



ИДЕИ И ПОЛИТИКА В ИСТОРИИ IDEAS AND POLITICS IN HISTORY

DOI: 10.22363/2312-8127-2023-15-4-355-373

EDN: BKHETF

Research article / Научная статья

“Genghis Khans” of the 17th–18th centuries: between politics and religion¹

B.U. Kitinov  

Institute of Oriental Studies RAS,
107031 Moscow, Rozhdestvenka str., 12

 e-mail: kitinov@mail.ru

Abstract. The Mongolian peoples traditionally associated crucial events and processes with the name of Genghis Khan. Nonetheless, that name acquired a nominal significance in one sphere, specifically as a title or an auxiliary name to the first, where it became a special name. The Genghis Khan name itself held a holy and tabooed implication that guided its subsequent realization. The study aims to investigate the impact of religion on the utilisation of Genghis Khan’s title by the Mongolian leaders during the XVII–XVIII centuries. The study focuses on two leaders of Mongolian peoples, the Chakhar in the east and the Oirat-Hoshut in the west, to examine the uniformity and diversity of interpreting and implementing this name as a title. They were Ligdan and Lkhavzan, with Ligdan being a direct descendant of Genghis Khan and Lkhavzan was considered to be a descendant of Khabutu, the younger brother of Genghis Khan. The author came to the following conclusions: such use of Genghis Khan’s name became possible due to the influence of a number of factors that actualised Genghis Khan’s name: 1) the struggle against separatism under the influence of external force; 2) the desire to “start anew”, to lead a “new era of prosperity”; 3) the need to identify oneself as a true leader under the increasing role of religion. The scientific contribution is to determine the multidimensional meaning of Genghis Khan’s name; its use as a title had common grounds and characteristics, and in general had the expected (albeit in the short term) results.

Keywords: Genghis Khan, Ligdan, Lhavzan, Dalai Lama, khagan, khan, the Manchus, the Khoshuts, the Chakhars

¹ This article is based on the author’s speech at the international conference “World Genghis Khan and Mongolian Studies» in Ulaanbaatar in August 2022.

© Kitinov B.U., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Article history: Received: 25.05.2023. Accepted: 08.08.2023.

For citation: Kitinov B.U. “Genghis Khans” of the 17th–18th centuries: between politics and religion. *RUDN Journal of World History*. 2023;15(4):355–373. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2023-15-4-355-373>

«Чингисханы» XVII–XVIII вв. : между политикой и религией²

Б.У. Китинов  

Институт востоковедения РАН,
107031 Москва, л. Рождественка, 12

 e-mail: kitinov@mail.ru

Аннотация. У монгольских народов самые важные события и процессы традиционно соотносились с именем Чингисхана. Однако была одна сфера, где это имя получило нарицательное значение — его использование как титула или второго, в качестве дополнения к первому, т. е. особенного имени. Имя Чингисхана само по себе имело сакральный и одновременно табуированный смысл, что повлияло на его дальнейшую актуализацию. Целью исследования является выявление влияния религии на использование имени Чингисхана как титула лидерами монгольских народов в XVII–XVIII вв. Исследовательская проблема заключается в единстве и разнице толкования и сфере использования этого имени как титула, что можно наблюдать при изучении жизнедеятельности двух лидеров у восточных (чахаров) и западных (ойратов-хошутов) монголов. Это были Лигдан и Лхавзан, причем первый был прямым потомком Чингисхана, второй считался потомком Хабуту, младшего брата Чингисхана. Автор пришел к следующим выводам: такое использование имени Чингисхана стало возможным ввиду влияния ряда факторов, актуализировавших имя Чингисхана: 1) борьба с сепаратизмом в условиях воздействия внешней силы; 2) стремление «начать заново», возглавить «новую эпоху процветания»; 3) необходимость идентифицировать себя как истинного лидера в условиях возрастания роли религии. Научный вклад заключается в определении многоаспектного значения имени Чингисхана, его использование в качестве титула имело общие основания и характеристики, и в целом оказало ожидаемые (хотя и в краткосрочной перспективе) результаты.

Ключевые слова: Чингисхан, Лигдан, Лхавзан, Далай-лама, хаган, хан, маньчжуры, хошуты, чахары

История статьи: Поступила в редакцию: 25.05.2023. Принята к публикации: 08.08.2023.

Для цитирования: Китинов Б.У. «Чингисханы» XVII–XVIII вв. : между политикой и религией // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Всеобщая история. 2023. Т. 15. № 4. С. 355–373. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2023-15-4-355-373>

² Основу данной статьи составило выступление автора на международной конференции «Мир Чингисхана и монголоведение» в Улан-Баторе в августе 2022 г.

Khan, Khagan and the factor of religion

In fact, immediately after Genghis Khan's death in 1227, the question of the titlature of his successors arose, because the title of the chief khan became unclear, since his sons, who had their own uluses, were called the same as Genghis Khan, i.e. khans. I. D. Rachewiltz believed that one should distinguish the specifics of the use of these titles before and after 1229, i.e. the time of accession to the throne of Ugedei, the third son of Genghis Khan. Earlier there was only the title "khan", and only Ugedei, the first to succeed Genghis Khan, began to be called *khagan* [1. P. 272–274]. The word "khagan" (*qayan*) came into the political culture of the Mongols due to the strong cultural influence of the Uighurs. Since then, the rulers of regional Mongolian peoples were called khans, and the head of the entire Great Mongolian ulus (*yekeMongyolulus*) was called Khagan. Thus, the Khagans were the descendants of Ugedei and his brother Tolui up to the descendants of Khubilai, the founder of the Yuan dynasty that ruled in China since 1271³.

The role of religion in the domestic and foreign policy of these rulers, starting with Genghis Khan himself, should be particularly emphasised. Here is what the famous Persian statesman Juvayni wrote about the religious preferences of the Mongol ruler: "Since Genghis Khan was not a follower of any faith and did not follow any confession, he did not show intolerance and preference for one religion over another and did not exalt some over others... And just as he looked with reverence at Muslims, so he favoured Christians and idolaters. And his children and grandchildren, several people each, chose their own faith according to their inclination" [2. C. 20]. Juvayni's opinion on tolerance and religion of Genghis Khan generally coincides with the point of view of other specialists. In particular, G. V. Vernadsky quotes the following information from the "Yassa" of Genghis Khan: "Genghis Khan ... ordered that all religions should be respected, and no preference should be shown for one over others" [3. P. 102]. According to V.V. Bartold, who studied primarily Turkic-Muslim sources, "Genghis Khan remained a faithful shamanist" [4. P. 458]. However, a number of scholars, noting the adherence of the Mongol ruler to shamanistic practices and techniques, adoration of shamans (a famous example — Kokochu), believe that it is worth to note his special attitude to the teachings of Buddhism: "Genghis Khan was a shamanist. But he and his followers kept in touch with lamas, wrote to them" [5. P. 506]; "among Genghis Khan's relatives were lamas who reached high degrees; for example, his great-uncle was Hutukhta-mungur, and his uncle — Hutukhta-chzhurki" [6. P. 57]. According to the famous Mongolian scientist Sh. Bira, Genghis Khan, patronising followers of different religious views, was more favourable to followers of Buddhist doctrine [7. P. 331]. In our opinion, this point of view is well justified by newly discovered and studied sources, as well as in the

