A description of the traditional Tibetan government (1642-1951) was Chhos-srid-gnyis-ladan, that is, one which is possessed of both Dharma (Chhos) and Sarvara (Gnyis). While in organizational sense Chhos-srid-gnyis-ladan meant a dynasty of clerical and lay elements, in ideological sense it meant a synthesis. In this view Chhos-ldags (the norm of Dharma) and bja-gsum-ldags (the norm of Sarvara) are complementary components of the mundane norm. Was this concept in accordance with the traditions of Buddhism, Indian and Tibetan? For any discussion of this question, it is essential to underline that the word ‘religion’ is only one and an inadequate rendering of the word Dharma, and that the Tibetan word Chhos expresses the multiple and varied content of the Sanskrit term Dharma.

(i)

The Brahmanical (Hindu) goal of liberation (Moksha) is to be attained through a balanced pursuit of virtue (Dharma), wealth (Artha) and pleasure (Kama). For the man in society there is an inconsistency between Dharma and Artha or between Dharma and Kama as material well-being is the means for moral endeavor. In Vaiseshika view, material prosperity (Abhyudaya) as well as beatitude (NirVAruka) are realized through Dharma. Right from the Vedic times there has been a quest for harmony between the spiritual and the temporal needs of existence. In time this became the dominant ethos of Brahmanical (Hindu) civilization and had its reflection on the State.

In the Vedic scale of values Dharma was topmost, the pursuit of sacrifices and rituals was superior to that of governments and war, and the priest was the kingmaker. This was soon challenged, in the interests of a fruitful existence Rajasatru (science of government) was equated to Dharmasastra; Arthahiti (Economics) and Dushaniti (Politics) were duly admitted into the category of sublimate sciences. It was realized that ‘when the polity becomes lifeless, the Three Vedas sink and all the Dharmas completely decay’. Therefore the custodian of the polity, the Kshatriya Varna, effectively shielded the supremacy of the Brahman Varna. By a complex code of legal actions the
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Brahmana perpetuated his first place and continued to be the power behind the throne. There was no stigma for the Brahmana to be engaged in Artharniti or Damashini as the Rajasvarya was sublimated into Rajadharma.

"The Rajadharma is the refuge of the entire world.
In Rajadharma is found every form of renunciation.
In Rajadharma is combined every faculty of learning." *Mahabharata*

These were not altogether idle sentiments or frothy expressions; the ethos for harmony between spiritual and temporal needs created an ideal of philosophy-king (Rajarshi). Chandragupta Maurya, who in his youth beat back the battalions of Seleukos Nikator, ended his days as a Jiva recluse. His grandson Asoka remains the solitary grandeur of a saint-king in the entire history of mankind. In medieval India, Sivaji the Maratha gained the esteem of his people more because of his code of renunciation (Bhagwa Jhanda) than because of his genius in war. When Gandhi in our own time applied the ideal of renunciation in politics he was recalling the traditional polity of India.

An idealistic view of politics as the Rajadharma not only sanctioned the participation in statecraft by the sages and seers: the priests and monks. The Rajadharma summoned the philosophers and priests to a high moral obligation.

* (ii)

Buddhism began with a sharp antithesis between Politics and Ethics. The *Brahma-sutra* list the wrong means of livelihood and low arts—that is, the occupations forbidden for the monks and recluses—included Kshattriya.9 In Buddhist view Kshattriya involved violence and deceit, parsimony and cannibalism; and vivid accounts of such crimes characteristic of the Kshatriya are found in *Mahabuddha Jataka*, *Mahasuttasama Jataka* and *Mohasmagga Jataka*.99 Kshattridharma was in short Mithyasjiva.

The Buddhist concept of politics as a divine science was no doubt due to the wars and intrigues rampant in Shodasa Mahajanapada (sixteen principalities in North India struggling for paramountcy) at the advent of Buddhism; Buddhist ethics (non-violence and quietude) reacted sharply to the Brahmanical statecraft embodied in the *Artha* works. This disapproval of Kshattridharma continued into the Malayana literature and the works of Aryadeva (*Chatuskakata*), Asvaghosa (*Buddhacharita*) and Arysura (*Jatakamala*) abound with exposition and con-
The Buddhism of Kshatriya attributes like quest for security (vis-a-vis quiescence), attachment to state (vis-a-vis reconstruction) or levy for fighting (vis-a-vis forbearance) and above all environment as unfair means to realize a fair objective (as is Brahmanical works like Bhagavadgita) where listener of known on the wrong side is not as offence (the factor). But the Mahavas literature developed a tendency "to Forsake the application of statecraft within its own sphere".11

The reason for this accommodation is not to be traced in the Mahavas literature but in the national ethos which Brahman could not altogether destroy, Buddhism had to seek reconciliation between politics and ethics in its own way.

