

**The Sovereign Power of the Fifth Dalai Lama:
sPrul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma
and the Removal of Governor Nor-bu**

YAMAGUCHI, Zuihō

Preamble

Many years ago, when historical sources were still not readily accessible, I wrote an article entitled “Kojitsu-kan no Chibetto shihai ni itaru keii” 「顧實汗のチベット支配に至る経緯」 (The circumstances leading to Guši Khan’s rule over Tibet; hereafter: “Kojitsu-kan”) in which I discussed the establishment of rule by the Dalai Lamas. Then in 1970 Z. Ahmad published a detailed study under the title *Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, but as was subsequently pointed out by A. Macdonald and myself,¹⁾ Ahmad’s interpretations of the Tibetan sources that he quotes are often questionable. In addition, Ahmad does not take up for consideration the historical process whereby the fifth Dalai Lama secured sovereign power, and it is this question that I wish to address in the present article.

**The Accounts Given by Klong-rdol-bla-ma, Sum-pa-mkhan-po
and the Fifth Dalai Lama**

According to Klong-rdol-bla-ma Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang (1719–94), the establishment by the fifth Dalai Lama of his rule over Tibet occurred in the following manner:

Guši, Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King, obtained all of Tibet and presented it to the Omniscient Great Fifth [Dalai Lama]. Becoming his guardian, Guši Khan himself resided in Tibet . . . for twelve years. (*TBN*, f. 15b6)

Sum-pa-mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal-'byor (1704–88), on the other hand, writes as follows in his *dPag bsam ljon bzang*:

Because in the water-horse year (1642) [Guši Khan], together with his army, subjugated Karma bsTan-skyong-dbang-po, king of gTsang and son of Phun-tshogs-rnam-rgyal, ruler (*sde srid*) of the region of gTsang, and ruled

over all the inhabitants of Tibet, he came to be known as “Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King.” Subsequently he himself became king of Tibet and appointed bSod-nams-chos-'phel as regent. (*PSJ*, f. 301a5–6)

There is no mention of the fifth Dalai Lama here, and it was not the Dalai Lama who appointed bSod-nams-chos-'phel regent, but Guši Khan himself after he had become king of Tibet. Elsewhere in the *dPag bsam ljon bzang* (*PSJ*, f. 107a6) it is stated that on the 15th day of the third month of the water-horse year (1642), that is, at the start of the year according to the Kālacakra calendar, “[Guši Khan] himself ascended the throne of Tibet.”

Sum-pa-mkhan-po and Klong-rdol-bla-ma were more or less contemporaries who lived in the eighteenth century, but they have given different accounts of an important event that had occurred in the previous century. Let us now retrace the actual course of events on the basis of the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* (*VRN*).

The fifth Dalai Lama, referring to early 1642, states that:

In the third month news arrived that the inhabitants of Tibet had come under the rule of the Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King [*viz.* Guši Khan]. (*VRN*, Ka, f. 106a3)

Then the *mgron gnyer sTar-sdod-ba* returned from gTsang with the recommendation that “because it is Guši Khan's earnest wish, it would at all events be best for you to go to gTsang.” There was also a message from the *phyag mdzod* advising that the procession should be kept simple. Because he found it troublesome, the fifth Dalai Lama “did not want to go, but since [he] could not follow [his] own dictates” (*ibid.*, f. 106a6), he set out from 'Bras-spungs monastery on the 11th day of the third month. Since times were unsettled, the Dalai Lama wanted to take a train of attendants with him, but he was unable to gain the consent of the *zhal ngo* (= *phyag mdzod*, *viz.* bSod-nams-chos-'phel) in time (*ibid.*, f. 106b1). The Dalai Lama took a mountain route along the north side of the river gTsang-po, passed through 'U-yug, and reached Thob-rgyal, where he was met by Guši Khan, the *zhal ngo*, and others.

At the first meeting with the King, he presented me with a bell of agate which had belonged to the 'Phags-pa Rin-po-che and a rosary, made of emeralds, which was a treasure to which all of Mongolia was said to bow down. They were said to be [a pair] placed to the right and to the left of the 130,000 households of Tibet, and were special objects that had passed through sNe'u-sdong-rtse (seat of the Phag-mo-gru-pa régime) to the Rin-spungs-pa family. (*ibid.*, f. 106b4–5)

This ought to have meant that, by being presented with symbolic treasures of religious significance, the Dalai Lama was recognized as having control over all

religious affairs in Tibet, but the Dalai Lama seems to be implying that he was also granted secular power with control over the 130,000 households of Tibet. Ahmad's interpretation of this passage is far removed from the import of the original sources.²⁾

The fifth Dalai Lama continues with his account, mentioning that on the 25th day of the same month he visited bKra-shis-lhun-po monastery, where he received a courtesy visit from the head of the Phag-mo-gru-pa, who had been the nominal king of Tibet, and bSod-nams-chos-'phel acknowledged his salutations in a suitable manner. Then, immediately upon the Dalai Lama's arrival at gZhis-ka-rtse, he gave a reception to countless Tibetans and Mongolians at which

it was announced that [along with various Buddhist treasures] all 130,000 households of Tibet, starting with the estate of bSam-grub-rtse, had been presented [to the Dalai Lama]. (*ibid.*, f. 107b3–6)

Here again it is declared that the Dalai Lama had become national ruler of Tibet, but it is worth noting that this important event is given no date.

Some Moot Passages

On the occasion of the above reception, matters of national importance appear to have been discussed, and the Dalai Lama writes:

Citing the biography of the Dharma-King, [Sa-skya] 'Phags-pa, I said to the patron and priest (*viz.* Guši Khan and bSod-nams-chos-'phel) that the return, as a matter of course, of the monasteries and monastery landholdings of my own [dGe-lugs-pa] school that had been previously seized was praiseworthy and that, as long as there was no important matter for Buddhism in the future which could not be ignored and no trouble from attacks on us, it would be gratifying for both my own [school] and all other [schools] if all schools were to remain as hithertofore, whereupon [Guši] Khan nodded his assent with his hands clasped before his breast. But I do not know whether or not this conformed with the ideas of the Regent [bSod-nams-chos-'phel]. (*ibid.*, f. 110a3–4)

The important point here is that the Dalai Lama's wishes were made known to both Guši Khan and bSod-nams-chos-'phel, and it is evident that bSod-nams-chos-'phel was subordinate to Guši Khan but not to the Dalai Lama. Moreover, if this passage is considered in conjunction with the earlier quotation concerning the Dalai Lama's first meeting with Guši Khan, it is clear that the above passage concerns only control of religious affairs, and it is to be inferred that Guši Khan, with himself acting as guardian, entrusted secular sovereign power to bSod-nams-chos-'phel while recognizing the fifth Dalai Lama not only as head of 'Bras-spungs

monastery and the dGe-lungs-pa school, but also as leader of religious circles at large. However, the fifth Dalai Lama can hardly be said to have become even a symbolic ruler of the nation at this point in time.

It should be noted that the record of events contained in Volumes Ka and Kha of the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* was edited by the Dalai Lama himself in 1675 long after Guši Khan had died.³⁾ This fact is impressed upon us by the following statement appearing towards the end of his so-called *Chronicle of Tibet* (*ZhG*), said to have been composed in 1643 at Guši Khan's behest (*ibid.*, f. 119b5):

On the twenty-fifth day of the second month of the water-horse year (1642) the kings and ministers of all the inhabitants of Tibet also bowed their proud faces to show respect and entered into the act of sincere obedience, and from the start of the year according to the *Kālacakra*, when the moon of the third month was full, he became king of the three divisions of Tibet and raised the white umbrella of the law as far as the heavens. (*ZhG*, ff. 109b6–110a1)

The subject of the second main clause in this sentence is Guši Khan, and nowhere is it stated that the Dalai Lama had himself become head of state in the previous year. Guši Khan's subjugation of Tibet was completed on the 25th day of the second month, and all that happened on the 15th day of the third month was that Guši Khan ascended the throne of Tibet.

In the *Autobiography* of the first Panchen Lama, Paṅ-chen Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan (1570–1662), an important witness to events of this period, it is also stated merely that the fifth Dalai Lama visited Bkra-shis-lhun-po monastery with Guši Khan and bSod-nams-rab-brtan acting as patrons (*rgyal po mchod yon sbyin bdag tu bskos*), and there is no mention of the Dalai Lama's having gained control of Tibet. The only other reference to the Dalai Lama concerns a visit to Zha-lu monastery on the 2nd day of the sixth month, and otherwise his actions do not appear to have attracted the attention of the Panchen Lama. (*PIN*, ff. 115b1–116a4).

The Dalai Lama's journey continued through sNa-dkar-rtse, his mother's birthplace, and on the return trip he visited 'Jam-dbyangs-dkon-mchog-chos-'phel (1573–1646), the former abbot of dGa'-ldan Monastery and Gling-smad *zhabs drung*, at gSang-phu before arriving back at 'Bras-spungs monastery on the 25th day of the fifth month. The Dalai Lama comments that during his journey bSod-nams-chos-'phel's attitude towards him became more respectful and formal than before, and so he too acted accordingly (*VRN*, Ka, f. 112a6–b1).

