The purpose of this short paper is to establish the succession and approximate chronology of the heads of the Bhutanese state during the first hundred years or so of its existence. I am quite aware that my study has a mere preliminary character, as it taps only a few of the numerous sources, which are known to exist but are not yet available in the West. Thus it is hoped that it may be superseded in a near future by more thorough and complete research. Such as it is, I trust it may serve to some useful purpose.

The standard source for Bhutanese history of the early period is represented by LCB. It is an authoritative work, whose value, however, is impaired by confusion and mistakes in the dates; some of them can be corrected with the help of other Bhutanese texts and of Central Tibetan and Chinese sources.

Till the beginning of the 20th century Bhutan (Lho-'brug or 'Brug-yul) enjoyed the doubtful blessing of institutions that were as unique as they were cumbersome. The nominal head of the state was an incarnate lama, while secular administration was entrusted to a regent, who could be either a monk or a layman. Their titles were respectively rgyal-ts'ab (more commonly but improperly: žabs-druñ rin-po-c'e) and sde-srid (in full: sde-srid p'yaq-mdzod), the Dharma Raja and Deb Raja of British Indian authors. However, this set-up was not finally established until a fairly late period. In the beginnings the mode of selection of the rgyal-ts'ab wavered between heredity, incarnation and election by the ecclesiastic and lay dignitaries; and the lists in LCB are only an attempt at systematize a matter which escaped any consistent frame. As for the sde-srid, who later came to be elected for a period of three years, his rule was at first the result of victory or compromise in the rivalries of the regional chiefs. Foremost among them were the dpon-slob (or spyi-bla) of sPa-gro (or Rin-spuñs), Dar-dkar and Kron-sa, and the rdzoil-dpon of bKra-sis-c'os-rdzoun, sPu-na-k'a (or sPunis-t'añ) and dBari-'dus-p'o-brari. Civil war, or at least severe latent strife, was a quite normal condition in Bhutan; central

1 The following abbreviations will be used: LCB = Lho'i c'os 'byuñ, written between 1731 and 1759 by the 10th mk'han-c'en bsTan-'dzin-c'os-rgyal (1700—1767) (for a table of its contents see Catalogue of the Toyo Bunko collection of Tibetan works on history, Tokyo 1970, pp. 159—162); L'1DL = Life of the Seventh Dalai Lama (1703—1757) by the 2nd lCan-skya Qutuqtu (1717—1786); MBTJ = Mi dbañ rtogs brjod, biography of the Tibetan ruler P'o-lha-nas (1689—1747) by mDo-mk'ar Ts'e-rin-dban-rgyal (1697—1763); PTD = Pandita bstan 'dzin c'os kyi rgyal po'i rtogs pa brjod pa sgyu ma c'en po'i yar stabs, biography of the 10th mk'han-c'en bsTan-'dzin-c'os-rgyal (1700—1767) by the 13th mk'han-c'en Nag-dban-yon-tan-ma-yas (1724—1783); TSM = mt's'uns med c'os kyi rgyal po rje rin po c'eñ nman pa t'ar pa bskal bzan legs brls 'dod po'i re skon dpag bsam gyl sde ma, biography of the 1st rgyal-ts'ab Nag-dban bsTan-'dzin-rab-rgyal (1638—1696), written in 1720 by the 6th mk'han-c'en Nag-dbañ-lhun-grub (d. 1729—30). I owe heartfelt thanks to Mr. E. Gene SMITH, who lent to me the last two works.

2 The last žabs-druñ died in 1933 and no reincarnation was allowed. The last sde-srid had died in 1903 and his functions lapsed with the foundation of hereditary monarchy in 1907.
authority made itself felt only when a strong personality imposed his hold upon the clans of the several valleys.