³ Thereafter there were several other rulers with this title, but they, with few exceptions (e.g. Dayan-Khagan), had power only over a limited territory.

ongoing research. In particular, not so long ago it became known that the top of Genghis Khan's helmet was decorated with a figure of the defender of Buddhist teachings (dharmapala) — bodhisattva Vajrapani [8. P. 215]. The Tibetan source "Red Book" notes that a preacher from the Tsal Kagyu school named "Tsang-pa Dungkur-pa Wangchuk Tashi ... a disciple of Shang (rinpoche) ... was invited ... to Minyak [to the Tanguts in the Xi Xia state] to spread the teachings of Tsal Kagyu⁴. After the conquest of the Minyak state by Genghis Khan, he... gave the teachings to Genghis Khan and was sent by him to Sog [to the Mongols] to preach the Tsal Kagyu doctrine" [9. P. 45]. [9. P. 452]. As will be indicated below, the religious context of power would later prove to be closely intertwined with the titlature of Mongol rulers and their policies.

Subsequent rulers of Mongolia also patronised Buddhism, although in its time they became embroiled in inter-school controversies. For example, while Ugedei and his descendants supported various strands of Tibetan Buddhism, Khubilai opted for the Sakya school, and this situation persisted actually until Ligdan, the last khagan of the Mongols.

With the fall of the Yuan dynasty in 1368, the power of the Khagans, who actually ruled only in Northern Mongolia, was challenged by the Oirats (Western Mongols), who in the first half of the 15th century were the first ministers (Taishi) of these Khagans — descendants of Genghis Khan. In particular, they were Esen and his father Togon from the Choros family, who led the Oirats at that time.

Togon defeated the Eastern Mongol leaders Adai and Arugtai and sent gifts to the Ming emperor. Since he had deposed non-Genghisid Adai, who had illegally seized the all-Mongol throne, Togon soon became popular throughout Mongolia. However, this Oirat ruler was in no hurry to hand over the throne to Genghisid Toghtoa-Bukha, as had been previously agreed between them, perhaps because he himself wanted to become Khagan. In the early spring of 1439 at the traditional ceremony of worship in Ordos at the sacred yurts where the *sulde* of Genghis Khan was kept, Togon, instead of announcing the beginning of the reign of Toghtoa-Bukha, began to boast that he, an Oirat, was not lower than him, the great Genghis Khan. According to various sources, suddenly an arrow flew out of Genghis Khan's quiver from the yurt and plunged into Togon's back, and the latter died soon [10. P. 106; 11. P. 85; 12. P. 502–503; 13. P. 440]. After that Toghtoa-Bukha became Khagan, he took the name Daisun (Taisun) and appointed Esen as Taisha, with handling all paternal titles to him. At the same time Esen headed all the Mongol armies. Taisun took the eastern part of Mongolia under his rule, while Esen was in charge of the western part, i.e. the Oirats. In December 1446 Esen received a special seal from the Ming court, but it is not clear which title was conferred to him [14. P. 361]. Being the second ruler after Khagan, Esen

⁴ One of the currents in early Tibetan Buddhism, probably the first to spread among the Mongols.

sought to pursue his own policy, for instance, establishing his own relations with the Ming court. The subsequent events led to the loss of the influence of Oirats and consolidation of the Eastern Mongolian forces.

When the young Batu Menke (Munke)⁵, later known as Dayan-khagan (r. 1480?-1543), came to power in Mongolia, the Oirats' position weakened further. The anti-Oirat campaigns of Mandukhai-Khatun, the former widow of the Chahar ruler Mandugul and Batu Menke's consort, around 1510 led to the subjugation of the bulk of them to Batu Menke. This new leader subjected all the Mongol peoples to his authority and carried out a number of important administrative and managerial reforms. In particular, he abolished the institution of Taishi and created a system of Taiji, the second important rulers after the Khagan. Only Genghisids received the title of Taiji. Batu Menke became the first Khagan-Genghisid who ruled independently for the first time in a century [16. P. 138].

In addition, he moved the stake from the Kerulen and Orkhon region to the Chakhar region. Since then, only the rulers of this south-eastern region of Mongolia had the right to be called *Khagans*, to whom all other Mongolian leaders had to obey.

With the passage of time, when the number of Genghisids increased again, which led to the aggravation of the problem of leadership, the question of holding a high title became relevant again among the descendants of Genghis Khan. Such situations and processes coincided with the spread of a new wave of Buddhism from Tibet, this time the teachings of the Geluk school. And a leader appeared in whom both processes converged: the actualization of the problem of titlature and the need to respond to the current religious changes. This was Altan, the leader of the South Mongolian Tumet people, who was burdened by the need to recognize the authority of the Chahar rulers over him.

Altan, who had forcefully achieved recognition by the Ming dynasty (he even received the title of Sun-wan (shun-i-wan), which gave significant trade preferences, it strengthened his position) [17. P. 232], needed an authentic status, which would not only suit him as a Genghisid, but also marked his special role. The answer was found in the sphere of religion: in the famous Mongolian work "White History" (Mong. "Arbanbuyantunom-uncaganteuke" — "White History of the Ten Virtues") it was said that only a ruler (khagan)-chakravartin, patronizing lamas and teachers, spreading sutras and dharani, could be the supreme ruler.

In the political teachings of Buddhism, two types of worthy rulers are usually mentioned — dharmaraja and chakravartin. They are both revered as "the righteous rulers" who are eternally endowed with excellent moral, intellectual and other characteristics and qualities that enable them to govern their peoples and states in full dharma conformity. An important task for dharmaraja and chakravartin is to

⁵ He was the great-grandson of Esen, grandson of his daughter Tsetseg (see: [15. P. 37]), and in the male lineage he was one of the last representatives of the Borjigin family.

protect their country from attacks of enemies (for example, it is mentioned in such famous works as “Sutra of Golden Light” and “Brahma Net Sutra”). Moreover, it is precisely such countries are under the protection of “higher powers” — heavenly rulers. One of the important differences between the titles lies in the sphere of geopolitical: the idea of a chakravartin is to conquer the whole world [18. P. 224].

As Chakravartins (Khagan-Chakravartins) the Mongolian historical tradition considered Genghis Khan and his grandson Khubilai, the founder of the Yuan dynasty. It was probably such memories and connotations allowed Altan to pay due attention to the priestly (religious) function inherent in all Genghisid rulers, as well as to religion itself, particularly the young Tibetan Geluk school. Back in 1566 his nephew Khutukhtai Tsetsen-Khungtaiji, pushing the Oirats⁶, occupied northern Amdo, where he met lamas Borsa, Kansai, Darkhan, Usundurshanzhin and Altan Sanjir [20. P. 87], who were adherents of the Geluk school. Altan himself in the early 1570s had close contacts with the Amdo lamas Arig and Asen [21. P. 111; 22. P. 129, note 204].

