁾. This Peking, the Köke-nör, Lhasa and bKra-sis-lhun-po, on which we need not expatiate here ⁹⁾. Against the expostulations of Cayan

¹⁾ His biography is in *Kuo-ch'ao ch'i-hsien lei-chêng*, 首 ch. 94. Cf. *TWC*, ch. 17, f. 5a-b; *FPYL*, ch. 10, ff. 23a, 24a, 38b; ch. 11, ff. 2a, 37a; *piao* 3, f. 3b; Pelliot, tab. II, n. 210.

²⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 174, f. 1b; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 35a. After Galdan's flight and death the emperor requested the Köke-nör princes to hand over the lady. They demurred at first and consented only when the regent of Tibet gave his permission. But in the end the emperor did not press the matter and Büm was not given over; *Galdan*, p. 124.

³⁾ J. F. Rock, *The Amnye Ma-chhen range and adjacent regions*, Rome 1956, pp. 47-50; also the Chinese text translated there confuses Cayan Danjin with his father.

⁴⁾ About that time Cayan Danjin sent a *jaisang* as a permanent resident in Li-t'ang. In 1718 this man was, rightly or wrongly, suspected by the Manchus to have secret intercourse with the Dsungars; Haenisch, pp. 227-228.

⁵⁾ *L7DL*, f. 18a-b.

⁶⁾ *L7DL*, f. 20a.

⁷⁾ Giorgi, *Op. cit.*, p. 333.

⁸⁾ *L7DL*, f. 22a.

⁹⁾ See *CT*, p. 18.

Danjin and his followers, the emperor decided on 8th May, 1715, that the boy and his father, who in the meantime had reached the Köke-nör, should be interned for the time being in the Hung-shan 紅山 monastery ¹⁾.

The imperial order was badly received by Cayan Danjin and his faction, who applied to the emperor for its rescission ²⁾. On the other side, there was also a party among the princes who advocated submission under the imperial will. It was headed by Sebtenjal entailed a complicate exchange of messages and messengers between (Ts'e-brtan-rgyal), who was not a Qošot at all, but the chief of that branch of the Dsungars who, led by his father Jotba Bātur, had migrated to the Köke-nör and settled there. He was appointed a *beile* in 1703, a *chiin-wang* in 1724, and received a *jasaq* in 1725.³⁾ He died probably in 1730 ⁴⁾. In 1692 he had visited the Pañ-c'en at bKra-śis-lhun-po ⁵⁾. In 1707 or 1708 he repeated the pilgrimage; on this occasion he made the acquaintance of a promising Tibetan young man, P'o-lha-nas, the future minister and "king" of Tibet. He brought him to Lhasa and introduced him to Lajang ⁶⁾, thus starting him on a brilliant career. Other princes belonging to this party were Arabtan Ombu ⁷⁾, Dayan ⁸⁾ and Lajang's second son Surja ⁹⁾.

¹⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 263, ff. 4b-5b; cf. *L7DL*, f. 24b. The Hung-shan monastery is a small and obscure establishment, 60 *li* to the south of Ch'ü-t'an in the Monguor country. It was destroyed by Tibetan nomads in 1519, but was rebuilt later. L. M. J. Schram, *The Monguors of the Kansu-Tibetan border*, II, Philadelphia 1957, pp. 21-23.

²⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 265, f. 13a-b.

³⁾ His biography in *Kuo-ch'ao ch'i-hsien lei-chêng*, 首 ch. 95. Cf. also *TWC*, ch. 17, f. 15a-b; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 26b; id., *piao* 3, f. 4a-b; Pelliot, tab. I, n. 276.

⁴⁾ *FPYL*, *piao* 3, f. 4b, places his death in 1731; but the news of his decease was received by the Pañ-c'en on the 3rd day of the 4th month of 1730; *A2PC*, f. 385a.

⁵⁾ *A2PC*, ff. 127a and 129a.

⁶⁾ *MBTJ*, ff. 80a-81a.

⁷⁾ Arabtan Ombu (Rab-brtan-dbon-po) was a cousin of Lajang, being the son of Očir Khan's fourth son Püngsük. Little is known about him. In 1723, having joined the rebellion of Lobjang Danjin, he fell in the hands of the imperialists and was put to death; *FPYL*, ch. 11, ff. 8b-9a. Pelliot, tab. II, n. 183.

