

LU CAI VO PEI...  
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

JACQUES GERNET

Professeur au Collège de France

ET

E. ZÜRCHER

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. LXII

Livr. 4-5



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1976

## CHINA AND THE EUROPEAN TRAVELLERS TO TIBET, 1860-1880

BY

LUCIANO PETECH

### A. FIRST ATTEMPTS: THE FRENCH MISSIONARIES

The treaties concluded by China with France, England, the United States and Russia in 1858 and 1860 provided for free travel within the Chinese empire for the subjects of those powers; this clause was later included in all the treaties of friendship and commerce signed with other European nations. An unexpected problem arose almost at once: the entry of Western travellers into Tibet, a region which the treaties did not distinguish from the territory of China proper.

As at first Western interests were almost exclusively limited to the coast, the question concerned essentially the missionaries only. The Roman Catholic church had not forgotten that a mission of the Capuchin order had existed in Lhasa between 1707 and 1745, with two interruptions. Pushed back to Nepal and thence (1768) to India, the Capuchins were hit hard by the events of the French revolution and of the Napoleonic wars, and they vanished from the scene <sup>1)</sup>. But in 1846 the Pope provided for the future by creating the Vicariate Apostolic of Tibet, for the moment a purely nominal one, entrusted to the Missions Étrangères (or Lazarists) of Paris.

Although the Sino-French treaty of 1844 forbade the missionaries to move outside the five treaty ports, the Lazarists lost no time in penetrating into Eastern K'ams. A first half-secret exploring journey was undertaken in 1847. Then in 1854 Charles Renou and Jean-Charles Fage founded a missionary station at Bonga, a remote village between the Salween and the Mekong, about 28° 20'N.<sup>2)</sup> In 1859 it was attacked by hostile elements and the missionaries

---

<sup>1)</sup> On the Catholic missions in Tibet till the middle of the 18th century see L. Petech, *I missionari italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal*, I, Rome 1952, XXXIV-LXVII.

<sup>2)</sup> For descriptions of Bonga see C.-H. Desgodins, *La mission du Thibet de 1855 à 1870*, Verdun 1870; A. Launay, *Histoire de la mission du Thibet*, Lille-Paris n.d., I, 233-234.

retired to sMar-k'ams (Chin. Chiang-k'a), a Tibetan district headquarters farther north<sup>3)</sup>, and then back to Szechwan.

As soon as the convention of Peking (1860), confirming the Tientsin treaty of 1858, expressly stipulated the right of the missionaries to penetrate and to preach in the interior of China, the Missions Étrangères launched an energetic drive to render the title of their Vicariate effective. In 1861 Renou and Fage received passports covering Tibet, signed by baron Gros, French representative in Peking, and by prince Kung, president of the newly-established *tsung-li ya-men*; and when on the 4th June of that year they arrived at sMar-k'ams, these documents were accepted and recognized by the local authorities<sup>4)</sup>.

It goes without saying that the sMar-k'ams governor at once informed the Tibetan government. The Lamaist clergy became alarmed; and indeed in that same year 1861 the court of the minor Paṅ-c'en at Tashilhunpo was informed that the English had beaten the imperial army and that, in accordance with an edict obtained from the emperor, the French "lords of the Catholic Church" (*T'an-kru sbyar-bo* = *T'ien-chu chiao?*) had arrived to sMar-k'ams, bent on travelling further and spreading their religion; not only the people of K'ams, a Buddhist country, but specially that of Central Tibet, where the sect of Tsoñ-k'a-pa was flourishing, requested that the missionaries should be prevented from entering Tibet. Some time later special rites were held for this purpose<sup>5)</sup>.

<sup>3)</sup> C.-H. Desgodins, 119-120; A. Launay, I, 318-319, 322.

<sup>4)</sup> C.-H. Desgodins, 122; A. Launay, I, 329.

<sup>5)</sup> *De'i skabs su goñ ma bdag po c'en po dan' rgoñ ñan p'yi gliñ pa'i dmag skor gyis c'ab srid la ñen c'a c'e tsam yod par ma zad | gnam bskos mc'og nas bka' bžes t'ob don bžin P'e reñ gi T'an kru sbyar bo'i dpon po a ma rje sogs mañ tsam rim bžin sa bskor dan' k'o pa rañ gi c'os lugs spel bar sñon ma sMar k'ams su'byor ciñ | k'o pa'i c'os lugs lta spyod sogs ni log pa'i lam du bkri ba 'ba' žig yod stabs | spyir Bod dan' K'am Sog rGya roñ sogs sañs rgyas kyi bstan pa dar ba'i gnas dan' | lhag par rje rgyal ba gñis pa'i bstan pa šin tu dar ba'i gnas Bod yul dBus gTsañ k'oñs rnams kyi skye bo spyi mgrin gcig nas k'o pa rnams bkag sdoms kyi las don ts'ugs rgyu'i skor la brtag žu mdzad pa'i bka' lan stsol ba dan' de mts'uñs mc'og gsum dam can rgya mts'or t'ugs smon 'p'rin 'c'ol yañ dag mdzad. Life of the Fifth Paṅ-c'en, 129b.—And again: K'yad par den skabs ga Yin c'i li rgogs dan' | T'an kru sbyar bo žes pa dpuñ bsgril gyis goñ ma c'en po'i c'ab srid la log brgol dan' Bod yul sogs su c'os log spel rgyu'i grags ñan c'e sgañ yin stabs | de dag rmeg med du ži nas | rgyal bstan spyi dan' k'yad par dGe ldan riñ lugs bzañ po 'di ñid dar rgyas yun gnas yod pa'i skyabs 'jug gsol 'debs žus par bka' bžes dan' p'yag byin mdud bcas stsal. Op. cit., 131a.*

The stand of the Lhasa government, i.e. of the regent Rvasgren Qutuqtu (1856-1862) <sup>6)</sup> was not different; it was made unmistakably clear when the missionaries repeatedly tried to reach Lhasa. The driving force in these attempts was Auguste Desgodins (1826-1913). On the 5th August 1861 he, together with the Vicar Apostolic Thomine-Desmazures, started from sMar-k'ams for C'ab-mdo (Chamdo), en route for Lhasa. They obtained from the acting governor-general of Szechwan a passport for Tibet, dated 15. VII Hsien-fêng 11th (20th August, 1861), as well as a general order to the frontier officials to permit their passage and to afford them protection. But at the same time (on August 27) the C'ab-mdo authorities received an official communication from the Regent and the representatives of the three great monasteries of dGa'-ldan, Se-ra and 'Bras-spuñs, which strictly forbade their entry into Tibet. The orders from Lhasa were swiftly and sternly complied with; the two Frenchmen were overtaken at a short distance from C'ab-mdo and brought back to that town <sup>7)</sup>.

This abortive attempt revealed the existence of an opposition, which the French missionaries never succeeded in overcoming. But they did not desist on this account. Early in 1862 Thomine-Desmazures went to Peking to lay the matter before the French minister and the Chinese government. "Par un acte authentique le chargé d'affaires français lui promit la possession à perpétuité de la vallée de Bonga, le libre exercice de la religion chrétienne au Thibet et la liberté de s'établir à Lhasa. Enfin, on l'assura que des ordres pressants seraient envoyés à Chiang-k'a (sMar-k'ams) pour terminer le procès [for the damages suffered at Bonga in 1859]. Le prince Kung n'avait pas apposé son cachet sur l'écrit, mais il en approuvait le contenu que le chargé d'affaires lui avait so. mis" <sup>8)</sup>. Unluckily, the missionaries based their further action on this document, the validity of which was debatable, to say the least.

After re-establishing the Bonga mission, Renou joined Desgodins at sMar-k'ams, and in June 1862 the two renewed the attempt, only to be stopped at Lagong by officials expressly sent

<sup>6)</sup> On this regent see L. Petech, "The Dalai-Lamas and regents of Tibet", in *TP* 47 (1959), 380-391.

<sup>7)</sup> A. Launay, I, 333-347; C.-H. Desgodins, 80-84. It is a pity that the Tibetan or Chinese original of this document is not available; we must be content with the short summary given by the Lazarists.

<sup>8)</sup> C.-H. Desgodins, 124. Cf. A. Launay, I, 378.

down from Lhasa; they had to return to Bonga, where Renou died on 18th October, 1863<sup>9)</sup>).

Another failure was the attempt to secure a base in Lhasa itself by means of Chinese Christians. We know very little about this interesting story. In a letter of 3rd January 1860 the Vicar Apostolic Thomine-Desmazures mentions in passing that he had sent the Christian silk merchant Lieou, accompanied by the catechist Yang, to rent a shop in Lhasa. But in 1862 or 1863 the two were expelled from the Tibetan capital<sup>10)</sup>. A hint about these facts is found in a Chinese document. In November 1863 the commissariat officer (*liang-yüan*) Yen Ch'ing-yung was subjected to an official enquiry because, among other things, he had given hospitality in his official residence at rGya-mda' in Koñ-po to Christians from Kiangsu who were prevented from returning from Lhasa to Szechwan (apparently on account of the Ñag-roñ war)<sup>11)</sup>. In all likelihood these Christians were Liu and Yang.

The situation, already unpromising after so many setbacks, was further complicated by the Ñag-roñ (Chan-tui) war. For many years, the chief mGon-po-rnam-rgyal had extended his power to the detriment of the neighbouring principalities and eventually in open conflict with the imperial government. The struggle grew acute in 1863 with the intervention of a Tibetan expeditionary corps, and ended in 1865 with the defeat and death of the rebel chief; the region passed under the administration of the Dalai-Lama<sup>12)</sup>.

These events placed the missionaries, suspected of connivance with the rebels, in an awkward position. The Chinese authorities, already suspicious on their own account, were subjected to pressure by the Tibetan government, as the official documents reveal.

In autumn 1863 an imperial circular had guaranteed to the French mission in Tibet all the privileges provided for by the treaty of Tientsin; but a few days later a second circular annulled

<sup>9)</sup> A. Launay, I, 368-373. For the death of Renou see C.-H. Desgodins, 95-96, and A. Launay, I, 405-406.

<sup>10)</sup> A. Launay, I, 371 and 378.

<sup>11)</sup> *Mu-tsung Shih-lu*, 82.5b.