The activities of the Geluk lamas caused Altan to invite the leader of this school, Lama Sodnam Gyatso, to his nomadic camp near Kukunor. During a meeting in summer of 1578 this lama and Altan-khan exchanged titles: Sodnam Gyatso received a special title — Dalai-lama (ta-la’ibla-mabadzradhara: Lama — Ocean of teachings), Altan-khan — Chokyigyalpo (choskyirgyalpo — Ruler of faith) [23. P. 292; 24. P. 646]. These titles were important markers of the position and interaction of their holders, and further it was such contexts that would have the most important impact on the right of their bearer to claim unconditional rule; this was especially true for Mongol leaders.

Ligdan Genghis Khan

Since the end of the 16th century, the Mongols (south-eastern Mongols) were busy with internal strife and were increasingly influenced by the strengthening Manchus who claimed the Chinese throne. An attempt to consolidate power and influence among the Mongols was made by Genghisid Buyan-Taiji (Tsetsen-khan) (1555–1603, khan from 1594), but it was not successful. Especially fragmentation was characteristic of the Chahars, that was highly significant (and potentially dangerous for the entire Mongol state) against the consolidation of the Manchus united under the rule of Nurkhatsi (1559–1626)⁷. In 1604, Ligdan, the grandson of Buyan-Taiji, became Khagan. By this time the authority of these rulers had fallen so low that they were no longer called Mongolian (all-Mongolian) khagans, but only Chakhar khans [13. C. 448].

⁶ These Oirats were a smaller, second group of this people, nomadic in north-eastern Tibet. The first, main group of Oirats at that time was already advancing under the onslaught of the eastern Mongols and Turks towards southern Siberia. See: [19].

⁷ Nurhatsi became Khan in 1616.

Ligdan wanted not only to end the independent behaviour of the aimak owners, “but also the extermination of all disobedient vassals who dared to fight with their lord. Exasperated by this struggle and oppressions, the aimak owners decided to completely leave Ligdan and flee from his constant attacks” [25. С. 115–116]. Dissatisfied with the policy of Khagan refused to execute his orders and established relations with the Manchus and his other opponents⁸.

In the summer of 1626, Ooba Khuntaiji, the head of the Eastern Mongolian Kharachin people, agreed to Nurkhatsi’s patronage “to protect himself from other Mongols” [27. P. 14; 20. P. 291, note 22], because several noble people from his entourage were killed by Chakhars and Khalkhas. The situation is revealed in more details in “Meng-gu-yu-mu-tsi”: representatives of the Kharachins (Kartsinians) informed Nurkhatsi and the whole Manchu court about the “iniquities” of the Chakhar ruler and offered them help in fighting against Ligdan. “By decree, an envoy was sent for personal negotiations with the Kartsinians. In the 7th moon the Kartsinians sent a lama with 530 men to the court. Then the princes of the 3rd lv., Atszigee and Shoto, were commanded to meet them, treat them to a feast and slaughter a white horse and a black cow to pronounce an oath. In the 9th moon an emperor personally went on a campaign against the Chahars” [17. P. 200, note 103]. According to “Altantobchi”, a white horse (to Heaven) and a black bull (to Earth) were sacrificed [23. P. 296].

Thus, the sources allow us to conclude that, in addition to political spheres, there were and evolved special transitional or, more precisely, common zones (spheres), where the cultures of Mongols and Manchus could contact without prejudice to their fundamental religious or other postulates. Apparently, these peoples, in addition to following the teachings and practices of Buddhism (a huge embassy from the Kharachins was headed by a lama), had a great influence of shamanism, which was confirmed by a special rite with a horse and a cow between Mongols and Manchus.

The army of Ligdan was defeated by the army of Khuntaiji (Abahai, ruled as Taizong from 1636 to 1643), who led the Manchus after the death of Nurkhatsi in 1626. Khuntaiji “chased those who fled up to the mountains of Khingán” [28. P. 501]. The advance of the Manchu troops forced Ligdan to leave to the western direction, including towards the Russian territories.

In the dispatch of the Krasnoyarsk *voyevoda* A. Dubensky to the Tobolsk *prikaznaya izba* we also find: “...in the current year 137 [1629] May on the 11th day ... IvashkoTimofiev and his companions came from Matarsk lands and said in the *voyevoda*’s chancellery: there is an unknown Tsar coming from behind the Chinese kingdom, and they call him Dyuchyun-kan, but they do not know his name, and he took the Chinese kingdom and took the Labinsk state,

⁸ The Manchus also had marriage ties with “some aimags in eastern Mongolia” and soon they began to “interfere in the internal affairs of the Chahar house” [26. P. 200].

and Altyn Tsar was conquered, and he is going to war with the Mughals. And he says: I am Tsar of all pagan Tsars⁹; one tsar is great tsar it is tsar of Rus', and I am another Tsar, and there is no one more than we both. And he wants to go to the Russian towns". [29. P. 146]. From the document one can see that the Chakhar leader, mentioned as Dyuchyun-kan, was perceived as an enemy and conqueror by almost all the neighbors.

According to the archival document, this is what Altyn Khan's envoy Baigal Baisaev-bakshi said about Ligdan to Tomsk voyevoda I.F. Tatev in late 1631: "Chagir-kan came from behind the Chinese state from the north side, and went along the sea by dry way on horses, and they do not know how much (time) month or weeks people of Chagir-kan travelled from the Chinese state, and how far their land is beyond the Chinese state. And the Labinsk land and the Eshubinsk land and the Yellow Mughals are adjacent to the Chinese state, and the people of Chagir-kan have beaten all the people of those lands, and he takes with him a few Labinsk people. And the first news they got to Altyn about the Chinese state and about the Labinsk state, which the people of Chagir-kan had taken, when a Labinsk tatar came running, and his name was Atushta, and it had happened 3 years earlier. And the ambassadors came to Altyn-Tsar on the river Kemchik. And the Chinese state was taken by a tunnel, and the tunnel was led under the wall and went out in the middle of the town, and he drowned them with water, and took the land of Labinsk. And there were many people with him, and their dress, they say, sheepskin, and they had pistol fighters, and archery and spear ones" [29. P. 164].

The Russian authorities were interested in the matter of Chagir Khan's origin, where he came from and why nothing was known about him earlier. It is quite obvious that their concern was justified by the need to protect Siberian territories from a new unknown conqueror. The following information was received from Altyn-khan, the ruler of the Khotogoyt state in the north-west of Mongolia: "And Altyn said, "Father of Chagir-kan moved separately from him, Altyn, with his horde. And as his father died, and he, Chagir-kan, remained small, and he began to be offended by the hordes around him. And he left his father's horde and went over the seas with some men, that happened about 15 years and more, earlier. And as Chagir-kan grew up over the sea, having gathered with people, [he] came to the paternal horde and with those of his own and of the paternal horde with people captured those unpeaceful lands, from whom he had been offended, and took the Chinese and Labinsk states. And nowadays there are many people with him, with Chagir-kan, they say, and he has archery fighters and spear and fire ones, and [he] stands in the Chinese state" [29. P. 170–171]. Here in the biography of the Chakhar

⁹ An interesting turn ("Tsar of all pagan Tsars") in 1629 is an important little-known historical fact, definitely indicating that even then Ligdan was considered "pagan", probably an opponent of the Geluk doctrine, which was adhered to by quite a few eastern and practically by all western Mongols.

ruler some parallels with the life of Genghis Khan can be found: oppression after the death of his father, years of hardship, the association of companions, and desire of revenge for past offenses.