The Position of bSod-nams-rab-brtan

In 1613 the fourth Dalai Lama's *phyag mdzod bla ma* Chos-bzang-'phrin-las, who was a moderate, died, and bSod-nams-chos-'phel (also known as bSod-nams-rab-brtan) conducted the funeral service and succeeded to the position of *phyag*

mdzod (IVN, f. 46a5–6). In a recently compiled chronological table,⁴⁾ the latter's year of birth is given as 1595, but this date is difficult to accept since he would have been only eighteen years of age when taking up the position of *phyag mdzod*.⁵⁾ Moreover, in 1616 the fourth Dalai Lama died, with the *phyag mdzod bla ma* being closely involved in the subsequent selection of the new fifth Dalai Lama, and at this time he already had a disciple called Tsha-ba-dka'-bcu-pa Sangs-rgyas-shes-rab (?–1632), to be mentioned below, who was active on many fronts. Prior to this there had been some fighting between gTsang forces and the two sons of the Tümed leader Ho-lo-che from Kökönor (Qinghai 青海), and this I have already discussed in “Kojitsu-kan” and, more recently, in “Jūnana seiki shotō no Seikai Tumeto-bu.”⁶⁾

There were three candidates for the reincarnation of the fourth Dalai Lama, and according to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, the Panchen Lama and Gling-smad *zhabs drung* performed a kind of divination (*rtags dril*)⁷⁾ in front of the chief deity at Rva-sgreng monastery, birthplace of the bKa'-gdams-pa school, and as a result the candidate from the 'Phyong-rgyas-pa family was chosen to become the fifth Dalai Lama (VRN, Ka, f. 27a3–4). However, no date is mentioned, nor is this alluded to in the Panchen Lama's *Autobiography*.

As regards the genealogy of the 'Phyong-rgyas-pa family, the mother of the fifth Dalai Lama's grandfather had come from the lHa-rgya-ri-ba, while his father's mother had come from the Yar-rgyab-pa family. A member of the Yar-rgyab-pa family was the maternal uncle of Karma Phun-tshogs-rnam-rgyal (1586–1621), king of gTsang, but since 1611 there had been dissension between the two. The Gling-smad *zhabs drung* hailed from Gra-nang, which had close connections with the Yar-rgyab-pa family (*ibid.*, ff. 18b4–20a6) and was near Byams-pa-gling.⁸⁾

The infant fifth Dalai Lama was summoned by the gTsang régime and stayed at his mother's birthplace sNa-dkar-rtse, and even after he had been provisionally chosen as reincarnation of the previous Dalai Lama interference from the authorities continued in various forms. But eventually he was freed, and ultimately bSod-nams-rab-brtan's disciple (*sras po*)⁹⁾ Tsha-ba-dka'-bcu-pa came to test his recollections of his former life with the aid of personal belongings of the fourth Dalai Lama.

dKa'-bcu-pa showed me images, rosaries and so forth, but [on that occasion] there was nothing that could be described as a confirmatory examination. Yet when he went outside, he declared that the confirmatory examination had been totally convincing, and thereafter whenever he made me study, he would always say, “Do your best, and don't make me regret not having conducted a confirmatory examination on that occasion.” (*ibid.*, f. 28b3–4)

Once the selection of the new Dalai Lama had been confirmed rather arbitrarily in this manner by the *phyag mdzod bla ma*, the fifth Dalai Lama left

sNa-dkar-rtse in 1622 after having been privately instructed by Tsha-ba-dka'-bcupa on how to bless the people who thronged to see him. He arrived at 'Bras-spungs monastery on the 25th day of the second month, and on the 18th day of the third month he was tonsured by the Panchen Lama and received the name Blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho (*ibid.*, f. 30a2).

bSod-nams-rab-brtan's Protectorship of the Fifth Dalai Lama

Around this time *sde pa* A-dpal, the governor of sKyid-shod, once again intensified his antagonism towards the gTsang régime and laid plans to restore his former interests by utilizing Tümed forces. He inveigled the Tümed lHa-btsun brothers (Gu-ru Hung Tha'i-ji and Blo-bzang-bstan-'dzin-rgya-mtsho) into inviting the fifth Dalai Lama to Kökönor, and as a result of his scheming even the Panchen Lama gave his consent. bSod-nams-rab-brtan, meanwhile, took secret steps to prevent the infant Dalai Lama from being utilized in this manner, and on the evening of the 25th day of the fifth month, with the permission of the gTsang régime, he took the Dalai Lama to Ri-sgo castle in E, belonging to the lHa-rgya-ri-ba. There the Dalai Lama was looked after by Pad-dkar-chos-nyid bzang mo, who was to receive favours from the Dalai Lama far into the future, and he then returned to 'Bras-spungs in the fourth month of the following year (*ibid.*, ff. 30b5–33b3).

The Gling-smad *zhabs drung*, abbot of dGa'-ldan monastery, became involved in the education of the fifth Dalai Lama from 1627 onwards. Upon his appointment as head of Blo-gsal-gling College at 'Bras-spungs in 1623, his scholastic competence had been questioned by Gung-ru Sangs-rgyas-bkra-shis (?–1630), head of sGo-mang College. The abbot of dGa'-ldan monastery, who was affiliated to Byang-rtse College but retired in 1625, was himself not criticized of heresy, but in 1628 the Panchen Lama and the head of sGo-mang College denounced the fact that the Dalai Lama's study of exoteric Buddhism was entailing the study of non-Buddhist subjects. But the Gling-smad *zhabs drung* did not revise his educational methods. Subsequently the doctrinal differences between the Upper and Lower Tantric Colleges (rGyud-stod and rGyud-smad) also widened, and the smouldering feud over matters of doctrine gradually intensified (*ibid.*, ff. 44b1–49b4).

In 1631 the Dalai Lama, who had been distressed by these developments, again received an invitation from the lHa-rgya-ri-ba, and he was absent from 'Bras-spungs from the fifth month through to the intercalary ninth month (*ibid.*, ff. 59b5–66a5). Here too one may detect *phyag mdzod* bSod-nams-rab-brtan's great concern for the welfare of the Dalai Lama. In 1632 the Khalkhas of Sog-po pillaged mTshur-phu and 'Bri-gung.¹⁰⁾ and because the Hor-pa, who were under the jurisdiction of Tibet, set about revenging themselves, the gTsang régime was also compelled for appearance's sake to mobilize an army to quell this disturbance, and it asked the Panchen Lama and bSod-nams-rab-brtan to intervene. According

to the fifth Dalai Lama's *Autobiography*, it was bSod-nams-rab-brtan who actually mediated a settlement between the two parties on this occasion (*ibid.*, f. 68a6–b5). The same work also mentions on more than one occasion that bSod-nams-rab-brtan was forced against his wishes to maintain a cooperative stance towards the gTsang régime (*ibid.*, ff. 31a6–b1, 31b6–32a2, 65a2–3).

In the same year Chog-thu Khan of the Khalkhas invaded Kōkōnor and overcame the Tūmed forces of Ho-lo-che and the Yōngsiyebu and Ordos forces. Then in 1634 his son Ar-sa-lang murdered the Khalkha A-kha'i Da'i-chin and promptly gained control of Kōkōnor. The Karma-pas are said to have been in close contact with the Khalkhas from an early stage (*ibid.*, ff. 69b5, 71a5–6, 76b6, 79a1–2, 5–6).¹¹⁾

Events Leading up to Guši Khan's Rule over Tibet

It is to be surmised that bSod-nams-rab-brtan, who had been in contact with the Oirat Me-rgan-no-yon in 1631, had heard of Guši Khan, and in order to cope with the impending crisis he consulted with the patron mTsho-skyes-rdo-rje of the dGa'-lda family, dispatched a monk from dGon-lung monastery in Kōkōnor to the Oirats, and gained the cooperation of Guši Khan (1582–1654). It is also recorded that in 1635 Guši Khan visited the Jo-khang in Lhasa, observed the situation there, and then returned home the following year, and that around this time he met with Ar-sa-lang, who had invaded Central Tibet on the orders of Chog-thu Khan, and persuaded him to support the Dalai Lama (*PSJ*, f. 311a3; *TNL*, f. 5a1–3).

If this was indeed the case, then it is to be expected that Guši Khan himself would have visited the Dalai Lama and that the Dalai Lama would have naturally referred to this important fact in his *Autobiography*, but he makes no mention of it. One also wonders whether Guši Khan would have had sufficient time to travel from Jungaria to Lhasa and back again at this time. I have dealt with other associated events in "Kojitsu-kan,"¹²⁾ and one can only assume that *phyag mdzod* bSod-nams-rab-brtan's manoeuvres, including his thwarting of Chog-thu Khan's attack through his son Ar-sa-lang, bore fruit.

