

The Emergence of the Regent Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho and the Denouement of the Dalai Lamas' First Administration

YAMAGUCHI, Zuihō

The regent Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho (1653-1705) was the mainstay of the Dalai Lamas' administration in the late seventeenth century and was most closely involved in political decisions that were to affect its fate. He appears in the biography of the fifth Dalai Lama Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho (1617-82) from the age of eight, entering the Dalai Lama's service as a personal attendant from an early age, and was appointed regent in 1679 at the age of twenty-seven not long before the Dalai Lama died. He called himself "chief of the sons" (*sras kyi the bo*) of the Dalai Lama, but as will be shown below, this designation meant "chief of the [Dalai Lama's] spiritual sons" (*thugs sras kyi the bo*), and he used the honorific form *sras* ('son') to refer to himself out of respect for his teacher.¹⁾ This was quite clear to Tibetans and foreign researchers familiar with this usage, but the renowned Csoma de Kőrös failed to grasp this fact, and in *A Grammar of the Tibetan Language* (Calcutta, 1843; p. 191) he mistakenly refers to Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho as the fifth Dalai Lama's "natural son." Later the great Tibetologist G. Tucci was to question this in his *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Roma, 1949), but nonetheless many representative Tibetan scholars have, with some exceptions, continued until recent years to refer to Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho as the Dalai Lama's son.²⁾

As will be seen below, it is however true that the Dalai Lama's treatment of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was such that it is hardly surprising that such suspicions should have arisen. While Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was still alive a certain Ngag-dbang from 'Phyong-rgyas (also known as Lu-go *bla mkhyen*),³⁾ a disciple of 'Dar-lo Ngag-dbang-phun-tshogs-lhun-grub,⁴⁾ who was an attendant of the fifth Dalai Lama under whom Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho himself is also said to have studied, drew up 208 questions regarding Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's *Baidūr dkar po'i do shal dpyod ldan snying nor* (1683; Zhol Ed., 633 fols.), a famous treatise on the calendar and astrology. In response to this collection of questions, entitled *Baidūr dkar po las 'phros pa'i snyan sgron nyis brgya brgyad pa* (NNG), Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho wrote during the years 1678-88 his equally famous *bsTan bcos Baidūr dkar po las dri lan 'khrul snang g-ya' sel don gyi bzhin ras ston byed* (BYS), in which he replied to each of Lu-go *bla mkhyen's* queries. Many of these were "soft" questions

and are full of obsequious flattery, but they begin with some references to Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's personal history, and these provide a partial outline of his life.

According to Lu-go *bla mkhyen*, the fifth Dalai Lama was a reincarnation of King Khri-srong-lde-btsan (743-97), while Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was a reincarnation of the same king's eldest son Mu-ne-btsan-po (775-97). This claim is based on the following statement found in the *Rigs 'dzin thugs thig*, a "treasure text" (*gter ma*) allegedly discovered in 1663 by gTer-bdag-gling-pa (1646-1714) of the rNying-ma-pa school, who had taken the tonsure under the fifth Dalai Lama in 1656 and founded O-rgyan sMin-grol-gling monastery in 1676: "He who is the incarnation of Mu-ne, [is endowed with] the appearance of a king of great intellect, and has the name of the Buddha will control the two [religious and secular] laws" (*mu ne'i sprul pa blo chen rgyal po'i tshul/ buddha'i ming can khrims gnyis kha lo bsgyur/*). Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho adds credence to this prophecy by stating that gTer-bdag-gling-pa and Rig-'dzin Padma-'phrin-las (1641-1718) are referred to in the *Secret Biography* of the fifth Dalai Lama (*gSang ba ['i nam thar] rgya can*)⁵⁾ as "the two related spiritual sons" (*las can snying gi bu gnyis*).⁶⁾

The fifth Dalai Lama's and Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's relationship with the rNying-ma-pas has already been partially elucidated by A. Macdonald in her article "Un portrait du cinquième Dalai-Lama,"⁷⁾ and it is clear that it went far beyond what was normally acceptable among the dGe-lugs-pas. It was for this reason that when the Jungars later made a surprise attack on Lhasa and killed Lha-bzang Khan, they persecuted the rNying-ma-pa school in Central Tibet, and after having repelled the Jungar forces the Qing 清 dynasty took the same stance for some time. It is to be surmised that this action was taken in compliance with the demands of Buddhists in Qinghai 青海, who had been on good terms with the first and second Panchen Lamas, who had in turn been critical of the Dalai Lama's links with the rNying-ma-pas. Further research is needed to shed full light on this issue, but it is at least evident that soon after the discovery of the treasure text in question gTer-bdag-gling-pa made a prophecy that ingratiated himself with the Dalai Lama.

The chain of events whereby the fifth Dalai Lama and Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho came to protect and develop the land of Tibet as "father and son" is described by Lu-go *bla mkhyen* in the following terms (*NNG*, f. 11a2-6):

In particular, when this sovereign and great protector (viz. the fifth Dalai Lama) was born as Brahmā's Flower, also known as the lord Khri-srong-lde'u-btsan,... he invited countless learned translators, starting with the second Buddha Padmasambhava..., and opened the way for the spread and growth of the Jina's precious teachings [in Tibet], on which occasion [the Regent's original being] reincarnated as his chief son, Mu-ne[-btsan-po] or Mu-khri-btsan-po, and entered into a father-son relationship [with the

king]. As is shown by this, in all their rebirths they are reborn as inseparable [associates] by means of the good path of connections between father and mother, [father and] son, [teacher and] disciple, priest and patron, and so on.... In the "Chapter on Firm Faith" [in the *bKa' gdams glegs bam rin po che*] it is said, "... because of deep karmic connections they will be father and son again and again in every rebirth," and therefore there can be no doubt that "father-son" [refers to] whatever is inseparable, such as [the relationship between] teacher and disciple in Buddhism and father and mother in the secular world.

Here it is thus explained that "father-son" is a symbolic expression of their "inseparable" relationship. The fifth Dalai Lama and Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho were referred to as an "inseparably" related father and son because their predecessors were Khri-srong-lde-btsan and his son Mu-ne-btsan-po respectively, and it does not mean that they had been father and son in all their reincarnations.

In response to the above passage, Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho comments as follows (*BYS*, f. 5a2-6):

In important texts of the science of medicine too it is explained that [there are] two [kinds of sons]: the son of a family [in a physiological relationship] whose flesh and blood are born from a young man's semen in dependence on the channel of flavour combining the body's four elements and food and medicine, and the son who upholds the lineage and practices of the Buddha-Dharma [in a spiritual relationship] born of the channel of flavour [which transforms the three disciplines] of listening to, thinking of and practising [the Buddhist teachings into *prajñā*]. As for myself, [I belong to the latter, and] although I wanted to serve him (viz. the Dalai Lama) immediately while accepting the code of precepts for casting worldly mental confusion far away and eradicating transmigration and to exert myself as his servant to the limits of my physical, verbal and mental actions, [enter] the Dharma lineages both new and old and exoteric and esoteric, receive his untainted views, and also be taught knowledge of various sciences at the same time, I was unable to wait upon him because of my age (1669). Although both I and many others [received] future benefits from initiations that develop those [sciences] and cause them to mature so as not to pervert his profound intent and from religious services that bring about liberation, and although I was suitable both in name and deed as a son (*sras*) who had been enabled to maintain to a certain degree the lineage of the true Dharma, yet I had an uncommon desire to render service to the [fifth Dalai] Lama in a way that would not inconvenience him, but I merely thought about it, and for about six years for various reasons I was unable to wait upon him and, without any great efforts in learning except for examin-

ing the pulse in medicine, I was diverting myself in the arts and so on. Then, in the year Wood-Hare (1675), there was a command to serve as regent [although it did not eventuate], and because I eagerly asked permission as before that my wish be granted,...

Here too it is clear that Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was not related by blood to the fifth Dalai Lama. Among the two kinds of "sons" (—in the text "son" is rendered as "*bu or sras*"), he identifies himself as a son who has inherited the Dharma lineage, and he refers to himself with the honorific *sras*, thereby expressing his respect for the fifth Dalai Lama. However, for the benefit of those who are still unable to abandon their misgivings about Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's origins, let us next consult the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* (*D5N*) and Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's autobiography appearing in the *mChod sdong 'dzam gling rgyan gcig rten gtsug lag khang dang bcas pa'i dkar chag* (*CDK*).

