

not go very far with regard to the accuracy of the first part of the chronicles. Here folklore comes to our aid. It has preserved the names of two more kings of the first dynasty in two songs, the drift of which is not in opposition to what the chronicles say about them; these are the kings *Ñi-ma-mgon* and *Jo-dpal*. And the name of yet another king, or at least prince, of Western Tibet, Prince *Rin-chen*, is apparently attested by the chronicles of Kashmir. Certainly, we should be glad to be able to adduce more arguments to prove the accuracy of the account of the first dynasty. However, what can be adduced is in accordance with its statements, even with regard to chronology, and I think we have a right to accept also the account of the first West Tibetan dynasty as on the whole true and reliable.

In no case do the West Tibetan chronicles enable us to fix the time of the reign of a king exactly, and the Tibetan dates have to be used with much caution. The Tibetans, as well as the Chinese, have cycles of sixty years, which are differentiated by numbers. The first Tibetan cycle begins with the year 1024 A.D. (1026 according to Waddell). This great cycle of sixty years contains smaller cycles of twelve years each, the single years of which are named after twelve animals. To be able to distinguish between the same animal years within the cycle of sixty, the animals' names are coupled with the names of the Tibetan five elements. Thus, a date is complete if the following is given: (1) the number of the great cycle, (2) the animal of the little cycle, (3) the element. For instance, the water-ox year of the fourteenth cycle is the year 1853 A.D. But in most cases the date is not given completely enough to be of much use. In the most ancient dates only the animal's name is given. Some time between 1500 and 1600 the Ladakhis began to combine the animal's name with that of an element. Dates furnished also with the number of the cycle of sixty do not occur before the nineteenth century. Besides, I have come to the conclusion that the Ladakhi cycles are behind the Tibetan cycles by exactly twelve years. Compare the dates for the beginning of the Dogra war and for the discovery of the sapphire mine. But in the second half of the nineteenth century some lama authority introduced the Tibetan cycles. Thus we have no absolute certainty with regard to West Tibetan dates. As, however, several West Tibetan kings were contemporaries of other historical personages whose dates can be fixed, we are in a position to furnish all the Ladakhi kings with approximate dates. With regard to the second dynasty eventual mistakes can hardly amount to more than a decade. From the outset it must be understood that the reign of a certain king may have been longer or shorter than the period given in this chronicle; but it is probable that some years of his actual reign coincide with some of the years given here. The fixed dates, on which hinges the whole chronology given in this book, are the following:—*Glañ-dar-ma*, 816–42 A.D., according to the Chinese; *Atīśa*, 980–1053 A.D., according to the *Rehu-mig*; Prince *Rin-chen*, c. 1320 A.D., according to the Kashmir chronicles; *Tsoñ-kha-pa*, 1356–1418, according to the *Rehu-mig*; the Turkoman invasion of Ladakh under Sultan Haidar, 1532 A.D., according to the *Ta'rikh-i-Rashīdī*; the siege of *Bab-sgo*, c. 1650 A.D., according to various authorities; *Desideri's* visit to