Sum-pa-mkhan-po makes only a passing reference to the fact that in the winter of 1637 Guši Khan visited Central Tibet and was conferred a title by the fifth Dalai Lama (*PSJ*, ff. 107a3, 311a5; *TNL*, f. 5b6). This was, however, an event of great importance. In the intercalary fourth month of 1626 Thub-pa Tha'i-ji of the Ordos was bestowed the title of "Tha'i-sun-hung Tha'i-ji" at dGa'-ldan Palace at 'Bras-spungs prior to his return home, and he in turn reconferred the title of "Dalai Lama" on the fifth Dalai Lama (*VRN*, Ka, f. 41a3–b2). *Phyag mdzod* bSod-nams-rab-brtan would no doubt have fully appreciated on this occasion the effectiveness of bestowing titles on the Mongols. Therefore, when it came to bestowing a title on Guši Khan, he installed a high seat in the Jo-khang, arranged for the twenty-year-old Dalai Lama to be present, and conferred on Guši Khan

with all due ceremony the title “Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King” (*bstan ’dzin chos kyi rgyal po*), a seal, and a golden image of bTsong-kha-pa. In return Guši Khan gave various titles to the Dalai Lama’s high officials, including that of “Dalai’s Vice-Abbot” (*dalai phyag mdzod*) to bSod-nams-rab-brtan (*ibid.*, f. 85a3–b4).

Guši Khan then returned to Kōkōnor, and the following year he advanced into Khams. In the autumn of 1640 he attacked the anti-Buddhist king Don-yod of Be-ri, who was based along the border region between Kōkōnor and Khams and wielded some influence in Khams, and overcame him towards the end of the year, whereupon he gained control of Khams as far as Yunnan 雲南. Prior to this, bSod-nams-rab-brtan had already asked Guši Khan to launch an attack on the king of gTsang (*ibid.*, ff. 96a6–97a3, 100a5–b1).

This course of events has also been largely dealt with in “Kojitsu-kan,”¹³⁾ but in addition it is also stated in the fifth Dalai Lama’s *Autobiography* that Guši Khan used to his own advantage the trust placed by the gTsang régime in bSod-nams-rab-brtan in order to extricate the Panchen Lama from hostile territory in 1641 and conducted successful military operations in which he outmanoeuvred the gTsang army (*ibid.*, ff. 99a6–106a3).

The fifth Dalai Lama had been chosen as the incarnate lama of dGa’ldan Palace at ’Bras-spungs monastery with the agreement of bSod-nams-rab-brtan, and he was constantly forced to play the role of puppet so that ’Bras-spungs monastery could utilize to its advantage the Mongols in general and Guši Khan and his associates in particular. The true nature of the relationship between the fifth Dalai Lama and bSod-nams-rab-brtan can be seen in the fact that the Dalai Lama invariably uses honorific language when referring to bSod-nams-rab-brtan and makes constant allusions to the latter’s changes of mood in response to different events.

The Fifth Dalai Lama’s Resolve and His Visit to China

The first step along the path whereby the fifth Dalai Lama, no more than an incarnate lama of ’Bras-spungs monastery, came to view himself as king of Tibet and assumed the reins of government was the construction of the Potala. This too I have discussed elsewhere,¹⁴⁾ but here I wish to cite a passage concerning the period towards the end of the sixth month of 1643.

The Gling-smad *zhabs drung rin po che* came from gSang-phu, and as he was taking a walk on the roof of the residence at Se-ra monastery, he said, although I do not know whether or not that is how it was in the rNying-ma-pa oracle that he had consulted, “If there were a very large fortress joining dMar-po-ri and lCags-po-ri, it would form a counterpart to the two great monasteries of Se-ra and ’Bras-spungs, being secure both now and in the future, and being a spot sacred to the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, if one were

to establish a *ma-ni* retreat there, it would be suitable for purifying the sins of both monks and lay people,” whereupon I said that as long as the Mongols were [here], there would be no problem, but otherwise I could not see why he should want to concern himself with a fortress. To this he said, “If that were the case, then you should carefully consider whether there would be any cause for outrageous disturbances to occur as has been the case up until now. Hitherto, whenever an unrelated disturbance occurred, we fled to the north until it had been settled, and this was regrettable for Buddhism. Whereas it is now the time to act in this manner, it would be impossible to retrieve the teachings of the great bTsong-kha-pa if they were flushed away, and so I want you to clench your teeth and realize your original objective.” he thus gave me a broad range of advice for the present and future. (*ibid.*, f. 118a4–b1)

In this manner the fifth Dalai Lama was urged to become the real ruler of Tibet. On the 25th day of the third month, 1645, the ground-breaking ceremony for the construction of the White Palace of the Potala was performed, followed by the start of construction work on the 1st day of the fourth month (*ibid.*, ff. 125b4–127b2), and in 1648 the palace was more or less completed (*ibid.*, f. 142a3–b4). In the fifth month of the following year a simple ceremony was performed to celebrate the completion of the palace, and the Dalai Lama saw in the new year of 1650 in the Potala. But as will be seen later, it was only after he had gained complete sovereign power in 1660 that he took up permanent residence here in what was a symbolic move.

Around the time when the Potala was being built, the fifth Dalai Lama found himself in something of a quandary. This was because the Chinese Qing 清 dynasty had invited him to visit Beijing 北京. In 1640, 1646 and 1647 he sent envoys to newly emerging Qing China (*ibid.*, ff. 124a4–5, 133a3–4, 135b4–5, 137b4–5). The Chinese attached particular importance to the Dalai Lama’s influence over the Mongols, and eventually an imperial envoy with an invitation for the Dalai Lama to visit Beijing was sent to accompany a Tibetan embassy on its return to Tibet (*ibid.*, ff. 138b5, 139a4–6, 146a1–2).

With regard to relations between China, Tibet and Mongolia, some say that it is the relationship of monk and patron, while others say that an oath that Tibet is not under vassalage has not been made. (*ibid.*, f. 146a4)

In spite of such thoughts, however, the Dalai Lama accepted the invitation for fear of the consequences of declining (*ibid.*, f. 147a3–4), with Chinese envoys to further prompt him arriving in 1650 (*ibid.*, f. 152a3–4, 6) and 1651 (*ibid.*, ff. 158b6–159a1), and because the third envoy went so far as to specify the date of his expected arrival in Beijing, he promised to arrive in the seventh month of 1652 (*ibid.*, ff. 159a6, 160a1–2). I have described the Dalai Lama’s visit to Beijing elsewhere,¹⁵⁾ I will not repeat myself here, apart from noting that he set out from

'Bras-spungs monastery on the 17th day of the third month, 1652, and arrived back at dGa'-ldan Palace in 'Bras-spungs monastery on the 11th day of the eleventh month of the following year (*ibid.*, ff. 174a1-2, 220b1-4).

In the second month of 1653 the Dalai Lama, who was still in Beijing, asked for permission to return to Tibet, and on the 18th day of the same month a farewell banquet was held at the Taihe 太和 Palace; two days later he set out for Daiga 代噶 accompanied by Shisai 碩塞 and others (*ibid.*, ff. 202a3-204a5). On the 29th day of the fourth month, while he was at Daiga, an envoy from the Chinese emperor arrived to present him with a golden seal and golden letters-patent inscribed with the title "Great, Good, Self-Sovereign Buddha of the Western Heaven, . . ." At the same time he was also entrusted with a golden seal and golden letters-patent to be delivered to Guši Khan upon his return to Tibet (*ibid.*, ff. 208a5, 209a6-b3, 221a6; *Shilu*, Shunzhi 順治 10, 4th moth, *dingsi* 丁巳). The Dalai Lama left Daiga on the 1st day of the intercalary fifth month (*ibid.*, f. 210a3).

This visit to Beijing by the Dalai Lama had eventuated as a result of a submission that Guši Khan had presented to the Qing court on the 17th day of the ninth month, 1643, to the effect that the Dalai Lama was of enormous virtue and ought to be invited to the capital in order to recite the scriptures for the blessings that would accrue (*Shilu*), but it went against the Dalai Lama's own wishes and resulted in a public acknowledgement of his own position of subordination to the Qing court. But of greater future significance for the Dalai Lama was the fact that he had managed to persuade the Qing court to recognize the fact that he had been installed as a religious authority by Guši Khan, who appeared to be supporting his power from below. Moreover, within this scheme of things bSod-nams-rab-brtan was granted no authority whatsoever. This was because in reality the Dalai Lama and bSod-nams-rab-brtan did not stand on an equal footing as religious and secular authorities respectively under Guši Khan, whom they had made "Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King," and instead the Dalai Lama occupied the lowest position among these three as the puppet of bSod-nams-rab-brtan and was constantly concerning himself about the latter's intentions. But this new ranking had no bearings on actual sovereign power, and it did not have any practical significance until both Guši Khan and bSod-nams-rab-brtan had died.

Paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa's Reincarnation

The fifth Dalai Lama was an incarnate lama (*sprul sku*) of 'Bras-spungs monastery, but there was another incarnate lama at 'Bras-spungs monastery, namely, *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma, regarded as a reincarnation of Paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa (1478-1554). For the Dalai Lama to become the supreme religious authority in all Tibet, it was imperative that only a single incarnate lama in the person of the Dalai Lama preside over 'Bras-spungs monastery from his headquarters at dGa'-ldan Palace. Moreover, the incumbent *sprul sku* gZims-khangs-gong-ma happened to be a member of the Gad-kha-sa family, which had

put forward a rival candidate for the position of fifth Dalai Lama, and he was also a leading disciple of the panchen Lama, who was constantly at odds with the Gling-smad *zhabs drung*. This too was no doubt a remote cause of the ensuing tragedy.