⁸⁾ Dayan was a son of Secen Mergen Taiji (d. after 1696), and thus a grandson of Gušri Khan's sixth son Dalai Bātur. He had been slandered by Daši Bātur and had been exiled to Peking; now in 1716 he was pardoned and sent back to Köke-nör; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 33b. He was appointed a *beile* in 1716 and died in 1718; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 34b; id., *piao* 3, f. 5b. Cf. *TWC*, ch. 17, f. 6a-b; Pelliot, tab. II, n. 213.

⁹⁾ *FPYL*, ch. 10, ff. 31b-32a.

The ferment mounted so high, that the fear arose that Caḡan Danjin would embark upon a military adventure. Lajang, therefore, deemed it advisable to take some precautions, and sent his eldest son Galdan Danjin with a small force to the Nag-c'u (Qara-usu) region. He was also informed that the men of Hor-k'a-gži in the same district had joined the hostile forces. P'o-lha-nas and Lha-rtse sKyid-sbug-pa (apparently a member of his wife's family) ¹⁾ were despatched to deal with this new threat. They reached the Qara-usu and went on by forced marches as far as the banks of the Śag-c'u (?) river. There P'o-lha-nas took by complete surprise the Hor-k'a-gži chief Uičing Taiji ²⁾, who surrendered without striking a blow. On his return to Lhasa, P'o-lha-nas was thanked and richly rewarded by Lajang ³⁾.

But no war broke out, neither between Lajang and his Köke-nör relatives nor between the two Köke-nör factions. The emperor, apprehending a conflict, took serious military measures, mobilizing 1000 Manchu bannermen of Hsi-an fu and 3000 other troops (14th January, 1716) ⁴⁾. This threat, coupled with a peace mission sent by the Paḡ-c'en ⁵⁾, caused Caḡan Danjin to see reason. He yielded, and as a compensation the Li-t'añ incarnate was allowed to settle in the great monastery of sKu-'bum (T'a-êrh of the Chinese), the birth place of Tsoñ-k'a-pa; the order was received on 18th April, 1716, and carried out in August. At the same time the two wings of the Köke-nör Qošot were reorganized, the left one being placed under the command of Caḡan Danjin, Lobjang Danjin (Daši Bātur's son and successor) and Dayan ⁶⁾, and the right under Erdeni Erke

1) About 1707 P'o-lha-nas had married dPal-bzañ-skyid, a girl belonging to the sKyid-sbug family; *MBTJ*, ff. 71b-76a. The account in *CT*, p. 22, is to be corrected accordingly.

2) This might be the same as the Uičing Taiji who was the elder brother of Nag-dbañ-blo-bzañ-bstan-pa'i-rgyal-mts'an, the Caḡan Nomun Qān of sToñ-'k'or; K. Sagaster, op. cit., p. 129.

3) *MBTJ*, ff. 90a-92a.

4) *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 266, ff. 17a-18a.

5) *A2PC*, ff. 274b-275a.

6) To be more precise: Caḡan Danjin ruled the clans to the East, and Lobjang Danjin those to the West of the Huang-ho; *FPYL*, ch. 11, f. 3a. This distribution is reflected in the Jesuit map of the Köke-nör region, based on the survey carried out between 1714 and 1717. In W. Fuchs, *Der Jesuiten-atlas der K'anghsi-Zeit*, Peking 1943, sheet 9, the camp of Caḡan Danjin is marked about 100°50' long. E, 34°50' lat. N. (modern coordinates), to the North of the Huang-ho and to the East of Arurardja, in the region now called Go-šub-t'añ. The camp of Lobjang Danjin is marked about 100°20'

Toqtonai ¹⁾ and Arabtan Ombu; thus a balance was struck between the two opposite factions, and the assistant secretary Padma was sent to put into effect these arrangements ²⁾. The imperial troops were recalled ³⁾.