The foundation of the state was contemporary, and partly connected, with the climax and rapid fall of the kingdom of gTsaṅ, whose rulers supported the Karma-pa sect in Central Tibet. They did not refrain from oppressing other Red sects, such as the 'Brug-pa, although their main enemy were the dGe-lugs-pa (the Yellow Church), who in the end contrived the downfall of the kingdom. The formation of the present Bhutanese state had its beginning in 1616, when Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal (1594—1651), also called bDud-'joms-rdo-rje, migrated to the South. This move was due to inner contrasts within the 'Brug-pa subsect of the bKa'-brgyud-pa. Here too, as generally in Central Tibet, a trend had arisen to substitute incarnation as the mode of succession in the place of the earlier hereditary rule of great religious families. The rGya house of Rva-lun, the main seat of the 'Brug-pa, had put up Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal as their candidate to the succession of the scholar and saint Padma-dkar-po (1527—1592); but the struggle that ensued led to a decision by the ruler of gTsaṅ in favour of the son of the prince of 'P'yoṅs-rgyas, and Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal eventually retired to the unknown South. Gradually he established his overall authority in the western portion of that ill-defined and almost savage region, pushing into the background the Lha-pa Lamas of gNos, a branch of the 'Bri-guṅ-pa, who had been paramount till that time. Spiritual teacher, builder of monasteries, statesman, warrior, Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal was a true nation builder; practically unknown outside Bhutan, he certainly would deserve a special study, which, however, lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

His relations with his homeland Tibet were stormy. In 1639 Karma-bstan-skyoṅ (1622—1642), the last ruler of gTsaṅ, sent an army against Bhutan; the successful repulse of the invasion was attributed, as always afterwards in similar cases, to magic worked by the Bhutanese ruler. Only three years later, Karma-bstan-skyoṅ was overwhelmed by the Qosot chief Gusri Khan, who gave the temporal sovereignty upon the whole of Central Tibet to the Fifth Dalai-Lama. This meant the beginning of bad days for the 'Brug-pa; some learned lamas of that sect fled to Bhutan. War broke out, and during three years (1644—1647) Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal resisted the pressure of the Mongol-Tibetan army. Shortly later he supported the ill-starred revolt that broke out in gTsaṅ in 1648. In its wake another invasion of Bhutan took place, to be repelled as usual (1649). Afterwards Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal, although remaining on half-hostile terms with the Dalai-Lama, gave up

---

4 Such a study should be based mainly on his biography: dPal 'Brug pa rin po c'e nag dbaṅ rnam rgyal gyi rnam par 'tar pa c'os kyi sprin, written in the second half of the 18th century by Jam-dbyaṅs-bses-gñen.
5 Biography of Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal, II, f. 99a; LCB, ff. 37b—38a; TSM, ff. 21b—22b.
6 TSM, f. 24a; LCB, f. 39a.
7 TSM, f. 31a—b; LCB, ff. 41a—b, 43b—45a; G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, Rome 1948, p. 68.
8 Biography of Nag-dbaṅ-rnam-rgyal, II, ff. 135b—136b; TSM, f. 47a.
active interference in Tibetan affairs and dedicated himself to organizing his dominion. He decreed that sovereignty was to be vested in his successors; control of the Brug-pa clergy was entrusted to a chief abbot (gnas-brtan c’en-po; usually styled rje mk’an-c’en); secular government was the task of the sde-srid dbu-mdzad, later called p’yag-mdzod).\(^9\)

Nag-dbañ-nram-rgyal retired from state affairs into mystical seclusion in 1651, after which no further information on him is given by the texts; almost certainly he died in the same year. His succession was not simple. He had a son, Nag-dbañ ’Jam-dpal-rdo-rje, born in 1631\(^10\), who by rights ought to have succeeded him. But he was sickly and weak\(^11\) and was practically passed over. There is a sort of conspiracy of silence about him in our sources; but it seems that he lived on as a sort of outwardly respected prisoner of state. He married, but only a daughter was issued from his marriage; and he died in 1680 or 1681\(^12\).