Whereas dGe-'dun-rgya-mtsho (1475–1542), who became the second Dalai Lama, had declared himself the reincarnation of dGe-'dun-grub and acted in response to the demands of the times so as to counter the political moves of the reincarnated head of the Karma-pas, who had joined hands with the Rin-spungs-pa family, his contemporary Paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa had been a great scholar who had emerged from the formal training programme within the framework of orthodox dGe-lugs-pa doctrine, and in 1529 he became chief abbot of dGa'-ldan monastery and head of the dGe-lugs-pa school.

dGe-'dun-rgyal-mtsho was recognized for his efforts in building Chos-'khor-rgyal in 1509, and in 1512 he attained his long-cherished ambition of becoming chief abbot of bKra-shis-lhun-po monastery. Following the defeat of the Rin-spungs-pa in 1517, he returned to eastern Central Tibet, becoming chief abbot of 'Bras-spungs monastery in 1518, and in 1525 he was also appointed chief abbot of Se-ra monastery. After he died in 1542, bSod-nams-grags-pa became chief abbot of 'Bras-spungs monastery in 1543.

(In the following I have referred to the *Dam can rgya mtsho dgyes pa'i rol mo* [DGG], compiled by *yongs 'dzin dGa' ldan khri byang Blo-bzang-ye-shes-bstan-'dzin-rgya-mtsho*, for information on gZims-khang-gong-ma.)

In 1546 bSod-nams-grags-pa became chief abbot of Se-ra monastery as well, but in 1551 he retired to the gZims-khang-gong ("Upper Residence") at 'Bras-spungs monastery, handing over the position of chief abbot to bSod-nams-rgya-mtsho (1543–88), the reincarnation of dGe-'dun-rgya-mtsho who had entered 'Bras-spungs monastery in 1546, and bSod-nams-grags-pa died in 1554. Around this time the dGe-lugs-pas appear to have begun to approach the selection of incarnate lamas in all earnest, and bSod-nams-grags-pa's reincarnation bSod-nams-ye-shes-dbang-po (1556–92) was placed in the care of 'Bras-spungs monastery in 1559 (DGG, ff. 23b6–24a2).

It is a well-known fact that, whatever his reasons may have been, the fifth Dalai Lama disliked paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa. In his *Chronicle of Tibet*, the Dalai Lama criticizes Paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa more than once along with the Karma-pa dPa-'bo-gtsug-lag-'phreng-ba (1504–66) (*ZhG*, ff. 32a5–6, 40a5–6). This *Chronicle of Tibet* is itself modelled on Paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa's *Deb ther dmar po'i deb gsar ma*, of which it is essentially an enlargement that today might be described as a plagiary, and this again gives an indication of the intensity of the Dalai Lama's feelings towards bSod-nams-grags-pa. In his *Autobiography* too the Dalai Lama rightly or wrongly declares that this Panchen's discussion of the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* is "replete with useless obsolete words" (VRN, Ka, f. 51b3–4).

sPrul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma

The third reincarnation of gZims-khang-gong-ma, Ngag-dbang-bsod-nams-dge-legs-dpal-bzang-po (1594–1615), was a disciple of the Panchen Lama (*DGG*, ff. 24b6–26a1). His reincarnation Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po (1619–56) was chosen from the Gad-kha-sa family of sTod-lung (*ibid.*, f. 26a2–3; *VRN*, Ka, f. 30a–4–5), and in the third month of 1622, on the day on which the fifth Dalai Lama received the tonsure, the majordomo (*nang so*) of the Gad-kha-sa family appeared at the gZims-khang-gong in 'Bras-spungs monastery (*VRN*, Ka, f. 30a5). This was rather disconcerting for the Dalai Lama since several years earlier A-rgyal of the same Gad-kha-sa family had claimed that her own son (i.e.? elder brother of Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan) was the fifth Dalai Lama and had told the Gling-smad *zhabs drung* and others that “immediately before this infant of mine was conceived the omniscient Yon-tan-rgya-mtsho appeared [in a dream] and said, ‘Give me a home.’” (*ibid.*, f. 27a2–3)

From the very outset the presence of this incarnate lama weighed heavily on the fifth Dalai Lama. Two years later, when the former was six years old, he was formally recognized by the Panchen Lama as the reincarnation of the previous gZims-khang-gong-ma, whereupon he moved to the gZims-khang-gong, and the following year he received the precepts of a novice monk; he was fully ordained in 1638. During this time he received instruction primarily from the Panchen Lama, sometimes also going to stay at bKra-shis-lhun-po monastery (*DGG*, ff. 26a3–27a5).

In the section on the New Year of 1634 in his *Autobiography*, the fifth Dalai Lama writes:

From this time right through to the iron-serpent [year] (1641) the incarnate lama of the gZims-khang-gong, next to me in rank, continued to attend the *smon lam*. (*VRN*, Ka, f. 75a5)

This could be taken to imply that the Dalai Lama found his presence insufferable. But of course the Panchen Lama's influence would have played a part in his treatment, although in 1642, as will be seen below, he was reduced in rank.

Next there occurred an incident that shows that the Dalai Lama and *phyag mdzod* bSod-nams-rab-brtan were together shunning the *sprul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma*. It is described in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* in the entry for the 15th day of the fifth month, 1639.

bKra-shis-rgya-mtsho, the senior monk (*dbu mdzad*) when the whole monastery assembles, said that he had finished writing a prayer to the successive predecessors of *sprul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma*, starting from the Kashmir

Paṇḍita and Bu-ston Rin-po-che, whereupon the Venerable [*phyag mdzod*] said that because Paṇ-chen Rin-po-che and Gling-smad *zhabs drung* say that Bu-ston Rin-po-che was misunderstood in the colophon of one of paṇ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa's treatises (cf. *DGG*, f. 9b4), [these successive predecessors] are not appropriate, and so an ordinary prayer was used and the documents not wanted by him (*viz.* the *phyag mdzod*) were disposed of. (*VRN*, Ka, f. 91b4–6)

In the *DGG* this incident is described as an “act of calumny” (*dbyen dkrugs kyi sbyor ba*) and elaborated on in the following manner:

The fact that nothing of the sort is to be found in the [written] word of Paṇ-chen Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan is clear from “E-waṁ” in Volume Ca of the bKra-shis-lhun-po edition of the authentic complete works of the Paṇ-chen himself, and in his prayer to the successive predecessors of the *sprul sku* Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan there are listed in order “Magadha bzang mo Kha-che Paṇ-chen Shā-kyā-shri, . . . Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, Kun-dga'-blo-gros, Paṇ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa, . . . Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan.” In view of this, the fault of this being an example of *zhal ngo* bSod-nams-rab-brtan's tendency to detest *sprul sku* Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan gZims-khang-gong from the depths of his heart is patently obvious. (*DGG*, f. 9a6–b3)

The Ordeals of the Gad-kha-sa Family

In 1638, one year prior to the above incident, a far more serious incident had already occurred.

Because some young members of the Gad-kha-sa family were killed by Mongols, [majordomo Nor-bu] wanted to obtain [their land], and so he seized it. (*VRN*, Ka, f. 88 1)

As will be seen later, majordomo Nor-bu was looked upon as *phyag mdzod* bSod-nams-rab-brtan's successor, but because he was subsequently ousted by the fifth Dalai Lama, in the latter's *Autobiography*, compiled after the Dalai Lama's assumption of power, he is portrayed as having always acted violently. But since this incident would have suited the Dalai Lama's own purposes, he probably feigned ignorance of it. The Gad-kha-sa family was the family of *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma, and according to the *DDG*, the above incident occurred while the *sprul sku*, then nineteen years of age, was staying at his parental home; it is also stated that he was asked by his parents on this occasion to return to secular life, but refused to do so (*DGG*, ff. 33a6–34a5).

It is not clear whether the majordomo of the Gad-kha-sa family at this time was identical to the majordomo who had figured at the time of the request for the

recognition of the reincarnation of gZims-khang-gong-ma (VRN, Ka, f. 30a5) or to the majordomo to be mentioned below, but they were all regarded favourably by the fifth Dalai Lama. Prior to this the Dalai Lama alludes in his *Autobiography* to the attendance of *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma at the New Year's *smon lam* in 1633, and he also mentions that he visited the home of the Gad-kha-sa family (*ibid.*, ff. 70b5, 71a4). In the sixth month of 1636 the Dalai Lama betook himself to Chos-'khor-rgyal at the suggestion of their majordomo (*ibid.*, f. 82a4–6).

There is no evidence that the Mongols were tyrannizing Central Tibet at the time. Even after Guši Khan set out to pacify Khams after having been appointed "Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King" in 1637, the respect commanded by the Gling-smad *zhabs drung* ensured that there were no widespread disturbances (*ibid.*, ff. 85b3–86a2). That being so, one could speculate that it was majordomo Nor-bu who had mobilized the Mongols in order to realize his own ambitions.

sPrul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma, who found himself in unfortunate circumstances, received instruction from the Panchen Lama at 'Bras-spungs monastery in 1641 (PIN, f. 113b1; DGG, f. 26b3) and went to bKra-shis-lhun-po monastery in 1646 and late 1651 for further personal instruction, whereupon he returned to lhasa (PIN, ff. 130a4–131a2, 142a5; DGG, ff. 26b4–27a3). His name also appears among a list of people who received initiation from the fifth Dalai Lama in the fifth month of 1651 (VRN, Ka, f. 155a3; DGG, f. 27a3–5). In addition, when the Dalai Lama departed for China in the third month of 1652, *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma treated him to a midday meal at sKyor-mo-lung on the 18th day of the same month (VRN, Ka, f. 174a5) and accompanied him as far as bSam-grub-bde-chen in 'Dam (*ibid.*, f. 175a4–5; DGG, f. 27a5–6).