The Buddhist antithesis between Politics and Ethics was all through involved with a quest for temporal authority sublimated into righteous rule. This syndrome, as we may be described in current Western phraseology, is manifest right from the beginning in the Buddhist doctrine. CHAKRA and CHAKRAVARTI, SĀSANA and SASTA are expressions fraught with temporal implications. Chakra' is the symbol of power of a dynamic (victorious) ruler while ‘Chakrawarti' is the world ruler, 'Sasana' is common to Dharma as well as Dendra while 'Sasta' is master either as teacher or ruler. Before the Buddha, the term Sangha' was more used to denote occupational and political groups and less for a body of religious. When eventually Sangha became "the Great Soul" it was the Sugadha Sangha; it was then an active participant in social, economic and even political affairs. The Sangha, as the Third Jewel, did not accept Yana or Arama: it was a cooperation partly patterned on the oligarchic republics.12

Buddhist hostility to the Varrasana had the best and the most significant expression in its attitude to the Kshatriya Varna. The Buddhist Book of Genesis, Agama Sutta, records the Buddha's discourse about the creation of social order. It is a highly scientific enquiry into the early history of man: the Buddha's accounts of origin of property and election of king anxiously anticipate the Western philosophers of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this discourse while the monks and recluse are acclaimed as the best of men, the Kshatriya is regarded as the best of the social classes and the Brahman is placed second.

The people, according to this discourse, fixed their choice for king on the most handsome and capable individual and called him Mahanamata (one who is chosen by the multitudes), Kshatriya (one who is lord of Kshetra=field) and Raja (one who gratifies others according to Dharma); peer of this man came to be called Kshatrya. Next came the Brahman or the onerogged in Dhyana (meditation).
and Adhyayana (teaching the sacred texts), then the Vaisya or the class engaged in trades and last the Sudra or the class engaged in herding and such low occupations.

The Buddha concluded his discourse thus:19
The Kosatrya is the best among this folk
Who put their trust in lineage.
But one in wisdom and in virtue clothed
Is best of all among spirits and men.

(trans. Rhys Davids)

The precedence of the Kosatrya over the Brahmana was consistently followed in later literature (e.g. Vasudharmodaya; Abhidharmavatstava and Buddhaguhsa; Pratishadisangaha; and duly incorporated into Pali canon. The crux of the sentiment was however not the precedence over the Brahmana but the Kosatrya title to reign. Otherwise a democratic order open to merchants, courtiers and untouchables would not be so enthusiastic about Kosatrya birth of the Buddha. Nor would the Bhikhus and Sramanas anxiously record the Kosatrya origins of Asoka without such consideration.

While the Brahmanical works like the Puranas and Mahvaditkshara describe the Mauryas as Sudras, the Buddhist works like Mahaparinibbana Sutta, Dhyavadana and Mahavamsa meticulously record details in support of the Kosatrya ancestry of the Mauryas.14 It is not unlikely that the Mauryas were not good Kosatryas in Brahmanical view; Chandragupta the founder of the Maurya Empire had no inclination to enter into matrimonial alliance with the Yavanas (Greek) nor did he perform the Ayasamedha sacrifice. The Brahmanical esteem for Chandragupta was based on an admiration for the low-born while the Buddhist description of Asoka’s father as Raja Kosatrya Mucilaghisthabhak (an ascended Kosatrya king) was to affirm the Maurya entitlement to sovereignty.