Already upon the death of Nag-dbañ-nram-rgyal a party had pushed forward as the future ecclesiastic ruler Nag-dbañ bsTan-dzin-rab-rgyas (1638—1696), the third son of Mi-p’am Ts’e-dbañ-bsTan-dzin, alias rTa-mgrin-rgyal-mts’an (1574—1643), who descended in the second generation from the rGya family of Rva-lun. bsTan-dzin-rab-rgyas had been tonsured at the age of 8 by Nag-dbañ-nram-rgyal himself, who gave him the religious name\(^13\) and considered him as a second son\(^14\). This helped to establish his claim to the succession. A preliminary recognition was given already in 1651\(^15\). But it was only in 1680 that a faction led by dGe-dun-c’os-p’el caused him to be formally proclaimed as the 1st rgyal-tsis\(^16\). It was probably on this occasion that the rightful heir ’Jam-dpal-rdo-rje was quietly removed from the scene. bsTan-dzin-rab-rgyas was invested not only with the spiritual sovereignty, but also with actual government; accordingly, he is also reckoned as the 4th sde-srid. His activity, as described in his biography, seems to have centered upon religious ceremonies and the building of new monasteries; his main work was the cloister of rTa-mgo, decorated by Nepalese artists and consecrated in 1690\(^17\). Nevertheless, he also consolidated Bhutanese suze-
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\(^9\) LCB, f. 54a-b.
\(^10\) Biography of Nag-dbañ-nram-rgyal, II, f. 87b; LCB, f. 33b.
\(^11\) LCB, f. 54b.
\(^12\) The main sources for this statement are as follows. A passage of the biography of Se’u-la Byams-mgon Nag-dbañ-rgyal-mts’an (1647—1732) by the 9th rje mk’an-c’en Saky-rin-c’en (1710—1759) (sku bzhili dban p’yug rje bsiun Nag dban rgyal mts’an gyi rnam l’ar lams cad mk’yen pa’i rol mo, f. 61a) refers to an encounter between Se’u-la Byams-mgon and an aging and helpless ’Jam-dpal-rdo-rje in about 1680. The biography of the 2nd rje mk’an-c’en bSod-nams-od-zer (1613—1689; in office 1672—1689) mentions the marriage of ’Jam-dpal-rdo-rje and the rituals performed to ensure the birth of a male heir; no date is given, but the event occurred when bSod-nams-od-zer was on the see. ’Jam-dpal-rdo-rje’s daughter was born in 1680 and he died shortly after. The materials on which this note is based were supplied to me by Mr. E. Gene SMITH. I may add that TSM, f. 148a, mentions under the date of 1682 “the former residence of bla-ma ’Jam-dpal-rdo-rje”, which means that he was already dead.

\(^13\) TSM, f. 28b; LCB, f. 55b.
\(^14\) TSM, ff. 25b, 52b.
\(^15\) TSM, ff. 52b—53a.
\(^16\) TSM, ff. 123b, 131a; LCB, ff. 56a (where the date is wrong), 60a.
\(^17\) TSM, ff. 214a—229a.
rainty over Ghataka, i.e. Cooch-Behar (1683) 18. Another threat of Tibetan invasion was averted by negotiations, and a formal treaty was concluded in 1687 19. A menacing move by the Tibetan regent Sans-rgyas-rgya-mt's'o was met in 1691 by a firm assertion of the validity of the treaty concluded four years before 20.

Slowly bsTan-'dzin-rab-rgyas grew sick of the bickerings and factions between the various rdzo'n-dpon and spyi-bla; being moreover in indifferent health, he decided to retire 21. And thus on the Tibetan New Year of 1695 he formally abdicated and retired to the rTa-mgo monastery 22, where he died in the 5th month of 1696 23.

bsTan-'dzin-rab-rgyas had married, but had no male issue 24; this second failure of the hereditary principle led to its abandonment. The new sde-srid dGe-'dun-c'os'p'el thought for a moment of putting on the see 'Jam-dpal-rdo-rje's daughter mTs'o-skyes-rdo-rje 25. But the idea was dismissed at once; and the sde-srid, acting in concert with the rje mk'an-c'en, selected as the 2nd rgyal-t's'ab Nag-dban Kun-dga'-rgyal-mt's'an, born in Eastern Bhutan in the Earth-Snake year 1689 26. He was given a careful education, and at the age of 14 (i.e. in 1702) was tonsured and given his religious name, whereupon he was installed as religious head 27. His tenure of the seat, such as it was, was brought to a ruinous end by the conflict between the sde-pa P'a-jo (who became the 8th sde-srid) and the rdzo'n-dpon bsTan-pa-dban-p'yug; he had to retire to the temple of bKra-sis-c'os-rdzon, where he stayed for three years. In the end the sde-srid declared him illegitimate and the officials deposed him (probably in 1712) and imprisoned him at dBan-rdzon 28. Soon after he fled secretly and took refuge in a mountain ravine; but he was caught again and imprisoned in the g·Yun-drun-skyid, where he died of poison at the age of 25 on the 27th day of the 12th month of the Earth-Snake year 29. This date, being the same as that of birth, is impossible on any count and is probably a mistake for Water-Snake; thus his death would have taken place in January or February 1713.

