

to be such. It was begun as a pedigree of the kings of Leh, whose chief intention was to prove their descent from the famous line of the ancient kings of Lhasa. Thus the first portion of this chapter, covering roughly the period from 900 to 1400 A.D., does not contain much beside mere names. About the year 1400 the account begins to become fuller. This may be due to the fact that the second dynasty branched off at about that time, and this new line of kings may have had a stronger instinct for history. Or it may be due to Muhammadan influences. At any rate, the accounts grow in fullness after 1400 A.D. Still, they leave much to be desired from a European point of view. The writers were lamas, and to them the greatest events during the reign of a king were his presents to lamas and monasteries, or his building of chortens (*mchod-rten*, stūpa) and *mani*-walls. Much ink has been expended on these events, which are of very little interest to the average European. On the other hand, the campaigns of the kings are treated with extraordinary brevity, and of their economical work we hear nothing at all. Only in the case of the last few kings are we able to form an idea of their characters, and of the tactics employed during the campaigns we hear practically nothing. The chronicler is quite satisfied with telling us the final result. Thus we see that all those points which go to make a history of a country serviceable are missing in these Western Tibetan records; and yet the naïve tone of the chroniclers has often a charm of its own.

An important question is this: do the Ladakhi historians tell the truth, or is their history entirely or partially fabricated matter? The best test of the veracity of a historical account is a comparison with other entirely independent documents. Only in comparatively few cases are we enabled to compare a Western Tibetan account of an event with that of a foreign country. Of greater importance in that respect are the many inscriptions on rock and stone which are scattered all over the country. I have made a special study of these records, and have come to the following conclusion: from the inscriptions it becomes evident that at any rate the kings of the Rnam-rgyal dynasty are historical realities, and their order of succession is the same on the records on stone as in the chronicles. Records containing the names of all of them have been found, from Lha-dbañ-rnam-rgyal down to Tshe-dpal-rdo-rje-rnam-rgyal. As far as contemporary history of other countries can be adduced by way of comparison, the chronicles do not contain anything that conflicts therewith. The test of the veracity of the account of the first dynasty is of a more insufficient nature. Records on stone relating to the time from c. 850 to 1400 A.D. are rarer than those of later times, and several of them do not contain the proper name of the sovereign. This much has so far come to light. King Hbum-lde's name is found on the rock at Mul-bhe, which contains an edict by him. The name of his son, *Blo-gros*-[*mchog-ldan*], occurs in an inscription on the wall of the *Byams-pa-dmar-po* temple at Leh. An inscription at Tabo in Spi-ti mentions King Lha-chen-byañ-chub-sems-dpañ (first half of the eleventh century) as a contemporary of the Gu-ge king *Byañ-chub-hod* and the famous Indian teacher *Atiśa*. Thus the testimony of the inscriptions which have become known up to the present does