The emphasis on the Kosatrya birth was so deep that even after Nirvana the Buddha was honoured as a Kosatrya. King Milindu, identified with the Bactrian King Menander, is known to have asked Sthavira Nagaena thus: “If Nagaena, the Blessed One were a Brahmana then he must have spoken falsely when he said he was a king. But if he were a king then he must have spoken falsely when he said he was a Brahmana. He must have been either a Kosatrya or a Brahmana. For he could not have belonged in the same birth to two castes. This too is a double-edged problem, now put to you which you have to solve”. (trans. Rhys Davids)

The sage was indeed on the horns of a dilemma and had to direct his logic to the common feature between ‘a true Brahmana’
and 'a true Kshatriya'. Both are righteous beings: one is Emancipated and Enlightened through practice of righteousness and the other establishes himself and his dynasty through righteous rule.19

While any theological contradiction between a Buddha and a Raja was thus solved, Nagasena's answer lifted the Kshatradharma from the level of Mathajiva (wrong means of livelihood) to that of Siva (wisdom). Nagasena's exposition, however unintended, was a logical sequence of the legends about the Buddha's birth. An immaculate Being was to be born and all prognostications from Mara's dream till the sage Asita's visit converged that the avatara of a Chakravarthi Raja (Universal Sovereign) was to be either a Chakravarthi Raja (Universal Sovereign) or a Sambuddha (Fully Enlightened).

Thus the edification of monarchy or the subjugation of statecraft in Mahayana literature was a continuation of the tradition expounded by Nagasena. In Mahayana thought the king was Dharmaraja and not unique Buddha-Sattva. The climax was reached in Swarnaprabhasa Sutra which depicted the king as Devaputra. The Buddha's discourse about elective kingship yielded ground to Manu's divine creation. The Kshatriya now possessed an aura of divinity.20

Kshatriya-hood or royalty was merit worthy of a Bodhisattva. The greatest of Indian saints propagating in Tibet were born in the purple: Santarakshita, Padmasambhava and Atisha had renounced their temporal heritage to stride the trail of the Buddha. The Kshatriya origins of these teachers, not less than that of the Buddha and Avalokitesvara, were due to the nondualistic Tirthanana mind. The Tibetans could comprehend Kshatriya-Brhammadharma equation of Nagasena, from the living examples of the Indian masters preaching on the spot.

States with Buddhisva as established church were few, if any, in India and not much is on record about the matter of Church and State. The act of Srunam/Brahman participation in state business is however known. Few from being a taboo such participation was a norm. When Buddhism was retreating across the Himalayas, both Buddhist and Brahmanical traditions had accepted Srunam/Brahmam as the foundation of the state.

It will not be out of place to quote here a French scholar (Paul Mason-Osvald) about the destiny of the Indian concepts of state,

"...the Brahmanic notion of dharma which implies the special constitution of each caste and maintains a social order rather than it encourages the appearance of a political spirit, and the Buddhist notion of dharma, which aims at a law applicable to all mankind
and makes for unlimited imperialism. The one conception stands
short of monarchy, the other leaps beyond it and aspires to world
empire . . . . .

Certain flaws in the above proposition are pointed out by the
leading Indian authority on the subject, Professor U. Pandita Nath
Ghoshal. The broad conclusion however stands firm that the
state in Buddhism could be more sovereign than its counterparts
in Brahmanism.

If the Buddhist notion of Dharma facilitated the growth of
state authority this must have gone so in the interests of the Dharma.
The Sangha as a body or through individual members would thus have
no inhibition about Kshatravipasa (science of government).

"In Tibet Buddhist monks had the same rights as the laymes to
be appointed state officials, both military and civil".

Yuan ShiK trans. Tucci

This statement, from the Chinese chronicle about the 'barbarian'
dynasty (Mongol: Yuan), has an element of surprise since the monks
(particularly the Buddhist monks) could not be in the government of the
Celestial Empire nor could they ever share power with the Confucian
literati. When the Mongols made Tibet a part of their Empire, the
monks of Sakya and Kagyu sects were active participants in the politics
of their country; Lamas sharing power with the secular nobles was al-
ready a tradition. Qubilai Khan, resident in Khan Balak (later called
Peking), had to reckon with "the vastness, distance and difficulties of that
region inhabited by a wild and war-like population" and "decided to
rule it in accordance with local usage as to subdue the people". The
acceptance of "local usage"—the Buddhist monks as state officials—was
an imperative need of the Mongol imperialism as three quotes from the
Yuan ShiK bear out.

Therefore the justification of the Buddhist monks holding temporal
offices has to be sought not in the 'civilized' code of the Celestial
Empire but in the 'barbarian' tradition of Tibet.