In 1652, the year before Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was born, the Dalai Lama left on a visit to China and was absent from the Potala for about nine and a half months during this year. To be more specific, at the start of 1652 he entrusted the final part of the New Year ceremonies (*smon lam chen mo*) at the Jo-khang to Chu-bzang-ba dKon-mchog-chos bzang (1648-73), the abbot (*khri pa*) of dGa'-ldan monastery, took his midday meal at the White Palace of the Potala, still under construction, and returned to 'Bras-spungs monastery. Then in the second month, his departure for China now imminent, he was kept busy meeting messengers from without and receiving people of all social ranks who had come from all over Tibet to see him (*D5N*, Ka, ff. 171b5-172a2). On the 15th of the third month, after all the preparations had been completed, a large array of tents was erected at Dan-bag-gling-kha, situated to the southeast of 'Bras-spungs monastery, and a farewell party was held, with leading figures from both religious and secular circles coming to pay their respects to the Dalai Lama. Needless to say, the gNas-chung oracle (gNas-chung chos rje) was also present and, having been possessed by a tutelary deity, made a fitting prediction (*ibid.*, f. 173b3). Two days later, on the 17th, the Dalai Lama left 'Bras-spungs monastery in a procession, stayed the night at lHun-grub-rab-brtan, and had his midday meal the following day at sKyor-mo-lung. By the 2nd of the fourth month he had arrived at bSam-grub-bde-chen in 'Dam (*ibid.*, ff. 174a1-175a4), where he stayed for twenty days until his departure on the 21st. During this time Guši Khan (1582-1654) and the regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan (1595-1658) returned to Lhasa because the former was unwell (*ibid.*, f. 175a6-b1). Having set out for China in this fashion, the Dalai Lama eventually returned to dGa'-ldan Palace in 'Bras-spungs monastery on the 11th of the eleventh month of the following year (*ibid.*, f. 220b1-5; *CDK*, f. 584a5-6).

Chapter 11 of the *CDK* also contains a brief autobiography of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, where we read as follows (f. 584a3-6):

... In a place called Grong-smad,⁸⁾ large enough to have the wherewithal for the collection of revenue,... A-sug, said to be a descendant of mTshurston dBang-gi-rdo-rje,⁹⁾ and my mother Bu-khrid-rgyal-mo were truly fond of each other, and it was because of this that there arose difficulties in that my grandfather, the regent 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho, drove my aged mother away to rGya-la-sa, and a woman of rNam-gyal-gling-pa in Tshe-thang was taken in as a maid for my father. At this time... it was said in a prophecy, "The sun of happiness will rise high in the sky. The tutelary deity Hayagrīva Vidyārāja will support her. Call him dKon-cog-don-grub,"... and as was prophesied, the new bride from Tshe-thang died suddenly from an ailment of the teeth, and my aged mother was able to return to Grong-smad from rGya-la-sa. At the same time I was conceived, and in the year Water-Female-Snake (1653), called *nam rgyal*, of the eleventh sixty-year cycle, I was born in the seventh month not long before the return of His Holiness the Dalai Lama from the kingdom of China.

It is thus evident that since the fifth Dalai Lama was absent from Tibet for almost sixteen months prior to Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's birth, it would have been physically impossible for him to be Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's father.

Next, I wish to elaborate on the above comments, including the account in Lu-go *bla mkhyen*'s series of questions (*NNG*, f. 12b1-6). Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's father was called Grong-smad A-sug or *mi bdag* A-sug, and he was the son of the fifth Dalai Lama's second regent, known as Grong-smad-pa 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho (?-1667), the name bestowed on him by the Dalai Lama in 1660. According to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, in 1637, when Gushri Kang (Guši Khan) was conferred the title of "Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King" (*bstan 'dzin chos rgyal*), 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho was in return granted the title of Jai-sang *sde pa* (*D5N*, Ka, f. 85b1), by which name he is also known, but his name prior to this is unknown. In 1632 he was appointed to the post of personal assistant to the Dalai Lama (*ibid.*, f. 69b1-2; *CDK*, f. 584a4). In 1635, during his comings and goings to and from 'Bras-spungs, the Dalai Lama would sometimes take his midday meal at A-sug's home in Grong-smad (*D5N*, Ka, f. 78a6), and in 1637 the Dalai Lama and Jai-sang *sde pa* studied the calendar together (*ibid.*, ff. 83a3, 86b1-2, 90b4). In 1638 Jai-sang *sde pa* was sent to 'Ol-dga' on account of some impropriety (*ibid.*, f. 87b6), but he had returned by the following year (*ibid.*, f. 90b4).

Although his relationship with Jai-sang *sde pa* is unknown, a person by the name of Grong-smad(-nas) dGos-pa-bkra-shis was active as a military commander during the upheavals of 1641 (*ibid.*, ff. 101a6, 103a3, a6, b2) and died at gZhis-ka-rtse in about the eighth month of the following year, with an elaborate funeral service being held in his honour (*ibid.*, f. 113b6). In a later passage

in the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* (for the 7th of the sixth month, 1669) there is also a reference to the achievements of a person called dGos-pa-bkra-shis, majordomo (*nang so*) of Grong-smad (*ibid.*, Kha, f. 82a5-6),¹⁰⁾ but since he belongs to a later period, he cannot be the same person.¹¹⁾

According to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, Jai-sang *sde pa* was subsequently sent as envoy to the Khalkhas with a request for the dispatch of troops (*ibid.*, Ka, f. 114b4). In 1644 he accompanied the Dalai Lama on a journey to 'Ol-dga', where he fell ill (*ibid.*, f. 121b2). It is also stated that from this year onwards many refreshments and other articles were delivered from Grong-smad to the camp of tents where the Dalai Lama stayed during the annual "waterside recess" (*chu zhugs*, corresponding to the week during the eighth month when Venus appeared) (*ibid.*, f. 123a6). In the eighth month of 1648 when the Dalai Lama fell ill, and again in the tenth month of 1650, Jai-sang *sde pa* looked after him (*ibid.*, ff. 145a4, 153b4). After having conducted the New Year's *smon lam* ceremony at the start of the following year, the Dalai Lama was invited to Pha-bong-kha, and on his return trip he received offerings and hospitality at Grong-smad and elsewhere and then left for Lhasa, arriving back at 'Bras-spungs at the start of the second month (*ibid.*, f. 154b2-3).

Then, prior to his departure for China, the Dalai Lama visited Yar-klungs, where he had been born, via Chos-'khor-rgyal (*ibid.*, ff. 159a6-170b5). As we have already seen, on the 2nd of the fourth month of 1652 he had reached bSam-grub-bde-chen in 'Dam en route to China and spent about twenty days there. According to a passage dealing with the period shortly before his departure on the 21st (*ibid.*, f. 175b5-6),

Grong-smad A-sug had been suddenly overcome with extreme mental depression through the malefic influence of a 'byung *po* demon, and so I [recited] a *mantra* and performed a little rite to improve his fortune, whereupon he fully recovered after half a month.

This A-sug was Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's father, who, as we saw earlier, had lost his wife from Tshe-thang, and after a period of anguish he presumably recalled to Grong-smad his former wife (Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's mother), who had been banished by his father. He was not actually accompanying the Dalai Lama on his journey, but when the Dalai Lama was about to set forth, he appeared to be suffering from depression, and so the Dalai Lama performed a healing ritual for him and subsequently learnt that he had recovered. Prior to the Dalai Lama's departure, the regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan had appointed Jai-sang *sde pa* as his assistant and also as acting commissioner of finance (*ibid.*, f. 177b5-6; *CDK*, f. 584a4-6).

In the entry for the 23rd of the fifth month we read (*D5N*, Ka, f. 178b6):

Because the manner in which a memorandum written by Grong-smad A-sug had been written resembled the snow pattern [of the seven auspicious signs], it was clear that it was a good omen.

The Dalai Lama thus considered it auspicious when he saw the writing of a letter from Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's father, and it is evident that they were on quite friendly terms.

On his return from Beijing, the Dalai Lama reached Rva-sgreng on the evening of the 5th of the tenth month of the following year (1653) (*ibid.*, f. 217b3), and according to the entry for this day (*ibid.*, f. 218a1-2),

I gave Grong-smad A-sug a fine, large pearl rosary as a present. Since Jai-sang *sde pa* would never expect more than that, [I gave the present] accordingly.

It is clear from the above passages that Jai-sang *sde pa* was Grong-smad A-sug's father, but it would appear that, as we have already seen, around 1632 he had yielded the position of head of his household in Grong-smad to his son and become a monk, directly attending upon the fifth Dalai Lama. After the Dalai Lama's return from China, Jai-sang *sde pa* continued to act as his advisor and intermediary (*ibid.*, ff. 223b6, 248b3, b5), and it is also recorded that he nursed the Dalai Lama whenever the latter fell ill (*ibid.*, ff. 224a5, 227b4). He obviously enjoyed the full confidence of the Dalai Lama, who writes that in 1656, immediately after gZims-khang-gong-ma's death,¹²⁾ he dreamed that he was being attacked by foes, whereupon he fled in the dark through falling rain together with Jai-sang *sde pa* (*ibid.*, f. 250b1).