Somewhat more detailed and more correct information about Ligdan, about the reasons of his wars with his neighbours, about the situation in the east of Mongolia was collected by envoys Ya. Tukhachevsky and D. Ogarkov (no later than May 1635): “It is written in the order to [Ya]kov and the company: it is told to find out about Chagyr-kan truly. And in the Mugal lands Chagyr-kan has never been and is not here today. And there was Dyuchin-Tsar¹⁰ of Chulon-Tsar, a kinsman of the Chagar land of the Mugal, and fought with the Mugal Tsars for yasak, because his father, Cholon [Tsetsen]-Tsar, took yasak from many Mugal Tsars. And he, Dyuchin-Tsar, remained [weaker than] his father, and at that time those lands refused [to accept his power] and did not listen to him, Dyuchin-Tsar, and did not give him yasak from themselves. And as soon as Dyuchin-Tsar grew up, and he, having gathered his Chagar land, and those roundabout lands fought, which had not listened to him and had not given him yasak. And now Dyuchin-Tsar was killed from Urtusk-Tsar Kontarachi¹¹ and from Chinese people. And it was impossible for him to look at the Chinese state, not only that he could not take the Chinese state, because the state, they say, is strong” [29. P. 211].

Nevertheless, before his death, Ligdan managed to conquer a number of Mongolian territories: “And the envoys said that Dyuchin died at least two years ago, and he was in Mughal lands, and he fought Mughal people princes who owned their uluses and beat them: Ordosu-prince, Dolon Tyumen-prince, Chenchaba-prince, Munguzin-prince, Karachin-prince, Uzan-prince, Kerchin-prince, and he beat all those Mughal princes, and the rest of the people owned, and he, Dyuchin, died” [29. C. 256].

Indeed, in 1627 he subjugated the Tumets and Ordos, occupied Khukh-Khoto (Koke-Khoto) and it was after such conquests that he began to threaten the Khalkhas, including the above-mentioned Altyn-Khan, and even Oirats: “And that Tsar Chagir-kan (9) says: as I reach the Rus’ people, I will send my envoys to them, to the Russian people, I will not certainly beat Altyn-Tsar and White and Black Kalmyks” [29. P. 146]. Probably, it was these threats which served as a basis for Altyn-Khan and other eastern Mongols to seek help and support from the Russian authorities.

However, the main opponent and enemy for Ligdan remained the Manchus, who forced him to leave his native nomadic camps in the south-east of Mongolia and move westward. A. S. Martynov wrote: “It is well known that the reason for open hostility between Nurkhatsi and Ligdan-Khan of Chakhar was the status issue.

¹⁰ In Russian documents Ligdan is named as Chagir, Chegir, Dyuchyun, Dyuchin.

¹¹ I.e., Khungtaiji, son of Nurhatsi.

In 1619 Ligdan-Khan sent an embassy to the court of Nurkhatsi with a formidable letter in which he called himself “the ruler of the Mongolian state with forty tens of thousands of people Batur Genghis Khan” and demanded to stop invasions on the territory of the Ming Empire” [30. P. 65]¹².

Meanwhile, Ligdan had all the rights to rule over Mongolia. Probably, the complicated circumstances connected with his struggle for recognition of power over the Mongol khanates (“for yasak”) and the attacks of the Manchus forced him to actualize everything that related to the name of his great ancestor — Genghis Khan, including his name itself. Ligdan was the next Mongol ruler after Altan, uniting secular and sacred titles. According to “SharaTuji”, his full title sounded like “Linden-khutukhtu, the Greatest, Genghis-Daimin-Setsen, Victorious in all sides of the world, Pala-Chakravartin, Tai-Taisun, the Celestial among the Celestials, the Universal Hormusta, Who turned the Golden Wheel, the King of Teachings” [11. P. 89–90]. As can be seen from the title, Ligdan designated himself as the highly ranked reincarnation (khutuhtu), the brightest (daimin) and wisest (setsen) ruler, the protector (pala) of Buddhist teachings, turning both wheels of power — secular and religious (chakravartin); the other titles were a repetition of the previous ones. Thus, Ligdan, with his complex title, in fact, simply repeated what the popular tradition attributed to Genghis Khan — wise rule over the whole land and peoples, protector of the faith (religion)¹³. However, it is still not clear when or thanks to what/who he adopted this name as a title.

Religious connotations were inherent to the Manchus as well.

In the religious sphere, Khuntaiji followed Ligdan’s path of patronizing the Sakya and Kagyu schools¹⁴, as they still had considerable authority among the Mongols (in fact, since the Yuan period). This step was influenced, first of all, by political reasons: Khuntaiji, on the one hand, needed to attract Mongols to the war with Ming China, on the other hand, he needed an ideological basis to justify a certain continuity of his rule (dynasty) from the former Mongol dynasty — Yuan. Accordingly, it was supposed to recreate and reconfigure the most important

¹² The Chahars showed themselves as “faithful accomplices of the latter [Chinese], and on the one hand guarded the borders of the Middle Empire, and in the other delivered to the Chinese from their fine herds of horses for cavalry and artillery” [25. C. 124].

¹³ B. Natsagdorzh gives 15 variants of Ligdan’s name, where he is mentioned as Genghis Khan [31. C. 182–183]; in them Ligdan is praised including in Buddhist contexts: the ruler (holder) of the state and faith (erten-ü qad-un törü sasin tegüskenbariysan), Chakravartin who turned the Golden Wheel of Teaching (nom-un altankürdün-iorčiyuluyčičakirvati), etc.

¹⁴ Spiritual mentors of Ligdan were Maidari-khutukhta and Tsonetsorji (from the Tibetan school Karma Kagyu) and Sakya Panchen Sharba Ananda Sri Badra (from the Tibetan school Sakya), and to the latter, who arrived to the Khan in 1617, Ligdan gave the title “Vajradarahutuhtulama” [32. C. 15]. As for the Manchu leaders, Nurhatsi as early as 1621 was initiated into the practices of the Sakya school by lama Olug Darkhan Nantso, a representative of this branch of Tibetan Buddhism. [33. P. 51].

elements of the Yuan political structure and system, where the institutions of Tibetan Buddhism occupied a significant place¹⁵.

The idea of unity, or rather, the succession of power of Genghis Khan and his grandson Khubilai will be vividly manifested in certain aspects of the policy of the Manchus, who intended to seize Beijing, but before that they needed support from the Mongols. This event (the beginning of the subjugation of the Mongols) was also associated with the religious nuances. Thus, in 1634, when the Manchus defeated Ligdan, Abahai received a statue of Dharmapala Mahakala, a popular figure from the pantheon of Tibetan Buddhism, the patron of Ligdan and the Yuan emperors. The monks who served this statue, crossed to his side. According to N. Ya. Bichurin, one of Ligdan's wives was found to have "the throne seal of the Yuan court with a Chinese inscription"¹⁶. On this occasion, as well as because of the subjugation of a number of other Mongolian peoples, the Manchu leader "took the title of emperor and named his kingdom Daqing, i.e. Great Qing kingdom. 1636 is the first summer of this New Kingdom" [28. P. 503]. Abahai declared himself Emperor Huangdi (huangdi, hûwangdi), thus actually designating himself as the successor of the Yuan dynasty.