This uneasy situation ⁴⁾ did not last for long. It was radically changed by the Dsungar invasion of Tibet and the catastrophe of Lajang Khan. The emperor, relieved of any regard felt to be due to a faithful ally, saw his advantage in recognizing as the rightful Dalai-Lama the Li-t'an boy, who was securely in his hands. The more so, because the Dsungars very imprudently had deposed Lajang's puppet without having first secured the person of the Li-t'an incarnate. Thus at the same stroke the K'ang-hsi emperor obtained the enthusiastic support of Cayan Danjin and his faction, who saw their aims fulfilled with the emperor's recognition of the new Dalai-Lama; they also had to avenge the destruction of their kinsmen in Tibet, even if there had been no love lost between them. For once, the Köke-nör Qošot were unanimous in their support of the Manchu emperor and his politics.

An advance imperial division under Erentei and Sereng, rashly committed to an advance too far from their bases, was wiped out by the Dsungars (1718). This compelled the K'ang-hsi emperor to organize a large-scale expedition. The southern army, commanded by Galbi, which started from Szechwan and eventually was the first to reach Lhasa (so to say from the back door), was composed

long. E, 35°50' lat. N, to the North of the bend of the Huang-ho. Dayan was camped about 98°40' long. E, 37° lat. N, in the neighbourhood of Dulan-kitt to the West of the Köke-nör. We may note here that Lobjang Danjin's clan was dispersed after his rebellion; but the areas inhabited about 1715 by Cayan Danjin and Dayan still represent two enclaves of Qošot population in a region which in the meantime has become almost entirely Tibetan; A. Herrmann, *Historical and Commercial Atlas of China*, Cambridge Mass. 1935, sh. 67.

¹⁾ Erdeni Erke Toqtonai was, as already shown, a son of Gumbü and a grandson of Gušri Khan's third son Dalantai. He inherited the rank of *beile* in 1705, was promoted to *chiin-wang* in 1723, was granted a *jasag* in 1725 and died in 1749. *TWC*, ch. 17, f. 2a-b; *FPYL*, ch. 11, f. 2a; id., *piao* 3, f. 5a-b.

²⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 268, ff. 4b-5b; *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 33a; cf. *K. Ann.*, p. 439.

³⁾ *Shêng-tsu Shih-lu*, ch. 268, f. 5b.

⁴⁾ As late as October 1717, when the news of the advance of the Dsungar army reached Peking, the emperor was at first afraid that Lajang would join the invaders to attack Cayan Danjin, and he took his measures accordingly; Haenisch, p. 213.

of Manchu and Chinese only. The main northern army commanded by Yansin, who was to escort the new Dalai-Lama and on whom fell the brunt of the fighting, was not only larger, but was accompanied by the commander-in-chief prince Yün-t'i, the 14th son of the emperor. Its bulk consisted of the contingents of the Köke-nör and other Mongol princes, with a stiffening of Manchu bannermen. Thus the expedition became a national enterprise of the Köke-nör Qošot and, because of its religious implications, of the Mongols at large ¹).

Cayan Danjin reaped the benefits of his submission. He was invited to Peking, where he was highly honoured and promoted to *chün wang* (1718) ²).

We need not be surprised that after the occupation of Lhasa the first provisional government of Tibet set up by the imperialists was largely composed of Mongol princes, some of whom remained in the country as commanders of the occupation troops even after a purely Tibetan government was installed in 1721.

According to a Tibetan text, this military government of 1720 consisted of two Qalqa princes (Ts'e-dbañ-nor-bu and Don-grub), two Köke-nör Qošot princes (bsTan-'dzin and E-spos Ba'i-li) and two Tibetan noblemen (Na-p'od-pa and Lum-pa-nas) ³). We are giving below the personalia of the four Mongol princes, who played a not inconsiderable role in a delicate moment of Tibetan history.

Cewang Norbu, an adopted son of Todo Erdeni of the Qalqa, after the latter's direct offspring had become extinct, was enfeoffed in 1712 as a *chên-kuo kung* in the Sain Noyan division. At the beginning of the war he was stationed at Gas, and later he was sent to Hsi-ning with Hsi-an troops. He led 600 Köke-nör Mongols to Lhasa, where he remained till he was recalled to Peking in 1723. But before he could arrive there, he was ordered to march against the rebel Lobjang Danjin. In 1724 at last he came to the capital and was promoted to *beise* as a reward for his faithful services. He died in 1732 ⁴).

