

to a statement by Dr. Hutchison, Ahmad-Shāh's grave is shown to travellers in Kaṣṭawār, so that he cannot have died in Lhasa. The minister (*bkaḥ-blon*) of Bab-sgo seems actually to have taken the side of the Dogras; for we find the same statement in Tshe-brtan's account. Tshe-brtan also mentions in this connexion a certain Tshe-dbañ-rab-brtan, whom he calls an astrologer. Thus it is quite possible that the minister of Bab-sgo and Tshe-dbañ-rab-brtan are two different persons. Cunningham believed them to be one and the same, probably because they were occasionally mentioned together.

#### 5. SECOND WAR AGAINST CENTRAL TIBET (Cunningham, p. 354)

During the winter the Chinese (Tibetans) re-occupied the whole of the Garo (Sgar, Gar-thog) territory, and early in the spring of 1842 a body of about 3,000 men advanced into Ladák (La-dvags), and laid siege to the new fort at Lé (Sle). (The people of Balti (Sbal-ti) also rose; but they were soon reduced by a small force under Vazir Lakpat, who destroyed the fort and palace, to prevent the chance of another insurrection.) They were joined by the boy-king Jigmet Namgyal (*Hjigs-med-rnam-rgyal*), and the unwarlike Tibetans once more began to dream of independence. But after a short reign of six weeks, Dewán Hari Chand and Vazir Ratanu advanced with fresh troops, and the Tibetans were rudely awakened from their dream of liberty by the musketry of their old enemies, and the 3,000 would-be heroes who had talked of invading Kashmir, fled ignominiously towards Rudog (Ru-thogs). There they recovered themselves, and taking up a strong position, they determined to await the approach of winter, and then join in a general rising against the Indian invaders. But the simple Tibetan was no match for the wily Indian, and the Lhasan commander was soon made a prisoner by stratagem. The strong position of the Tibetans was shortly afterwards turned; and the Lhasan Vazir was glad to be permitted to retire on the single condition that the old boundary between Ladák and China (Tibet) should be re-established.

#### NOTES

In my opinion Cunningham emphasizes the cowardice of the Ladakhis more than is just. A great deal of their inability to resist the Dogras was due to their insufficient armament. The Dogras were equipped in the most excellent way with cannons and modern rifles. The Tibetans had ancient matchlocks, and, as we know from Moorcroft, there was only one matchlock to ten soldiers. Even swords were rare, and most of the Ladakhis had to rely on clubs, bows and arrows, and stone-flinging.