B. Ya. Vladimirtsov noted that it is necessary to pay attention to the political connotation of those events, because the Qing successfully used religion to achieve their goals. It was extremely important for the Manchus to present Ligdan as a man who decided to destroy Buddhism, and in particular, the Geluk doctrine, because in this case "the main reason for the death of the "last Genghis Khanid" becomes faded: rivalry and struggle with the Manchus" [36. P. 241].

Lhavzan Genghis Khan

During the period under consideration there was a consolidation of power among the Oirats led by the Khoshut-Genghisids. The great influence on such processes was exerted by Khoshut Zaya-pandita, who, due to his outstanding achievements in the field of the Buddhist study, became a very famous lama and mentor, for which he received the name (title) Zaya (Victorious). Upon completion of his studies, he was sent to preach the Geluk teachings to the Oirats. I. Ya. Zlatkin believed that Tibetan

¹⁵ This feature of Manchu policy would be reflected on the influence of Buddhist hierarchs among the Mongols: realizing the importance and role of religion among them, the emperors created a balance to secular power by transferring a similar amount of power to their spiritual leaders; thus the Mongols had two higher social classes with alternative power, thus eliminating the danger of them uniting and acting together. See: [34. P. 120].

¹⁶ Many modern scholars question this story and believe that it was invented by the Manchus to legitimize their domination over the Mongols and subsequent assertion of their power in China (e.g. see: [35]). Something similar took place in 1294 when the Mongols "found" a jade seal, the "Seal Transmitting the State," which had been used by all previous dynasties in China until it was lost by the Jurchens in their conquest of the Sung Empire. The find "became an important aspect of propaganda for the right of the Mongols to rule China." [22. P. 69].

leaders sent Zaya-pandita to the Oirats not so much for religious but for political reasons. He also noted that this event coincided with the period of formation of three Oirat khanates and the defeat of the Chakhars [37. P. 26]. Probably, by that time, among the Oirats, there were changes in the interpretation of the right to the Genghisid power: it was important not to belong to the direct descendants of Genghis Khan (the Golden family), but to follow his regulations and loyalty to his Yassa. “Since most of the Mongols were under the rule of the Manchus, the Oirats must have considered themselves the only successors of the Mongol Empire and still were proud of their independence” [38. P. 269].

The strengthening of the Geluk teaching among the Oirats during the first third of the 17th century and their successful military operations, pressure from the Manchus, including the religious sphere, had an impact on the political processes of the Eastern Mongols — there was an expectation of the emergence of a leader, spiritual or secular, who would unite them. At that time when the eastern Mongols were still debating who was Khan and who was Khagan, the Dalai Lama introduced a new title related to religion — Tenzin (bstan ‘dzin — protector, patron of the teaching), awarded for special services to the Geluk teaching. This innovation influenced changes in the established titulature of the rulers of the Mongolian peoples and, in general, in their political culture, which had previously developed in the discourse of the cult and heritage of Genghis Khan.

Among the Oirats, the first to receive the title Tenzin was the Khoshut leader Gushi-khan, later it was awarded to the Dzungar ruler Galdan, also known as Boshogtu-Khan. Ch. Atwood notes the “striking difference” between the Genghisid and Dzungar polities¹⁷, which were in the title of their monarchs, because the Genghisids bore the title “Khan”, while the Dzungars possessed such a title rarely, and it was never hereditary [40. P. 613]. Nevertheless, the unconditional adoration of Genghis Khan’s name and memory continued to exist among the Mongolian peoples.

In its own way a unique case is the acquisition of the title (name) Genghis Khan by the Tibetan khan Lhavzan of Khoshut, grandson of Gushi-Khan, around 1703. Without going into the details of his coming to power and the beginning of his rule, it should be noted that there were quite good reasons for the need to strengthen his position — hostility from the regent (Dipa) Sangye Gyatso (internal reason) and the threat of seizure of Tibet from other Oirats — Dzungars (external reason). Lhavzan needed, among other things, something that would allow him to strengthen his authority and influence, and he, like Ligdan a century earlier, turned to the title-name of Genghis Khan.

According to the biography of Zhamyan Shadba, a famous lama of the Geluk school, he granted Lhavzan the name Genghis Khan as early as in 1703 [41. P.

¹⁷ On the time of origin and the meaning (significance) of the name of the Dzungars, and the role of Buddhism in this, see: [39].

177]. B. Natsagdorzh cites a Qing document, where it is noted that the regent (Dipa) Sangye Gyatso gave this name to the Khoshut ruler [31. P. 190]. Under this name he was also known among the subjects of the Dzungarian ruler Tsevan-Rabdan: according to the testimony of the Russian envoy captain I. Unkovsky, the “Bukharians”, subjects of Tsevan-Rabdan, who communicated with him, reported that “Araptan [Tsevan-Rabdan] decided to marry his daughter to the son of Genghis Khan, who lives with the Dalai Lama” [42. P. 104]. The Italian Jesuit missionary I. Desideri, who stayed in Tibet in the early 18th century, also calls LhavzanasGenghis Khan and a friend of the emperor [43. P. 255].

Lhavzan was strengthening his position in Lhasa by opposing the regent.

Meanwhile, the situation in Tibet had a specific development due to the fact that the new Dalai Lama the Sixth Tsangyang Gyatso, a reincarnation of the Great Fifth Dalai Lama Ngawang Gyatso, began to pursue a rather specific spiritual policy and practice. This caused opposition from a number of prominent lamas who advocated the “purity” of the Geluk teachings and formed a powerful opposition to him. Among them was the abovementioned famous ZhamyanShadba. The Dalai Lama’s innovations formed an opposition consisting of Drepung and Sera monks, who turned to Lhavzan for help [Dreyfus]; the latter was also dissatisfied with the regent’s omnipotence and Tsangyang Gyatso’s renunciation of his vows a few years earlier.

Dipa, facing pressure from Lhavzan, was forced to resign, putting his son, NgawangRinchen, in his place. Nevertheless, relations between the two men were strained¹⁸. At the beginning of the new 1705 at one of the meetings of the highest lamas in Potala it was decided that both of them (the Khan and the regent) should leave Lhasa [46. P. 10–11]¹⁹. Lhavzan agreed to leave for Kukunor, where the main population of the Khoshut Khanate was located, but after reaching his tribesmen in Nagchukla (north-eastern Tibetan region on the way to Kukunor), he gathered an army loyal to him and moved with it back to Lhasa [47. P. 130–131]. Sangye Gyatso hastily formed troops from the militia of the Central Tibetan regions of Uy, Tzang and Ngari, but was defeated, captured and held in the fortress of Gonkar. He was guarded there by Tsering Tashi, Lhavzan’s Tibetan wife, who executed him on September 6, 1705 [48. P. 273; 49. P. 109].