As is set forth in the DGG (f. 27a6–b4), upon the Dalai Lama's return from China in 1653, *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma hastened from sPo-bo Chu-mdo to present him with a gift on the 3rd day of the twelfth month (VRN, Ka, f. 221a6–b1), and when the Dalai Lama returned from a visit to the Panchen Lama in 1654, he went to meet him on the 25th day of the ninth month (*ibid.*, f. 230b1), while on the 11th day of the tenth month he invited him to a midday meal at the gZims-khang-gong (*ibid.*, f. 231b4–5).

At about this time Guši Khan fell ill (*ibid.*, ff. 229a1–2, 230a2–4, 230b1, 5–6, 231a3, 232a2–4, 232b6), and he died on the 7th day of the twelfth month, 1654 (*ibid.*, f. 233a4–6), whereupon private funeral rites were held (*ibid.*, ff. 234a3–235b5, 235a4–5, 236a3). He was cremated on the 23rd day of the eleventh month, 1655, upon the completion of a memorial chapel (*ibid.*, f. 244b3–4).

The fifth Dalai Lama was now faced with a problem. With the sanction of the Qing court he had made his patron Guši Khan recognize himself as standing above Guši Khan, but he had not been granted power to appoint the regent. If Guši Khan's successor were to inherit a powerful position, the Dalai Lama would have no choice but to acknowledge the successor's exercise of his power to appoint the regent. But difficulties arose concerning Guši Khan's successor, and so

bSod-nams-rab-brtan postponed the designation of an “Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King” (*ibid.*, f. 237a5–6). The Dalai Lama skilfully manipulated this question of Guši Khan’s successor, ultimately ensuring that only he himself could exercise the power to appoint the regent, but for want of space a more detailed discussion of this train of events must await another occasion.

Sometime later *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma listened to the Dalai Lama’s religious discourses for the last time for a period of twenty-three days from the 12th day of the third month, 1656, invited him to drink tea together on the 25th day of the same month, and attended his lectures for two days from the 1st day of the fourth month (*ibid.*, f. 247a2–6), and there are further references to him too in the fifth Dalai Lama’s *Autobiography* (*ibid.*, ff. 236a6, 237a1). In the third months of 1654 and 1655 he also visited bKra-shis-lhun-po monastery (*PIN*, ff. 148a3, 152a6).

In the second month of 1655, prior to his departure for ’Ol-kha, it seems that *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma was kept waiting in vain for a guest before a large assembly, apparently because of faulty communications. In the passage immediately preceding the reference to this incident, it is stated that “until then [his] seating and so forth were accorded the respect due to a great lama, but since the water-horse [year] (1642) he had been downgraded to the third rank by the decision of the Regent himself” (*VRN*, Ka, f. 237a1–3). In other words, *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma had been driven into a corner for more than ten years, and this process now seems to have reached its final stages. The fifth Dalai Lama blames everything on the Regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan, but as is evident from other passages, it may be understood to have been carried out in accordance with the Dalai Lama’s own wishes.

sPrul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma’s Death

It was after the above lectures in the fourth month of 1656 that misfortune befell *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma.

The reincarnation of the gZims-khang-gong having been stricken with a sudden fever from the 25th day [of the fourth month], I was preparing to set out because I had been asked to come to perform an empowerment [rite] to ward off evil when the Regent [sent a message] from Lhasa saying that because it appeared to be a contagious disease for which there were no exceptions, it was inappropriate [to go] now. He had also notified the gZims-khang-gong, and because with something like a contagious disease there is no means of protection, I was compelled to follow the [Regent’s] instructions in postponing [my visit]. (*ibid.*, f. 248a–2–4)

Then, because Gling-stod *chos-rje* and Byang-ngas nursed him, the *sprul sku*, who had been stricken with fever; completely recovered, and whereas there

was nothing untoward at the time when there was an order from the Regent to send Governor Nor-bu to the land of the Mongols for the purpose of mediation, on the morning [of the twelfth] he suddenly fell ill. [On the previous day the *sprul sku*] had offered tea to the assembly [at 'Bras-spungs monastery], had hastened to request an oracle at gNas-chung temple, and had returned [to the gZims-khang-gong] from Lhasa during the day in order to report it to the Regent, and I felt guilty for having postponed the empowerment [rite] to ward off evil on the previous day. Now instructions arrived through Ja'i-sang *sde pa* to come at all costs, and, breaking off meditation, I went to the gZims-khang-gong and performed the empowerment rite of Mahākāla for warding off all evil, but because [his mind] had become turbid on account of demons and he had lost consciousness, it was of no avail, and he passed away on the morning of the thirteenth [of the fifth month]. (*ibid.*, ff. 248b3–249a1)

Here too the fifth Dalai Lama attributes the *sprul sku's* death to illness, but he died after having once recovered. In the *DGG*, where it is maintained immediately prior to the citation of the above passage that everything happened in accordance with the wishes of the tutelary deity of gNas-chung, we read as follows:

[Initially] it had seemed that the presents made when large groups of visitors from Khams and Mongolia came to Lhasa and visited Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan, the *sprul sku* of the gZims-khang-gong, were greater than those made to the fifth Dalai Lama. Moreover, not only was there a custom of referring to the Dalai Lama's dGa'-ldan Palace as the "Lower Residence" and calling Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan's abode the "Upper Residence," with the "Upper and Lower Residences of 'Bras-spungs" being referred to as if they were more or less equal [in rank], but with regard to the offerings at the *smon lam* in Lhasa and their ranking at [other] prayer meetings too his seat was placed next to the Dalai Lama's seat, and the respect accorded to him was considerable, but by various means the chamberlains at dGa'-ldan Palace, starting with Regent bSod-nams-chos-'phel, unable to control their envy, were waiting for an opportunity to kill the person of Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan. Now, on account of the advent of the time for Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan himself to also become a tutelary deity, from the twenty-fifth day of the fourth month of the fire-monkey [year], when he was thirty-eight years of age, he appeared to be suddenly stricken with fever, and this provided a golden opportunity. Thereupon the son-in-law of Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan's own family, the Gad-kha-sa family, who was a cousin of Regent bSod-nams-chos-'phel and was known as Governor Nor-bu or Majordomo Nor-bu, conspired with the Regent to secretly murder him by using his illness as a cover, and on the thirteenth day of the fifth month, despite the many weapons that they drove into his person, they served no purpose, whereupon they stuffed silk cloth

down his throat and killed him. (*DGG*, ff. 49b1–50a1)

Since no other sources are indicated, it cannot be positively asserted that he was actually murdered in this manner, but the surrounding circumstances were sufficient to arouse such suspicions. The *DGG* defends the fifth Dalai Lama, claiming that he was cleverly deceived by bSod-rnam-chos-'phel (*ibid.*, f. 50b3–4), but the relevant volume of the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* was edited by the Dalai Lama himself after the deaths of both the Regent and the Governor, and it is patently clear from his undisguised criticism of Paṅ-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa in his *Chronicle of Tibet*, written in 1643, that the Dalai Lama detested the incarnate lama from the Gad-kha-sa family. Elsewhere too he appears to foist the responsibility for the entire train of unfortunate events on the dead Regent.

The remains of the deceased were cremated in the courtyard of the Tantric College at 'Bras-spungs monastery (*VRN*, Ka, f. 251a5; *DGG*, f. 50b6).

Measures Taken after the Death of sPrul sku gZims-khang-gong-ma

According to the summary of events given in the *DGG*.

Then, because the corpse remained in its entirety without burning, it was enshrined as the inner deity inside the chief *stūpa* of the eight great silver *stūpas* that had been erected and was installed for a time in the gZims-khang-gong at 'Bras-spungs monastery. But because explosions and other terrifying noises, such that those people attending to the remains were unable to stay there, could be heard from inside the *stūpa* and there was also a moaning and so forth at the same time, the silver *stūpas* were dismantled [on orders] from the Regent as instructed by [the oracle of] gNas-chung [temple], whereupon the remains were immediately placed in a wooden box, carried to the river sKyid-chu, taken progressively downstream, and placed in the valley of Dol at lHo-kha, and at present they are at Dol Chu-mig-dkar-mo. (*DGG*, f. 51a2–5)

The corresponding passage in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* comes immediately after the account of bSod-nams-rab-brtan's death from illness.