The accepted date for first propagation of Buddhism in Tibet is
about the first quarter of the seventh century and that for the ordina-
tion of Tibetan monks is about the last quarter of the eighth century.
The Drepung (Sangha) was an established fact by about c. 845; its
activities were not confined within the walls of the monasteries; the
monks were organizing the schools and advising the kings. When king
Gang-darma's persecution of Buddhism reached the height, a monk assassinated the apostate (c. 842). The regicide was an act of piety for the monk and an act of redemptive compassion to the king. Persecuted people recalled the injunction of the scriptures about redress from disputes (Sarvadurgapravishadu;): forbearance and meditation cannot be practiced while harm is done to the Three Gems and the Spiritual Teachers are endangerd.21

On the decline of the Central dynasty and the breakup of the country into numerous principalities, the abbot of big monasteries exercised law and order in their respective localities. This became a normal fixture long before the advent of the Mongols. Meanwhile Indian works on the role of Brahmana Namama were under study; all these texts were not strictly canonical but were found worthy of incorporation into Tantric. One such was Rajavijaya attributed to Chansaka; the translator was Rinchen Ralung, the great monk-scholar who marked the regeneration of Buddhism in Tibet and later rated with Atisa. Four successive verses of the Tibetan version (Chapter VIII) describing the limbs of society emphasize the parity between the ruler (rgyal-po) and the monk/priest (drgye-ldongs/bran-ge).

The king is the summit of Chhos
The monk/priest is the root
The root bears the fruit
Thus the root may not be hurt.

The king is the fruit of Chhos
The monk/priest is the flower
The flower bears the fruit
Thus the flower may not be damaged.

The king is the tree and the monk is the root
The ministers are the branches and the people the leaves
If the root is preserved the tree does not perish
The monk/priest has thus to be well preserved.

All (interests/estates) being dependent on each other
The king preserves the monk
The Chhos, wealth and fame are attained
When the monk is ever preserved.22

These words not only affirmed the high status of the monk but also advised a patron-priest relationship between king and monk in the total interest of Chhos.

The Tibetan kings responsible for propagation of Buddhism, appropriately designated as Dharma(r)ja (Chhossregyal) and later recalled in
Mongol se Chakravarti, no doubt practiced patron-priest relationship. The regicide (c. 842) and the sequel created a new situation and the priest had to take a larger and a more direct part in temporal affairs. In the 13th century, when the Mongol Emperors and the Sakya Lamas formed patron-priest relations, the monks were more than priests and had added statecraft to their routine. The Sakya Lamas categorically approved such conduct as in the interest of Chos.

The Sakya Pandita (c. 1032-1100) made the famous pronouncement that monasticism of the acts of the world (byig-sten-bya-ba) led to the path of the Sacred Doctrine, his nephew Chos-grub-lha-brjabs (c. 1135-1186) when accused of secular (Mongol) style of dress answered thus, "The Buddha had predicted the rise and fall of the Doctrine (according to exigencies of time); the happiness of the people would depend on their own Karma (and not on the style of dress); one (Lama) must behave (preach) in a way that suits (wins over) the other (devotee)."

This elastic conduct (bya-ba) by no doubt varied dividends. Bya-ba-byin-thang sums up thus: "Under the auspices of the Patron (Chos) and the Priest (Chos-lha-brjabs) the riches of Mongolia and China made Tibet the centre of the Sacred Doctrine."

About the administrative system during the Priest-Patron Regime the same work says: "Tibet was happy and the Sacred Doctrine glittered like a mirror because of the Two Laws, the Lama’s Command and Emperor’s Rule. As there were two sets of laws—one for the lama (domain of the church) and one for the Monde (domain of the state)—there were two sets of officials (monk and lay) not necessarily working exclusive of each other. The monks and the nobles were closely connected and there could not be any absolute separation between spiritual and temporal estates. Besides the Lamas held a good number of civil posts. The aksa, the Sakya hierarchy, was the meeting point of both ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions. Here was a government possessed of both Chos (Pharma) and Seal (Samvara)."

The contemporary Mongol chronicles noticed "the succession of Indian and Tibetan traditions" in "the principle of dual government."

The Mongol bias to affiliate much of Lamasist theories and institutions to India is well known. While the terms of Chos srid-myi-dam may be traced to Indian thought, its practical application is no doubt a phenomenon of Tibetan history. While Indian scriptures contain sanction for the Sangha to engage itself in Rajabharna, Indian history had no institutional precedent for Tibet.
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Eng. Trans. in Rhys Davids: Dialogues of the Buddha (Pali Text Society 1921/1936), Pt I, p.18. 21

11. Ghoshal locates an instance in Jatahoona of Aryasura; Indian Political Ideas (cited under note 6 above), pp. 139-41.
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Eng. Trans. in Rhy's Davids: Dialogues, Pt II, p. 94

14. The conflicting opinions about the ancestry of the Mauryas may be read in Hera Prashan Sastri's paper in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1930 and Hemchandra Roychoudhuri: Political History of Asima India (Calcutta 1931), pp. 194, 266-8 & 355-6.