After the victory over the regent, Lhavzan was declared *gyalpotripa* (rgyalpo k’ripa), the full title could sound as *Tenzin Jingir* (Genghis) *gyalpo* (bstan ‘dzinjingirrgyalpo) [48. P. 273]. He sent a report on the events to Peking. The emperor, dissatisfied with the former regent for concealing the truth about the death of the previous (the Fifth) Dalai Lama and needing the support of the Khoshuts to strengthen his position in Tibet, supported Lhavzan and sent him the

¹⁸ As follows from “Galdan’s Biography”, the regent tried to poison Lhavzan, but thanks to the potions of Zamyang Shadba he recovered [44. P. 125–126; 45. C. 124].

¹⁹ Before that the regent had organised riots in Sera against the Khan.

title “ifakun-shun-han” (I-fa-kung-shun-han²⁰) [46. P. 15]. Khoshut Khan, who became the sole ruler of Tibet, faced a new opposition in the person of the Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso. Probably, Lhavzan tried to reach some agreements with him, but since the Dalai Lama was brought up by the executed Dipa, such attempts were doomed to failure.

Meanwhile, despite his renunciation of these vows, Tsangyang Gyatso was considered the true Dalai Lama. Tibetans, in general, perceived the behavior of the Dalai Lama as a pure vision of tantra [51. P. 142]. According to the History of Galdan: “At that time, due to the holiness of the Dalai Lama [Tsangyang Gyatso], his vows were returned to the Panchen bogdo. He behaved like a true yogi, and therefore had no equal [to him]. During this time Lhavzan Khan addressed the Court about him several times” [44. P. 125].

The contradictions between the Dalai Lama’s entourage and the Khoshuts, first of all with Lhavzan ended with the decision of the Qing court “to capture the fake Dalai Lama and bring him to Beijing” [20. P. 332; 52. P. 33]. In 1706 Tsangyang Gyatso was sent to Beijing, but outside Lhasa the lama’s guards were attacked by monks of Drepung, Sera and Ganden monasteries, who freed him and brought him to Drepung [53. P. 43]. The Khoshuts demanded to return the lama, threatening to destroy the monastery. Wishing to spare the monks from suffering and oppression, the Dalai Lama returned to his escort. After reaching the vicinity of Kukuror in his escort, he died on November 14, 1706 for unclear reasons²¹ near the small lake Kunganor.

Lhavzan claimed to have found the “true” incarnation, Ngawang Yeshe Gyatso²², who was totally dependent on the Tibetan ruler. This new Dalai Lama was recognized by the Fifth Panchen Lama and Emperor Kangxi, but was not accepted by the people of Lhasa and many lamas. According to W. D. Shakabpa, people did not recognize in him the true reincarnation of the Dalai Lama [54. P. 146]. The Khoshuts of Kukuror, Lhavzan’s tribesmen, did not agree with this choice either, because it had been made without their participation [49. P. 110]. Thus, the political and religious situation in Tibet was again on the verge of war and peace.

In 1714 lamas of Sera, Drepung and TashiLhunpo appealed to the Dzungar Khungtaiji Tsewang-Rabdan for help in overthrowing Lhavzan, eliminating the “false” Dalai Lama and enthronement of the “true” incarnation — the young

²⁰ N. Ya. Bichurin calls the title “Fujiao-Gunshun Khan” — “Patron of faith and submissive Khan” [28. C. 534]. According to B. D. Dandaron, it was “Fu-kuo-nung-shunh”, and he translates it as “Patron of doctrine and faithful khan” [50. P. 142]. Obviously, the title notes Lhavzan’s efforts to “bring order” to the situation with religion and encourages his desire to maintain friendly relations with the emperor. Also one should note that the Khan title to the de facto ruler of Tibet was not granted by the Dalai Lama but by the Qing emperor.

²¹ The death of the Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso on the way to Beijing occurred from smallpox [49. P. 110]. According to Chinese sources, he died of an unknown disease [20. P. 34].

²² According to some historians, he could be the son of Lhavzan himself. See, for example: [46. P. 17–20]. Ngawang Yeshe was a lama in the medical datsan of Chakpori.

Kalsan Gyatso [55. P. 32]. The latter had already been discovered and was kept in the Kumbum monastery in Kukunor under the protection of the Khoshuts.

This appeal, as well as a number of other important reasons led to the fact that in 1717 the Dzungar army (6 thousand soldiers) invaded Tibet through its western part, made a forced march to the center of the country and in early November captured Lhasa.

Lhavzan, before the Dzungars attacked Lhasa, sent a message for help to Beijing, but the Kukunor (Khoshut-Tibetan) army sent by the Manchus to Tibet could not support him [56. P. 47–48]. Lhavzan himself was killed in the battle at Potala. According to the Panchen Lama, “the Dzungars killed the Khan because they did not recognize him. His wife, son and Mongolian nobility were arrested... The commanders of the Dzungars said that they should meet me... on the 14th day... about 4,000 warriors gathered in the large reception hall of the Potala, where I preached (to them)” [57. P. 419].

After the death of Lhavzan in Mongolian history there were no more worthy rulers who bore the proud name of Genghis Khan.

The name of Genghis Khan was relevant for all peoples and their leaders who in one way or another correlated themselves with this great ruler. In particular, C. Lemerrier-Quellejay, who studied the letters of the Kalmyk Khan Ayuka to the Turkish padishah, wrote that when the Bashkir rebellion began in the early 1700s, the Russian authorities asked Ayuka for help, but he refused, saying that “we are all descendants of Genghis Khan, and belong to the same people” [58. P. 69]. The French researcher noted: “This curious call for solidarity of the Genghisids, uniting Muslim nomadic tribes (Bashkirs, Kazakhs and Karakalpaks) and Buddhists (Kalmyks) over religious differences, shows the living stability of memories of the great Mongol Empire in the eighteenth century” [58. P. 70]. It should be noted that we are not so much speaking about the empire as about the name of its creator, which allows us to believe that the name of Genghis Khan, sometimes perceived as a title, had a great significance for the part of the world whose history was forever linked to this man, declared the man of the millennium.

Conclusion

Thus, with a difference of almost 100 years, two famous leaders of the Mongolian world received the name of Genghis Khan as part of their title. In both cases, it was not an attempt to appropriate the name of a great ruler, but the result of the influence of specific factors (conditions) that actualised the name of Genghis Khan:

- The struggle against separatism under the influence of an external force (“a call for unification, solidarity”);
- the desire to “start anew”, to lead a “new era of prosperity” (“revival of the Golden Age of the Mongols”);

- the need to identify himself as a true leader in the context of the role of religion (“Buddhist Genghis Khan = Chakravartin”).

Ligdan believed that he was the head of all Mongolia, and Lhavzan believed that he was the head of all Tibet, and even the Dalai Lama was accountable to him.