In the eighth month of 1656 Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's father A-sug died (*ibid.*, f. 252a2).¹³⁾ Paper inscribed with his name was burnt, the place of his rebirth was ascertained, a service was held for his remains, and a large number of tiles with Buddha-images were made (*ibid.*, f. 252a4). Because Jai-sang *sde pa* appears to have gone to Grong-smad for the funeral and was not in attendance on the Dalai Lama at this time, the latter had to summon the steward (*gnyer pa*) of the Jo-khang to look after his personal needs (*ibid.*, f. 252a2).

Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho is mentioned for the first time in the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* in the entry for the 26th of the eighth month of 1660. On the 13th of the seventh month of this same year, the year after the suppression of *sde pa* Nor-bu's uprising, the Dalai Lama gave Jai-sang *sde pa* the name of 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho and appointed him regent, and at the same time the son of Guši Khan's principal wife, then known by the title "Upholder of the Teachings and Adamantine King" (*bstan 'dzin rdo rje rgyal po*), given to him on the occasion of his accession to the throne of Tibet in the first month of 1658 (*ibid.*, f. 258b2), was granted anew the title of "Upholder of the Teachings and

Dayan King" (*bstan 'dzin da yan rgyal po*) (*ibid.*, f. 297b3-6). The 26th of the eighth month came about forty days after the conferral of these titles, and it fell on two consecutive days, on the first of which "Grong-smad Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho came, and since then he has begun to serve permanently as an attendant" (*ibid.*, f. 298b6). At the time Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was in his eighth calendar year (—hereafter ages are given in calendar years).

In the second month of 1662 the Dalai Lama, on his return from a visit to Se-ra monastery and Pha-bong-kha, stopped at Grong-smad and took his mid-day meal there (*ibid.*, f. 314b3). Then in the tenth month of 1664 he consecrated the thirteen-year-old Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho (*ibid.*, f. 358a2), and on the 17th of the ninth month of 1666 he was invited to a service celebrating the completion of a new temple that the Grong-smad family had built at Chubzang, which he attended with an entourage of almost two hundred monks and laymen, receiving many offerings for doing so (*ibid.*, Kha, f. 22a2). That night he set out for 'Bras-spungs monastery, which he left on the 21st, travelling via Za-dam-klu-sdings to the hot springs at Chu-tshan-kha in the north in order to take the waters there, and on his return he had his midday meal on the 9th of the ninth month at Grong-smad and then returned to 'Bras-spungs (*ibid.*, f. 23a3). During this same ninth month he granted the Grong-smad family estates in nearby 'Phan-yul-gro-sa and sMon-mkhar so as to provide for Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's education (*ibid.*, f. 24a5-6). The Dalai Lama was obviously much taken by the boy's potential.

Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's grandfather Jai-sang *sde pa* fell ill during the first month of 1668 (*ibid.*, f. 43b6) and died in the second month, but by this time the young prodigy, now aged sixteen, was already standing on his own two feet (*ibid.*, f. 44b5-6). The *bstan 'dzin da yan rgyal po* also died during the same year (*ibid.*, f. 48a2). Towards the end of the year, when the Dalai Lama was suffering from pains in his left elbow joint, Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was consulted together with the next regent (*ibid.*, f. 72a4-5). From around this time Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's name begins to appear as that of the representative figure among the Dalai Lama's attendants, and just as had been the case with Jai-sang *sde pa* immediately before his appointment as regent, he pleased the Dalai Lama by looking after him when he was ill and telling his fortune (*ibid.*, ff. 72a5, b2, 74a3, 133a4, 274b3).

On the 1st of the intercalary eighth month of 1669 Blo-bzang-mthu-stobs assumed the position of the Dalai Lama's third regent, and on this occasion, as is only to be expected, Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho did not yet figure among the candidates for the post (*ibid.*, ff. 83b6-84b3). However, from around this time he began studying under the Dalai Lama and received various initiations from him (*ibid.*, ff. 113b5, 114b4, 122a5, 143b5). At the start of 1671 Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, now in his nineteenth year, again surprised the Dalai Lama by preparing an almanac for that year in accordance with the Phug school (*lugs*)

(*ibid.*, f. 106a2).

The Dalai Lama's treatment of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was by no means routine. When the ranking and seating of monks and nobles at official gatherings were being decided in 1672, the Dalai Lama decreed that thenceforth at large gatherings such as the New Year ceremonies a decorated area with seat and desk was to be provided next to his own seat for Grong-smad A-bar, that is, Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, who was still only twenty-one years old (*ibid.*, f. 142a5).

In 1674 the then regent was embroiled in a scandal involving a woman, and the following year he was compelled to retire to Zangs-ri (*ibid.*, ff. 203b4, 238b2, 241a1-6).¹⁴⁾ This gave rise to the question of selecting a successor. In 1675 during the preliminary selection of candidates, Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, now twenty-three years old, was included alongside Blo-bzang-sbyin-pa (who eventually became the fourth regent) and others, and in the final test by lot he came first among the four candidates (*ibid.*, f. 255a4-b2). The Dalai Lama initially decided to appoint him regent and even sought the advice of a tutelary deity, but was unable to obtain approval, partly on account of the fact that a succession of lay regents was deemed unacceptable, and also for other reasons apart from the question of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's wives (*ibid.*, f. 255b3-6).¹⁵⁾

Because Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho himself recommended Blo-bzang-sbyin-pa for the post, the Dalai Lama decided to appoint him for an initial term of three years (*ibid.*, f. 258a6-b4), although he actually remained in office until 1679 (*ibid.*, Ga, f. 125a2). Of course, during this time Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's political position is given increasing prominence in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, and he is mentioned as foremost among the Dalai Lama's attendants with the exception of the regent (*ibid.*, ff. 27a4, 35a6, 105b3), while his family's contacts with the Dalai Lama also become quite noticeable.¹⁶⁾

In 1679 Blo-bzang-sbyin-pa, who had now served as regent for longer than the initially proposed term of three years, was forced to submit his own resignation, in part because he was inclined to ill health and also lacked decisiveness (*ibid.*, f. 125a2-4). On the 13th of the third month the Dalai Lama sent a messenger to advise Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, who had until then declined to be appointed because of his age and lay status, that he wished to appoint him regent (*ibid.*, f. 125a6). Once his informal consent had finally been obtained (*ibid.*, f. 126a2-3), the Dalai Lama stated on the 13th of the fifth month that, unlike in the case of previous regents, he would invest the lay Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho with full authority in both religious and secular affairs and that Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho would have exactly the same competency as himself, and he promised to issue an edict to this effect (*ibid.*, f. 126a3-b1). He wrote the edict on the 20th and sealed it with the imprint of his hands so that it could be inscribed on a wall opposite the main triple staircase at the entrance to the Potala's White Palace (*ibid.*, ff. 127b6-128a2). Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was then installed in his new position on the 6th of the sixth month (*ibid.*, f. 132b1). The

section of this edict that is of particular interest to us here reads as follows (Tōhoku No. 5668, Ka, f. 100b2ff):

... At a time when the teachings of the great Tsong-kha-pa had been enhanced even further through the sincerity and strong determination of the Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma King (i.e., Guši Khan), in the year Water-Horse (1642)... when [the Khan] established all [sovereignty over Tibet] as a perpetual gift, I found myself unable to take control of both religious and secular authority, and so Regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan assumed responsibility for secular authority, whereafter because all members of his family died, I appointed Regent 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho and others in succession to bear the responsibility. As this Grong-smad-pa Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho is not only the grandson of Regent 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho, but in several prophecies such as the recently discovered sealed treasure text (*gter gsar rgya can*) he is warranted suitable for becoming ruler of Tibet, in the year Wood-Hare (1675) I urged upon him in detail the reasons that he ought to accept the responsibility, but because of his firm resolve I had to excuse him. The others did not win all that much support, and Blo-bzang-sbyin-pa, superintendant of rNam-rgyal College, had the most support after Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, but there was no pretext for ignoring the course of events, and the will of Heaven could not be resisted. Nevertheless, on a repetition of the test by lot, the result was [a warning] to exercise caution [with regard to the second-best choice], and I appointed him to the post, noting his term of office with the implication that if all went well for three years without any disturbance and if obstacles had then subsided, there could be a continuation,... and the possibility of a continuation also arose, but since the regent himself firmly declined because of the risk of some disturbance occurring should his term of office be extended, the test by lot was repeated two or three times, and because consultations with the oracle Tshangs-pa-dung-thod-can and so on also concurred, the way for the new appointment became clear. No other suitable person could be found, and I tried to prevail upon Grong-smad-pa Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho [who had been deemed suitable] in every previous test by lot, prophecy and so on, but in one way and another he was unwilling to accept. However, as in the example of the white conch and the sea monster (*makara*) (according to which the conch, if raised on milk, will eventually become a means for overcoming the sea monster), [he was unable to betray his debt of gratitude for having been tenderly cared for from childhood and] refusal was no longer excusable. Although it is most regrettable that henceforth he will have many concerns, if this regent continues [in his post], nothing further will need to be said....