15. Eng. Trans. in Rhy's Davids: The Questions of King Milinda (Sacred Books of the East), Dilemma no 48. William Tarn: The Greeks in Macedonia and India (Cambridge 1937/1951) holds that Menander was not a Buddhist but contends on numismatic evidence that Menander proclaimed himself a Chakravarti in a Buddhist sort (pp. 125-6). Ghoshal: Indian Political Ideas, p. 115, note 9 and A. K. Naran: The Indo-Greeks (Oxford 1937), p. 98 reject this. In my submission the Chakra on Menander's coin could symbolize either Dharma or Danda and possibly did symbolize both. To substantiate this, it is not necessary to answer whether Menander was a Buddhist in a denominational sense or whether Menander could have claimed Dharanavijaya. I contend that Chakra is common to both Buddha (Brahmana) and Chakravarti (Kshatriya). Nagan's Brahmana-Kshatriya equation could have no better motif for a coin or an ensign than Chakra.

16. An exhausitive and critical note on the epithet Desavartya is found in the contribution by F. W. Thomas to B.C. Law Volume, Part II, (Poona 1946). The usage, according to Thomas, may be traced back to Nagarjuna's time. Re: Desavartya as Kshatriya title, Ruchandhuri rightly insists on Chinese and Greek influence, Political History, pp. 518-9. Divine Right was much in the air; the Brahmana and the Saka-Yavana no doubt communicated the new fangled concept.
to the Buddha engaged in evaluation of the Kshatriya.
As the Brahmanical theorists had to formulate Divine Creation in accordance with the Brahmanical notion of Devas, the Buddhist theorists had to respect the Buddhist notion of Devas. The Mahayana world of gods (Devaloka) is a kingdom ruled by Brahma and 32 'royal gods'; this assembly of 33 Devas'jedra recalls oligarchic repabiles like Saka or Lichchhavī. Thus the the Desaputra, according to Suanaprapthahanama Sutra, was a Kaja made up of the contributions of India and his 32 colleagues. Ghosal finds this an adaptation of Manu's Divine Creation of the temporal ruler out of the essences of the Regents of the Quarters, Indian Political Ideas, p. 266.

Desaputra was the highest most high; the word Desaputra was the quintessence of the Divine Royalty in its totality. The numerous character of the progenitor (13) or the legend of 10,000 Desapurana does not suggest a numerous clan of innumerous deities as Thomas thinks; in Mahayana mythology of Bodhisattvas are usual. It is not warranted to equate Desaputra with minor deities (like the Dikpalas) or with kings (like those of Kucha-Khotan). The nātsa 'gutta' is not demeaning. Manjusri Kumara Bhumitra is more beloved than Manjusri, either form Jina (Buddha) or Sūtraputra (Buddhāsūtraputra) may be used to describe a saint or a hierarch to have experienced in the monasteries of Tibet. Franklín Edgerton regards Desaputra as a synonym of Deva. Dictionary of Buddhism Hybrid Sanskrit. In the above extract from Suanaprapthahanāma both forms Deva and Desaputra are used. Desaputra, in my admission, is not a title characteristic of local or minor king; whoever sported this title was no doubt claiming divinity. Desaputra is not an elective ruler and has divine title, possibly of pluristic origin (Greek, Iranian, Chinese, Hsiung Nu and Brahmanic).

The point for notice is the apotheosis of the Kshatriya, that is, the progress from popular contract to divine status. In Agama Sutra the Kshatriya is Mahāmanuṣya. In Vaibhavagīga
(संस्कृतम्: निर्देशायूपम: दिङ्करारः) the first Kshatriya is none else than Bhagavan Buddha (Gautama Siddhartha). In Shravanaledha the Raja, though born of mortal parents, is Devanirmita.

