

sequently upon Rudok (1846) was known to English officials until after it was made. But the Chinese may well have learned that the Jammu Maharajah, once a great Sikh leader and enemy of the British, was now their ally, and it might fairly be supposed that he would not attack Tibetan territory unless he had the tacit approval of his suzerain. The rape of Ladak was scarcely resisted; possibly the extraordinary difficulties of the march from Lhasa, together with the delay involved in getting leaders and some troops from China proper, had rendered impossible any effective opposition. But now a further thrust of the Dogra troops, who ventured from newly acquired Ladak just as the Goorkhas had come out from Nepal, roused the distant giant. An army, partly Chinese, partly Tibetan, crossed the vast and desolate country which separates Western Tibet from Lhasa.

The intruders were forced back, keeping Ladak, it is true; but again we admiringly find the majesty of the Elder Brother recognised by the periodic presents sent from the Maharajah of Kashmir to the Emperor who reigns so far away, across so many leagues of upheaved and pathless wilderness,—in memory of 1846.

This date is of special importance in the history of European relations with Tibet. In this same year of the Ladak war, Father Huc entered Lhasa, was kindly received by the Tibetan authorities, and after a stay of a few months was required by the Chinese authority in Lhasa to leave, reasonable provision being made for his transportation to, and through, China. No other Europeans entered Lhasa