Perhaps it was the lamas in Ligdan and Lhavzan’s entourage who suggested the transformation of the name of the creator of the Mongol empire into a title (middle name) when the previous systems of governance were in crisis, with strong rivals opposing the chief rulers; however, the result would not have been obvious without the use of religious designation. Genghis Khan had even earlier been declared a chakravartin, spinning both wheels of power, secular and spiritual. Later the opinion prevailed that only that leader could lead the people who supported Buddhist teachings (realization of the power of the secular wheel), for which he was sanctified by the lamas with the name of Genghis Khan (manifestation of the power of the spiritual wheel). Both Ligdan and Lhavzan named themselves Genghis Khan to justify their right to lead the affairs of state and faith. They were large-scale thinking leaders of their time, and the name of Genghis Khan seemed to give them “supreme” patronage. And religion also gave them its support, and on the whole these were times of a certain renaissance of the general Mongolian spirit.

To be Genghis Khan, i.e. to have this name as a title, meant the highest responsibility in achieving stability in difficult transitional times, to gain the favour of the higher powers and the loyalty of his subjects.

References

1. ID. Qan, qa’an and the seal of Güyüg. *Documenta barbarorum: Festschrift für Walther Heissig zum 70. Geburtstag*. Hrsg. v. Klaus Sagaster, Michael Weiers. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983, p. 272–281.
2. Dzhuveyni Ala-ad-din. *Chingiskhan. Istoriya zavoyevatelya mira* [Genghis Khan. History of the Conqueror of the World]. Trans. from English in Russian language of E.E. Kharitonova. M.: Publishing house MAGISTR-PRESS, 2004.
3. Vernadsky G. *The Mongols and Russia*. New Haven; 1953.
4. Bartol’d VV. Turkestan v epokhu mongol’skogo nashestiya [Turkestan in the era of the Mongol invasion]. *Bartol’d V.V. Sochineniya* [Works]. Moscow: Nauka Publishing house, 1963. Vol. 1.
5. Howorth H. *History of the Mongols from the IX-th to the XIX-th Century. Pt. I. The Mongols proper and the Kalmuks*. London; 1876.
6. Kiselev SV., Yevtyukhova LA., Merpert NYa., et al. *Drevnemongol’skiye goroda* [Ancient Mongolian cities]. Moscow: Nauka Publishing house; 1965.
7. Douglas WO., Conger D. Journey to Outer Mongolia. *National Geographic*. 1962. March.
8. Charleux I. Chinggis Khan’s ancestor, Buddha or Shaman? *Mongolian Studies*. 2009. Vol. 30. –31.
9. Tshal pa kun dga rdo rje brtsams. *Deb ther dmar po*. Beijing, 1981. (Красная книга.)
10. Saṅg Sečen. *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (‘Precious Summary’). *A Mongolian Chronicle of 1662*. Canberra: Australian National University; 1990.

11. *Zheltaya istoriya (Shara tudzhi)*. [Yellow story (Shara tuji)]. Transl. from Mongolian, transliterated, introduction and commentaries by A.D. Tsendina. Moscow: Vostochnaya literature Publishing house; 2017.
12. Jamsran L. Attempts to Overcome a Crisis of State: the Oirats Gain in Strength. *The History of Mongolia. Vol. II. Part 3. Yuan and Late Medieval Period* / ed. by D. Sneath and C. Kaplonski. Global Oriental; 2010, p. 497–507.
13. Vladimirtsov BYa. Obschestvennyy stroy mongolov. Mongol'skiy kochevoy feodalizm [Social structure of the Mongols. Mongolian nomadic feudalism]. *Vladimirtsov B.Ya. Raboty po istorii i etnografii mongol'skikh narodov* [Works on the history and ethnography of the Mongolian peoples]. Moscow: Vostochnaya literature Publishing house, 2002, p. 295–488.
14. Serruys H. The Office of Tayisi in Mongolia in the fifteenth Century. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. 1977;37 (2):353–380.
15. Zlatkin I.Ya. *Istoriya Dzhungarskogo khanstva 1635–1758* [History of the Dzungar Khanate. 1635–1758]. 2nd ed. Moscow: Nauka Publishing house; 1983.
16. Atwood Ch. *Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire*. Fact on Line, Inc.; 2004.
17. Chzhan-mu, Khe Tsyutao. *Men-gu-yu-mu-tszu (Zapiski o mongol'skikh kochev'yakh)* [Men-gu-yu-mu-ji (Notes on Mongolian nomads)] Transl. from Chinese by P.S. Popov. St. Petersburg: Parovaya skoropechatnya P.O. Yablonskago; 1895.
18. Zimmermann M. Only a Fool Becomes a King: Buddhist Stances on Punishment. *Buddhism and Violence* / ed. by M. Zimmermann and the assistance of Chiew Hui Ho and Philip Pierce. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2006., p. 213–242.
19. Kitinov BU. Migratsii oyratov v pervoy chetverti XVII v. nakanune vozvrashcheniya v Dzhungariyu [Migration of the Oirats in the first quarter of the 17th century. on the eve of returning to Dzungaria]. *Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Vseobshchaya istoriya*. RUDN JOURNAL OF WORLD HISTORY. 2021;13 (4):420-430. doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2021-13-4-420-430
20. Ahmad Z. *Sino-Tibetan relations in the seventeenth century* / Serie Orientale, XL. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1970.
21. Bell Ch. *The Religion of Tibet*. New Delhi, Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1992.
22. Elverskog J. *The Jewel Translucent Sutra. Altan Khan and the Mongols in the Sixteenth Century*. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2003.
23. Lubsan Danzan. *Altan tobchi (Zolotoye skazaniye)*. [Altan tobchi (Golden Legend)]. Transl. from Mongolian, introduction, commentaries, and applications by N.P. Shastina. Moscow: Nauka Publishing house; 1973.
24. Okada H. The Third Dalai Lama and Altan Khan of the Tümed. *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the V Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*. Narita, 1989. Naritasan shinshoji, 1992. Vol. 2. P. 645–652.
25. Pozdneyev A.M. *Mongol'skaya letopis' Erdeniyn erikhe. Podlinnyy tekst s perevodom i poyasneniyami. Materialy dlya istorii Khalkhi s 1636 po 1736 g.* [Mongolian Chronicle of Erdeniin Erihe. Original text with translation and explanations. Materials for the history of Khalkha from 1636 to 1736]. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk; 1883.
26. Bichurin N.Ya. *Zapiski o Mongolii* [Notes on Mongolia]. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya Karla Krayy; 1828.
27. Elverskog J. *Our Great Qing. The Mongols, Buddhism and the State in Late Imperial China*. University of Hawai'i Press; 2008.
28. Bichurin N.Ya. *Sobraniye svedeniy po istoricheskoy geografii Vostochnoy i Sredinnoy Azii* [Collection of information on the historical geography of East and Central Asia]. Compiled by L.N. Gumilyov, M.F. Khvan. Cheboksary: Chuvash State Publishing House; 1960.
29. *Materialy po istorii russko-mongol'skikh otnosheniy. 1607–1636: Sbornik dokumentov* [Materials on the history of Russian-Mongolian relations. 1607–1636: Collection of documents]. Compiled by L.M. Gataullina, M.I. Gol'man, G.I. Slesarchuk. Main editor I.Ya. Zlatkin, N.V. Ustyugov. Moscow: Main Editorial Office of Oriental Literature; 1959.