<sup>12)</sup> On the Ñag-roñ war see for the moment L. Petech, *Aristocracy and government in Tibet 1728-1959*, Rome 1973, 120-121 and 178-179; I hope to be able to return to this subject later. For the local oral tradition see R. Kaschewski and P. Tsering, "Die Niederschlagung des Empörers von Ñag-roñ und andere Reminiszenzen des dPal-sprul Rin-po-čhe", in *Zentralasiatischen Studien*, 7 (1973), 443-474.

the first<sup>13</sup>). At least this is the version given by the Lazarists. The Chinese documents tell another tale:

“*Chia-shên* X (= 21st November, 1863). The *amban* resident in Tibet Man-ch'ing 滿慶 and the junior *amban* Ên-ch'ing 恩慶<sup>14</sup>) report as follows. dBañ-p'yug-rgyal-po<sup>15</sup>) requests us to submit on his behalf the following memorial. On the Eastern route near the Tibetan border the Frenchmen Lo Lê-nu 羅勒拏 and Hsiao Fa-jih 蕭法日 (Renou and Fage) show themselves hostile to the Tibetan officials, who do not allow them to go to Tibet. They are joined in a common endeavour with the Ñag-roñ (Chan-tui) rebel mGon-po-rnam-rgyal. During the last spring Lo Lê-nu sent from [Ta-chien-] lu a certain Liu 劉<sup>16</sup>), who brought with him tea bales for distribution to the Chinese soldiers in the Batang and Litang zone, his purpose being to captivate the hearts of those men. Besides, they spread rumours in favour of mGon-po-rnam-rgyal of Ñag-roñ. They consider the native people (Man) of Anterior Tibet as enemies; still, they dare not offend Chinese officials and Chinese troops. Besides, [there is] a writing according to which the governor-general of Szechwan no longer fights against Ñag-roñ; this is a forged imperial edict to the Chinese and Tibetan officials in Tibet. It is necessary to eliminate the Ñag-roñ rebels; you absolutely cannot wait for further orders. Thus far [the memorial].

The chief and second *t'u-ssü* of Batang have yielded to their incitements and have joined the Ñag-roñ rebels. Lo Lê-nu has also betaken himself to sMar-k'ams (Chiang-k'a) and declared that the office of His Excellency Ching[-wên] 景 [紋]<sup>17</sup>) had received an imperial edict [according to which] the Bonga (Po-mu-ka) region in Ts'a-ba-roñ (Ts'a-wa), belonging to Anterior Tibet, is assigned

<sup>13</sup>) C.-H. Desgodins, 126-127.

<sup>14</sup>) Man-ch'ing was appointed junior *amban* about 1855, promoted senior *amban* in 1857 and recalled in 1859; but on account of the Ñag-roñ war he was able to hand over charge and to leave Lhasa in 1865 only.—Ên-ch'ing was appointed junior *amban* in 1857; he was recalled at an unknown date, and left Tibet in 1866.

<sup>15</sup>) bŚad-sgra dBañ-p'yug-rgyal-po, regent of Tibet 1862-1864; see L. Petech, *Aristocracy and government*, 165-180.

<sup>16</sup>) This man may be the Joachim Lieou who in 1868 was a dishonest and untrustworthy interpreter to the missionaries; A. Launay, II, 34. He can hardly be identical with the merchant Liu sent to Lhasa in 1859-60, because the latter seems to have been a Kiangsu man, while this Liu was, as stated a few lines after, a Szechwanese.

<sup>17</sup>) Ching-wên, appointed *amban* in 1861, arrived at Lhasa in 1865 only, after a long delay on the Szechwan border. He was recalled in 1868.

to Lo Lê-nu for permanent administration, and wherever there are Christians intending to enter Tibet, absolutely no obstacle should be placed in their way. Besides, he sent again a certain Liu to [Ta-chien-]lu to carry tea in order to captivate the hearts of men. According to a report by the *rdzon-dpon* (*ying-kuan*, district governor) of sMar-k'ams received here, the minds of the people are not at rest, and this represents a violation of the treaties by Lo Lê-nu. He conspires to make himself master of Anterior Tibet, and we have documentary evidence for this.

Moreover, it is known that in 1846 Lo Lê-nu unlawfully entered [Tibet] from Hsi-ning. The *amban* resident in Tibet Ch'i [-shan] sent him from Lhasa to Szechwan, whence he was expelled to Canton with the order to return to his own country<sup>18</sup>). Unexpectedly, Lo Lê-nu made again a detour from Canton through Yünnan and secretly entered Men-kung, which belongs to Tibet, to establish himself there.

Later on, the said nation (France) concluded a treaty with our dynasty. Although it allows [the French] to preach their religion everywhere, it does not permit them to meddle in public affairs. [In spite of this,] the above-mentioned Lo [Lê-nu) and Hsiao [Fa-jih] carry on spying activity from Men-kung, and in the Batang, sMar-k'ams and C'ab-mdo regions they have arrogated to themselves the title of Excellency (*ta-jên*). Besides, they have with them a good-for-nothing disciple, one Liu from Szechwan, who pretends to be an official and assists them in acting the tyrant. Under many pretexts they deceive the natives (Man). They even presume to give orders to Chinese officials and to bring the native to subjection.

Therefore, the lay and monk officials of Tibet have ascertained that Lo [Lê-nu] and Hsiao [Fa-jih], presuming in this way upon their position, behave outrageously. If they are permitted to enter Tibet, of course they will bribe Chinese and natives to follow their religion. Tibet was always a country in which our dynasty caused the Yellow Church to flourish widely. On the contrary, 'Bras-mo-ljois (Sikkim) and La-dvags (Ladakh), which are to the south-west of the Tibetan border, belong to the P'yi-gliñ (P'i-lêng 披楞); and P'yi-gliñ is another name for the English<sup>19</sup>). Since the French

<sup>18</sup>) This is an absurd identification of Renou and Fage with Gabet and Huc, the two Lazarists who in 1846 had actually reached Lhasa.

<sup>19</sup>) Tibetan P'yi-gliñ transcribes Urdu and Persian Feringī, derived

missionaries showed their intention to enter Tibet from Szechwan, the P'yi-glin posted their troops in all the places of 'Bras-mo-ljoñs and insisted upon entering Tibet for commercial purposes. They will wait till the French enter Tibet from the east, and then the P'yi-glin too will enter from the south-west.

We have carefully investigated Lo [Lê-nu] and Hsiao [Fa-jih]. The purpose for which they want to enter Tibet is ostensibly to preach their religion; their veritable intention, however, is to get a good hold of Tibet. As to these two nations which try to get hold of Tibet, their aims rest not with Tibet [alone]. For the others (i.e. the British) to reach Tibet, mountains and rivers as far as [Ta-chien-] lu for ten thousand *li* belong to other people. But these (i.e. the French) have already reached the border of Szechwan; if one tolerates them on the Szechwan frontier, we fear that there will be not a single day of peace and quiet.

Therefore, the officials and people of Tibet pledge themselves till death to the main task not to allow them to enter Tibet. They do not presume [thereby] to violate knowingly the treaties. Truly our State preserves intact their territory; and they still hope to be allowed to find means to block [the entry of the foreigners]. They will not allow one thousand men of the type of Lo [Lê-nu] to enter Tibet; this would entail disastrous consequences.

Besides, the *amban* resident in Tibet has already reported on the subject of the entry of the French into Tibet to spread their religion and has received an imperial rescript [commanding] not to allow them to enter Tibet. The governor-general of Szechwan too has sent a circular to his subordinate officials [telling them that] if there are some Frenchmen entering Tibet, it is absolutely necessary to stop them with good words and invite them to go back. On this account they beg with the same words the Dalai-Lama to supplicate the heavenly favour, to condescend to remember the laymen and monks of Tibet, who are dull and ignorant.

Let a mandate to be transmitted to the governor-general of Szechwan, to issue orders according to instructions to the civil and military officials of the sub-prefecture (*l'ing*) of [Ta-chien-]lu. Should there in the future be Chinese subjects who receive documents for a journey to Tibet, and also military personnel entering Tibet for service reasons, a secret control is absolutely necessary; if

---

at the time of the Crusades from the name Frank. In Tibet it indicated the Europeans in general, and later the British in particular.



[among them] there are men who have been converted to Christianity, it is not permitted to grant passports to all such people for exit from the [frontier] passes''<sup>20</sup>).

This memorial is clear enough. On the one side it gives expression to the absolute opposition of the Tibetan regent (and of the great monasteries behind him) to the entry of Christian missionaries; on the other hand it voices the misgivings and suspicions of the Chinese officialdom about the role they played in local politics. The ensuing imperial rescript, of the same date 21st November, 1863, accepted both positions:

“Rescript to the Prince Counselor (*i-chêng wang*; prince Kung) and to the Grand Council. Concerning the information submitted by Man-ch'ing on the Frenchmen Lo Lê-nu and Hsiao Fa-jih on the Eastern route. During the last spring they sent the good-for-nothing Liu to bring bales of tea from [Ta-chien-]lu for distribution among the Chinese soldiers in the Batang and Litang region, in order to captivate the hearts of the people. They also spread false rumours and inveigled the senior and junior *t'u-ssü* of Batang to join the Ñag-roñ rebels. We command Ch'ung-shih and Lo Ping-chang<sup>21</sup>) to investigate and report whether this information is correct or not.

Again; Lo Lê-nu declared that Ching-wên has received an imperial edict [according to which] the Bonga region in Ts'a-ba-roñ, belonging to Anterior Tibet, is assigned to him for permanent administration, and if Christians go to Tibet, it is not permitted to hinder them. If this [information] is true, then the missionaries spread the false rumour of an imperial rescript (*chao-yü*), which is a truly heinous offence. Besides ordering the *tsung-li ya-mên* to lodge a regular protest with the French minister residing in Peking, we charge Ch'ung-shih and Lo Ping-chang to issue strict orders to all our subjects on the frontier to carry out painstaking investigations. If there are missionaries from the inner regions who enter Tibet secretly, they should be stopped and turned back. They should not be allowed to pass stealthily exploiting the negligence [of the officials].

As the French intend to enter Tibet to spread their religion,

<sup>20</sup>) *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo*, T'ung-chih, 21.23a-24b.

<sup>21</sup>) In 1863 Ch'ung-shih (1820-1876) and Lo Ping-chang (1793-1867) were respectively provincial commander and governor-general of Szechwan. On them see A. W. Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, Washington 1943-44, 211-212 and 537-538.

the P'yi-glin in their turn wish to come to Tibet for commercial purposes; their mind is truly unfathomable. Last winter the Gorkhas have sent envoys to Tibet to renew their old friendship. To the north-west of them all the smaller tribes too desire to form forever a bulwark for Tibet. Let Fu-chi 福濟<sup>22)</sup> be given orders to carry out his instructions with energy. We enjoin on the Gorkhas always to appreciate the old friendship. Secret defence measures should be taken to prevent the P'yi-glin to carry out their spying designs"<sup>23)</sup>.