Dondup Dorji (Don-grub-rdo-rje), son of Galdan Dorji of the Qalqa, inherited in 1692 from his father the title of *chün-wang*. Upon the death of his grandfather Cayan Dorji (1699) he was in the

¹) The list of the Mongol princes participating is found in *K. Ann.*, pp. 440-441.

²) *FPYL*, ch. 10, f. 38b.

³) *LM*, p. 180.

⁴) *FPYL*, ch. 4, ff. 19a, 20a, 21b; id., ch. 10, ff. 37a, 43a; id., *piao* 2, f. 33a; Haenisch, pp. 218, 222-224, 395, 398, 422, 423.

following year promoted to *ch'ing-wang* and Khan of the Tušētu division. In 1702 he lost this dignity and was reduced to his original rank. He took part in the Tibetan campaign and was recalled from Lhasa in 1721, after which he was reinstated as *ch'ing-wang* and Khan (1723). He died in 1743 ¹⁾. The third rJe-btsun Dam-pa or Maidari Qutuqtu (1725-1771) was his son ²⁾.

Lobjang Danjin (Blo-bzañ-bstan-'dzin) was the son of Daši Bātur. He was born in 1692 ³⁾, and in 1714 inherited his father's title of *chün-wang*. He showed himself a loyal supporter of the Manchu when the Dsungars invaded Tibet and took part in the campaign, leaving Lhasa at an unspecified date, but most probably in 1721. In 1723 he rebelled, but was soon defeated and barely escaped with his life, taking refuge in Dsungaria (1724). When the Dsungar kingdom collapsed, he was taken prisoner (1755), brought to Peking, offered as a victim to the temple of the Yung-chêng emperor, but pardoned and allowed to settle in Inner Mongolia ⁴⁾. In 1762 he was still alive, because in that year the princes of Köke-nör petitioned the emperor to give him back his old pastures in that region; the request was granted, the borders being carefully defined ⁵⁾. His two sons Bayan and Caγan Ebügen became officers (*shih-wei* 侍衛) in the imperial bodyguard ⁶⁾.

Aboo, called E-p'u (or E-bus) Beile Bātur Jo-nañ in Tibetan texts, was the third son of Bātur Erke Ĵinong Qoroli (d. 1709), a grandson of Gušri Khan, who after a long diplomatic struggle between Sañs-rgyas-rgya-mts'o and the K'ang-hsi emperor had left Köke-nör and settled in Alashan (1686) ⁷⁾. He was given in 1704 the rank of imperial brother-in-law, *hošo efu*, with rights of inheritance. In 1709 he succeeded his father as *beile*. He held a com-

1) *FPYL*, *piao* 2, ff. 1a-b, 2b-3a; *LM*, p. 180.

2) *K. Ann.*, p. 441.

3) He was 22 when his father died in 1714; B. Szcześniak, loc. cit.

4) *Kao-tsung Shih-lu*, ch. 489, ff. 19a, 28a-b; cf. ch. 491, ff. 4b-5a, 11b-12a; *FPYL*, ch. 12, ff. 17b-18a; Pelliot, p. 20. For his action during the Dsungar invasion of Tibet see Haenisch, pp. 214-216. It is difficult to obtain correct information about Lobjang Danjin because, as a rebel, he has neither a biography nor a proper entry in the relevant Chinese texts. There is only a short and vague biographical sketch in the *Chung-kuo jên-ming ta-t'zŭ-tien*, p. 1746a.

5) *FPYL*, ch. 13, f. 24a; this document is not included in the *Shih-lu*.

6) *TWC*, ch. 17, ff. 1b-2a.

7) *TWC*, ch. 17, f. 16a-b. Cf. *L7DL*, f. 65a; *K. Ann.*, pp. 430 and 441; Pelliot, Tab. 11, n. 112.

mand on the Dsungar frontier and in 1720 came back to Köke-nör, from where he was ordered to Tibet with 600 men. He was recalled in 1723 and fought in the last stages of the campaign against Lobjang Danjin. As he was a personal enemy of general Nien Kêng-yao 年羹堯¹⁾, the latter's disgrace contributed to his fortune. In 1724 he came to court and was promoted to *chün-wang*, but in 1729 was degraded to *beile*, banished from Köke-nör and confined in Alashan. He was given back the rank of *chün-wang* in 1732 and died in 1739²⁾.