Whereas the great tutelary god [gNas-chung] had informed the Regent through two monastic supervisors the previous year when he [the *chos rje*] was setting out to take the baths at sTod-lung that the *stūpas* and so forth at the gZims-khang-gong, which were possessed by demons, must be moved elsewhere, the silver *stūpas* were only destroyed and not moved elsewhere, and this led to [the Regent's] being taken ill. When he said that [the building of] the gZims-khang-gong must be moved now that ill omens and inconvenience had increased, people such as rGyal-rdzongs replied that there was no need to destroy a building that was still worth using, and there was much

discussion of the rights and wrongs of the matter. But, true or otherwise, if the eight great *stūpas* were not destroyed, [popular] understanding, expressed along the lines that noises and moaning could be heard from inside the *stūpas*, would err, and therefore, without any conclusion having been reached, his relics and so forth were transported to [the Gad-kha-sa family home in] sTod-lung-mda' and his furniture and other effects were transported to Chu-sbug in the east. (VRN, Ka, ff. 264b4–265a1)

The fifth Dalai Lama here criticizes bSod-nams-rab-brtan for having been slow to act and for having mishandled the situation. He also writes that he himself had an unpleasant experience (*ibid.*, f. 249b2–4; DGG, f. 51a6–b2), but this is mentioned as a pretext for doing away with the lineage of reincarnations of the gZims-khang-gong, which had been an encumbrance ever since the time of bSod-nams-grags-pa, and he does not of course mean that he had incurred divine punishment for his own mishandling of the affair. Moreover, following the change in oracle *chos rje* at gNas-chung temple in 1646 (VRN, Ka, f. 135b5), the *chos rje* had cooperated quite openly with the Dalai Lama, although it is not clear whether this was because he had been won over by the Dalai Lama or because he himself was adroitly complying with the Dalai Lama's wishes. It is also known that the *chos rje* did not allow him to attend gZims-khang-gong-ma's funeral, saying that he was not to be present at the cremation, and sent him instead to the recently completed Potala (*ibid.*, f. 250a5–6; DGG, f. 51b2–5).

The Power to Appoint the Regent

After the death of Guši Khan, the fifth Dalai Lama used the dispute over Guši Khan's successor taking place in Kōkōnor to undermine and then skilfully appropriate the substance of Qośot kingship over Tibet (VRN, Ka, ff. 246b2, 248a2, 258a6–b6, 263a4–5, 266a2, 267a4–5, 269b1–3, 276a3–4). During this time he also succeeded in reducing the number of lineages of incarnate lamas at 'Bras-spungs monastery to just one. It was the Regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan who brought these measures to fruition, but this influential figure, who had supported the Dalai Lama while keeping him under his control, died most conveniently on the 3rd day of the third month, 1658 (*ibid.*, f. 261b4–6), and in effect there now remained no obstacle whatsoever to the Dalai Lama's own ascendancy.

bSod-nams-rab-brtan's funeral was conducted in the fourth month of 1659 (*ibid.*, ff. 270b4–274a2), but shortly after his death the Dalai Lama mediated the dispute in Kōkōnor (*ibid.*, f. 263a4–5), and by bestowing the title of Dalai Hung Tha'i-ji on Dalai Baatur in the eleventh month of 1658 (*ibid.*, f. 267a4–5), he sought to maintain a balance between him and Guši Khan's successor, who had already received the title of "Upholder of the Teachings and Adamantine King" (*bstan 'dzin rdo rje rgyal po*) in the first month of the same year (*ibid.*, f. 258a6–b6). Then in the second month of 1659 he oversaw an arrangement whereby this pair

of leaders cooperated with one another as “royal brothers” (*ibid.*, f. 269b1–3).

At the time there was one person who took it for granted that he would be able to inherit bSod-nams-rab-brtan’s authority. This was Governor Nor-bu. He was related to the former Regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan, and in view of his career and the positions that he had held until then, the world at large would no doubt have made a similar assumption. But if the fifth Dalai Lama had readily allowed this, it would have been tantamount to endorsing Governor Nor-bu’s succession to the position of regent in a way over which he had no control, and because the regent’s authority had been conferred by Guši Khan, he would have been publicly acknowledging a historical fact that had been beyond his control. If this had happened, then far from becoming the sovereign ruler of Tibet as had been anticipated by the Gling-smad *zhabs drung*, the Dalai Lama, now the sole incarnate lama at ’Bras-spungs monastery, would have ended up recognizing the succession by relatives to the position of a powerful figure such as bSod-nams-rab-brtan, who had been able to freely choose the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama, and completely relinquishing the substance of his own sovereign power. This had to be avoided at all costs, and he had to demonstrate to the public that he held the power to appoint the regent. It could also be speculated that if Governor Nor-bu had in fact perpetrated the murder of *sprul sku* gZims-khang-gong-ma, then were he to become regent, it would have been possible for him to divulge or pretend that he had merely realized the wishes of the Dalai Lama, and there was a danger that he might use this as a means by which to control the Dalai Lama.

Governor Nor-bu had his base at gZhis-ka-rtse, a strategic centre in the western part of Central Tibet. This had served as the base of the Rin-spungs-pa and Zhing-shag-pa families when they had held power and had in effect ruled over Tibet. In 1642, when Guši Khan overcame Karma bsTan-skyong-dbang-po of the Zhing-shag-pa family, this area was provisionally entrusted to the dGa’ldan family, which had possession of the entire sKyid-shod region, including Lhasa, but because Guši Khan did not approve of this, it was returned in 1644, and the controversial majordomo Nor-bu became “lord of the fortress” (*rdzong dpon*). It is said that “thereafter he was generally known as *sde srid* or *sde pa*, and he only thought of himself as a younger brother of the same family (*rus gcig*) as the Regent” (*ibid.*, f. 122a1–2).

Although I have translated *sde srid/sde pa* as “governor” when referring to this Nor-bu, these terms are also the Tibetan equivalents of “regent.” Despite the fact that Nor-bu came under the overlordship of Guši Khan and the Regent, he was in reality entrusted with control of western Central Tibet and was treated as if it were in his possession. In this respect he differed from the ordinary “fortress lord” (*rdzong dpon*) or “fortress keeper” (*rdzong sdod*) who was dispatched by the government. However, it was not long before this state of affairs changed completely.

Prior to this political upheaval, the fifth Dalai Lama had already taken certain anticipatory measures. Immediately after the Regent’s death, he returned to the

lHa-rgya-ri-ba family their estates which the Regent had been managing in a private capacity, and he placed under the control of the government rights of possession to the land that had been added to these estates on the Regent's own initiative. He thus took steps to prevent Governor Nor-bu and others from arbitrarily inheriting these lands (*ibid.*, f. 264a6–b4).

The Removal of Governor Nor-bu

In the fifth month of 1659, one month after the Regent's funeral, a major reshuffling of personnel was announced.

The adopted son of the [previous] Regent, although his heedlessness was not excessive, [was mediocre], and because of the importance attached to the fact that he was a close relative of the former Regent, he was dispatched as fortress keeper of gZhis-ka-rtse. It had been intended to appoint rTa-nag-sa-ba as his adjutant, also in charge of his subordinates, but [the other party] came to say, "We have no need for such an adjutant since he is like a retainer to us," whereupon I (*viz.* the Dalai Lama) gave up trying to win them over, and because it would be awkward not having someone suitable, I dispatched gDong-kha-nas ostensibly as one of my relatives, thinking that he would meet the wishes of the adopted son of the previous Regent. (*ibid.*, f. 275a2–3)

Governor Nor-bu was stationed at gZhis-ka-rtse, and the adopted son (*sras po*) of the previous Regent was sent there as the new fortress keeper. This adopted son is thought to have belonged to the sGo-sna-shag-pa family, and he may be identical to the person referred to earlier in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* as "*sras po* Rab-brtan" (*ibid.*, ff. 77a6–b1, 97b4, 103b1, 104a3), although one cannot be sure. Because Governor Nor-bu expected to be promoted to the post of regent, he agreed to this change.

Towards the end of the fifth month Governor Nor-bu visited Lhasa, and he was probably received by the Dalai Lama at dGa'-ldan Palace.

He displayed the dignity of a naturally consummate headman, and his inner thoughts, such that he looked upon the new estates [that he hoped to gain] in the manner of the divine law or divine king [looking down] on everything within and without or of the king of birds whose eyes close from below, manifested themselves [in his outer demeanour]. (*ibid.*, f. 276a4–5)

Governor Nor-bu had presented himself before the Dalai Lama with the expectation that he would be granted the post of regent, but there were no instructions to this effect. One can easily picture the Dalai Lama with a cold smile playing on his lips as if to say, "Have you learnt your lesson now?" Then the 16th day of the sixth month arrived.

The Venerable *mgron gnyer* was sent to Governor Nor-bu's residence to notify him of his new appointment, but inside the gate [someone] came back, saying, "if it is something acceptable, that will be all right, but if it should be face-losing, then it would be absurd for him (*viz.* Nor-bu) to give his consent," and so they discussed separately from what had already been decided how it might be possible to save face. In the evening around teatime the Venerable [*mgron gnyer*] returned and told me all about how that person had received him. The following day I sent the Venerable *mgron gnyer* and 'Or-nas [to tell him], together with the reasons, that impermissible things had been done on three occasions, and while all of his possessions apart from military supplies and [the residence of] the Gad-kha-sa [family] were left as they were, his estates and residences in various regions were confiscated. (*ibid.*, f. 276b4–6)

This rough treatment of Nor-bu caused quite a commotion. The grand lamas of the two Tantric colleges and of Se-ra and 'Bras-spungs monasteries, as well as the vice-abbot of sTag-lung monastery, gathered in order to discuss how they might be of assistance to Governor Nor-bu, but even the worldly-wise vice-abbot of sTag-lung monastery was overridden by the other monks, who had little practical knowledge of secular affairs, and the Dalai Lama ridiculed them for being unable to arrive at a conclusion on account of their being swayed in their thinking by Nor-bu's vested rights (*ibid.*, f. 277a2–4). He then took a further step.