This rescript made short work of the unofficial "agreement" of 1862, which merely recognized the purchase of landed estates at Bonga, but which the missionaries seem to have (or were believed to have) construed as a grant of administrative powers in the whole valley.

Under the same date another, short rescript replied to the memorial of the Lhasa *ambans* in similar words:

"Rescript. Man-ch'ing and Ên-ch'ing have reported on the desire of Lo Lê-nu and the others to enter Tibet to preach their religion. The Tibetan officials are decidedly opposed to their voyage and it is quite clear that [the officials] are sincere and loyal. Today we sent instructions (*yii-chih*) to Ch'ung-shih and Lo Ping-chang to find means to stop them, while still respecting the treaties. As for their information on the penetration of the P'yi-glin from the west, it is only correct to be prepared in advance. Now, although the Gorkhas seek good relations [with Tibet] and all the smaller tribes to the north-west of them too wish to form an eternal barrier for Tibet, nonetheless the frontier ought to be prepared as before; let there be no negligence, not for a single day. We instruct Man-ch'ing and his colleagues to consult with dBañ-p'yug-rgyal-po about adequate defence measures, without allowing the slightest carelessness"<sup>24)</sup>.

Clouds were gathering over the heads of the missionaries; and at this very moment they lost also the support of their government. On 15th March, 1864, the French minister in Peking Berthemy informed them that the Chinese cabinet, either because

<sup>22)</sup> Fu-chi (d. 1875) had been sent as a special commissioner to Tibet, but in practice had not yet crossed the border and had remained at Ch'êng-tu; L. Petech, *Aristocracy*, 177.

<sup>23)</sup> *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo*, T'ung-chih, 21.24b-25a. This rescript is included also in a long document in *Mu-tsung Shih-lu*, 82.4b-5a.

<sup>24)</sup> *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo*, 21.25b. The portion concerning the missionaries is included in another document in *Mu-tsung Shih-lu*, 82.8b.

truly powerless or out of ill will, seemed decided not to intervene in the question and to decline all responsibility for it. He concluded by inviting them to retire to Chinese territory. To clinch the matter, the French minister of Foreign Affairs wrote to the Superior of the Lazarists requesting him no longer to send missionaries to Tibet <sup>25</sup>).

Partly on account of the imprudent behaviour of the missionaries, who in their excessive reliance upon the support of the French government had showed themselves rather haughty in their relations with the Chinese authorities, partly because of the consequences of the Ñag-roñ war, their position in south-east Tibet had become indefensible. In April 1864 the Lazarists were compelled to leave sMar-k'ams and to return to Batang. Bonga, which was abandoned shortly after and was re-occupied in May 1865, was attacked by local elements in September and October of that year and the missionaries succeeded with difficulty in escaping to Batang, where their activity was limited ever after <sup>26</sup>).

Some attempts at obtaining admission by diplomatic means led to no result. In this context we may notice a letter of the two *amban* of Lhasa Ên-lin and Tê-t'ai dated 26th September 1869 and addressed to the Vicar Apostolic Mgr. Chauveau. The original text is not available and we have only the French translation included in a letter of Mgr. Chauveau. The two officials state categorically that Tibet was a country in which religion alone was paramount and that therefore it refused any contact with foreigners <sup>27</sup>). It is also interesting to note that when Bonga was attacked in 1865 the missionaries showed to the assailants copies of the treaties of 1858 and 1860 as well as their Chinese passports. But the leaders of the attacking party, four officials sent from Lhasa, declared coolly that they did not recognize the authority of the emperor, still less treaties and passports; only the will of the Dalai-Lama counted for them <sup>28</sup>). We are confronted here with a Leitmotiv which repeated itself constantly afterwards. Of the

<sup>25</sup>) A. Launay, I, 419-421.

<sup>26</sup>) C.-H. Desgodins, 97-106; A. Launay, I, 425-432, 438-441, 446-451.

<sup>27</sup>) C.-H. Desgodins, 130-131; A. Launay, II, 64.

<sup>28</sup>) C.-H. Desgodins, 105-106. The names of the leaders are given in French phonetic transcription by A. Launay, I, 450-451. They were three representatives of the great monasteries: 'Jam-dbyañs-bsam-gtan (for dGa'-ldan), Yon-tan-rgya-mts'o (for Se-ra), bSam-gtan (for 'Bras-spuñs); plus the lay official (*sod-druñ*) 'Bras-k'ud *sras* (French: Tchrekeusé).

two assertions, the first ("Tibet is a religious country") was regularly employed by the Lhasa authorities in their official communications to foreigners; the second ("imperial authority not acknowledged") was made, in more or less explicit terms, by the Tibetan officials on the spot, charged with preventing the entry of foreign travellers into Tibetan territory.

## B. THE TIBETAN OPPOSITION TO THE ADMITTANCE OF FOREIGNERS

In the sixties of the 19th century no outstanding international interests were yet at stake in Eastern Tibet. France did not at that time (nor later) entertain territorial ambitions in that region; nor did it wish to exert itself in favour of the missions beyond a certain point, as shown by the official declaration of 1864. But in the seventies other powers entered the arena, viz. Britain and Russia. This tended to complicate the problem, as too many factors were interplaying.

There was first of all the desire of Britain to secure a minimum of information (and later of influence) on what later came to be called the glacis of the Indian fortress. Similar ambitions were entertained by Russia; its territories were relatively far away from the Tibetan borders, but the Tsar took into account the fact that the Dalai-Lama was the recognized spiritual leader of the Buriats, Lamaist subjects of the Russian empire. The Chinese government in its turn, although bound by the treaties, was obviously not looking with favour upon the entrance of foreigners in a country in which Chinese authority had entered into a slow but continuous decline. Last but not least, there was the government of the Dalai-Lama, whose policy was fairly clear: on the one side it tried to reduce to a minimum the authority and the interference of the Manchu resident, and on the other it was decided to block any attempt at foreign penetration, upon which a theocratical regime could not but look with deep suspicion, both for religious and political reasons. This policy was already outlined, as we have seen, in the sixties of the century.

For England and Russia the first step had to be the geographical exploration of the Country of Snows. The British government of India, more directly interested in the problem, got around the obstacles by means of the secret explorations and cartographical work of the "Pundits" of the Survey of India (1865-1884); the two voyages of Sarat Chandra Das (1878 and 1881-2) denote both the

climax and conclusion of this sort of activity, conceived and organized by the British-Indian authorities only.

In the meantime, however, the London government had intervened. By a "separate article" annexed to the Chefoo agreement of 13th September 1876 it secured the right of sending to Tibet an official mission, with the choice of the starting point (Peking or India); China agreed to grant the necessary passports and to order the imperial residents in Lhasa to supply an escort. As well known, there was a long delay and the mission was organized only in 1886 under the leadership of Colman Macaulay; but before it could leave India, Britain by the agreement of 24th July 1886 renounced to this right, in exchange for Chinese recognition of the annexation of Upper Burma <sup>29</sup>).

The clause of the most favoured nation covered also the separate article of Chefoo and extended it automatically to all the nations who had signed treaties with China. This removed the doubts arising from the vagueness of the stipulations in the treaty of 1860, which opened Chinese to foreigners without specifying whether this applied to Tibet as well. The imperial government could no longer refuse passports for Tibet to subjects of other powers, and in the same year 1876 granted such passports to the Russian Prževal'skij (who made use of it only three years later), in 1877 to the Englishman Gill and in 1878 to the Hungarian Széchenyi.

At first China intended to execute loyally the engagements entered into. However, the problem was complicated at once by the alarmed and shocked reaction of the Tibetan government, which in 1876 was committed (as it had been in 1863) to prevent by all possible means the entry of the Westerners. They had learnt at once from the *amban* of the Separate Article. In April 1877 the British Consular Officer E. C. Baber, stationed in Chungking, reported that "the Tibetans had convinced themselves that their independence, such as it was, was in danger and that they had no wish to replace Chinese control, to which they had long grown accustomed, by the influence of a European Power; in Lhasa, so the French missionaries told Baber, it had been decided to resist by force any attempt to implement the Separate Article" <sup>30</sup>). The report was quite correct, and Tibetan opposition is the central theme in all the Chinese documents we are going to discuss.

<sup>29</sup>) A. Lamb, *Britain and Chinese Central Asia, the road to Lhasa 1767 to 1905*, London 1960, 143-147 and 155-173.

<sup>30</sup>) A. Lamb, *op. cit.*, 148.

The first to come up against it was the British captain W. J. Gill, who in 1877 travelled from Ch'êng-tu through Ta-chien-lu and Litang to Batang, the last town under direct Chinese control. There he was informed that the Tibetan lamas were preparing to oppose his entry in their territory. The imperial authorities, as he informs us, were sincerely concerned for his safety, which they were unable to guarantee; and thus he preferred to give up his project and continued his journey through Yünnan to Burma <sup>31</sup>).

In the same year E. C. Baber was posted as British consular officer to Chungking and started at once to explore this remote part of China; in March 1878 he travelled over and mapped the route from Chung-king to Chia-ting. His activity roused the governor-general of Szechwan Ting Pao-chên <sup>32</sup>) to emulation. In May 1878 he proposed to his government to send an official, skilled in Western mathematics, map-making methods etc., through Tibet and Nepal to British India, to explore (and apparently map) the routes in those countries, returning by way of Assam and the Brahmaputra. For this task he selected the senior licentiate (*kung-shêng*) Huang Mou-ts'ai 黃茂材. The Peking government accepted both the project and the man and applied to the British chargé d'affaires Fraser for the necessary passports; the latter of course wrote to the government of India on the subject <sup>33</sup>). I did not follow up this subject and ignore the reply of the Indian government. What is relevant here is the fact that the Tibetans opposed by force the entry of Huang Mou-ts'ai <sup>34</sup>).

The repulse of Gill first and of Huang Mou-ts'ai later could not be passed over, and the Peking government felt compelled to intervene, sending positive instructions to the authorities concerned to respect the stipulations of the treaties; these instructions are contained in a document dated 16th January, 1879.

"The *tsung-li ya-mên* submits a memorial. 'As Chinese and foreigners are receiving passports for passage through Tibet,

<sup>31</sup>) W. J. Gill, *The River of Golden Sand*, London 1880, 197-198.