The 3rd rgyal-t's'ab Nag-dban P'yogs-las-rnam-rgyal was early rumoured to be an incarnation of Nag-dban-rnam-rgyal, and was recognized as such by the 8th sde-srid. At the age of six he was conducted with great solemnity to dBan-'dus-p'o-bran, where he was educated by the sde-pa dge-bses, who later became the 9th sde-srid. In the Water-Dragon year 1712 he took the vows of dge-t'sul and in the same year he was given his religious name. At once the 9th sde-srid installed him on the see, his residence being the new

---

18 TSM, ff. 161b—163a.
19 TSM, ff. 187b—191b.
20 TSM, ff. 248a—250a.
21 TSM, ff. 314b, 320a—321a.
22 TSM, f. 329a—b.
23 TSM, f. 335a; LCB, f. 57a.
25 LCB, f. 61b.
26 LCB, f. goñ 62a.
27 LCB, f. goñ 62a—b.
28 LCB, f. 62a—b.
29 LCB, ff. 62b—63a. He is the Ba-dan-rnam-dkar of MBTJ, f. 344b.
temple of Zab-lдон-lhun-rtse. Of course his fortunes were closely knit with those of his protector, and when rebellion broke out against the sde-srid he had to flee for his life. He absconded in various places and eventually took refuge with the Ka-spe bla-ma 'Brug-don-grub, the dpon-slob of sPa-gro. There he fell ill and died at the age of 29, on the 21st day of the 4th month of an unknown year, probably 1729 or 1730. In spite of his misadventures, his quality as incarnation of Nag-dbañ-rnam-rgyal was not denied. Only, to explain the existence of rival claimants, the Bhutanese clergy offered a "theological" explanation: P'yogs-las-rnam-rgyal was reckoned as the embodiment of the Word (gsun-sprul) of Nag-dbañ-rnam-rgyal, while at a later time the 6th rgyal-ts'ab was recognized as the embodiment of the Mind (t'ugs-sprul), thus from that time there were in Bhutan two parallel series of incarnations of the founder of the state.

The 4th rgyal-ts'ab Mi-p'am-'jigs-med-nor-bu was the incarnation of Nag-dbañ 'Jam-dpal-rdo-rje and therefore was also called the rGyal-sras sprul-sku; the adversaries of 'Brug-rab-rgyas and P'yogs-las-rnam-rgyal put him forward as their candidate. He was placed on the throne at the age of 13, but died at 18 after a short reign of 6 years, probably in 1735. His rule was marked by the war with the Ka-spe bla-ma, in which P'o-lha-nas intervened (see later).

The 5th rgyal-ts'ab Mi-p'am-dbañ-po was the elder brother of the deceased and hitherto he had been the 10th sde-srid. His career as such will be dealt with below. After his return to Lhasa in 1736 he was recognized as the rgyal-ts'ab; or at least this is how the LdGR describes his position. We are, however, under the impression that his tenure was more in the nature of a regency, and the circumstances of the instalment of his successor give some ground to this suspicion. Anyhow, he was poisoned by his enemies and died at the age of 30 on the 16th day of the 5th month of the Ox year 1745.

The 6th rgyal-ts'ab Nag-dbañ 'Jigs-med-grags-pa was the incarnation of the Mind of Nag-dbañ-rnam-rgyal. He was born in Central Tibet, and when still a child the fame of his miraculous marks spread to Bhutan. Thus goi-sa Mi-p'am-dbañ-po (i.e. when he was still sde-srid) sent the 7th rje mk'an-c'en Nag-dbañ-p'rin-las (on the see c. 1730—1737) to fetch him to Bhutan, where he was installed on the see. Thus it appears that he was recognized as spiritual ruler long before the death of Mi-p'am-dbañ-po. He was responsible for the great restoration carried out in 1754 at Rva-luil, the mother-convent of the 'Brug-pa in Tibet. He was still reigning when the LCB was written, and died in 1761.

---
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We shall deal now with the office of sde-srid, which was filled mostly (but by no means always) by laymen.

The 1st sde-srid bsTan-'dzin-'brug-rgyas (1591—1656), of the 'Ob-mts'o family, entered holy orders at 11. He was one of the closest collaborators of Nag-dbañ-rnam-rgyal, who before retiring appointed him head of the civil administration (1650). After six years he in his turn retired (Wood-Sheep year 1655) and died at lCags-ri in the following year 39.