Whatever is done by this person (Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho) is no different

from what I myself may do, and there are to be no debates meant to keep him in check and no ulterior designs in the measures taken by all others. Furthermore, should attempts be made to cause dissension between myself and the [new] regent, the interests of the government will be severely impaired and the adverse effects will be considerable, and therefore any scheming involving untruthful fabrications will not be pardoned. If it should happen that because of his age and so on his burden should become more than he can bear,... [the monkhood and laity] will cooperate so that he succeeds in the proper manner as was done for his predecessors who retired, and I will ask that the Dharma-protecting deities... untiringly grant assistance to accomplish the four kinds of ritual deeds. Written at the great palace of the Potala divided into the gateways to the four kinds [of attainment] on the second *rgyal ba* day (i.e., 8th) of the bright half of the fifth Hor month of the year Earth-Female-Sheep, known in the holy land (India) as *siddhārtha* and in this country as *don-grub*, and in the kingdom of the Manchu Emperor corresponding to the stem-and-branch called *gyi yi* (*jiwei* 己未). *Jayantu*.

It was further stated that although the new regent had asked to be ordained as a monk, it was decided that it would be preferable for him to remain a layman in order to fulfill his heavy responsibilities. This edict granting Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho enormous powers was dated the 8th of the fifth month in the Chinese calendar, corresponding to the 15th of June in the Western calendar. In China an intercalary month had been inserted after the third month of the previous year (1678), but since there was no corresponding intercalary month in Tibet until the sixth month of 1680 (*D5N*, Ga, f. 192a2), this fifth month corresponded to the sixth month in the Tibetan calendar, and the 8th of June in the Western calendar corresponded to the 1st in the Tibetan calendar. Moreover, in the Tibetan calendar the 5th fell twice in this month (*ibid.*, Ga, f. 132a5), and so the 8th in the Chinese calendar corresponded to the 7th in the Tibetan calendar.¹⁷⁾ This means that the above edict was issued on the day after Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's installation as regent on the 6th of the sixth month. According to Chapter 11 of the *CDK* (f. 585a6), the "recently discovered sealed treasure text" mentioned in the edict refers to the *Bhruṃ mtshan rdo rje rva gdengs thog mda'i rgya can* and its prophecy.¹⁸⁾

In the supplement to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* written by Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho himself, he refers to his appointment as regent in the following terms (*D5N*, Nga, f. 155a3-5):

On the 6th of the sixth month of the year Earth-Sheep (1679), an auspicious day, he declared that my being a reincarnation of the God-Son-King (Mu-ne-btsan-po) accorded with the books of prognostication; he consent-

ed to look upon a clod of earth as gold; as if placing the burden of an ox on a calf, he appointed me in control of both religious and secular authority, unlike previous regents, as well as [issuing] an official decree stamped with his own large handprint to the effect that all, both high and low, should treat me no differently from the Omniscient Lord Lama himself; and he granted me the authority absolving me of service except to the Wheel-Turning King or those who uphold their power according to the Dharma together with the Father Lord Lama himself and the Dharma-King gTer-bdag-gling-pa.¹⁹⁾

Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho then goes on to describe his own understanding of his position as regent (*ibid.*, f. 156a2-3):

As is made clear in the official edict granted in the year Earth-Sheep (1679), my wishes cannot be like those of ordinary people, nor can the chief of [the Dalai Lama's] sons who preserves the lineages of both religious and secular authority be anyone other than myself, but in view of the fact that during this lifetime I must give precedence to the secular on account of the power of vows [made in former lives]....

Here, as in the *BYS*, he refers to the fifth Dalai Lama as "Father Lord Lama" and to himself, presiding over both religious and secular authority while remaining a layman, as "chief of his sons."

In this fashion the fifth Dalai Lama vested full authority in his regent Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho. At this juncture it may be instructive to review the Dalai Lama's own achievements since the time when he himself effectively seized full power on the 13th of the seventh month of 1660.²⁰⁾

As I have noted elsewhere, the Dalai Lama's conduct had met with considerable criticism from the Panchen Lama, Chos-kyi-rgyan-mtshan, particularly on account of his proclivity towards rNying-ma-pa doctrine and his arbitrary political decisions.²¹⁾ When the Panchen Lama died in 1662, the Dalai Lama did not even supervise the funerary rites, but, perhaps in order to place his successor under his own control, he showed no delay in indicating his intention to chose the Panchen Lama's reincarnation (*ibid.*, Ka, f. 315a6), and the authorities at bKra-shis-lhun-po promptly responded accordingly (*ibid.*, f. 321a5). In the autumn of the following year the vice-abbot (*phyag mdzod*) of bKra-shis-lhun-po, who had served under the deceased Panchen Lama, died suddenly, with his place being taken by Phun-tshogs-rab-brtan, who had the support of the Dalai Lama (*ibid.*, f. 340b4), and progress was also made in the process of selecting the Panchen Lama's successor.

The selection of the Panchen Lama's successor appears to have given rise to considerable contention (*ibid.*, f. 349a2), and in the summer of 1666 the vice-

abbot visited the Dalai Lama with a request for active support (*ibid.*, Kha, ff. 16a6, 17a6). The vice-abbot then proceeded with the selection process in accordance with the Dalai Lama's instructions (*ibid.*, f. 39b3; *P2N*, Ka, f. 16a1), and in the tenth month of the following year the investiture ceremonies were completed and the second Panchen Lama took up his position in the presence of representatives of the Dalai Lama, the regent, and Dayan Khan (*P2N*, Ka, f. 17b6).

In the sixth month of 1670 the Panchen Lama, accompanied by attendants, visited the Dalai Lama and stayed about two months (*D5N*, Kha, ff. 97b1, 101a1). This established the Panchen Lama's subordinate position *vis-à-vis* the Dalai Lama during the remainder of the fifth Dalai Lama's rule, but this relationship did not last for long afterwards, and from the final years of the sixth Dalai Lama's incumbency onwards the Panchen Lama's presence underwent historical developments quite contrary to the fifth Dalai Lama's expectations.²²⁾

The fifth Dalai Lama had no desire to elevate the position of king of Tibet held by Guši Khan's descendants above that of the Dalai Lama's government. After Guši Khan's death, Qinghai was placed under the shared control of Dayan Khan and Dalai Hung-tha'i-ji, who were brothers by different mothers. Then early in 1668 the regent 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho died, and not long afterwards Dayan Khan died too. In the intercalary eighth month of the following year the Dalai Lama appointed Blo-bzang-mthu-stobs as the new regent (*ibid.*, f. 104b1), but it was only in the third month of 1671, immediately after the arrival of news that a disturbance among the Oirats had been suppressed by the future Bošogtu Khan that the investiture of bsTan-'dzin Dalai Khan was finally performed (*ibid.*, f. 108b6). Thus the fact that the power to appoint and dismiss the regent did not lie in the hands of Guši Khan's family was demonstrated on two separate occasions.

In 1663 (after the Panchen Lama's death in 1662), the incarnate lama dBen-sa *sprul sku* of the Oirats (the future Bošogtu Khan) visited the Dalai Lama, received full ordination (*ibid.*, Ka, f. 339a2), and became his disciple, and then in the eleventh month of 1666 he returned home, bearing the full expectations of the Dalai Lama (*ibid.*, Kha, f. 26b6). In 1670, when dBen-sa *sprul sku*'s elder brother Seng-ge was engaged in a conflict with Cho-khur-o-pa-shi's son Pā-khan Bande (*ibid.*, f. 54b1), he was killed by the latter's elder brother Cod-pa Pā-thur (*ibid.*, f. 104b5), and so dBen-sa *sprul sku* left the monkhood to take revenge and overcame Pā-khan Bande. A messenger from dBen-sa *sprul sku* reached the Dalai Lama, who had already heard news of these events, at the start of the fourth month of 1671 (*ibid.*, 110a3), and when an envoy was sent back in the summer of 1672, the Dalai Lama decided to reward him for his services with the title dGa'-ldan Hung-tha'i-ji (*ibid.*, f. 147a4, b4). This meant that the system of control over the Oirats, endorsed through the bestowal of the title

Se-chen rGyal-po on O-chir-thu Tha'i-ji in the sixth month of 1666 (*ibid.*, f. 17a2), had now been changed to one of divide and rule as in the case of Qinghai. However, the Dalai Lama's attempt to mediate between the two parties by dispatching envoys to them was unsuccessful (*VSM*, f. 76b5).

As has already been shown by Z. Ahmad,²³⁾ dGa'-ldan Hung-tha'i-ji began making attacks on Cho-khur-o-pā-shi and Se-chen rGyal-po from around 1676 and, having taken the former captive and killed the latter, completed the unification of the Oirats. Cod-pa Pā-thur had already been forced to flee to Qinghai (*D5N*, Kha, f. 158b2). Then in the fifth month of 1678 the Dalai Lama, having seemingly abandoned his policy of divide and rule, conferred the title of dGa'-ldan bsTan-'dzin Bo-shog-thu Khan on dGa'-ldan Hung-tha'i-ji and sent an envoy to deliver a seal and other articles (*ibid.*, Ga, f. 17a2).