<sup>32</sup>) On Ting Pao-chên (1820-1886; governor-general of Szechwan from 1876 to his death) see A. W. Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, 723-725.

<sup>33</sup>) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Ting Pao-chên, 8; *Ch'ing-chi wai-chiao shih-liao*, 13.26a-28a.

<sup>34</sup>) *Ch'ing-chi wai-chiao shih-liao*, 63.15b-16a. As a result Huang Mou-ts'ai had to go back to the Jun-yü 潤玉 region (?) and thence to Yünnan, returning in the end to Szechwan; *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Wên-shih, 1.16.

we request to grant them adequate protection'. On the ground of a report on the senior licentiate Huang Mou-ts'ai, Ting Pao-chên had previously memorialized: '[Huang Mou-ts'ai intended to] pass through Tibet in order to travel in the Five Indies <sup>35)</sup>; [but] the Tibetans sent [soldiers] to guard the frontier posts and did not permit his entry into Tibet. If in future travellers from Britain and other countries pass through Tibet in accordance with the clauses of the Yen-t'ai (i.e. Chefoo) agreement, it is certainly to be feared that disputes may arise and lead to incidents. I request that the *amban* resident in Tibet be instructed to give strict orders to the Tibetans not to raise obstacles'.

China has already articles of agreement with all nations and we must act in conformity with them. How can the Tibetans, acting without authority, dare to stop Chinese and foreigners who have received passports [permitting them] to pass through Tibet? We enjoin on Sung-kuei 松濛 <sup>36)</sup> to compel with severity the Tibetans to obedience, so that they should act in a peaceful and law-abiding manner. If in future there are Chinese or foreigners holding passports for crossing Tibet, all of them must be securely protected; they must not be stopped, thus causing incidents or acts of violence. If the Tibetans presume to make opposition and to disobey, we order to investigate the facts and to act with severity. We order that a copy of the original minute be given [to Ting Pao-chên] to peruse. [To be transmitted] at the speed of 500 *li* <sup>37)</sup>. [Thus far] the rescript. Take cognizance" <sup>38)</sup>.

As a matter of fact things took a turn different from what the document provided for. For the Peking government it was neither easy nor in the last instance convenient to use the mailed fist in dealing with the Tibetans. First, it was not realistic to try to impose its will against the unanimous opposition of the ruling classes of Tibet, without an expensive armed expedition. On the other hand the Chinese themselves were not happy about the voyages

<sup>35)</sup> The Five Indies (North, West, South, East, Centre) is an ancient term going back to the times of the Buddhist pilgrims.

<sup>36)</sup> Sung-kuei was senior *amban* in Tibet from 1874 to 1880. Nothing else is known of him.

<sup>37)</sup> *The degrees* of urgency of government despatches were expressed by the distances in *li* which the courier was expected to cover daily. J. K. Fairbank and S. Y. Têng, *Ch'ing administration: three studies*, Cambridge Mass. 1960, 10-18.

<sup>38)</sup> *Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 84.11b-12a. Same in *Ch'ing-chi wai-chiao shih-liao*, 14.36b-37a.

of the foreigners, and thus the disobedience of the Lhasa government served as a convenient screen, i.e. as an adequate reason for dissuading and obstructing by every means the foreign travellers without going as far as an outright refusal. For these reasons Peking apparently did not pursue further the affair of Huang Mou-ts'ai, although it was a serious affront to imperial authority.

This policy is already implied in another document of the 12th May 1879, concerning possible British attempts at penetration from Sikkim. Ting Pao-chên gave instructions to control the situation by posting a Chinese official at Gyantse, and insisted that "when foreign travellers want to enter Tibet, we must contrive means to avoid it. If it cannot be avoided, then special attention must be paid to their protection. This question should not be taken lightly, so that it may not give rise to incidents" <sup>39</sup>).

At a certain moment, however, tension increased sharply. On the 24th June, 1879, the Hungarian explorer count Béla Széchenyi arrived at Hsining from Central Asia. As above mentioned, he held a Chinese passport valid for Tibet, and on the 29th July of that year the *tsung-li ya-mên* had instructed the *amban* Sung-kuei to supply him with an escort for the journey through Tibet; the *amban* had replied reporting that he had sent twenty Chinese soldiers and forty men of Tibetan militia toward Tsaidam, from where Széchenyi was expected to start on the route to Lhasa <sup>40</sup>).

The news aroused a storm of protests in the Tibetan capital. The regent rTa-ts'ag Qutuqtu <sup>41</sup>) and his ministers officially resolved to prevent the entry of foreigners and took a solemn pledge to that effect before the monks and the people. Acting in the correct prescribed way, they couched their decision in the terms of a petition to the emperor, forwarded through the *amban*. On the 17th October the Peking government dealt with this memorial:

"Rescript to the Grand Council. Sung-kuei reports: 'The Tibetan government (*shang-shang* 商上) presents a petition to prevent and not to allow foreigners to enter Tibet. I request to deal severely

<sup>39</sup>) *Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 92.6b-7a.

<sup>40</sup>) B. Széchenyi et al., *Die wissenschaftlichen Ergebnisse der Reise des Grafen Béla Széchenyi in Ostasien 1877-1880*, Vienna 1893, I, XCL and CLIII.

<sup>41</sup>) The rTa-ts'ag (for the Chinese: rJe-druñ) Qutuqtu Ñag-dbañ-dpalldan-c'os-kyi-rgyal-mts'an (1855-1886) was the regent of Tibet from 1875 to his death, during the minority of the XIII Dalai-Lama; L. Petech, "The Dalai-Lamas and regents of Tibet", in *TP*, 47 (1959) 393.



with the T'ung-shan 通善 rJe-druñ Qutuqtu, who directs the affairs of the Tibetan government; and personally I suggest to punish him with the utmost rigour'.

Travelling of foreigners in Tibet is authorized by the treaties. [And yet] the Tibetan laymen and monks stick to their own ideas and disobey, presenting officially a petition not to allow the frontier to be crossed. Sung-kuei has been unable to make them understand the situation clearly; his behaviour is not at all correct. We order to refer him to the proper Ministry for determination of his punishment. The T'ung-shan rJe-druñ Qutuqtu should at first be treated with severity, and after some time be pardoned. We order Sung-kuei and Sê-lêng-ê 色楞額 <sup>42)</sup> to lay upon the Qutuqtu the responsibility for making all the monks and laymen to see reason; they should be reminded, in the matter of the entry of foreigners into Tibet, that some of them, not many, have travelled there in the past without any question of oppression arising <sup>43)</sup>. They should not worry with unfounded suspicions and hereby create occasions for incidents. When foreigners arrive in Tibet, the Tibetan government should despatch Chinese and Tibetan subalterns and privates to take proper care of them and to escort them. In case that [the officials] disobey and oppose as before, we intend that the *ambans* resident in Tibet and the Qutuqtu be severely punished. The responsibilities for this affair are very serious. Sung-kuei and Sê-lêng-ê must give the utmost attention to it and provide in the best possible manner. Not the slightest negligence will be allowed; they must give a good example in the public interest. The Tibetan government in this matter should conform to the circumstances of the case.

We order the *tsung-li ya-mên* to communicate [this document] to the minister plenipotentiary of the said nation (Austria-Hungary), so that he may be informed of the question. At the same time we order Hêng-hsün 恆訓 <sup>44)</sup> and Ting Pao-chên to give to the foreign-

<sup>42)</sup> Sê-lêng-ê (d. 1890) was appointed junior *amban* in the 2nd month of 1879 and senior *amban* in the 11th month of the same year. He was recalled in 1885, but handed over office in 1887 only. Two short biographies of him are included in *Ch'ing-shih lieh-chuan*, 59.52b-53a, and in *Pei-chuan chi-pu*, 29.25a-b.

<sup>43)</sup> This is apparently an allusion to Gabet and Huc.

<sup>44)</sup> Hêng-hsün, a member of the imperial clan, received the title of *fu-kuo Chiang-chün* in 1844 and died in 1883; *Ch'ing-shih-kao*, Hong Kong edition, 616-A. No biography of him is extant. Since about 1877 he was provincial commander of Szechwan; *Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 61.12a-b, 72.9a-b, 77.11a.

ers, when they arrive in Szechwan, information about the Tibetan situation and contrive to dissuade them and hold them back, advising them to desist from the voyage; this would be much better. As before, Sung-kuei and Sê-lêng-ê should take appropriate measures in their sphere and act [accordingly]; let them not delay intentionally. Communicate this to the *tsung-li ya-mên* and at the same time let this rescript be made known to Hêng-hsün, Ting Pao-chên, Sung-kuei and Sê-lêng-ê at the speed of 500 *li*. Perused" 45).

A new element in the situation was introduced by the Tibetan "petition". Really it was not as innocent as it seemed to be; the regent had performed an act which bordered upon open challenge 46). The Chinese government could be incensed as much as it liked; the fact was that Lhasa was decided to push its will through at any cost. The story of Széchenyi's attempt is evidence in the case.

Instead of starting from Hsining and heading straight for Lhasa, the Hungarian nobleman chose to continue his journey through Western China; on the 24th September he arrived at Ch'êng-tu 47). There he obtained from Ting Pao-chên the promise of a military escort as far as Batang; but he also received a communication dated 9th October 1879, by which the *tsung-li ya-mên* informed him of the Tibetan "petition" and advised him against a prosecution of his journey to Lhasa 48). Széchenyi nonetheless left for Batang, where he arrived on the 1st December, only to receive there the news that the Tibetans were preparing to prevent his entry by force if necessary 49). The information was correct; the Tibetan government had sent to the Batang region as a special commissioner the *p'ogs-dpon* (military paymaster) Śan-k'a-pa, who was making preparations to oppose the entry of the traveller 50).

45) *Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 99.17a-b. This text is found, in an abridged form and addressed by the *tsung-li ya-men* to the Szechwan and Tibet authorities, also in *Ch'ing-chi wai-chiao shih-liao*, 16.24b-25a.

46) Compare also the document cited at the end of this study.

47) B. Széchenyi, I, CXXXIII. It is not my intention to deal here with the journey of Széchenyi and the Chinese documents concerning it, on which a study by Dr. Daniela Tozzi Giuli is pending.

48) B. Széchenyi, I, CLVIII-CLIX.

49) B. Széchenyi, I, CLXXXII.

50) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Ting Pao-chên, 15; *Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 112.12a-b. For the title *p'ogs-dpon* see L. Petech, *Aristocracy and government in Tibet*, 11 and 237.

Eventually count Széchenyi thought it expedient to give up the attempt and, like Gill, left for Yünnan and Burma <sup>51</sup>).

### C. THE JOURNEY OF N. M. PRŽEVAL'SKIJ

In this setting, already marred by the developments of the Széchenyi affair and marked by stiff Tibetan opposition, by the impotence (if not ill-will) of the *amban*, and by the lukewarm support of the Peking government, Prževal'skij's attempt to reach Lhasa took place.

Russia, more remote from the Tibetan plateau than the British in India, had first to solve the problem of the exploration of Central Asia. This was done to a large extent through the voyages of A. V. Kaulbars (1872) and A. N. Kuropatkin (1876-77) and the second Prževal'skij expedition (1876-77), which explored the Tarim basin and the adjacent portions of Mongolia. Then came the turn of Tibet. The easiest way of access for the Russians was from the north, parallel to the ancient caravan track from Hsining by which Huc and Gabet had gone to Lhasa in 1846. This was the route chosen by the third Prževal'skij expedition.

On the 2nd April (New Style) 1879 General Nikolaj Mihailovič Prževal'skij (1839-1888) left the Russian frontier post on the Zajsannor in the Semipalatinsk province, accompanied by the ensigns Fedor Leont'evič Eklon and Vsevolod Ivanovič Roroborskij and by an escort of ten men, partly Cossacks and partly soldiers. After having passed through and surveyed a large part of Central Asia, he reached Hami, from where he moved due south in the direction of Lhasa. Actually the conditions under which he started on his journey were worse than those that had caused the failure of Széchenyi, who had the advantage of belonging to a nation which could not be suspected of imperialistic aims in Asia, and who was to a certain extent supported by the Chinese government. Prževal'skij, a Russian officer accompanied by Russian soldiers, coming from the north with a three-years old passport, unsupported by the *tsung-li ya-mén* (which apparently ignored his movements) was to come up against almost insurmountable difficulties.

His approaching march was not devoid of obstacles. In the zone of the sources of the Yangtzekiang he had trouble with the local nomads, accustomed for centuries to attack the trade caravans;

---

<sup>51</sup>) B. Széchenyi, I, CLXXXVIII.

Prževal'skij gives them the names Golyk and Jegrai <sup>52</sup>). The latter followed the expedition from a distance, until in the Tangla (gDañs-la) pass they rushed to the attack, only to be thrown back with losses by the musketry of the Cossacks (19th November) <sup>53</sup>).

Not far from the Tangla, the Russians met two Tibetan officials, who requested them to stop and wait for instructions from Lhasa. Prževal'skij complied, encamping on a stream at the foot of mount Bumza, in a region under the authority of the governors ('go-pa) of Nag-c'u (Napču of Prževal'skij) <sup>54</sup>). After a long wait of three weeks he eventually received the visit of a delegate of the Tibetan regent, accompanied by lesser officials and by representatives of the three great monasteries of dGa'-ldan, Se-ra and 'Bras-spunš. Courteously but very firmly, they vetoed the continuation of the journey; to give greater weight to their words, cavalry forces were hovering in the neighbourhood. A reference to the Chinese passport was brushed aside by the brusque declaration that the delegates had nothing to do with the Chinese and obeyed the Tibetan government alone <sup>55</sup>). Confronted with this unbending opposition, nothing was left for the Russian explorer but to place it on record in an official document bearing the seals of the Tibetan officials (15th December, 1879), after which he started back for Tsaidam <sup>56</sup>).

<sup>52</sup>) N. M. Prževal'skij, *Tret'e putešestvie v central'noj Azii: iz Zajsani čerez Hami v Tibet i na verhov'ja Želtoj Reki*, St. Peterburg 1883, 236.—The Golyks are the famous Ngolok (Ňo-log), of whom and whose predatory activities all the Western travellers in that region have something to say. Jegrai are the brigand clans in the Yagra (g'Yag-ra?) region, mentioned by Kishen Singh. See *Report of Pandit Kishen Singh's explorations in Great Tibet and Mongolia 1879-1882*, in *Records of the Survey of India*, VIII, 2, Dehra Dun 1915, 223.

<sup>53</sup>) N. M. Prževal'skij, 241. The Old Style dates of the Russian text have been reduced to New Style chronology.

<sup>54</sup>) N. M. Prževal'skij, 248-252. On the twin 'go-pa of the Nag-c'u district see L. Petech, *Aristocracy and government in Tibet*, 13.

<sup>55</sup>) N. M. Prževal'skij, 273. Already before that, the officials of Nag-c'u-k'a had told him that the Lhasa *amban* had repeatedly advised the Tibetan government to receive the foreigners honourably, but his requests and explanations had remained unheeded.

<sup>56</sup>) N. M. Prževal'skij, 273-276. A hazy recollection of these facts had persisted till recent years in the official circles of Lhasa. "In 1880 reports reached Lhasa from the district officer of Nag-c'u-k'a that a party of British travellers was in the region; however, there is no certainty that they were British, because any Caucasian seen in Tibet at that time was taken for a Britisher. The Tibetan government sent officials to ask the

The attempt of Prževal'skij was hardly noticed in Peking. The Tibetan authorities had dealt with the case almost arbitrarily, passing over the competence of the *amban* and only informing them when everything was finished; and thus no document of the *central Chinese government* concerning the question was ever published, as far as I know. But by a stroke of luck we get detailed information preserved in the provincial archives of Szechwan. At the end of 1886 the Manchu official Wên-shih 文碩<sup>57)</sup>, posted as *amban* to Lhasa, was passing through the capital of Szechwan; the governor-general supplied him, for his information, with copies of a group of four documents dated in the year 1879. The first and the second of these concern the Prževal'skij affair, the third refers to local questions of Batang, and the fourth to the voyage of Széchenyi. We shall give here the translation of the first two.

“The authors of this respectful report, we humble non-commissioned officers, took leave and started, confiding in our good fortune. On the 7th (19th December, 1879) we arrived at the Nag-c'u (Qara-usu). En route we succeeded in ascertaining that the Russians were encamped in the Meng-ch'iung 蒙穹 region, which is still more than 50 *li* beyond the Ts'ang-na 倉納 pass<sup>58)</sup>. The Tibetan monk and lay officials have moved and concentrated more than 300 men cavalry to occupy it. The Ts'ang-na pass in its turn is at two stages from the Nag-c'u. After having gone where they expected to, the Tibetan official Chu-chieh 竹結 *mk'an-po*<sup>59)</sup> and the representatives of the three grand monasteries

travellers to leave and they turned back”. W. D. Shakabpa, *Tibet, a political history*, New Haven and London 1967, 197.

<sup>57)</sup> Of Wên-shih we know only that in 1869 he had been appointed *amban* of Buluntohai (in the farthest north of Dsungaria) and that in 1872 he had alleged illness and had been dismissed; *Ch'ing-shih-kao*, 99-B and 100-B. Appointed *amban* in Tibet on 27th December 1885 (*Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 220. 7b), he took office only in the spring of 1887. He was recalled on the 3rd March 1888 and left Lhasa in the middle of that year; *Tê-tsung Shih-lu*, 251.9a.

<sup>58)</sup> Mêng-ch'iung could transcribe something like 'Bum-k'yuñ; it is apparently the same as [Pom] Bum-čun of Prževal'skij. It should be the zone of mount Bumza (the Mondza of Kishen Singh?).—Ts'ang-na is the K'ra-ts'an-la occurring in an itinerary of the Third Pañ-c'en; Appendix to the *Life of the Third Pañ c'en*, 73a. It is also the Ta-tsang-la of Kishen Singh, which marks the border between the districts of Nag-c'u and rDza-mar; *Report of Pandit Kishen Singh's explorations*, 245.

<sup>59)</sup> This is the head of the mission, the *mk'an-po* 'Jigs-med-c'os-'byor. But I cannot determine the Tibetan word transcribed as Chu-chieh.

returned to the Nag-c'u. Now we non-commissioned officers have arrived there and proceeded to their residence to talk with them. They told us that the Russians have already turned back and have gone away. We asked them detailed questions about the circumstances. The Tibetan officials gave the following account.

We had received orders to come here. On the 29th day of the 10th Tibetan month (12th December)<sup>60</sup> we sent ahead the Mongol Lo-tsang-wa and the two 'go-pa (*ying-kuan*) of Nag-c'u (Qara-usu) to precede us and to gather information. Among the names of the thirteen Russians arrived there, there are two which seem to be Mongolian<sup>61</sup>). On that occasion the three officials begged the Russians to kindly stop for a few days, till we representatives and officials could arrive there to meet them. They replied that for the moment they would have waited for one day, but if we delayed, they could not wait and certainly on the next morning they would continue their journey. Lo-tsang-wa and the others insisted to detain them, and they allowed a term of two days. Then Lo-tsang-wa and the others returned, to inform us monks and laymen.

On the 30th (13th December) we started with a cortège of about ten attendants. On the 1.XI (14th December) we arrived in the Mêng-ch'iung zone and had a personal talk, in courteous forms, with the Russians. [We enquired] of which nation they were subjects, for what purpose and from where they came here. Three men among them made the following statement: We are no Westerners (*yang-jên*); actually we are subjects and representatives of the Pa-ta Ts'a-k'ang Han 八達擦康罕 of Russia<sup>62</sup>). Russia had clearly informed the [Chinese] emperor [of our purpose], and by imperial decree we have been given permission to travel in the whole empire. Therefore, we wish to go to Tibet. Why do you prevent us? Among other things, a single imperial edict (i.e. passport) is valid in every province and permits us to travel there; how can you not respect it? Again, here is the "dragon-passport" (*lung-piao*); have a look at it.

<sup>60</sup>) The Tibetan date (which in this instance coincides with the Chinese one) has been calculated according to the tables of D. Schuh, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Kalenderrechnung*, Wiesbaden 1973.

<sup>61</sup>) An allusion to the two Transbaikalian Cossacks Dondok Irinčinov and Džambal Garmaev, who were Lamaist Buriats.

<sup>62</sup>) The term underlying this transcription is Baatar Cağan Khan, "heroic white sovereign", the Mongol title of the emperor of Russia. Strictly speaking, the Chinese characters transcribe a form \*Bada[r] Jaqan Khan.