The 2nd sde-srid La-snon-pa bsTan-'dzin-'brug-rgags (1607—1667) was a bastard brother of Nag-dban-rnam-rgyal. In 1651 he was appointed spyi-bla of sPa-gro 40, and four years later he became sde-srid, being the first to bear the title of p’yag-mdzod. He took care of the building of Nag-dbañ-rnam-rgyal’s tomb and quenched the hostility of the other sects 41. Under his rule Bhutan had to meet another invasion from Tibet, led by the Shigatse sde-bdag nan-so Nor-bu and the gTsan mda’-dpon bKra-sis-sgan-nas. Fighting lasted till the 9th month of 1657, the critical points being sPa-gro, mK’ar-sa and the Bum-t’añ pass. Peace was concluded thanks to the mediation of the Sa-skya prince-abbot 42. Nevertheless, the Bhutanese supported the revolt which broke out in gTsan late in 1657 and lasted two years 43. Having governed the country for 12 years, bsTan-'dzin-'brug-rgags died in the Iron-Sheep year 1667 44.

The 3rd sde-srid p’yag-mdzod Mi-’gyur-brtan-pa (1613—1680), also called Dam-c’os-lhun-grub, belonged to the sMin-’k’yud family and was born in Central Tibet. Later he came to Bhutan and was appointed Kroñ-sa dpon-slob, from which post he ascended to the office of p’yag-mdzod; on this occasion he assumed the style of c’os-rgyal Mi-’gyur-brtan-pa. It was a rather agitated period. In 1675 he pacified the Mon-pa, i.e. Eastern Bhutan 45. In the following year there was another Tibetan invasion, by five different routes. It ended with a serious defeat of the column operating toward sPa-gro, about 30 Tibetan officers and 360 petty officers and soldiers being made prisoners; the other columns retreated 46. Peace was concluded in 1678, once more thanks to the efforts of the Sa-skya prince-abbot and of the treasurer of the Pan-c’en 47. Already in that year the sde-srid had expressed a wish to retire 48. Two years later he carried out his intention, and this energetic regent, who had given Bhutan its present shape by the annexation of the eastern districts, retired to lCags-ri, where he died in the same year 49.

Following the unanimous decision of the lamas and monasteries, the sku-zabs rin-po-c’e, i.e. the first rgyal-ts’ab, took full political powers (1680);

39 TSM, ff. 58b—59b; LCB, f. 93a—b.
40 LCB, f. 50b.
41 TSM, ff. 59b—60b.
42 TMS, f. 64b; LCB, f. 51b. The Pan-c’en too had some hand in it; autobiography of the 1st Pan-c’en, ff. 157b—158b.
43 LCB, ff. 51b—52a; G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, pp. 71—72.
44 TSM, ff. 67b—68a; LCB, ff. 93b—94a.
45 TSM, p. 94b.
46 TSM, ff. 96b—104b.
47 TSM, ff. 107b—108a.
48 TSM, f. 107a.
49 TSM, ff. 115b—116a; LCB, ff. 94b—96a.
he is therefore counted as the 4th sde-srid. As we have seen, he retired at the
beginning of 1695.

The 5th sde-srid dGe-'dun-c'os-'p'el had a long and distinguished career. In 1667 he was rdzoñ-dpon of dBaṅ-'dus-p'o-bran⁵₀, and shortly after he became spyi-bla of the capital sPuns-t'aṅ, an office which he held for 21 years till 1688⁵¹. When bsTan-'dzin-rab-rgyas retired to rTa-mgo, he was elected sde-srid. He is said to have been a man of warlike and cruel disposition; soon he made himself thoroughly hated; hostility against him mounted high and the fame of his cruelty spread even outside Bhutan. But of course this may also mean simply that he led a faction disagreeable to the author of the LCB. He died after a rule of 7 years (c. 1695—1702)⁵².

The 6th sde-srid Nag-dbaṅ-ts'e-rin was usually called sde-pa druñ-yig, because in 1692—93 he had been secretary (druñ-yig) of the first rgyal-ts'ab⁵₃. Later he was rdzoñ-dpon of dBaṅ-'dus-p'o-bran. Being elected regent, he introduced the bsTan-'gyur into Bhutan and ruled for three years (c. 1702—1705)⁵₄.

The 7th sde-srid, dbu-mdzad dPal-byor, governed the country rather weakly during three years (c. 1705—1708)⁵₅.