As a result of this train of events, the Dalai Lama found himself pitted against the Khalkha Thu-shi-ye-thu rGyal-po, who had aided O-chir-thu Se-chen Khan and fought against dGa'-ldan Bošogtu Khan, and this paved the way for the Thu-shi-ye-thu rGyal-po's subsequent submission to the Qing dynasty. Meanwhile, the Dalai Lama's stance to be seen in his contacts with Wu Sangui 吳三桂 (Prince Pingxi 平西王 ["Prince Who Pacifies the West"]) during the so-called War of the Three Feudatories (*sanfan zhi luan* 三藩之亂) to be discussed below aroused the suspicions of the Qing dynasty, thereby widening the gulf between the Dalai Lama and the Qing dynasty even further, and consequently the links with dGa'-ldan Bošogtu Khan became of still more decisive importance during the rule of the fifth Dalai Lama. Since the Dalai Lama's contacts with Wu Sangui and his relations with Wu Shifan 吳世璠 have already been exhaustively explored by Z. Ahmad,²⁴⁾ here I shall generally follow his account while adding some comments of my own.

The fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* mentions a disturbance in rGyal-thang and prayers for the restoration of peace in the second month of 1674 (*ibid.*, Ka, f. 201b6). According to the '*Dzam gling rgyas bshad*,²⁵⁾ rGyal-thang lies to the northeast of a line joining Pong-rdzi-ra, 'Dzud and 'Jang, with Mi-li to the east and Lo-lo lying to the south of rGyal-thang and southwest of Mi-li. In recent years Zhongdian 中甸 in Yunnan 雲南 has been identified by some with rGyal-thang, but in the accounts of the then situation found in the *Qing shilu* 清實錄 (Veritable Records of the Qing) Jiedamu 結打木 (rGyal-thang) and Zhongdian in Lijiang 麗江 are clearly differentiated. rGyal-thang corresponds to the area south of Dingxiang 定鄉 (Xiangcheng 鄉城) mentioned by T. Wylie, and it presumably coincides with the areas marked "Upper, Middle and Lower Xiangcheng" in the *Zhonghua minguo ditu ji* 中華民國地圖集. It thus lies some distance to the north of Zhongdian.

According to the entry for the 17th of the fourth month in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, an envoy arrived from the Qing to report a rebellion by the "Imperial Prince Pingxi" and ask for the Dalai Lama's cooperation. The

Dalai Lama explains in his *Autobiography* that he was unable to promise any active support since he himself did not have any military force under his command, but upon consultations with his patrons the Mongols, it was decided in accordance with the wishes of the majority of their leaders that Dalai Hungtha'i-ji would immediately deal with the situation; moreover, although it was not known who the mastermind behind the uprising was, it was thought to be probably someone in or around lJangs, and as a countermeasure Prince (*rgyal bu*) bKra-shis (probably a son of Guši Khan by his Tibetan wife Er-khe-ha-thon)²⁶ was dispatched with the title Uljo'ithu Pāthur Tha'i-ji (*ibid.*, Kha, f. 204b3). In an entry for the seventh month of Kangxi 康熙 13 (1674) the *Qing shilu* states that an attack was to be launched against Imperial Prince Pingxi for having seized rGyal-thang, which belonged to the Karma-pas, and that, if captured, the prince was to be sent under escort, but no mention of such intentions is to be found in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*.

On the 6th of the sixth month the Dalai Lama received an envoy from Prince Pingxi himself. Out of regard for the Qing he had trouble deciding how to receive him, but then decided to accord him the treatment due to an official envoy. According to his *Autobiography*, he reprimanded him on account of the revolt, and while declaring that the Tibetans had no intention of turning against the Qing, also let it be known that in accordance with Buddhist teachings he would not refuse contact, although he disapproved of the use of force (*ibid.*, f. 211a1). Since Wu Sangui was one of the most powerful leaders under the Qing and held the rank of "imperial prince" (*qingwang* 親王), the Tibetans were initially unable to predict the outcome of this rebellion, and they were therefore unable to give a more definite response. But the following month Wu Sangui promptly sent a second and third envoy, and there appear to have been fairly involved discussions of the military situation as well (*ibid.*, f. 213b4). When these envoys set out on their return journeys, not only were they given suitable gifts together with the Dalai Lama's response, but they were also entrusted, apparently at the request of Wu Sangui, with an image of the Dalai Lama and a special thread symbolizing the religious connection between the two (*ibid.*, f. 215a5). Thus Wu Sangui's diplomatic negotiations proved successful.

On the 5th of the eleventh month of the same year, perhaps because prayers and imprecations had had their effect, the combined forces of the Tibetans and Mongols under Uljo'ithu Pāthur Tha'i-ji managed to secure complete control of both monks and laymen in rGyal-thang and Yangs-thang (*ibid.*, f. 221a1). If we check this against the entry in the *Qing shilu* for the cyclic day *yimao* 乙卯 in the fourth month of Kangxi 14 (1675), it would seem that the rGyal-thang area had been recovered as a result of political negotiations with Wu Sangui.²⁷ For this reason the Dalai Lama took it upon himself to submit an appeal to the Chinese that, should Wu Sangui be defeated, he be not put to

death, and at the time Dalai Hung-tha'i-ji's army was in fact encroaching on Qing territory. The entry in the *Qing shilu* for the cyclic day *yiwei* 乙未 in the fourth month of Kangxi 17(1678) makes it clear that the forces of Qinghai were acting in concert with those of Wu Sangui.

In the seventh month of 1678 the Dalai Lama received the last embassy from Wu Sangui (*ibid.*, Ga, f. 88b5), and according to the *Qing shilu* the latter died one month later. rGyal-thang appears have been secured by the Tibetans, whereupon a Tantric College was added to the monastery dGa'-ldan Sum-rtsen-gling that had been built there, and everything was put in order (*ibid.*, f. 88b6); an entry for the 6th of the eleventh month also mentions personnel affairs relating to rGyal-thang (*ibid.*, Ga, ff. 102b1, b4, 103a3). According to the *Baidūr ser po'i me long*, the original monastery (called rTsi-bzhag-dgon) had been completely destroyed by fire, and the above-mentioned monastery was subsequently erected in its place and began functioning in 1679 (*VSM*, f. 364a6).

Wu Shifan remained in power for a further three years, but there is no record of any contacts with him in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*. According to the *Shengwuji* 聖武記 (fasc. 5), a letter was seized by the Chinese in which Wu Shifan appears to have sought the assistance of the Tibetans in return for the territories of Zhongdian and Weixi 維西, while the *Qing shilu* shows that, after having intercepted this letter, the Qing developed an interest in the fifth Dalai Lama's true intentions towards Wu Sangui.

Coupled with the fact that the Dalai Lama had bestowed the title of Bošogtu Khan on dGa'-ldan Hung-tha'i-ji of the Oirats, the Qing dynasty had been harbouring growing mistrust of the Dalai Lama, and in the entry in the *Qing shilu* for the cyclic day *mouzi* 戊子 in the intercalary eighth month of Kangxi 19 (1680) it is indicated that, in their dealings with the Mongol chieftains, the Chinese would thenceforth switch to a policy of disregarding whether or not they had a letter of approval from the Dalai Lama. This represented the abandonment of the basic Chinese policy since the founding of the Qing dynasty of keeping the Mongol chieftains under control through the offices of the Dalai Lama, and the Dalai Lama would no doubt have felt enormous political pressure as a result of this move.

This entire state of affairs regarding the position of the Dalai Lama's administration in its relations with the Qing dynasty was passed on to Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, who emerged on the scene entrusted with full responsibility for dealing with the situation. The first important task with which he was faced was regaining control of mNga'-ris sKor-gsum, where the Dalai Lama's influence was on the decline. During the first half of the seventeenth century sTag-tshang-ras-pa (1574-1651) had spread the teachings of the 'Brug-pa school in Ladakh (La-dvags), but the dGe-lugs-pas had also enjoyed a certain following. However, in the second half of the century, after the Dalai Lama's assumption of sovereign power, the situation changed completely, for Ladakh was subject-

ed to pressure from the Moghuls of Afghanistan, converted, albeit nominally, to Islam, and was placed under Moghul suzerainty.

The difficulties encountered by the 'Brug-pa school under these circumstances were not confined to Ladakh, but also had a serious effect on the dGe-lugs-pas centred in mNga'-ris to the southeast. The Dalai Lama's government pressed the Ladakhi king for an improvement in the situation, whereupon the Ladakhis turned reactionary, and their military operations extended as far as Gu-ge and modern Mustang in the east. The Dalai Lama's government accordingly decided to resort to direct military action. The history of these events has already been thoroughly elucidated in the writings of L. Petech,²⁸⁾ and in the following I shall summarize the course of events on the basis of his research while noting some points in which our interpretations differ.