We monks and laymen replied: We have repeatedly received imperial rescripts [on this subject]; they have been translated and now they are on record. We have also received repeated orders from the *ambans* residing in Tibet, that whenever foreigners arrive on the border, immediately an efficient protection should be afforded them; this too is on record. However, all the laymen and monks of this Tibet of ours have frequently had sad experiences when we extended kindness [to foreigners]. All together they have sworn a sealed [covenant] not to allow foreigners to enter Tibet, and have requested that a memorial [should be presented to the emperor] on their behalf; this is on record. We thought you knew it. Now we have come here to dissuade you and to prevent [your entry]. As actually you did not come to know about it during your voyage, therefore [now] we advise and counsel you to the contrary, in the hope that you will turn back.

The two parties discussed till sunset. Eventually the Russians said: If it is unavoidable that we turn back, you people who have come here must draw up a written agreement containing your names and surnames, so that tomorrow, returning to our country, we may report that our instructions have been carried out. We will not delay in any way [in this region]. If you do not draw up a written agreement, we certainly shall start tomorrow on the march for entering Tibet. Even if one thousand soldiers and ten thousand horses were [pitted against us], we thirteen shall not be afraid. Give us at once a written reply whether this is possible or not.

We monks and laymen took counsel and examined the situation. If we did not draw up a written agreement, this would give occasion to incidents. There was nothing else to do but draw up this sealed agreement [written] in the barbarian (*i*) language. By then it was evening and everybody returned to their tents. On the 2nd (15 December) at sunrise the document of agreement was handed over to the Russians, who read and accepted it. After this they prepared their baggage and started on the march; [and thus the matter] was finished. We monks and laymen have already clearly examined the major part of the circumstances and have transmitted [our opinion] to the *bka'-śag*; <sup>63)</sup> it stands on record. But there is also the popular feeling [to reckon with]; and thus we wait to be back in Lhasa to present an oral report on all this.

---

<sup>63)</sup> The *bka'-śag* is the Tibetan council of ministers, composed of four *bka'-blon*.

Now we non-commissioned officers, although all the [delegates], monks and laymen, have related to us the circumstances of these proceedings, did not feel quite happy about it. Over and above this, we have questioned people travelling in the neighbourhood and all of them unanimously stated that it is true that the Russian turned back. Actually there were no causes of conflict with them, and thus there were no dangerous consequences. They say that the monk and lay [officials] now have sent the [two] 'go-*pa* (*ying-kuan*) of this region, Lha-sdiñs *sras* (La-ting-sê) and K'e-smad (K'e-mai)<sup>64</sup>) to follow and watch them. How did they cross the gDais-la (Tang-la) pass? Have they passed the frontier? We cannot trust them. We shall wait here till we feel sure and the 'go-*pa* are back, then at that point we shall forward an urgent report. For the present, concerning our investigation of the return of the Russians and every detail, we have respectfully prepared a report [to be despatched] at the speed of 300 *li*. We humbly ask Your Excellencies to condescend to read it with attention and to examine it. Lastly, we inquire about your health. The supernumeraries Ma Lin 馬林 and Chêng Pang-yen 鄭邦彥 respectfully report. On the 8.XI (20th December), about 4 p.m. Arrived from Nag-c'u (Qara-usu) to Lhasa on the 14th (26th December)"<sup>65</sup>).

This document shows that the Tibetan government had acted on their own account, completely by-passing the *amban*, so that the latter was compelled to send two non-commissioned officers of his escort to gather a minimum of information; apparently the influence of Sung-kuei was at a rather low level, and it took him a whole month to obtain an official report from the *bka'-śag*, as we are going to see.

In the meantime the two Chinese officers, as promised, sent a second report, which eliminated any reasonable doubt on the actual departure of the Russians.

"The authors of this respectful report, the humble non-commissioned officers, had first presented a summary report, begging to examine it with care. [To that we may add.] On the 9th (21st December) the Tibetan officials received a letter from Lha-sdiñs *sras* [of the following content]; The Russians left Mêng-ch'iung and travelled for two great stages as far as the halting place in the

<sup>64</sup>) On these two Tibetan officials see later p. 251.

<sup>65</sup>) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Wên-shih, I. 10-11.



Hsiang-têng 鄉登 region <sup>66)</sup>, where they tried to purchase horses from the Wa 娃 <sup>67)</sup> encamped in the neighbourhood. On the 7th (19th December) they resumed the march and we followed to watch them. It is common knowledge that the Russians on their way [toward Lhasa] had suffered on the route an attack by the Yai-jê Wa 崖噉娃 <sup>68)</sup>; they did not succeed [in looting] anything from the Russians, and on the contrary the Yai-jê Wa lost several men killed or wounded. Now it is rumoured that the Yai-jê Wa want to join the Mêng-pa Wa 蒙巴娃 and the Kê-chieh Wa 格結娃 <sup>69)</sup> to avenge themselves; they purpose to cut the route to the Russians. We ignore whether this is true or not, but special couriers have already gone out to investigate. We beg you to think on this and to decide, and to send an answer quickly, so that adequate measures may be taken.

The lay and monk [officials], keeping with them this letter, took counsel with us non-commissioned officers, asking how to act in this matter and begging us to give them advice. Listening to their words we were overcome with surprise and greatly feared that inside this there was a [hidden] intention. We said: "You may send couriers with a letter for Lha-sdiñs *sras* informing him that it is essential to be wary and to investigate carefully whether this is true or false. It is imperative to follow and watch them, accompanying them till outside the frontier. When the Russians have gone a long way, then (Lha-sdiñs *sras*) may come back. As far as the Yai-jê Wa are concerned, special couriers should be sent to give them instructions. It would be important to present them with gifts and to order them officially to avoid whatever may be to the detriment of the Russians. Should they be killed, on whom the responsibility will fall? In no case you should delay. After having

<sup>66)</sup> Hsiang-têng is hard to identify, as for geographical reasons it seems to be different from the Shiabden Gompa of Kishen Singh, *Report*, 245.

<sup>67)</sup> Wa, or Wa-śul, is the name of nomadic tribes speaking a particular dialect (*Wa-skad*); they represent an ill-defined population now dispersed in the Ngolok country, in Amdo and Minyak; R. Stein, "Mi-ñag et Si-hia", in *BEFEO* 44 (1951), 254; id., *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines*, Paris 1959, 66.

<sup>68)</sup> The Yai-jê Wa are the Jegrai of Prževal'skij; see above p. 237.

<sup>69)</sup> The Mêng-pa Wa may perhaps be localized in the region of the Dsanag mung bu la of Table 76 in A. Herrmann, *Historical and Commercial Atlas of China*, Cambridge Mass., 1935. The Kê-chieh Wa are the herdsmen clans of the dGe-rgyas region, on which see T. V. Wylie, *The geography of Tibet according to the 'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad*, Rome 1962, 103.

consulted among themselves, the lay and monk Tibetan officials must reply, and the couriers should start at once with the copies of the letters". We non-commissioned officers too have sent a little Wa to investigate.

On the 13th (25th December) after noon the special couriers returned. They had followed [the Russians] day and night for seven stages as far as Hsia-jê-shui-t'ang 下熱水堂 <sup>70</sup>). They saw Lha-sdiñs *sras* and handed the letter to him. At the same time they gave notice that the Russians were to be left in peace during their journey. Also a *brgya-dpon* (*chia-pêng*) <sup>71</sup>) specially sent to the Yai-jê Wa country has already left for investigating; it is hoped that no occasion for incidents will arise. It is our task to follow and watch them as far as the upper T'ung-t'ien-ho 通天河 <sup>72</sup>), then we shall go back.

The Tibetan official Chu-chieh *mk'an-po* in his turn sent the representatives of dGa'ldan etc., giving them [an escort of] about fifty cavalymen. On the 14th (26th December) they left to explore. Coming out of the gDañs-la (Tang-la) pass, they travelled for eight or nine stages, until they were satisfied that the Russians had departed. Then they were allowed to return. We non-commissioned officers shall remain here for the moment. When the two Tibetan officials Lha-sdiñs *sras* and K'e-smad come back after having personally ascertained the truth or falsehood of the footsteps of the Russians, we shall leave for Lhasa, to report that our instructions have been carried out. Now all this information is respectfully transmitted to you at the speed of 400 *li*. We humbly beg to condescend to take cognizance. The supernumeraries Ma Lin and Chêng Pang-yen humbly report. Despatched on 21. XI (2nd January 1880) <sup>73</sup>).

Besides these two reports, the governor-general of Szechwan gave to Wên-shih a copy of the official communication of the Tibetan cabinet (*bka'-śag*) to the *ambans*.

"Copy of the original report of the *bka'-śag*. Translated on the

<sup>70</sup>) Hsia-jê-shui-t'ang may be a purely Chinese name meaning "Glades of the upper Hot Waters", although the last syllable looks more like the Tibetan *t'an*, "plains". A localization is difficult.

<sup>71</sup>) *brGya-dpon*, literally commander of a hundred but actually little more than a sergeant, is a rank in the Tibetan army. See L. Petech, *Aristocracy and government*, 12.

<sup>72</sup>) The T'ung-t'ien-ho is one of the source branches of the Murui-usu (Yangtze-kiang). See *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta-tz'u-tien*, *sub voce*.

<sup>73</sup>) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Wên-shih, I. 11-12.

9.XII (20th January, 1880); despatched for information on the 14th (25th January). The administrator of Tibetan affairs, Propagator of the Yellow Doctrine (*kuang-yen huang-fa*), T'ung-shan rJe-druñ Qutuqtu writes the following letter to Their Excellencies the two Commissioners for the handling of Tibetan affairs.

There were some foreigners, thirteen in all including both masters and servants, who arrived in the Nag-c'u region belonging to Tibet, with the intention of penetrating into Tibet. When they arrived there, the 'go-pa (*ying-kuan*), chiefs (*t'ou-mu*) and prominent persons (*po-hsing*) of Nag-c'u gave them express notice of the prohibition. They not only took no notice of it, but absolutely wanted to enter Tibet. When a communication on this subject arrived [in Lhasa], at once the three grand monasteries of Se-ra, 'Bras-spuñs and dGa'-ldan, as well as the monks and laymen of all Tibet <sup>74</sup>), officially appointed their representatives, to proceed [to the Nag-c'u] to exhort them to return to their country. They have already sent [here] a letter, which is on record. Now the three grand monasteries of Se-ra, 'Bras-spuñs and dGa'-ldan, the monk and lay officials and all the Tibetans together, through the channel of the *bka'-blon* and of the *spyi-k'yab mk'an-po* (*tsung k'an-pu* 總堪布) <sup>75</sup>) report the following.