The 8th sde-srid 'Brug Rab-rgyas, also called sde-pa Waṅ P'a-jo, was the most forceful personality of this period of Bhutanese history. He was at first mgron-gfier of the government, then rdzoñ-dpon of bKra-sis-c'os-rdzon. After a short conflict he defeated the sPuns-t'aṅ rdzoñ-dpon bsTan-pa-dbaṅ-p'yug and seized the office of sde-srid. The deposition of the 2nd rgyal-ts'ab was his work; and P'yogs-las-rnam-rgyal, whom he installed in his place, was practically a mere puppet in his hands⁵₆. There was perhaps some connection between this coup and the invasion by Lajang Khan, the Qosot ruler of Tibet, who had to retire having accomplished nothing (1714); but it seems that the occasion for the heated exchange of letters that preceded the war was the sde-srid's hostility against the dGe-lug-pa governor of rTa-waṅ⁵₇. After 13 years of rule, during which he founded many chapels and temples, 'Brug Rab-rgyas retired formally (c. 1720), and for another ten years (till c. 1729) he stayed at Zab-don-lhun-rtse as the de facto ruler of the land; during this period he compiled a new code of laws. However, the weight of his personality lasted heavily upon Bhutan and eventually his rule, indirect though it was, aroused plenty of discontent. A civil war broke out, complicated by border frictions with the Lhasa government; and in its course he was murdered together with his ministers⁵₈.

⁵₀ TSM, f. 70b.
⁵¹ TSM, ff. 107b, 124b, 178b, 201b; LCB, f. 96b.
⁵₂ LCB, f. 96b; cf. f. 61b.
⁵₃ TSM, ff. 273a, 310a.
⁵₄ LCB, ff. 96b—97a.
⁵₅ LCB, f. 97a.
⁵₆ Cf. MBTJ, f. 344b.
⁵₇ MBTJ, f. 101a. Actually in the relevant passages (MBTJ, ff. 101b—102a) the sde-srid is called by the title of king (rgyal-po) of Bhutan. But another passage of the same text (MBTJ, f. 345a) proves that it was Waṅ P'a-jo who clashed with Lajang Khan. For an account of this war see L. PETECH, China and Tibet in the early 18th century, Leiden 1972, pp. 29—30.
⁵₈ LCB, ff. 97a—b, also 62a, 65a. For a résumé of this war see L. PETECH, China and Tibet in the early 18th century, pp. 161—162.
Upon his retirement (c. 1720) 'Brug Rab-rgyas had set up as the 9th sde-srid his own nephew (zan-dbon) Nag-dba'n-rgya-mts'o; he was also called the sde-pa dge-bses because he had been the spiritual teacher of 'Pyogs-las-rnam-rgyal. He held office for ten years (c. 1720—1730), without playing (it seems) a serious role at the side of his energetic uncle. In all likelihood we have to identify him with the 'Brug sde-srid with whom the 2nd Pan-c'en entertained a lively correspondence in 1726. He too was killed during the civil war.

After the death of both uncle and nephew, their adversaries installed a new rgyal-ts'ab as well as a new sde-srid. They were brothers. The elder was the 10th sde-srid Mi-p'am-dba'n-po, who was called originally bsTan-'dzin-'brug-rgyal and was an incarnation of the first rgyal-ts'ab. He entered holy orders at 10, receiving the tonsure from 'Pyogs-las-rnam-rgyal. During the war he was chosen as sde-srid, and on this occasion his name was changed to Nag-dba'n-bsTan-'dzin Mi-p'am-dba'n-po. Almost at once he fell out with the Ka-spe bla-ma 'Brug-don-grub, who was the chief supporter of 'Pyogs-las-rnam-rgyal, and a new war ensued. The Ka-spe bla-ma, being the weaker party, asked for the help of the Tibetan ruler P'o-lha-nas, who sent an army into Bhutan. Mi-p'am-dba'n-po was worsted and came to terms; late in 1730 he sent his uncle Dam-pa Ts'e-rin-dba'n-c'en to Lhasa to sign the peace treaty. Both brothers, rgyal-ts'ab and sde-srid, pledged loyalty to P'o-lha-nas and to the Chinese emperor through their representatives. Their and the Ka-spe bla-ma's declarations of allegiance and tribute were duly transmitted to Peking. But as internal strife continued, two officials were sent to Bhutan (1731); their efforts, however, met with no success. Then in the 10th month of the same year the ambans sent a Manchu officer, the major Ho-