The Dalai Lama's government decided to send troops to Ladakh in order to demonstrate the authority of the new government in its response to the Ladakhis. dGa'-ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang,²⁹⁾ the son of Dāla'i Hung-tha'i-ji (one of the "royal brothers" by different mothers who wielded power in mTsho-kha in Kōkōnor alongside bsTan-'dzin Dalai Khan), was at the time a monk at bKra-shis-lhun-po, but he was forced to abandon his vows and then placed in command of the Tibetan forces in 1678. He surrounded bKra-shis-sgang on the border between Gu-ge and Ladakh and, after having been joined by reinforcements of fellow Mongols, soundly defeated the Ladakhis and pursued them as far as Leh (sLes), where he established his camp. The Ladakhi army pitched camp before the Byang-la pass and waited for the decisive battle, which it lost, and the Ladakhis then fled to the lowlands of Ti-mur-sgang in western Ladakh. The army from Lhasa occupied Ladakh for three years (1681-83), during which time the Ladakhi army managed to hold on to only Bab-sgo. Eventually the Ladakhi king asked the Moghul governor of Kashmir for assistance, and as a result in 1683 the Tibetans were driven back as far as bKra-shis-sgang and there besieged by an army dispatched by the Moghul governor and reinforced with troops from Baltistan.

The Ladakhi counteroffensive against the Tibetans thus proved successful, but in autumn of the same year the Ladakhi king bDe-ldan-rnam-rgyal was forced to pay a heavy price for the Moghuls' assistance. In his capacity as a Moslem he promised to keep the mosque at Leh in good repair, something that he had been demurring to do since 1665, and he also agreed to strike coins bearing the name of his suzerain, the Moghul emperor, and sent his younger son as a hostage to Kashmir as a guarantee that wool from Ladakh would be sent only to Kashmir. In addition, Purig and Baltistan were removed from Ladakhi control.

The Tibetans now launched another offensive, and on the 10th of the seventh month of 1684 a report reached bKra-shis-lhun-po from dGa'-ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang to the effect that he had regained control of mNga'-ris (P2N,

Ka, f. 89a3). Earlier in the same year Bošogtu Khan³⁰⁾ had sent auxiliary troops to reinforce dGa'ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang's army, and the Ladakhi king bDe-ldan-rnam-rgyal and his sons, unable to withstand these forces, abandoned their territories and surrendered. The Tibetan forces granted the king property, and on the 13th of the tenth month his second son and one hundred attendants arrived under escort in Lhasa (*D5N*, Ca, f. 73b6).³¹⁾ dGa'ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang made a triumphal entry into Lhasa in the eleventh month (*ibid.*, f. 78b2) and returned to Ladakh at the end of the year (*ibid.*, f. 88b6), and during this time the Ladakhi prince and others were ordained as monks (*ibid.*, f. 90a3). The Ladakhi king converted to the dGe-lugs-pa school, and his second son entered 'Bras-spungs monastery as a monk (*ibid.*, Nga, f. 294b5; Ca, ff. 90a3, 124a5). The efforts of Mi-pham-dbang-po (1641-1717), the head of the 'Brug-pa school who had been dispatched to Ladakh in 1683 prior to the Tibetan counteroffensive, seem to have been most effective in winning over the Ladakhi royal house (*ibid.*, Nga, f. 295a5; Ca, f. 124b1). Petech does not appear to attach very much importance to the role played by the presence of Bošogtu Khan's auxiliary troops in forestalling any interference on the part of the Moslems in the restoration of dGe-lugs-pa influence in Ladakh, but it is unlikely that the Moslems would have responded in the way that they did to the thoroughgoing restitution of Tibetan authority without any external pressure whatsoever. Although there are no historical sources positively confirming this, it is quite conceivable that the military strength of Bošogtu Khan may have acted as a deterrent in preventing the active intervention of the Moghuls.

In the end, the Ladakhi king was compelled to agree to the conduct of trade with Central Tibet and the payment of tribute, Ru-thog and Gu-ge were annexed to Tibet, and the king was also obliged to cover the expenses for the Lhasa *smon lam* and the newly inaugurated *tshogs mchod* service. In this fashion, the Dalai Lama's government gained control of strongholds and monasteries in and around Gu-ge, and a Tantric College was established at bKra-shis-sgang, while in Ladakh itself monasteries such as Khrig-se (Khri-rtse) and dPe-thub returned to dGe-lugs-pa jurisdiction.

Before he had managed to resolve the problems associated with Ladakh, entrusted to him by the Dalai Lama, the regent Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho met with an event of momentous implications. This was the death of the fifth Dalai Lama. The handling of the subsequent course of events became the sole responsibility of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, and because they led directly to the collapse of the Dalai Lamas' first administration, I wish to leave a full treatment of this subject for another occasion.

Addendum

After having finished writing this article, I realized that I had inadvertently overlooked an extremely important study by H.E. Richardson. In parts it parallels the content of the above, although our interpretations are not always the same. However, since I saw no reason to revise what I had written, I have made no changes in the light of Richardson's work, and I suggest that it be consulted in conjunction with the present article.

H.E. Richardson, "The Fifth Dalai Lama's Decree Appointing Sangs-rgyas rGya-mtsho as Regent," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980), pp. 329-344; reprinted in Hugh Richardson, *High Peaks, Pure Earth: Collected Writings on Tibetan History and Culture* (London: Serindia Publications, 1998), pp. 440-461.

Abbreviations

- BYS** Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, *bsTan bcos Baidür dkar po las dri lan 'khrul snang g-ya' sel don gyi bzhin ras ston byed* (Tōhoku No. 7035), 1685-88, 473 fols. (*The Vaidūrya g-ya' sel of sDe srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho*, New Delhi, 1971)
- CDK** Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, *mChod sdong 'dzam gling rgyan gcig rten gtsug lag khang dang bcas pa'i dkar chag thar gling rgya mtshor bgrod pa'i gru rdzings byin rlabs kyi bang mdzod*, 1697, Zhol Edition, 767 fols.
- D5N** Dalai Bla-ma V, *Za hor gyi bande blo bzang rgya mtsho'i 'di snang 'khrul pa'i rol rtsed rtogs brjod kyi tshul du bkod pa du kū la'i gos bzang*, Zhol Edition, Vols. Ka (364 fols.), Kha (281 fols.), Ga (246 fols.).
- D5N** Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, *Drin can rtsa ba'i bla ma Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i thun mong spyi'i rnam thar du kū la'i gos bzang glegs bam gsum pa'i 'phros bzhi pa*, Zhol Edition, Vol. Nga (360 fols.); *ibid.*, *lnga pa*, Vol. Ca (338 fols.).
- MTJ** mDo-mkhar-zhabs-drung Tshe-ring-dbang-rgyal, *Mi dbang rtogs brjod*, 1733, 395 fols. (*Mi'i dbang po'i rtogs pa brjod pa*, Chengdu 成都, 1981)
- NNG** 'Phyong-rgyas Ngag-dbang, *sNgon med pa'i bstan bcos chen po Baidür dkar po las 'phros pa'i snyan sgron nyis brgya brgyad pa*, 64 fols. (*The Vaidūrya g-ya' sel of sDe srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho, together with the sNyan gron nyis brgya brgyad pa*, New Delhi, 1971)
- P2N** Blo-bzang-ye-shes, *Shā kya'i dge slong Blo bzang ye shes kyi spyod tshul gsal bar byed pa 'od dkar can gyi phreng ba*, bKra-shis-lhun-po Edition. (*Pañ chen thams cad mkhyen pa chen po rje btsun Blo bzang ye shes dpal bzang po'i bka' 'bum*, Vol. Ka [400 fols.])
- VSM** Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, *dPal mnyam med ri bo dga' ldan pa'i bstan pa zhwa ser cod pañ 'chang ba'i ring lugs chos thams cad kyi rtsa ba gsal bar byed pa Baidür ser po'i me long*, 1698, Zhol Edition, 419 fols.