We sent to the Nag-c'u region monks and laymen specially deputed in official mission, who collectively report that the above-mentioned officials arrived to the Nag-c'u and from there proceeded to the mTs'o-mo-ra (Ts'o-mu-jê 磋木熱) region <sup>76</sup>). On the 29. X (12th December) they sent the two 'go-pa (*ying-kuan*) of Nag-c'u to convince [the Russians]. Then on the 1.XI (13th December) the Tibetan monk and lay delegates themselves proceeded to the Pêng-ch'ing 蚌傾 region in rDza-mar (Tsa-ma-êrh 雜瑪爾) <sup>77</sup>), where the foreigners were staying. They inquired about their health according to the rites and then asked the following questions:

<sup>74</sup>) In the Chinese documents this expression is used to indicate the Tibetan government as a whole.

<sup>75</sup>) The *spyi-k'yab mk'an-po* was the head of the ecclesiastical establishment in Tibet and was directly responsible to the Dalai-Lama.

<sup>76</sup>) This is the Tso-mora of Kishen Singh and of the Survey maps.

<sup>77</sup>) It is difficult to identify Pêng-ch'ing; but geographically it should correspond to the site of the Nier-čungu source at the foot of the Bumza mountain; Prževal'skij, 249. We could suppose that Pêng transcribes Pon in Pon-bum-čun.—The rDza-mar district, on which see T.V. Wylie, *Geography of Tibet according to the 'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad*, 103, is the Zamyр of Prževal'skij and Jāma of Kishen Singh.

You gentlemen are subjects of which country? By which route did you arrive? For which purpose do you enter Tibet?

Upon this [they replied]: We are men from Russia. Our ruler is usually called Pa-ta-êrh Ts'a-k'ang Han <sup>78</sup>). As to our voyage, a prince of our dynasty has written a letter to the Ch'ing emperor, who granted us permission to travel in all the territories depending from the Ch'ing empire, visiting them for our pleasure. Moreover the Ch'ing emperor, as we believe, sent to the two Manchu *ambans* resident in Tibet several rescripts permitting our entry; did you hear or know something about this? It does not matter in what regions ruled by the Ch'ing emperor we penetrate; we have a general travelling permit and you must not prevent us. Here is the authentic document, which we invite you to read. How can you stop us?

To this we replied: These words [in the passport] are written in Chinese; we think it is certainly so [as you say]. Indeed this legal precedent goes back more or less to the times of the Hsien-fêng emperor (1851-1860), who permitted the Westerners from the P'yi-glin country to enter Tibet. Not only some time ago several imperial edicts [on this subject] have been received, but also the officials of every rank residing in Tibet have been authorized, when P'yi-glin Westerners enter Tibet, to give orders to permit their entry and not to allow obstacles to be placed in their way; letters patent on this matter have been published repeatedly. But the Tibetan ruler and ministers together with their Tibetan subjects since the earliest generations have always considered religion as the main thing, and [put] human passions in the second place; this is an unfailing prescription. Both things together do not agree. From whatever country these foreigners may come, we will never allow a single one of them to enter Tibet. We are absolutely decided, and together we have taken a pledge in this sense. According to the approved practice, through the *amban* resident in Tibet we have already in many ways according to circumstances explained the matter to the emperor. The orders are that for no reason whatsoever you gentlemen may enter Tibet. Therefore, the monks and laymen of Tibet gathered together have officially deputed us to go to discuss with you and to ask you instantly to turn back.

Upon this, [the Russians] said: We have spent more than seven or eight months for covering the route from Urumchi, Hami and

<sup>78</sup>) See above, n. 17.

Tsaidam just to [reach his place]. Up to this point more than one hundred camels have dropped dead [on the route] and we spent several thousand taels; and now you do not allow us to enter Tibet. Besides, the ruler of our nation, the Pa-ta-êrh T'sa-k'ang Han, had a substantial exchange of letters with the Chinese emperor [about us], and as a result the Chinese emperor sent plentiful information to the Manchu *ambans* resident in Tibet. Since you do not allow us to enter Tibet, we want the Manchu *ambans* resident in Tibet [themselves] to refuse our words.

Then we replied: Your Pa-ta-êrh Ts'a-k'ang Han may have sent many letters to the Chinese emperor, but we ignore whether the Manchu *ambans* resident in Tibet have these letters with them. Summing up, the prohibition for you to enter Tibet is valid and we must ask you to go back.

Upon this they said: But are you or are you not subjects of the Chinese emperor? Since you do not allow us to enter Tibet, then letters ought to be sent immediately to the *amban* of Hsining and to Kukunor, Tsaidam and other localities. We cannot come as far as here by a long journey, and then decide [not] to enter Tibet.

To this we replied: Tibet is indeed under the sovereignty and the laws of the emperor of China, and normally abides reverently by the laws of the state. But as religion and human passions do not agree with each other, in the same way it is the rule for people of this sort that they shall not enter Tibet; and decidedly not a single one of them is permitted to enter Tibet. We are firmly resolute with full knowledge of the facts, and the motives for this [are contained] in a petition presented [to the emperor] by the entire people of all Tibet through the *ambans* resident in Lhasa. Besides, you do not agree at all with our religious tenets; probably you gentlemen too are well aware of it. Now your gentlemen with your servants, thirteen men in all, have come here; again and again we beg you courteously to go back. We must repeat it: with all energy we insist, asking you to return by the way you have come. Nobody at all will do anything illegal against you gentlemen and your servants. Certainly you must think about it carefully.

Then we prepared at once a present according to local custom, [viz.] a package of *hui-mien* 灰面 (?) and a package of rice. When we sent them, [the Russians said]: As we have no mutual acquaintance, we do not accept them. And [the presents] were returned unaccepted; then we returned to our camp.

After some time we received a written reply, [as follows]: We

have been in many countries, but apart from you nobody else has stopped us. Now you do not allow us to enter Tibet; but for what reason? You must by all means explain this. It is indispensable to write a document, in which you include singly the seals and names of you all. When it has been drawn up, then we shall turn back without waiting for the letter of the Manchu *amban*. If not, we thirteen shall not hesitate even if thirteen thousand soldiers came here, and we shall go on. We have waited for more than twenty days. Now we can [wait] no longer and tomorrow we shall resolutely enter Tibet.

Having received their communication, at once, taking into account the conditions previously agreed between all those present, we drew up a document and affixed our seals to it. On the 2.XI (14th November) at sunrise it was handed over; to the thirteen men it became quite clear in their minds. There had been not the slightest damage to men, goods, animals or cattle; and we shall accompany them on their way back. Aside this, there were no further questions, such as matters of money or the like; these are the facts.

Thus it was received [by us ministers]. At the same time we have prepared and despatched to you a copy of the sealed letter that has been given to the foreign Russian gentlemen and to his servants, thirteen men in all. [We omit some sentences containing a communication from the sMar-k'ams *rdzön-dpon* bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas to the *amban* concerning count Széchenyi and his departure from Batang for Yünnan on the 15th December]. We beg [the *amban*] to decide and to act quickly [in this matter]. In this way we shall create a precedent if later people from these or other foreign lands shall be encountered. By whatever frontier they introduce themselves into Tibet, what is needed is to lay down once and for all that we should be on our watch and prevent [their entry]; nothing else matters. To spare them the fatigue of the double journey, we must beg you to grant us graciously the order to prevent [their passage]. They must not cross the Tibetan border because of negligence. Of all these matters, how can we submit a report to the emperor? And how can it be notified to the Grand Council, to the governor-general of Szechwan, to the governor-general of Shensi-Kansu, to the *amban* of Hsining, so that they take cognizance? We humbly wait for satisfactory arrangements to be made. Urgent request.

The request has been received. We note that on this occasion

several Tibetan monks and laymen have been officially selected as representatives and have been sent to the Nag-c'u, where they have given to the foreigners a document under their seals, of which they have prepared copies and have transmitted them separately. They hope and pray that the two Excellencies may think how to prepare a report and at the same time how to make a general communication *informing* the Grand Council, so that in the afore-said item all the provinces should act accordingly. We also expect that satisfactory measures should be taken in detail. We beg you to take this thing at heart; therefore, we have drawn up this document" 79).

The statement sent by the *bka'-śag* to the Chinese authorities is highly interesting. It bears witness to the initiative taken by the Lhasa government to block everywhere and by every means the entry of Europeans, even at the cost (if need be) of defying imperial orders. From another point of view, we can observe an almost verbal coincidence between the report of the Tibetan delegation and the account of Prževal'skij, which confirms the absolute correctness of both.

Joined to the Tibetan report was the Chinese translation of the document given to Prževal'skij, which is known also from the Russian version prepared on the Tibetan text by Professor V. P. Vasil'ev and published in Prževal'skij's book 80). The following translation is made on the Chinese text.

"Copy of the document of guarantee issued to the Russians. Tibet, a Buddhist country, had successively [seen] several P'yi-gliñ foreigners, who arrogated to themselves many names, even illicit ones; and at various times there was talk of their penetrating into Tibet. [But] it is the rule that suchlike persons should never at all enter Tibet. And therefore the ruler and ministers of Tibet (Tangut) and all the people monks and laymen from the past generations till the present have taken and sworn a sincere voluntary covenant to prevent [the entry of the foreigners] at the risk of death. Upon this matter they are resolute with full knowledge of the facts. Through the *ambans* resident in Tibet this question has been presented to the ear of the emperor repeatedly and in detail.

Now in the site called Pêng-ch'ing belonging to rDza-mar near the Nag-c'u on the 13.X (26th November) it happened that an

79) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Wên-shih, I. 13-16.

80) N. M. Prževal'skij, *op. cit.*, 276-277.

officer (*ta-jên*) of the Pa-ta-êh Tsa-k'ang Han [by name] Li-ko-na Pi-hsia-pa-lê-ssü-kê (Nikolaj Prževals'kij), the *t'u-su-na-ch'i*<sup>81</sup>) A-kê-lêng (Eklon), the *t'u-su-na-shih* Hsi-pei-kuo-ssü-kê (Švyjkovskij)<sup>82</sup>) and a following of ten soldiers arrived there, stating their intention to enter Tibet. As a consequence, all the authorities of Tibet collectively received a report on this affair [from] the headmen of that district, i.e. the two 'go-pa (*ying-kuan*) of Nag-c'u. As that place is far away, [the Russians] remained waiting twenty days there. Beginning with the great monasteries of Se-ra, 'Bras-spun and dGa'-ldan and ending with all the monks and lay [officials] of Tibet, they have officially deputed monk and lay representatives to proceed there to exhort [the Russians] to return. Upon this, we have personally met them, at once [explaining them] the aforesaid reasons. Repeatedly and in detail we have advised them to comply; it was imperative for us to ask them to return to their country. To this they replied that, if they were not allowed to enter Tibet, the aforesaid delegates ought to put into writing the reasons for the refusal to their entry in Tibet, in a document with their seals. As soon as received, they would immediately turn back. If not, on the following day they would at once enter into Tibet.