60 LCB, ff. 97b—98b.
61 MBTJ, f. 346b.
62 LCB, f. 68a—b.
63 The Ka-spe were a noted family of the T'ed district in East Bhutan. They had become spyi-bla of sPa-gro in 1687 (TSM, f. 194b), and Ka-spe P'un-ts'ogs, spyi-bla since 1690, played an important role during the last years of the 1st rgyal-ts'ab., TSM, ff. 230b—231a, 266a, 273a, 276a, 278b, 306b, 321a. He may have been the Ka-spe dge-slon who in 1701 sent an embassy to the Dalai-Lama; Life of the 6th Dalai-Lama, f. 512b.
64 For this war see L. Peter, China and Tibet in the early 18th century, pp. 162—163.
65 MBTJ, f. 348b. Ts'e-rin-dba'n-c'en visited Lhasa again in 1736; L7DL, f. 203b. He cannot be identical with the other uncle, the sde-srid dPal-'byor, because the latter was already at the head of the government when 'Brug a-k'u (uncle) Ts'e-rin-dba'n-c'en had another audience with the Dalai-Lama in the 7th month of 1737; L7DL, f. 233b.
66 MBTJ, f. 349a.
67 Document of 14th March 1731, in Shih-tsung Shih-ju, 103.4b. Cf. Fan-pu yao-fu, ch. 17.25a—b; Wei-tsang t'ung-chih, 15.9b; Hsi-tsang-chih, 3.10b. — It is curious to note that the Chinese give a different set of names for the Bhutanese chiefs. The rgyal-ts'ab is called Cha-erh-sa (hsi, sê)-li-pu-ku-chi qubilghan; the first three characters stand for rGyal-sras; li is obscure; pu-ku-ke is 'Brug; ku-chi cannot be reconstructed. The sde-srid is given (also by the Tibetans) the title and name of noyan Rin-c'en 'P'rin-las-rab-rgyas.
68 Wei-tsang t'ung-chih, 15.9b (= Hsi-tsang-chih, 3.11b). The History of the chiefs of sTag-lun, f. 402a (on which work see China and Tibet in the early 18th century, p. 4), shows that the envoys were sPol-gon Darhan and sMan-t'a-n-pa.
shang, accompanied by the Tibetan minister (bka'-blon) Broñ-rtse. They succeeded in patching up an agreement of general peace, as well as a promise of tribute from both factions. It appears that at that time real power lay with the Ka-spe bla-ma; but when he died in 1735, "the people summoned back to power" the sde-srid. After 7 or 8 years of rule he went to visit Central Tibet. This happened in the 2nd month of 1736 and he was received with great deference by the Dalai-Lama, to whom he brought as present an elephant. This visit too was duly communicated to Peking. He left Lhasa, but remained in Tibet for some months more, and it was only in the 7th month that he was finally complimented out. Upon his return home he took over the position of rgyal-ts'ab, left vacant by the death of his younger brother.

The 11th sde-srid dPal-'byor was the paternal uncle of the two brothers. He had been the real power behind the scene, and it was he who after the civil war had placed his nephew on the seat of rgyal-ts'ab, remaining at his side as chamberlain (gzims-dpon). He took over the office of sde-srid when Mi'p'am-dbañ-po went to Tibet, i.e. in 1736. Among his activities we note the restoration of the lCags-ri monastery, which had been destroyed by fire. Envoys sent by him were received at Lhasa in 1737, 1738 and 1739. He is said to have retired after about three years. Actually his tenure lasted a little longer, because his retirement took place in 1740 and is registered by the Central Tibetan texts along with the full name of his successor. At the time of the final redaction of LCB he was still alive in the hermitage of Sarbon-spi-ri.

The 12th sde-srid Nag-dbañ-rgyal-mts'an was at first rdzoñ-dpon of bDa-lín-k'a, then of bKra-sis-c'os-rdzoñ, and distinguished himself at the time of the Tibetan invasion of 1730. Later he was a minister (blon-po) and was

56 Op. cit. Ho-shang is the Go lao-yeh who, according to the History of the stTag-luñ chiels was stationed at Gyantse when the two envoys went to Bhutan. Ho-shang and the minister were the bearers of letters from the Pan-c'en to the 'Brug gžun and to the Ka-spe bla-ma; autobiography of the Second Pan-c'en, f. 396b.

70 Wei-tsang t'ung-chih and Hsi-tsang-chih, loc. cit. The new Ka-spe bla-ma Nag-dbañ-brug-pa visited Lhasa after the sde-srid in 1736 and again in 1737; L7DL, ff. 204b, 235a. He sent his complimentary mission to the New Year festival of 1739, and again visited the Dalai-Lama in 1742; L7DL, ff. 252a, 277b. In 1746 it was his nephew who had an audience with the Dalai-Lama; L7DL, f. 328a.