Notes

- 1) Honorific forms are also used when referring to one's own parents, but not when referring directly to oneself. An example of the former usage can be seen in the following passage:
kho bo ni rang gi yab rje dam pas khyim du gces par bzung bas (MTJ, f. 208b1)
 "Because I was brought up indulgently at home by my own father,..."
- 2) In *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Roma, 1949; p. 257, n. 145), G. Tucci writes as follows: "That Saṅs rgyas rgya mts'o was the fifth Dalai Lama's son is stated by Csoma de Kőrös, but I have found no explicit information in the Tibetan sources." Since then, L. Petech, *China and Tibet in the Early 18th Century* (Leiden, 1950; p. 9), H. Hoffmann, *The Religions of Tibet* (London, 1961; p. 175), and H.E. Richardson, *Tibet and Its History* (London, 1962; p. 46) all touch on this matter, with Richardson stating that Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was "widely believed to have been his (viz. the fifth Dalai Lama's) natural son." However, in his article "The Dalai Lamas and Regents of Tibet" (*T'oung Pao* 47 [1959], pp. 368-394; offprint, p. 12, n. 7) Petech draws a similar inference to my own, adding, "No Chinese or Tibetan texts, and not even the contemporary accounts of the Italian missionaries, so full of gossip, know anything about it." The Tibetan W.D. Shakabpa similarly writes in *his Tibet: A Political History* (New Haven, 1967; p. 125), "It is true that such rumors existed; but there is nothing in Tibetan records to collaborate the story." But G. Smith, *Tibetan Catalogue* (Vol. 1 [1969], p. 107; Reel B, 1-3), referring to Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's supplement to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, still writes, "Sde srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho (1653-1705), this great politician and author, was the son of the fifth Dalai Lama and nephew of the Jaisang sde pa...." As is indicated in the present article, Jai-sang sde pa was not Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's uncle, as is widely claimed, but his grandfather.
 In order to rebut the erroneous view that Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho was the fifth Dalai Lama's son, Phun-tshogs-tshe-ring writes in his *Deb ther kun gsal me long* (pp. 270-72), published in Qinghai in June 1987 at about the same time as the original Japanese version of this present article was completed, that Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, born in 1653, could not possibly have been the Dalai Lama's son since the latter was travelling to and from China between the third month of 1652 and the tenth month of the following year. I was able to consult this work only after my Japanese article had been published, but because Phun-tshogs-tshe-ring does not specify the month of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's birth, the possibility of his having been the Dalai Lama's son is not completely disproved.
- 3) His name also appears in the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, e.g., Lu-ma 'go pa sngags pa (Lu-ma 'go slob dpon) Ngag-dbang (*D5N*, Kha, f. 252a3/ f. 262a6). We also find the name *bla mkhyen* Ngag-dbang-can (*ibid.*, Ga, f. 177b5).
- 4) 'Dar-lo Ngag-dbang-phun-tshogs-lhun-grub's dates are unknown, but he was a Sanskrit scholar of the 17th century who translated several Sanskrit grammatical treatises found in the bsTan-'gyur. The Peking Edition contains his translations of the *Pāṇinivyākaraṇa-sūtra* (No. 5914) and Rāmacandra's lengthy commentary (No. 5915), and he also translated Anubhūti-varūpācārya's *Sārasvatavṛkkaṇa-sūtra* (Peking No. 5912, sDe-dge No. 4297). In the sDe-dge Edition, the translation of the autocommentary on the latter work (No. 4298) is also attributed to him, and there is a reference to this in the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* (*D5N*, Kha, f. 5a5). In addition, the translations of the *Āyurvedasārvasvasāra-saṃgraha* (Peking No. 5879) and *Amoghadarśineta-vibhaṅga* (sDe-dge No. 4443) are also ascribed to him, and according to Tibetan tradition the *Brahmavedasāraṅgadhara-caraka* (Peking No. 5881, sDe-dge No. 4440) was translated by him as well. He is further said to have taught and written about Sanskrit and Tibetan grammar (*D5N*, Kha, f. 94b3), and as is indicated by the fact that he was responsible for editing fasc. 4 of the *Gang gā'i chu rgyun* (Tōhoku No. 5587), a record of the fifth Dalai Lama's exoteric and esoteric studies (*D5N*, Kha, f. 160a6), he appears to have served the

Dalai Lama in a scholarly capacity (*ibid.*, ff. 127a2, 128b4, 136a3, 163b5, 166b1, 198b5, 225b1; Ga, ff. 30b3, 48b5, 66b3). In an entry for the intercalary second 10th day of the sixth month of 1680, towards the end of the Dalai Lama's life, it is mentioned that the great translator 'Dar-pa was seriously ill (*ibid.*, Ga, f. 195a6). According to the *CDK* (f. 584a), Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho also studied under him.

- 5) With regard to this text, see A. Macdonald, "Un portrait du cinquième Dalai-Lama" (A. Macdonald and Y. Imaeda, eds., *Essais sur l'art du Tibet* [Paris, 1977], pp. 119-156), p. 126, n. 11; p. 128, n. 14. According to the supplement to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* (*D5N*, Nga, f. 245a6), the *gSang ba rgya can* was written in 1686, which means that it postdates the Dalai Lama's death; its full title is, according to Samten G. Karmay, *rJe bla ma srid zhi'i gtsug rgyan mchog gi rnam par thar pa gsang ba las kyang chos gsang bar gyur pa'i ye shes sgyu ma'i rol rtse* *rgya can*, but I have not yet seen it.
- 6) See *NNG*, f. 9b and *BYS*, f. 5b. On the *gSang ba rgya can*, see n. 5 and *NNG*, f. 10a. Historical observations on these two important rNying-ma-pa figures in the context of their connections with the fifth Dalai Lama at this time may be found in A. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-47.
- 7) See n. 5.
- 8) sKyid-shod Myang-bran Grong-smad lies to the west of Se-ra and Pha-bong-kha and is en route from Lhasa to Pha-bong-kha.
- 9) On mTshur-ston dBang-gi-rdo-rje, one of the translator Mar-pa's leading disciples, see *Deb ther sngon po* (Kun-bde-gling Edition), Nya, f. 7b5ff.
- 10) It is stated that dGos-pa-bkra-shis, *nang so* (majordomo) of Grong-smad, had many achievements to his credit, constantly served 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho, had a strong sense of responsibility, and in particular looked after Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho from his infancy as if he were his own child, praying to the gods for their protection, as a result of which the estates at Grong-smad were all safe and secure, and he received the seal of a *dar khan*.
- 11) Between these two majordomos there was a *nang so* of Grong-med called Tshe-dpal, who died of food poisoning at the time of the Dalai Lama's journey to Yar-klungs in 1651, whereupon the Dalai Lama offered prayers for the repose of his soul at the request of Jai-sang *sde pa* (*D5N*, Ka, f. 168b2) and wrote a memorial tablet for him at bSam-yas mChims-phu (*ibid.*, f. 170a1-2).
- 12) On gZims-khang-gong-ma's death, see Yamaguchi Zuihō, "The Sovereign Power of the Fifth Dalai Lama: *sPrul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma and the Removal of Governor Nor-bu" (*Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 53 [1995], pp. 1-27), pp. 10-18.
- 13) He is referred to as *nang so* A-sug and not as paterfamilias, perhaps because 'Phrin-las-rgya-mtsho may have been the nominal head of the family; he is said to have died of food poisoning at gZhis-ka-rtse.
- 14) A brief account of questions surrounding the regent Blo-bzang-mthu-stobs appears in L. Petech, "The Dalai Lamas and Regents of Tibet" (see n. 2; *Selected Papers on Asian History* [Roma, 1988], pp. 125-147), p. 134. According to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, Blo-bzang-mthu-stobs's retirement from the post of regent was a political response to the Sa-skyapas, and rumours linking him with a woman had no basis in fact (*D5N*, Kha, f. 241a1-6). Even after his retirement he showed no hesitation in making frequent visits to the Dalai Lama up until the latter's final years (*ibid.*, Kha, f. 277b2-3; Ga, ff. 2b4, 14a1, 19b1, 41b5, 92a6, 99b5, 127b4, 164a2, 212b5, 243b5).
- 15) According to Chab-spel Tshe-brtan-phun-tshogs and Nor-brzang-o-rgyan, *Bod kyi lo rgyus rags rim gyu'i phreng ba* (Lhasa, 1991; Vol. 2, p. 642), Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho had two wives from the 'Chi-med-dga'-tshal and dPal-rab-khang-gsar-ba families respectively by whom he had three sons (Ngag-dbang-rin-chen, dMag-zor-tshe-ring and Ngag-dbang-brtson-'grus) and one daughter.
- 16) At the New Year in 1677 *dpon sa* Bu-khrid-rgyal-mo of Grong-smad, i.e., Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's mother, was invited along with monks to drink tea with the Dalai Lama (*D5N*, Ga, f. 28a2), and there are further references to her contacts with the Dalai Lama (*ibid.*, ff. 55a4,