This short-lived dominance of the Mongol princes in Tibet was much weakened by the creation of the Tibetan council of government in 1721 and by the withdrawal of the imperial garrison, due to the retrenchment policy of the new Yung-chêng emperor. Then came Lobjang Danjin's rebellion (1723-1724), which marked a most important turn in the history of Köke-nör³⁾. One of the causes of the revolt was Lobjang Danjin's frustrated ambition to be placed in some form at the head of the Tibetan government⁴⁾. His rash and badly prepared rebellion meant the final break with his former associate Cayan Danjin, who remained loyal. But from a wider angle, we may observe that the Qošot never recovered from the aftermath of the devastation and massacres by the imperial troops of Nien Kêng-yao. Their autonomy was severely restricted when direct imperial administration was established in Köke-nör in 1725 with the creation of the prefecture (*fu*) of Hsi-ning. Not only they gradually lost the greater part of their pastures, which were occupied by Tibetan nomads, being thus deprived of their economic foundation; but they were never fully trusted again by the imperial government, and their political and military importance diminished rapidly. It vanished completely when in 1754-57 the Dsungar kingdom and nation were destroyed, and Köke-nör ceased forever to be an important military frontier. The Qošot princes sank into insignificance. After the revolt of Lobjang Danjin they ceased to play a role in Tibetan history as well, and the only mention of them in Tibetan texts is when they came in pilgrimage or sent presents to the Dalai-Lama or to the Paṅ-c'en Rin-po-c'e.

¹⁾ On whom see A. W. Hummel (ed.), *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing period*, Washington 1943-44, pp. 587-590.

²⁾ *FPYL*, ch. 10, ff. 27a, 28a, 40a, 43a; ch. 11, ff. 14b, 15a, 21b-23a; id., *piao* 3, f. 1a-b; Haenisch, pp. 396 and 398.

³⁾ L. M. J. Schram, op. cit., II, pp. 35-36; id., III, Philadelphia 1961, pp. 58-60; et passim.

⁴⁾ *FPYL*, ch. 11, f. 3b.

§ 5. *The Tibetan rising against the Dsungars*

The rule of Cering Dondub's occupation army and of their Tibetan puppet sTag-rtse-pa Lha-rgyal-rab-brtan was unadulterated tyranny and oppression. Its main feature was a violent persecution of the Red sects, which was inspired or prompted by Blo-bzañ-p'un-ts'ogs, the abbot of the sGo-mañs college in 'Bras-spuñs ¹). To the many instances already known ²), we may add the sack of the main centre of the rÑiñ-ma-pa sect, the rDo-rje-brag monastery; its incarnate abbot, who was also the chief lama (Bla-c'en) of that sect, was killed ³). But the attack against gŽis-ka-rtse mentioned by Desideri ⁴) is ignored by all the Tibetan sources and may be another instance of Desideri's several inaccuracies about this period.

A re-appraisal of the available evidence about the Tibetan risings against the Dsungars also tends to throw grave doubts on Desideri's accuracy and to reduce the role of P'o-lha-nas to a level even lower than what I believed in the past ⁵).

The career of P'o-lha-nas during those hectic years is interesting, but betrays neither boldness nor consistency of behaviour nor even strength of character. Although he was imprisoned and flogged by the Dsungars, he soon rallied to sTag-rtse-pa's puppet government. After all, so did many other Tibetan officers of Lajang, foremost among whom his old friend bKra-śis-rtse-pa, who became one of the leading figures in the new regime ⁶).

P'o-lha-nas remained on good terms with sTag-rtse-pa and even started to accompany him in his visit to bKra-śis-lhun-po (January-

¹) *K. Ann.*, p. 440.

²) *CT*, p. 44.

³) *K. Ann.*, p. 441. Also the Mongol document translated by W. Heissig in *ZDMG* 1954, p. 405.

⁴) Desideri, in *MITN*, VI, p. 22.

⁵) For this period see *CT*, pp. 46-54.

