

# みんなのポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

## Chapter1

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2011-07-22 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 長野, 泰彦, 武内, 紹人, バークハート, ケッセル メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.15021/00000976">https://doi.org/10.15021/00000976</a>

## Introductory and Geographical

In view particularly of Professor Tucci's revelatory volumes of travel and archaeological research in the more westerly regions of Tibet, and of his and Professor Petech's scholarly studies in the history, in view also of the continuing important work of both, an effort to extend a knowledge of the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* language may be considered opportune. Of the two notes contributed to the J.R.A.S., 1926 (pp. 505-6) and 1933 (pp. 405-10), the former, introducing the language as apparently akin to Lepcha, was content to present a specimen from a Stein Ms., obviously medical, which could have reached Tun-huang in connection with the Tibetan domination or armies there from the early part of the VIIIth century A.D. The second, relying upon another Stein fragment, likewise medical, recognized by (Sir) G. L. M. Clauson in the British Museum, proffered reasons for identifying the language as *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* and related to the Kunāwarī and the 'Western Pronominalized Group' of Tibeto-Burman, described in the Linguistic Survey of India: some of the numerals and some medical terms and grammatical features were elicited, and a metrical passage was quoted, with a tentative translation. Despite the linguistic importance of a stage of Tibeto-Himālayan speech antedating its cognates by about 1000 years and approximately coeval with the earliest known Tibetan a further concentrated effort was postponed, except for the compilation of a vocabulary, in favour of a search among Sanskrit medical texts for a possible original: *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* medicine was likely to be of Indian derivation, either direct or *via* the Tibetan; and a more or less definite correspondence might furnish, as has happened in analogous cases, a wholesale solution of the linguistic problem. An intermittent search in the extensive Sanskrit and Tibetan medical literature not having materialized such a possibility, help was sought from Professor S. N. Dasgupta, a rare expert in Indian medical science, whose definite decision on the content of the specimen verse was that it did not correspond to an Indian text. A second possibility, since the two Mss. were written in Tun-huang, where there was activity in multilingual translation, was that there might be among the Tun-huang Mss. an original or version in some known language: but among the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Khotanī pieces of comparable nature no equivalent appeared; and recently Mr. C. H. Yuan, who with great kindness devoted time to a scrutiny of all the British Museum Stein pieces of medical character in Chinese, found nothing corresponding to the indications of the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* texts. Chinese medical literature is one of the last subjects to be envisaged by a non-expert; but a slight examination of M. Dabri's work may suggest that it may have some general similarities to the Indian; and Mr. Yuan conceived that there might be popular Chinese tracts in the style of the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ*. Chinese items, including the examination of the pulse, are recognized in Tibetan medicine in one way or another

and some such might have reached the *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ* practitioner.

The practical upshot is that the interpretation of the two fragments must be attempted by a frontal linguistic attack. In 1936 the available material was more than doubled by the accession of a third Ms., detected in the Pelliot collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Not long afterwards, photographic facsimiles, procured through the kind intermediacy of the Société des Amis de la Bibliothèque Nationale, rendered possible, despite the abrasion and general obscurity of the Ms., a mainly continuous reading; and finally, with the aid of a strong light, a lense and an amanuensis, allowed a transcription of the whole extant text, wherein there are some few lacunae. A recent revision, taking advantage of frequent recurrences of word and phrase, has removed a fair proportion of the errors and uncertainties in the first draft, though many remain; and the outcome may be regarded as more or less utilizable for linguistic studies. The text is manifestly akin to that contained in the British Museum Ms. and may be part of the same work; but differences of punctuation, etc., discourage an identification of scribe or copy.

The medical nature of the contents of all the available specimens of the language may have an explanation. In Tun-huang, where the Mss. were, no doubt, written, an interest in a language of far western Tibet would hardly be felt by others than soldiers and sojourners from the region itself, imported by Tibetan military service or other concerns. Medicine, a primary need of all communities, may have been all that such persons required of their own literature; and the relative freedom of the Mss. from the irregularities of spelling so prevalent in the Tun-huang writings of other languages may indicate that for these texts in a sparsely used dialect there was no opportunity of employing scribes of analphabetic Chinese, or other external, culture.

The definite nature of the subject-matter might seem to promise a complete interpretation of the texts; and in course of time such a result may indeed be reached. The medical notions expounded have in part, no doubt, an Indian foundation; and some particular items were adduced in 1933. But some scrutiny of the medical tracts and treatises in Sanskrit, Tibetan, etc., from Tun-huang and of the standard works of later Tibetan medicine has not been linguistically very fruitful. The vocabulary, largely independent of normal Tibetan, is still mainly problematical; and grammatically the language has independent peculiarities and difficulties, while in the subject-matter there is certainly one item of folk usage. The first and most practical proceeding is to elicit the morphological features of the language and furnish it with a habitat and date and a name. Tentatively the language has already been identified with the speech of *Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ*, a state known to Tibetans from early times and located in Gu-ge, a district in the province of mNa'-ris-skor(skor)-gsum, the westernmost territory of the present Lha-sa State. (8) But the matter requires further particu-

larization in regard to geography, history, ethnography and linguistics.