- 99a5, 140a1). The name of dMag-zor-tshangs-dbang, probably Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's younger brother, also appears together with that of his mother (*ibid.*, ff. 96b3, 11a5). Although the reason is not given, she also visited Zangs-ri where the former regent Blo-bzang-mthu-stobs had retired (*ibid.*, ff. 140a2, 174b5). In early 1680 immediately before her departure for Zangs-ri (*ibid.*, ff. 174b6, 188b4) and upon her return, as well as on a later occasion (*ibid.*, f. 209b4), the Dalai Lama received Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's two siblings and his mother. Towards the end of this same year the Dalai Lama offered prayers for Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho's mother (*ibid.*, f. 217b6), and in the summer of the following year he composed verses for inscribing on eight *stūpas* that she had erected (*ibid.*, f. 238a2).
- 17) See D. Schuh, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des tibetischen Kalendarrechnung* (Wiesbaden, 1973), p. 166; Yamaguchi Zuihō, "The Significance of Intercalary Constants in the Tibetan Calendar and Historical Tables of Intercalary Months" (*Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989* [Narita, 1992], Vol. 2, pp. 873-895), pp. 891-892.
 - 18) This prophecy is also quoted in the *NNG*, f. 10a6, and it reads as follows: "If the underlings of dBu-ru are not ruled by demonic qualities, then he who is an incarnation of Mu-ne and has the name of the [Three] Jewels will pacify this kingdom of Tibet like the sun appearing through the clouds." The "Three Jewels" are interpreted as signifying "Buddha" (*sangs rgyas*), and the prophecy means that under the Dalai Lama's government, having escaped rule by the administration of gTsang, Grong-smad A-bar, bearing the name Sangs-rgyas, will bring peace to Tibet.
 - 19) It is not known by whom the *Bhruṃ mtshan rdo rje rva gdengs thog mda'i rgya can* was discovered, but in view of these words of Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho it would appear to have been endorsed by a text discovered by gTer-bdag-gling-pa.
 - 20) See Yamaguchi, *op. cit.* (n. 12), pp. 24-25.
 - 21) See Yamaguchi, *op. cit.* (n. 12).
 - 22) This is demonstrated in great detail in L. Petech, *China and Tibet in the Early 18th Century* (Leiden, 1950).
 - 23) See Z. Ahmad, *Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (SRS; Roma, 1970).
 - 24) See SRS, pp. 200-229.
 - 25) See T.V. Wylie, *The Geography of Tibet According to the 'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad* (Roma, 1962), pp. 39, 99, and 179-80, nn. 587-93.
 - 26) The use of the term *rgyal bu* ('prince') means that he must have been either the son of Guši Khan, the son of the previous king of Tibet, or the son of Dalai Khan, the current king of Tibet. One of the sons of the deceased Dayan Khan was called bSod-nams-bkra-shis, but he did not have the title of Pāthur Tha'i-ji, while none of the Dalai Khan's sons was called bKra-shis. Only the youngest son of Guši Khan's principal wife and father of Blo-bzang-bstan-'dzin, who in 1723 revolted against the Qing, was a prince and also had the title of Pāthur Tha'i-ji. These facts can be confirmed in dKon-mchog-bstan-pa-dar-rgyas's *Yul mdo smad kyi ljongs su thub bstan rin po che ji ltar dar ba'i tshul gsal bar brjod pa deb ther rgya mtsho* (DMC; 1833, 412 fols.), ff. 44b2, 49a5, and in Sum-pa-mkhan-po's *dPag-bsam-ljon-bzang* (PSJ; 1748, 317 fols. [Śatapitaka Series]), f. 310b. Z. Ahmad identifies the prince in question with Dashi Zheling Taji 達什凌嘎台吉 (SRS, p. 209), but he does not fulfill the above conditions. Ahmad bases himself on the *Qingshigao* 清史稿, "Liezhuan: Fanbu" 列傳藩部 5, which erroneously identifies the three grandchildren of Dalai Daiching, the son of Dalai Hung-tha'i-ji, as the children of the great grandfather, the name of one of whom (rDo-rje-mnam-rgyal) was further mistranscribed, a fact that can be ascertained in the *DMC*, f. 48b4, and *PSJ*, f. 310b.
 - 27) According to the entry in the *Qing shilu* for the cyclic day *jiashen* 甲申 in the tenth month of Kangxi 20(1681), Zhongdian originally belonged to Lijiang but was ceded to the Mongols by Wu Sangui in Kangxi 9(1670). Furthermore, the *Shengzouji* (fasc. 5) reports the interception of a letter from Wu Shifan asking for reinforcements from Qinghai in exchange for the cession of Zhongdian and Weixi. It is to be surmised, therefore, that rGyal-thang and Yangs-

thang had also been ceded by Wu Sangui under similar circumstances. Ahmad refers to letter(s) regarding the cession of Haojing 鶴慶 and Lijiang as well (*SRS*, p. 223), but he has misinterpreted the *Qing shilu*.

- 28) L. Petech, "The Tibetan-Ladakhi-Moghul War 1679-1683," *Indian Historical Quarterly* 23 (1947), pp. 169-99 (reprinted in *id.*, *Selected Papers on Asian History* [Roma, 1988], pp. 19-44); *id.*, *The Kingdom of Ladakh C. 950-1842 A.D.* (*KL*; Roma, 1977), Chap. 6, "The Collapse of Ladakhi Power" (pp. 57-80).
- 29) The *MTJ* implies that Pho-lha-nas bSod-nams-stobs-rgyas (1689-1747) was a reincarnation of dGa'-ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang (f. 12a5ff), and it therefore includes a detailed biography of the latter figure, according to which he was a son of Dāla'i Hung-tha'i-ji. Genealogies confirming this can be found in the *PSJ* (f. 310b) and *DMC* (f. 48b4). As is also mentioned in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, lHa-dbang-dpal-'bar, who was dispatched with auxiliary troops, was the son of dGa'-ldan bsTan-'dzin Bo-shog-thu Ji-nong, who was the son of Guši Khan's son Tshe-ring-er-du-chi (*DMC*, f. 48b1; *PSJ*, f. 310b; *D5N*, f. 122a5); he was, in other words, the great grandson of Guši Khan. Petech is, therefore, incorrect when he writes that he was "born as a Dsungar prince from the Hungtaiji family" (*KL*, p. 71) and later that "he left, perhaps for Dsungaria" (*ibid.*, p. 79). When subjugating rGyal-thang in accordance with his policy of divide and rule in Qinghai, the fifth Dalai Lama used bKra-shis Pāthur, the son of a Tibetan princess (see n. 23), but on this occasion he entrusted the task in question to siblings with different mothers but unrelated to bsTan-'dzin Dalai Khan. According to the *MTJ* (f. 25a2), after his triumphant return to Central Tibet, dGa'-ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang, having ignored Dalai Hung-tha'i-ji's attempts to hold him back, was accompanied on his return to Ladakh by Pho-lha-nas's father Padma-rgyal-po, a subordinate whom he treated like a brother, as far as the shores of Lake Yar'brog, where they reluctantly parted. Some time later dGa'-ldan Tshe-dbang-dpal-bzang repeatedly appeared to dGe-legs-rab-rgyas, a monk at bKra-shis-lhun-po, during meditation (*dag snang*), saying that he was going to seek lodgings with the Pho-lha family, and eventually news came that he had died in mNga'-ris (*MTJ*, f. 30a6). Memorial services for him are mentioned twice in the supplement to the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, on the 22nd of the twelfth month of 1686 (*D5N*, Ca, f. 199b4) and on the 2nd of the second month of 1687 (*ibid.*, f. 209b2), and in the latter case there is also a reference to a memorial service for lHa-dbang-dpal-'bar, who had hastened to his assistance with auxiliary troops.
- 30) Early in 1681 news was brought that dGa'-ldan Bošogtu Khan had subdued Yarkand and the surrounding area, and in the fifth month of 1684 an envoy bearing taxes collected in Yarkand arrived in Lhasa (*D5N*, Ga, f. 219b6; Ca, f. 51b3).
- 31) In a note referring to this passage, Petech writes: "Although this piece of information is given under the date of 20th November, 1684, it really refers to events of the year before" (*KL*, p. 76, n. 1). But the date of this passage is that of the day on which bDe-ldan-rnam-rgyal's second son, whom the king had been compelled to hand over to the Tibetans, arrived in Lhasa together with one hundred attendants, and the battle to which reinforcements had been sent would have taken place earlier than this, probably prior to the summer of this same year if one takes into account the dates on which news of victory reached bKra-shis-lhun-po and Lhasa. If the Kashmiri forces had already withdrawn before the winter of the previous year, then the destruction of the fortress at Leh prior to the summer of this year would have presented no difficulties. Yet for some reason Petech includes this assault in the "events of the year before."

Postscript

The first half of this article is a revised version of an earlier study entitled "Sesshō Sangyē

Gyantso no shutsuji o megutte” 攝政サンギェー・ギャンツォの出自をめぐって (On the personal background of the regent Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho), in *Enoki hakushi shōju kinen Tōyōshi ronsō* 榎博士頌壽記念東洋史論叢 (Collected articles on East Asian history dedicated to Dr. Enoki [Kazuo] on his 70th birthday; Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院, 1988), pp. 443-458. For the English translation I am indebted to Rolf W. Giebel, who is also familiar with Tibetan.