Because it was inappropriate that the Gad-kha-sa should be within a short distance of the Potala Palace, they were moved to substitute lands of equivalent value in lHo-kha [to the south of the g'Tsang-po in eastern Central Tibet], and it was decided to increase their estates by the equivalent of the bright half of the month, but at this time the adopted son sGo-sna-shag-pa, bKras-sgang-tshe-ring and others were all secretly engaged in endless scheming. (*ibid.*, f. 278a6–b1)

sGo-sna-shag-pa was, along with Governor Nor-bu, a matrilineal relation (*zhan tshan*) of the former Regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan, and therefore the two of them were known as the "two matrilineal relations." The fifth Dalai Lama made the oracles give messages urging the continued suppression of these two figures (*ibid.*, f. 278b1–3) and waited for his next opportunity.

sGo-sna-shag-pa asked to be allowed to go to g'Tsang with his family on the pretext of taking the baths, and although both the designs and actions of the adopted son could not be trusted, because it would give an unfavourable impression to the world at large, which would not understand the reason [if I were to refuse permission], I granted permission, thinking that, there being a possibility that the two matrilineal relations might [conveniently] show defiance [of me], [their evil] intentions would become clear if they did so.

(*ibid.*, f. 278b-3-4)

Resistance to Mediation

There were of course some who recommended that the “two matrilineal relations” be incarcerated (*ibid.*, ff. 280b6-281a2), but unfavourable popular criticism had already reached the Dalai Lama’s ears, and this caused him some concern. By the tenth month there were rumours that Nor-bu had fled to gTsang or to bKra-shis-lhun-po (*ibid.*, f. 281a5-6). According to the information gained by the Dalai Lama from messengers whom he had dispatched, the adopted son sGo-sna-shag-pa had moved his family from gZhis-ka-rtse, while the “two matrilineal relations” had gained the protection of bKra-shis-lhun-po monastery and were defending the fortress at gZhis-ka-rtse, and there was a strong possibility that they would raise a rebellion (*ibid.*, f. 281b1-3). Setting aside the question of the grasp of the situation by his sources in bKra-shis-lhun-po, the Dalai Lama decided to dispatch troops, claiming that righteousness had been on his side from the outset and that the situation was one that could not be overlooked. He sent a messenger to convey his intentions to the “royal brothers” in Kōkōnor, had an advance force dispatched, and made preparations to send forth the main body of troops as well (*ibid.*, ff. 281b3-282a1).

Shortly afterwards moves were initiated to negotiate peace, and on the 29th day of the tenth month a messenger from the Panchen Lama arrived.

He said that if gZhis-ka-rtse fell, all manner of things would happen, and suggested that because who won would depend on luck at the time and because [the dispute] had also caused the decline of the sNeu-sdong-pa and Rin-spungs-pa, I should perhaps now postpone the use of troops, grant the two matrilineal relations a fortress as a stipend, and make a promise to leave only the control of gZhis-ka-rtse as it was. In this [proposal] the Panchen Lama prided himself on knowing that he was in accord with the law and on being able to act [reasonably]. For this reason [on a previous occasion] when the Governor himself had caused an army to withdraw, [the Panchen Lama had] praised him as being like the Buddha for having fought as if with the devil. I sent a reply in which, along with saying it appeared that [a self-seeking standpoint] had been expressed by that very same *ācārya* himself (*viz.* the Panchen Lama), I carefully explained the train of events and focussed on the criticism that, between the two methods of the tough and the moderate, there was now no choice but to concentrate on military means, even if it meant terrifying [the other party] as in the analogy of showing a mask to an infant. (*ibid.*, f. 283a6-b3)

It is clear that the Dalai Lama no longer thought of the Panchen Lama as anyone remotely resembling a former respected teacher of his. At the start of the

eleventh month, the former chief abbot of dGa'-ldan monastery, along with the heads of Byang-rtse and rTse-shar Colleges and the head lamas of the three chief monasteries of Se-ra, 'Bras-spungs and dGa'-ldan, and also accompanied by other incarnate lamas and the vice-abbot of sTag-lung monastery, came to request that Nor-bu be forgiven since he was a "brother" (*sku mched*), or cousin of the former Regent (*ibid.*, f. 283b4–5). The Dalai Lama, finding himself in the midst of people who were reacting in a way completely different from himself, defiantly responded in the following manner:

There are no brothers of the same paternal line as the Regent himself, nor is there a single blood relation [of the Regent] such as a child or grandchild. If one were to extend the scope to siblings [born to just one] of the parents or to brothers of the mother, the two majordomos of Kha-rab-pa cannot be said to be less closely related than Governor Nor-bu, and these two are also superior in ability. Even though the officials of sKyid-shod or the government may make friends [with one another] and become related by marriage, if one had to respect the degree of relatedness [when appointing and dismissing them], this would cause stagnation. Would it really be right if, by reason of the fact that they are my kinsmen, or members of the Phag-mo-gru-pa, or of the head family of Sa-skya, I were to offer them the place of officiator at the *smon lam* in Lhasa and show them around with great pomp? These 130,000 households of Tibet were given only to me by the Upholder of the Teachings and Dharma-King (*viz.* Guši Khan), and they were not given so that I might share them with those two matrilineal relations. I explained in detail the reasons why what [these two] had been doing during this year could be regarded as an insurrection by liege subjects. (*ibid.*, ff. 283b5–284a2)

Nevertheless the attempts to mediate a settlement did not cease. The Dalai Lama's above explanation shows evidence of deception in several places. In the first place, he claims in effect that it was not their predecessor, the Regent bSod-nams-rab-brtan, but the fifth Dalai Lama himself who had received sovereign power over Tibet from Guši Khan. But as is stated by the Dalai Lama himself in his *Chronicle of Tibet*, Guši Khan became king of Tibet on the 15th day of the third month, 1642, and, as is noted by Sum-pa-mkhan-po, he appointed bSod-nams-rab-brtan regent without the Dalai Lama being present. It cannot, therefore, be said that the sovereign power exercised at the time by bSod-nams-rab-brtan had arisen from the powers that Guši Khan had vested in the Dalai Lama.

Nor was it true that Governor Nor-bu had gained his position simply because he was related to the Regent, for he was chosen over the heads of closer kin, a fact that is acknowledged by the Dalai Lama himself. Moreover, as is mentioned by the Dalai Lama in his *Autobiography*, Nor-bu held from an early stage a succession of important posts (1638: *ibid.*, ff. 87b2–3, 87b6–88a1; 1641: ff. 103a5–6, 103b2; 1643: ff. 120b5–121a1; 1644: f. 122a1–2; 1648: ff. 140b5–141a1; 1652: f.

178b2–4; 1654: f. 226b5–6; 1656: ff. 247a1–2, 247b2–3, 248b4, 251b6–252a2; 1657: f. 256a4–b4; 1658: ff. 260b5–6, 262a2). If the Dalai Lama had long considered him unsuitable, why did he wait until immediately after bSod-nams-rab-brtan's funeral acting instead of exercising his sovereign power while bSod-nams-rab-brtan was still alive and ordering him to dismiss Governor Nor-bu? The Dalai Lama would have had no answer to such a question.

Although it is stated in the Dalai Lama's *Autobiography* in connection with this treatment of Nor-bu that the "royal brothers" of Kōkōnor acknowledged Nor-bu's mistakes (*ibid.*, f. 256a6–b4), in point of fact they voiced their objections to the Dalai Lama's plans, and the attack on gZhis-ka-rtse was not carried out as had been the wish of the Dalai Lama (*ibid.*, f. 285a6–b2), while the army of subjugation was disbanded in the intercalary twelfth month without any use of force (*ibid.*, f. 287a6). The "royal brothers," who were lenient towards the "two matrilineal relations" (*ibid.*, f. 287a4–5), were also approached with another proposal by people from Central Tibet (*ibid.*, f. 287a5–6). In this atmosphere of resistance it thus ultimately required a considerable effort on the part of the Dalai Lama for his measures to be accepted by the "royal brothers," who came to Lhasa on the 25th day of the intercalary twelfth month of 1659 (*ibid.*, ff. 288b5–289a1). This too indicates that the Dalai Lama had been vested with anything but complete sovereign power in 1642.

Seizure of Absolute Power

As a result of opposition from those around the Dalai Lama, except for the oracles, rNying-ma-pas and aides closely associated with him, his defiant stance fell flat, and his hard-line measures failed to bear fruit. But overall the Dalai Lama achieved his objectives, and the banishment of the "two matrilineal relations," indispensable for making his investiture of sovereign power a *fait accompli*, was realized.