⁶) bKra-śis-rtse-pa was an official of the Pañ-c'en; as such, he appears for the first time in 1693; *A2PC*, f. 135b. In 1706 he commanded the troops of the Ñañ district in gTsañ; *MBTJ*, f. 57b. At the time of the storming of Lhasa (November 1717) he played a highly suspect game; *CT*, pp. 37-39. He rallied the Dsungars at once and was sent by sTag-rtse-pa to occupy the castle of Rin-c'en-rtse, which had been confiscated to P'o-lha-nas; *MBTJ*, f. 142a. On that occasion or soon after he was appointed a minister (*bka'-blon*) in the puppet government, and with this title he appears frequently in the memoirs of the Pañ-c'en, for the first time at the end of 1718; *A2PC*, f. 287a. This appointment was to cost him dear. At the end of 1720 he was sentenced to death by the Manchu and beheaded together with sTag-rtse-pa, in spite of the attempts of the Pañ-c'en to save his life; *CT*, pp. 63-64.

February 1719) ¹⁾. But at gZis-ka-rtse he pleaded ill health and applied for an appointment as official (*sne-mo las-'dzin*) in the gÑa'-nañ district on the Nepalese border; the request was granted. After having made his preparations for the journey, he started in the company of the three Bon-groñ-pa brothers, the youngest of whom was his old friend [Bon-rigs] Nag-dbañ-bde-c'en, who had helped him during his imprisonment; later he seems to have been a magistrate in Lhasa ²⁾. P'o-lha-nas went first to bKra-śis-lhun-po, where he payed his respects to the Pañ-c'en. Then he passed through his old fief of Rin-c'en-rtse, now held by bKra-śis-rtse-pa, and reached the end of his journey at Śel-dkar (Shekar dzong of the maps ³⁾), which was to be his official residence. Here he was greeted by the local magistrates, one of whom was a son of bKra-śis-rtse-pa. He took up his duties in gÑa'-nañ, while his uncle dGra-'dul, to whom he was fondly attached and to whose advice he always listened, went to Nepal, probably on pilgrimage to the Buddhist shrines there ⁴⁾.

Up to this point P'o-lha-nas had behaved more or less like a faithful official of the Lhasa government and of the Dsungar generals. Now, in this out-of-the-way place, where he was practically outside the reach of the scanty Dsungar occupation army, his outlook changed. The welcome of the country people had been so cordial and he had found such a ready support, that he now began thinking of an armed rising against the Dsungars. These ideas came to a rapid maturation, when P'o-lha-nas heard of the actions of K'añ-c'en-nas in nearby mÑa'-ris, with which we hope deal in the future. He sent a letter to K'añ-c'en-nas by a trusted officer, informing him of the situation in gÑa'-nañ and proposing a concerted open revolt ⁵⁾. Whether Chinese intrigue had a hand in this is difficult to say; but the fact remains that imperial envoys arrived at bKra-śis-lhun-po in the 2nd month of 1719, and two messengers of the Li-t'añ incarnate left sKu-'bum for the same destination in the 3rd month ⁶⁾. Another fact that perhaps contributed to shaping P'o-lha-nas' decision, was the death of his uncle dGra-'dul, which

¹⁾ *A2PC*, ff. 286b-288a.

²⁾ *CT*, pp. 39, 98, 126, 132.

³⁾ Wylie, pp. 66, 133.

⁴⁾ *MBTJ*, ff. 159a-163b.

⁵⁾ *MBTJ*, ff. 166b-167a.

⁶⁾ *CT*, pp. 51 and 58. The two facts are to be kept apart, because of evident chronological reasons.

happened at mNa'-ris rDzon-dkar about that time ¹⁾. A restraining element of prudence may have disappeared with him.

The rest of the tale has been told in *CT*, pp. 52-54. The chronology of these events is very vague, but I still remain under the impression that the actual revolt started only in the spring of 1720, possibly aided by the withdrawal of the Dsungar forces in Southern Tibet in order to concentrate against the imperial army advancing from the north; it achieved little or nothing beyond seizing a country bare of occupation troops, and did not influence the main course of the events, which was decided solely by the Manchu-Mongol-Chinese armies of Galbi and of Yansin.

¹⁾ *MBTJ*, ff. 167a-168a.