30. Martynov AS. *Status Tibeta v XVII–XVIII vekakh v traditsionnoy kitayskoy sisteme politicheskikh predstavleniy* [The status of Tibet in the 17th–18th centuries in the traditional Chinese system of the political ideas]. Moscow: Nauka Publishing house; 1978.
31. Natsagdorj B. Mongolyn tüükhend kheden Chingis khaan baisan be? [How many Genghis Khans were there in the history of Mongolia?]. *Mongolyn nuuts tovchoon sudlal* [The Study of the Mongolian Secret Tobchi]. Ulaan-Baatar; 2015, p. 180–196.
32. Skynnikova TD. *Lamaistskaya tserkov' i gosudarstvo. Vneshnyaya Mongoliya. XVI — nachalo XX veka* [Lamaist Church and State. Outer Mongolia. XVI — early XX centuries]. Novosibirsk: Nauka Publishing house; 1988.
33. Grupper SM. Manchu Patronage of Tibetan Buddhism during the First Half of the Ch'ing Dynasty. *Journal of Tibetan studies*. 1984 (4):47–76.
34. Moses LW. *The Political Role of Mongol Buddhism*. Indiana University Uralic Altaic Series. Vol. 133. Indiana University Press; 1977.
35. Weiers M. Die Historische Dimension Des Jade-Siegels Zur Zeit Des Mandschuherrschers Hongtaiji. *Zentral-Asiatische Studien*. 1994 (XXIV):119–145.
36. Vladimirtsov BYa. Nadpisi na skalakh khalkhaskogo Tsoktu-taydzhi [Inscriptions on the rocks of the Khalkha Tsoktu-taiji]. Vladimirtsov B.Ya. *Raboty po istorii i etnografii mongol'skikh narodov* [Works on the history and ethnography of the Mongolian peoples]. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura Publishing House, 2002, p. 221–246.
37. Zlatkin IYa. Zaya-Pandita kak politicheskii deyatel' [Zaya-Pandita as a political figure]. *320 let starokalmytskoy pis'mennosti: materialy nauchnoy sessii* [320. years of Old Kalmyk writing: materials of a scientific session]. Elista: Kalmyk book publishing house, 1970, p. 21–40.
38. Miyawaki J. The Chinggisid Principle In Russia. *Russian History*. 1992;19 (1/4):261–277.
39. Kitinov BU., Lyulina AG. Dzungar: religion and designation. *Vostok. Afro-Aziatskiye obshchestva: istoriya i sovremennost'* [East. Afro-Asian societies: history and modernity]. 2023 (3):173–184.
40. Atwood Ch. Titles, appanages, marriages, and officials: a comparison of political forms in the Zunghar and Thirteenth Century Mongol empires. *The History of Mongolia. Vol. II. Part 3. Yuan and Late Medieval Period.* / ed. by D. Sneath and C. Kaplonski. Global Oriental; 2006, p. 610–634.
41. Gonchog-Chzhigmed-Vanbo. *Povestvovaniye o zhizni Vsevedushchego Chzham'yan-Shadbiy-Dorchzhe, mogushchestvennogo uchenogo i siddkha, nazyvayushcheyesya «Brod, vedushchiy k udivitel'no blagomu udelu»* [A narrative about the life of the Omniscient Zhamyan-Shadbiy-Dorzhe, a powerful scientist and siddha, called “The Ford leading to an amazingly good destiny”]. Introduction, transl., comm. by N.V. Tsyrempilov. Ulan-Ude: Publishing house of BSC SB RAS, 2008.
42. *Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire (AVPRI)*. Fund 113. List 113/1. Case 1. 1724.
43. Desideri I. *Mission to Tibet: the extraordinary eighteenth-century account of Father Ippolito Desideri, S.J.* / transl. by Michael J. Sweet; ed. by Leonard Zwilling. Wisdom Publications; 2010.
44. Heissig W. Ein mongolisches Textfragment über den Olötenfürsten Galdan. *Sinologische Arbeiten*. Deutschland Institut Peking. 1944 (2):92–160.
45. Dzhambadordzhi. Khrustal'noye zertsalo [Crystal Mirror]. *Istoriya v trudakh uchenykh lam* [History in the works of learned lamas]. Moscow: Tovarischestvo of the scientific publications KMK, 2005, p. 62–154.
46. Petech L. *China and Tibet in the early XVIIIth century: history of the establishment of Chinese protectorate in Tibet*. Second, revised edition. Leiden: E.J. Brill; 1972.
47. Aris M. *Hidden Treasures and Secret Lives: A Study of Pemalingpa, 1450–1521, and the Sixth Dalai Lama, 1683–1706*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study; 2015 (reprint of 1988).
48. Petech L. Notes on Tibetan History of the 18th Century. *T'oung Pao*. Second Series. 1966. Vol. 52. Livr. 4/5. P. 261–292. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4527650> [accessed 11.12.2019].

49. Pomplun T. *Jesuit on the Roof of the World: Ippolito Desideri's Mission to Tibet*. Oxford University Press; 2009.
50. *Istoriya Kukunora, nazyvayemaya «Prekrasnyye noty iz pesni Brakhmy»*. *Sochineniye Sumba Khambo* [The story of Kukunoor, called “Beautiful notes from the song of Brahma”. Essay by Sumba Khambo]. Transl. from Tibetan, introduction, and notes by B.D. Dandaron. Moscow; 1972.
51. Kapstein MT. *The Tibetans*. Malden, Blackwell; 2006.
52. *Bod mi'i khriims mthun gzhung dga' ldan pho brang dbu brnyes nas lo 360 'khor ba'i bka' drin rjes dran dang ma ongs mdun bskyod kyi kha phyogs*. Vol. 1. Dharamsala: LTWA, 2002.
53. Kitinov BU. Shakur Lama: the Last Attempt to Build the Buddhist State. *Buddhism in Mongolian History, Culture and Society*. / ed. by Vesna Wallace. Oxford University Press, 2015, p. 37–52.
54. Shakabpa WD. *Tibet. Politicheskaya istoriya* [Tibet. Political history]. St. Petersburg: Nartang Publishing house, 2003.
55. Rockhill WW. *The Dalai Lamas of Lhasa and Their Relations with The Manchu Emperors of China 1644–1908*. Dharamsala: LTWA; 1998.
56. Kitinov BU., Lyu Tsyun. *Religiya v oyratskoy politike dinastii Tsin* [Religion in Oirat politics of the Qing dynasty]. *Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriya: Vseobshchaya istoriya* RUDN JOURNAL OF WORLD HISTORY. 2019;11 (1):44–55. doi. org/10.22363/2312-8127-2019-11-1-44-55
57. Shakabpa TWD. *One hundred thousand moons: an advanced political history of Tibet*. Translated and annotated by Derek F. Maher. Vol. 1. Leiden, Boston: Brill; 2010.
58. Lemerrier-Quellejray C. Les Kalmuks de la Volga entre l'Empire russe et l'Empire ottoman sous le règne de Pierre le Grand. *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*. Janvier-Mars 1966 ;7 (1):63–76.

Information about the author:

Kitinov Baatr — Doctor Habilitatus, Associates Professor, Senior research fellow, Department of History of East, Institute of Oriental studies of RAS, e-mail: kitinov@mail.ru. ORCID: 0000-0003-4031-5667