18. Ghoshal: Indian Political Ideas pp.73,114 & 120.

In 1368 the Mongol (Yuan) dynasty in China was overthrown and succeeded by a native (Ming) dynasty. In the beginning of 1369 Emperor Tai-tsu, founder of the Ming dynasty, ordered the the court to compile the official history (Shih) of the Yuan. Sixteen Yuan scholars worked on the Yuan documents and completed the the work in a year; the work was supervised by the Emperor himself. The Yuan-Shih preserves a valuable record of Tibet and Tibetan government during the Mongol (Yuan) period. Ignorant of the language I owe my knowledge of Chinese historiography to the works of Charles Gardner, Carrington Goodrich and Lien-Shen Yang. Beasley and Pulleyblank (ed): Historians of China and Japan (London 1961) contains on pp.64-59 a critique of the annals from the Tang to the Ming from the pen of Lien-Shen Yang.


[In Sanskrit:

[वन्नक्रमालक्षणं अन्वयं] 
[श्रवणालेधारः] 

[वन्नक्रमालक्षणं] 
[श्रवणालेधारः]

[वन्नक्रमालक्षणं] 
[श्रवणालेधारः]

[वन्नक्रमालक्षणं] 
[श्रवणालेधारः]
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প্রথম হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান
গৃহ অবস্থান নির্দেশিত হইলে আমরা আর্কায় দালান খিলান
(দ্঵িতীয় হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)
গৃহে অবস্থান নির্দেশিত হইলে আর্কায় দালান খিলান
(মূল হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)
গৃহে অবস্থান নির্দেশিত হইলে আর্কায় দালান খিলান
(অনুষ্ঠান হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)

প্রথম প্রথম কৃষ্ণ দেগুলিসঙ্গে বাঁচিয়ে রাখলো হাতিদের অগ্রিম প্রস্তুতি
(নবনীত প্রস্তুতি হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)

প্রথম হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান নির্দেশিত হইলে আর্কায় দালান খিলান
(নবনীত প্রস্তুতি হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)

নবনীত কন্যা উম্মরী কলিতে শিক্ষা পরিনামে অস্ত্রকলাকার হইলে অস্ত্রকলাকার
(নবনীত প্রস্তুতি হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)

নবনীত কন্যা উম্মরী কলিতে শিক্ষা পরিনামে অস্ত্রকলাকার হইলে অস্ত্রকলাকার
(নবনীত প্রস্তুতি হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)

নবনীত কন্যা উম্মরী কলিতে শিক্ষা পরিনামে অস্ত্রকলাকার হইলে অস্ত্রকলাকার
(নবনীত প্রস্তুতি হাতে আর্কায় দালান খিলান)
A description of the Sakya administrative system is not called for here. Chinese and Mongol chronicles besides Tibetan literature provide data for considerable study. Tucci: op. cit., pp. 11-19 may be seen for a brief notice.

Extracts from two Chinese state papers may be made in corroboration of the Tibetan claims about equality in status between the Mongol Emperor and the Sakya Lama.

The official history (Yuan Shih), compiled immediately after the overthrow of the Yuan, states: "The orders of the Ti-shih, Imperial Master (= Sakya Lama), and of the Emperor were equally valid in Tibet. For a hundred years the Emperors showed the greatest respect and confidence for the Imperial Master. The Emperors and all the princes took the vow and used to salute the Imperial Master, kneeling to receive his blessing. In the Court gatherings, when the different officials took place allotted according to their rank, the Imperial Master sat next to the Emperor. Each Emperor on ascending the throne, publicly addressed a message of praise and protection to the Imperial Master". (trans. Tucci).

The Mancu Emperor Chien-lung in his famous Dissertation on Lamaism, inscribed in 1792 on a marble stele in Yung-ho-kung (the Lamasist Cathedral of Peking), said: "During the Yuan dynasty the Lamas were worshiped in a way that interfered with the government. This led to abuses which no one dared to question. For instance decrees given by the Teacher of the Emperor had the same force as the decrees emanating from the Court. At official audiences, while all the officials had to stand at places assigned to them according to rank, the teacher of the Emperor alone was allowed to remain seated in his place of honour in the corner. His disciples bore titles such as Minister of Interior, Minister of Finance, Duke of the Empire. There was an unbroken succession of them who carried veils of jade or gold. Presuming on their prestige they carried themselves haughtily and ostentatiously which resulted everywhere in great vexations difficult to describe here exhaustively". Eng. trans. in F.D. Leising: Yung-ho-kung (Stockholm 1941), p. 19.
The inference is unavoidable that the Patron-Priest relations between the Mongol Emperor and the Tibetan Teacher did not much affect the authority (i.e. sovereignty) of the Teacher in his Teacher’s homeland.