

of these Muhammadan portraits in a Buddhist temple, until the lama in charge explained that they were Ladakhi kings. By the side of the picture, there is a long inscription in gold on indigo tinted paper, which mentions King bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, the builder of the temple. From this inscription it appears that the picture represents this king who testified to his close attachment to the Turkomans by dressing exactly like them. As regards the Turkoman invasion under Sultan Haidar during his time, it is very difficult to reconcile the Tibetan with the Turkish account. The latter is found in the *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*. Not only according to the Tibetan chronicles, but also according to inscriptions from Ladakh, he gained a signal victory over the Turkomans. According to the *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, on the other hand, he was a servant of the Turkomans who held him in little honour.<sup>1</sup> I have come to the conviction that he was a very clever politician. bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal knew very well that he could not resist the first violent attack of the Turkomans with an armed force. He, therefore, concluded a treaty with them, and apparently took their side. He then very cleverly enlisted the energy of the Turkomans on his side, for co-ercing his disobedient vassal princes and unpleasant neighbours. Some of them were Muhammadans; for instance, the chiefs of Suru, Sod, Baltistan, and one in Nubra. It is rather remarkable, therefore, that the Turkomans actually went against and fought them. Whether the Lhasa expedition came to an end a few marches beyond the Manasarowar Lake, or eight marches from Lhasa, as stated in the *Tārīkh*, does not matter much. In the eyes of the Ladakhi kings, the chiefs of Guge as well as the Central Tibetans required suppressing. After the Turks had spent all their strength on the enemies of the Ladakhis, the latter rose against them themselves, and turned them out of the country. As the Ladakhi chronicles tell us, the corpses of the slain Turks were placed before the idols of the temple of the four Lords (*mGon-khang*). This is the reason why the male members of the royal family of Ladakh are shown wearing the Turkestan dress in the frescoes, whilst the female members are dressed in true Ladakhi fashion, wearing on their heads the *berag*, a leather strap covered with turquoises.

Above the temple of the four Lords (*mGon-khang*) are the ruins of bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal's palace. They include a little Lamaist monastery which is of no particular interest. Ruins of other parts of the ancient palace, for instance watch-towers, are found all along the ridge of the rNam-rgyal-rtse-mo hill. Some of the ruins are of a decidedly earlier date than the reign of bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal. For instance, I am told that the foundations of a certain round tower are commonly known by the name of 'aBrog-pai-mkhar, "Dard castle." It may, therefore, be attributed to a building which was erected before the Tibetan conquest of Ladakh, in c. 900 A.D. A man from Leh brought me a fragment of a copper pot, which he said he had found on the top of rNam-rgyal-rtse-mo. It contained an inscription in ancient characters, giving the name of a prince: *rGyal sras dBang-(nya ?)-gsing dbang-po*, "Prince dBang-(nya ?) gsing dbang-po." As the word *rnam-rgyal* does not occur in the name, it may be the name of a younger son of a king of the first dynasty of Ladakhi kings. In the

<sup>1</sup> *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, pp. 418 ff., 423 and 460.