70 LCB, f. 69a; PTD, ff. 43b—44a.
71 L7DL, ff. 196a—197a; Wei-tsang t'ung-chih, 15.9b.
72 Document of 7th June 1736, in Kao-tsung Shih-lu, 17.21b—22a. Two very submissive memorials of the sde-srid and of the Ka-spe bla-ma to the emperor, both dated 9th September 1736, are included in Wei-tsang t'ung-chih, 15.9b—10b (= Hsi-tsang-chih, 3.12a—14a).
73 L7DL, f. 205b; PTD, f. 44b.
74 L7DL, f. 267a.
elected to the office by the laity of Bhutan. He ruled for about three years. In 1741 he sent envoys to the Pan-c'ën at bKra-sis-lhung-po, in 1742 he re-established the sPa-gro sTag-ts'an-dpal monastery and the lha-k'an at sKyer-c'u, giving notice of it to the Dalai-Lama. He died in 1743 and his funeral rites were performed in Lhasa during the following New Year's festival.

The 13th sde-srid Šes-rab-dbañ-p'yug had been a mgon-gñer and had been out as military commander (k'a-lo-sgyur-pa) in East Bengal; probably he acted for a time as rGya spyi-bla, i.e. as Bhutanese agent in Cooch-Behar. When the second civil war broke out, he appears with the name of mgon-gñer Sri-t'ub as the organizer of the Ka-spe troops. Shortly after he became spyi-bla of sPa-gro. Then he retired, but was brought out of his retirement to become sde-srid (1743 or 1744). He sent a special embassy to Lhasa in 1746 to announce the accession of the new žabs-druri, then again in 1747 and every year from 1752 to 1757. In the Fire-Ox year 1757, when the narrative of LCB comes to an end, he had been in office for about 13 years and his rule had brought happiness and peace to the country. He retired in 1762 and was still alive in 1767.

For the sake of completeness we shall carry on the tale for a few years more.

The 14th sde-srid 'Brug-p'un-ts'ogs (1762—1764) died in office after only two years.

The 15th sde-srid bsTan-'dzin-rnam-rgyal took the seat in 1764 and retired (or died?) in 1767.

The 16th sde-srid bSod-nams-lhung-grub, appointed in 1767, retired in 1770.

The 17th sde-srid bZi-dar was at first mgon-gñer of the government, then dpon-slob. He was at the helm of the state during the Bhutanese invasion.

---

80 LCB, ff. 98b—99a.
81 Life of the Third Pan-c'ën, f. 33b (full name given).
82 L7DL, f. 293b.
83 L7DL, f. 306a.
84 LCB, f. 99a.
85 PTD, f. 37a—b. The identity of Sri-t'ub with Šes-rab-dbañ-p'yug is established by the passage of the L7DL quoted below.
86 LCB, f. 99b. The Dalai-Lama sent presents for the accession of dpon-slob Sri-t'ub as sde-srid of Bhutan; L7DL, f. 311a.
87 L7DL, f. 331b.
88 L7DL, ff. 339b, 404b, 409b, 429a (repairs to the gtsug-lag-k'an of sPuñs-t'ao), 440a (important repairs at Rva-luñ), 468b, 475a, 521b.
89 LCB, f. 99a—b.
90 PTD, f. 94b.
91 PTD, f. 107a.
92 PTD, ff. 94b, 98a, 102a.
93 Life of the 8th Dalai-Lama, f. 38a, where the full name is given; PTD, f. 103a, calls him simply sde-srid bsTan-'dzin.
94 The Central Tibetan texts state that he died in 1767; Life of the 3rd Pan-c'ën, f. 275b (full name given); Life of the 8th Dalai-Lama, ff. 45a, 53a. But PTD, f. 107a, mentions two former sde-srid (gdan-zur) alive in 1767; one was Šes-rab-dbañ-p'yug and the other Gyun-med-bsTan-'dzin. The latter cannot but be identical with sde-srid bsTan-'dzin-rnam-rgyal. I cannot solve the contradiction at present.
95 PTD, f. 104b.
96 PTD, f. 84a.
of Cooch-Behar, which in 1771 the Pan-c'en had tried in vain to avert and which led to British intervention. bZi-dar was deposed at the end of 1772. With him we may close our list.