A decree forbidding all contact with the "two matrilineal relations," who had managed to escape, was issued (*ibid.*, f. 287a6–b1), and in the third month of 1660 retaliatory measures were taken against those who were considered to have cooperated with them in g'Tsang (*ibid.*, f. 291a4–5). A special image of Avalokitesvara was installed in the Dalai Lama's new residential quarters at the Potala and special rites lasting four weeks were performed from the 15th day of the fifth month, preparing the way for the Dalai Lama, who had now gained the powers presaged by the Gling-smad *zhabs drung*, to take up permanent residence in the Potala (*ibid.*, f. 295b4–6).

Then on the 13th day of the seventh month the Dalai Lama appointed Grong-smad-pa Ja'i-sang *sde pa* regent, giving him the name 'Phrin-las-rgyam-tsho, while Guši Khan's successor, who had provisionally been granted the title of "Upholder of the Teachings and Adamantine King" on the occasion of his accession to the throne in the first month of 1658, was given anew the title

“Upholder of the Teachings and Dayan King” (*bstan ’dzin da yan rgyal po*) (*ibid.*, f. 297b3–6). Thus was inaugurated a new political setup, with the fifth Dalai Lama as head of state and sovereign ruler of Tibet.

In the second month of 1662 the Panchen Lama died. The Dalai Lama, now head of state, set out on a trip, claiming that his presence had been requested by the oracle at bSam-yas monastery, and he sent only a rather inconspicuous envoy to attend the funeral of the great scholar who had been his teacher (*ibid.*, f. 315a2–b1). It would appear that the deceased’s intercession on behalf of the “two matrilineal relations” had considerably angered him. The vice-abbot of sTag-lung monastery, who had also tried to intercede, became the target of a rumour that the “two matrilineal relations” had sought shelter with him, and as a result his monastery was searched (*ibid.*, f. 291b5–6). As for the “two matrilineal relations” themselves, they eventually disappeared from the pages of history.

Abbreviations

- DGG:** Blo-bzang-ye-shes-bstan-’dzin-rgya-mtsho, *Dam can rgya mtsho dgyes pa’i rol mo*, Gangthog, 1967; 79 fols.
- IVN:** Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho, *rNam thar nor bu’i ’phreng ba*, ’Bras-spungs Pho-brang Edition, 1652; 52 fols.
- “Kojitsu-kan”: “Kojitsu-kan no Chibetto shihai ni itaru keii” 「顧實汗のチベット支配に至る経緯」 (The circumstances leading to Guši Khan’s control of Tibet), in *Iwai Hirosato hakushi koki kinen tenseki ronshū* 『岩井大慧博士古稀記念典籍論集』 (Collected textual studies in honour of the 70th birthday of Dr. Iwai Hirosato; Kaimeidō 開明堂, 1963), pp. 741–773.
- PIN:** Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan, (*Rang gi rnam thar*) *Nor bu’i ’phreng ba*, bKra-shis-lhun-po Edition, 1660; 191 fols.
- PSJ:** Sum-pa-mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal-’byor, *dPag bsam ljon bzang*, 1748 (repr.: Śatapiṭaka Series); 317 fols.
- Shilu:** *Shunzhi shilu* 順治實錄 (Veritable Record of Shunzhi).
- TBN:** Klong-rdol-bla-ma Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang, *bsTan pa’i sbyin bdag byung tshul gyi ming gi grangs*, “gSungs ’bum,” Vol. ‘A, Kun-bde-gling Edition, 1777; 20 fols.
- TNL:** Sum-pa-mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal-’byor, *mTsho sngon gyi lo rgyus*, 1786 (repr.: Śatapiṭaka Series); 19 fols.
- VRN:** Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho, *Du kū la’i gos bzang*, Vol. Ka, ’Bras-spungs Pho-brang Edition, 1675?; 364 fols.
- ZhG:** Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho, *rDzogs ldan gzhon nu’i dga’ ston dpyid kyi rgyal mo’i glu dbyangs*, Zhol Edition, 1643; 113 fols.

Notes

- 1) See A. Macdonald, "Portrait du cinquième Dalailama" (*Essais sur l'art du Tibet* [Paris, 1977], pp. 119–156), p. 128, nn. 16, 17, and my book review entitled, "Z. Afumado, *Jūnana seiki ni okeru Chūgoku-Chibetto kankei*" [Z. アフマド『十七世紀における中国・チベット関係』(Z. Ahmad, *Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century*), *Tōyō Gakuhō* 『東洋學報』, Vol. 55, No. 4 (1973), pp. 99–107.
- 2) Z. Ahmad, *Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Roma, 1970), pp. 130–132.
- 3) A. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 128.
- 4) Tshe-brtan-zhabs-drung, *bsTan rtsis kun las btus pa* (Xining 西寧, 1982).
- 5) Although no more than a conjecture, if his birth year were pushed back twelve years, he would be roughly of the same generation as Guši Khan. He is too young for Tsha-ba-dka'-bcu-pa, who came to conduct the tests for confirming the fifth Dalai Lama's previous life, to have been a disciple (*sras po*) of his. According to the *mChod yon nyi zla zung gi khrims yig* (ff. 6b–7b) preserved at the Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫 (Tibetan Noncanonical Works, No. 444), he was born into the rGya-le family of sTod-lung. One of his forebears is said to have been the king *sa yi tshangs pa* rGya-le-nas, who served as *gu shri* to the third Dalai Lama bSod-nams-rgya-mtsho and the fourth Dalai Lama Yontan-rgya-mtsho. The *gu shri* who served under two Dalai Lamas was the *phyag mdzod gu shri* dPalldan-rgya-mtsho.
- 6) See "Kojitsu-kan," pp. 741–744, and Yamaguchi, "Jūnana seiki shotō no Seikai Tumeto-bu" [十七世紀初頭の青海トゥメト部] (The Kōkōnor Tūmeds in the early seventeenth century; *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 『成田山佛教研究所紀要』, No. 16 [1993], pp. 1–26), pp. 7–10.
- 7) See my book review (n.1), p. 101b.
- 8) See Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho, *'Jam dpal dbyangs chos kyi rje dkon mchog chos 'phel gyi rtogs brjod mkhas pa'i ma rgyan* (*A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism*, No. 5594; 19 fols.), f. 3b2.
- 9) *Sras* is the honorific equivalent of *bu* ("son/child"), but it is also used to indicate respect to one's own or another's teacher, in which case it becomes an honorific term for "disciple," and *thugs sras* is used in the same sense. *Sras po* has the same meaning, but in the following, when it is used to refer to the adopted son of bSod-nams-rab-brtan, I have translated it accordingly. Cf. n. 5.
- 10) See Yamaguchi, "E. G. Sumisu, *Panchen Rama issei jiden*, kaisetsu sono ta" [E. G. スミス『パンチェンラマ一世自伝』解説その他] (E. G. Smith, *Autobiography of Panchen Lama I*, "Introduction," etc.; *Tōyō Gakuhō*, Vol. 53, Nos. 3–4 [1971], pp. 176–187), p. 177a.
- 11) See the biography of Zhva-dmar VI Gar-dbang-chos-kyi-dbang-phyug, in Si-tu Chos-kyi-'byung-nas, *Karma kam tshang brgyud pa rin po che'i mam thar* (dPal-spungs Edition, 1775; 350 fols.), ff. 135a–136b, 144b, 154b–155a, 164a. See also Yamaguchi, "Jūnana seiki shotō no Chibetto no kōsō to Seikai Mongoru" [十七世紀初頭のチベットの抗争と青海モンゴル] (The conflict in early seventeenth-century Tibet and the Kōkōnor Mongols), *Tōyō Gakuhō*, Vol. 74, Nos. 1–2 (1993), pp. 1–25, and *id.*, "The Conflict in Early Seventeenth-Century Tibet and the Kōkōnor Mongols," *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kiyō*, No. 16 (1993), pp. 27–48.
- 12) "Kojitsu-kan," pp. 746–750.
- 13) See "Kojitsu-kan," pp. 750–753.
- 14) See Yamaguchi, *Chibetto* [チベット] (Tibet; Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會, 1987), Vol. 1, pp. 215–216; Vol. 2, pp. 342–347; and my book review (n.1), p. 104.
- 15) See Yamaguchi, *Chibetto* (n.14), Vol. 1, pp. 102–104; *id.*, "Sesshō Sangyē-gyantso no shutsuji o megutte" [攝政サンギェー・ギヤンツォの出自をめぐって] (On the origins of the regent Sangsrgyas-rgya-mtsho; in *Enoki hakushi shōju kinen Tōyōshi ronsō* 榎博士頌壽記念東洋史論叢) [Collected papers on Oriental history presented to Dr. Enoki (Kazuo 一雄); Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院, 1988], pp. 443–458), pp. 448–452; and *id.*, "Chūgoku no Chibetto Bukkyō jūin" [中國のチベット佛教寺院]

(Tibetan Buddhist temples in China; in Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄, ed., *Chūgoku* [中國] [China], Vol. 3]Mainichi Komyunikēshonzu 毎日コミュニケーションズ, 1989], pp. 216–223), pp. 217–218.

[This is a translation by Rolf W. Giebel of my Japanese article entitled “Dalai Lama Gosei no Tochiken: Katsubutsu gZims-Khang-gong-ma to Kanrei Nor-bu no Massatsu” in *Tōyō Gakuhō* Vol. 73 Nos 3–4 (March 1992).]