Now, you gentlemen have never before penetrated into dBus (Anterior Tibet) and it would not be in accordance with our custom. Therefore, we kindly ask you to turn back.

[In witness] of this; the representative of the 'Bras-spun monastery Blo-bzañ-bstan-dar (Lo-pu-tsang-tan-ta); the representative of the Se-ra monastery dGe-'dun-c'os-grags (Kên-têng-ch'ü-cha); the representative of the dGa'-ldan monastery Rin-c'en-bzañ-po (Jên-ch'ing-sang-pu); the official delegates of all the monks and laymen (i.e. of the government) of Tibet, viz. *mk'an-c'un* 'Jig-med-c'os-'byor (little [*hsiao*] *k'an-pu* Chi-kê-mei-ch'ü-chio-êrh); *rtse-druñ* Byañ-c'ub-dge-legs (*tzü-chung* Chiang-ch'ü-kê-lê); *rtse-druñ* Ye-šes-bstan-'dzin (*tzü-chung* I-hsi-tan-tseng); *druñ-'k'or* rDo-rje-dgra-'dul (*tung-k'o-êrh* To-chi-čan-tui); *druñ-'k'or* dBañ-rgyal-nor-bu (*tung-k'o-êrh* Wang-chieh-lo-pu); the [two] Nag-c'u 'go-pa, i.e. *druñ-'k'or* rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje (Ha-ta-wu-su *ying-kuan tung-k'o-êrh* Lang-chieh-to-chi) and *rtse-druñ* rGyal-mts'an-

<sup>81</sup>) This is the Mongolian *tusalaci*, attendant or subordinate.

<sup>82</sup>) "The passport issued in 1876 by the *tsung-li ya-mên* for our journey to the Lop-nor contained the family name of the sub-lieutenant Švyjkovskij, who at that time accompanied me along with S. G. Eklon, but soon quitted the expedition on account of an illness". N. M. Prževal'skij, 276 n.



dños-grub (*tzü-chung* Chien-ts'an-o-chu). Done on the 2.XI of the year *chi-mao* (14th December 1879)" <sup>83</sup>).

The members of the Tibetan delegation can be identified, with the exception of the three Lamas representing the grand monasteries <sup>84</sup>), whose names seem not to occur in the Tibetan texts.

'Jigs-med-c'os-'byor was one of the foremost monk officials (*rtse-drun*) of the late 19th century. In 1861 he was already a *rtse-mgron* (chamberlain of the Dalai-Lama) and in that year he was appointed *mk'an-c'un*, i.e. member of the supreme ecclesiastical administrative council (*yig-ts'an*) <sup>85</sup>). No information on him is available for the following years, till the time of the Prževal'skij affair <sup>86</sup>). In 1880 he was still a *mk'an-c'un* and came back to Lhasa from this mission to the Russians during the New Year's festival (*smon-lam*), which in that year took place between the 11th and the 25th February <sup>87</sup>). Later he was appointed *p'og-dpon*, i.e. paymaster of the troops; but he had already retired from that charge when on the 28.III (12th May) 1886 he was sent to P'ag-ri, entrusted with the task of stopping on the border the expected British mission of Colman Macaulay <sup>88</sup>). Apparently the Lhasa government attributed to him part of the merit for the abandonment of the mission, because in 1887 he was granted the honorific title *darhan mk'an-po*, with which he appears in the following year as well <sup>89</sup>). In 1890 he received the half-Chinese title of *ta bla-ma*, in other words *mk'an-c'e*, president by seniority of the

<sup>83</sup>) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Wên-shih, 1.16-17. In the Russian translation the document is dated 3. XI (15th December).

<sup>84</sup>) The inclusion of representatives (*s'pyi-t'us*) of the three grand monasteries in all the delegations dealing with foreigners was a constant practice; they kept an eye on behalf of the clergy on the action of the government officials. Two examples may suffice: the Tibeto-Nepalese treaty of 1856 and the Anglo-Tibetan treaty of 1904 bore the seals of the representatives of dGa'-ldan, Se-ra and 'Bras-spuñs.

<sup>85</sup>) *Life of the Twelfth Dalai Lama*, 77a. On the *mk'an-c'un* see L. Petech, *Aristocracy and government in Tibet*, 8.

<sup>86</sup>) The 'Jigs-med-c'os-'byor who in 1862 was political and commercial representative (*sgar-dpon*) at Hsining (*Life of the Twelfth Dalai-Lama*, 89a), must be another man.

<sup>87</sup>) *Life of the Thirteenth Dalai-Lama*, Ka, 74b.

<sup>88</sup>) Op. cit., 138a. For the office of *p'og-dpon* see L. Petech, *Aristocracy*, 11. On the Macaulay mission see back, n. 29.

<sup>89</sup>) *Life of the Thirteenth Dalai-Lama*, Ka, 154a, 155b, 180a.

*yig-tś'an*; normally this charge preceded retirement <sup>90</sup>). As *mk'an-c'e darhan* he was in charge (1892) of the reconstruction of the images in the *mgon-k'an* (chapel of terrific deities) of the sNags-pa college of 'Bras-spuñs <sup>91</sup>). Then in the 4th month (May-June) of the same year he accompanied the *bka'-blon bla-ma Ye-śes-p'ul-'byuñ*, who was proceeding to the Chumbi valley to assist in the negotiations that led to the Anglo-Tibetan trade regulations of 1893; in the sixth month he was back in Lhasa <sup>92</sup>). In 1895 he was retired (*žabs-zur*) <sup>93</sup>) and that is the last we hear of him.

sMon-groñ-pa Byañ-c'ub-dge-legs was *rtse-gñer* (steward of the Potala palace) when during the New Year's festival of 1880 he came back to Lhasa with 'Jigs-med-c'os-'byor <sup>94</sup>). In 1891 he was *rtse-p'yag* (treasurer of the Dalai-Lama's treasury in the Potala) sent on a mission to Koñ-po; we find him again as *rtse-p'yag* in 1894 and 1895 <sup>95</sup>).

Lotsawa Ye-śes-bstan-'dzin occurs in the texts only on the occasion of his return to Lhasa during the *smon-lam* of 1880 <sup>96</sup>).

The *druñ-'k'or* (lay officials) rDo-rje-dgra-'dul and dBañ-rgyal-nor-bu are the *śod-druñ* (same as *druñ-'k'or*) K'e-smad and the *rtsis-pa* (finance accountant) K'o-nañ, who were members of the delegation <sup>97</sup>); but as the Chinese document give the personal names only and the Tibetan text the family names alone, it is practically impossible to determine the coupling of the two series of names.

The *druñ-'k'or* rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje, lay 'go-pa of Nag-c'u, must be identical with the Lha-sdiñs *sras* mentioned in the second Chinese document (see above, p. 241). He was the Lha-sdiñs rNam-rgyal-rdo-rje, whose daughter married in 1882 the ruler of Sikkim mT'u-stobs-rnam-rgyal <sup>98</sup>).

<sup>90</sup>) *Ch'ing-chi ch'ou-Tsang tsou-tu*, Shêng-t'ai, 3.21. On the title see L. Petech, *Aristocracy*, 8.

<sup>91</sup>) *Life of the Thirteenth Dalai-Lama*, Ka, 222b.

<sup>92</sup>) *Life of the Thirteenth Dalai-Lama*, Ka, 233a, 234b. On the negotiations for the trade agreement see A. Lamb, *Britain and Chinese Central Asia*, 196-204.

<sup>93</sup>) *Life of the Thirteenth Dalai-Lama*, Ka, 259 a.

<sup>94</sup>) *Op. cit.*, 74b, 77b.

<sup>95</sup>) *Op. cit.*, 212b, 237b, 262a.

<sup>96</sup>) *Op. cit.*, 74b.

<sup>97</sup>) *Op. cit.*, 74b. On the K'e-smad family see L. Petech, *Aristocracy*, 92-95.

<sup>98</sup>) S. Ch. Das, *An introduction to the grammar of the Tibetan language*, Calcutta 1915, Appendix II, 2-3. Cf. L. Petech, *Aristocracy*, 198.

Lastly, the *rtse-drun* rGyal-mts'an-dños-grub, monk 'go-pa of Nag-c'u, seems to be unknown to the texts.

As a conclusion to the present study, we may point out that the "petition" of 1879 represented an official statement of the Tibetan government on its policy towards the Western travellers. This declaration of principles was then communicated to the autonomous principalities of Eastern Tibet and to the monasteries under direct Chinese authority (i.e. not dependent from Lhasa) by a circular dated 20.I (29th February, 1880) bearing the seals of the Regent and of the three monasteries. The Tibetan text is not available; we have only a French translation, the correctness of which is impossible to check. This document is aimed above all against the activity of the missionaries, but takes also position against the access of any European traveller. Although the Lhasa government had been informed by the *ambans* that the entry of the foreigners was permitted, it protests against this imposition and declares that they cannot be allowed to enter. "Nous jurons, sous peine de mort pour les parjures, d'empêcher les Européens de parvenir même à nos frontières, et nous sommes prêts à subir la mort, s'il le faut, plutôt que de violer notre serment. Nous avons écrit ce serment solennel et nous l'avons livré au résident impérial à Lhasa, afin qu'il le communique à l'empereur". It concludes by giving the news of the successful action against the entry of Count Széchenyi <sup>90</sup>).

That the Lhasa government was in bitter earnest is shown by the stern punishment meted out to the administrator (*skyabs-dbyins*) of Tashilhunpo Señ-c'en Blo-bzañ-bstan-'dzin-dpal-'byor and to the P'a-lha *mda'-dpon* and his wife, who had befriended and helped S. Ch. Das in 1881-2. On the whole, the government of the Dalai-Lama stuck consistently to this policy till the end, merely allowing some exceptions in very special cases.

<sup>90</sup>) A. Launay, *Histoire de la mission du Thibet*, II, 154-157.