### (1) Geographical.

From a great scientific publication of the (late) British Government of India it is possible to obtain a working conception of the West Himālayan territories which is significant also for historical and ethnographical studies. The main axis, the Great Himālaya, commences in the extreme west of Nepal a marked curvature, convex southwards and westwards, which brings it to the Sutlej river in the region of the Shipki Pass and Mount Purgul; after which it continues, in a direction more or less S.E. to N.W., to the north of Kashmir, where it terminates in Mount Nanga Parbat. North of this Great Himālaya, but separated from it by the Zaskar Range, a mainly parallel branch of less elevation to which Mt. Purgul belongs, is the long valley of the upper Indus, enclosed on its north by the lofty Ladak Range, which, however, it thrice cuts through, first, southwards, in its remote upper reaches, later northwards and return, in the Ladak territories, before reaching its gorge, Rondo. North and then east of this long curving range are in the west the Karakoram territories of Ladak; after which it buttresses first the great Byān-thān, 'North Plateau', of Tibet and then the vast region of lakes which extends, north of the Brahmaputra valley, almost to the longitude of Lha-sa. It seems that the huge mountain Gurla Māndhātā, which, south of Lake Mānasa-rovara, confronts Kailāsa on the north of the same, may belong to the Ladak Range. The Kailāsa Range itself from its eastern terminus in the actual Kailāsa stretches, more or less parallel to the Ladak Range, for a limited distance, after which its continuation in the region of the Rudok district and of the Pangong (Spān-skoñ) Lake seems not to have been scientifically determined. Of the Indus river one of the sources, on which stands Gartog, the chief place of mÑah-ris-skor-gsum, flows between the two ranges, Ladak and Kailāsa, while others are still further north and east.

Of the southward bifurcations of the Great Himālaya one calling for mention here is the lofty Pir Panjal Range. Diverging from the Great Himālaya near the point where the river Sutlej cuts through the latter, it constitutes a precipitous southern boundary of the district of Lahul, where are the Chandra and Bhaga rivers and their confluence, forming the Chandrabhaga, or Chenab. Continued across the state of Chamba, it reaches Kaṣṭawār, where the Chenab cuts through it, and then the South east corner of Kashmir, of which it furnishes the boundary on the south. The Dhavalādhār Range, which has diverged further east, somewhat beyond Badarīnāth in Garhwāl whereof it constitutes the northern limit, is in its westward progress, cut through by the Sutlej river somewhat south of Rampur, the capital of Bashahr State, and then bounds on its north the uppermost sources of the Beas and Ravi, of which

the former has its ultimate confluence with the Sutlej, and the latter with the Chenab, on the plains of India. The Outer Himālaya of Siwalik, bounds [...] the Indian plains.

In these slight borrowings from geographical science no notice has been taken of some important matters which the science has expounded and discussed. One of these is the great width of the whole complex, viz.c. 90 miles from the highest snow mountains to the Outer Siwalik, whereof the last-named has 5 to 20, 9 the Lesser Himālaya 40-50, miles. Secondly, there is the fact that in some stretches at least the most towering peaks are situated not on the main axis, but on lofty spurs radial to it. These spurs, in which the passes are often not less formidable than those in the main ranges, condition in a large measure the territorial partitions east and west; and the numerous lesser ramifications give to the whole Western Himālayan region the aspect of a jumble of mountains, whereof only the rivers with their frequently diverted courses and often very contracted valleys afford to some extent a conspectus.

Routes of communication, with particulars of season, transport and accommodation, are specifically described in the official Gazetteers of the several states; and we have also a monograph in (Professor) Major Kenneth Mason's *Routes in the Western Himalaya, Kashmir, & c.* (Vol.I, Calcutta, 1920). The natural routes over the high ranges, considerably perhaps supplemented by subsequent openings, will have been the valleys of the rivers or torrents flowings down from the main passes. Here it may be relevant to cite one or two particulars. Commencing in the extreme west, where the Great Himālaya is of relatively reduced height prior to its triumphant finale in Nanga Parbat, we do not find historical relations, political or economic, between the rather ancient Indo-Āryan state of Chamba on its south and the W. Tibetan Zanskar, adjoining it beyond the range. The next eastward stretch, where Lahul, with the sources of the Bhaga and Chandra, reaches up into wholly desolate and uninhabitable regions, seems from the narrative of Father de Azevedo, who in 1631 made the journey from the Ladak district of Rupshu through Lahul and then over the Pir Panjal into Kulu, to present the acme of difficulty and privations. It may be conjectured that the tribulations are predominantly on the south of the range, since Lahul, during a long period a district of the W. Tibetan State, may have been more approachable from the north. The narrative contains the earliest European mention of the Tibetan name, *Gar-za*, of the district: the Tibet name of Kulu is *Nū-i-ti*.

The next stretch, viz. the curve of the Great Himalaya from Shipki eastwards to the Nepal frontier, commences with 'the Hindustan-Tibet Road', which is the valley of the Sutlej river. Central in the whole length of the Great Himālaya, it was evidently at the beginning of the 19th century conceived by British officials and explorers in India as the highway to trans-Himālayan regions: this may have been at

first on local information, mentioning also its convenience for reaching the upper Indus valley, concerning which less was known than might have been expected. The next historical route of penetration is the Niti Pass, far to the south and east in the extreme northwestern corner of Garhwāl, where are the great mountain Nandā Devī and the ancient Hindu sanctuaries of Badarīnāth and Kedārīnāth. The use of this extremely difficult route by the Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries of the 17th century may have been commenced upon advice from the inviting or welcoming king, to whose capital, Tasparang (Chabrang) on the upper Sutlej river, the map shows it as the most direct approach. Moorcroft, whose commercial design in 1807 contemplated the Kailāsa-Mānasa-sarovar district, may not have been aware of the missionary precedent: he seems to have wished to take Badarīnāth on his way; and his journey, commencing with the valley of the Dhaulī branch of the uppermost Ganges, turned eastward on reaching Daba, which is south of Tsaparang. He may indeed have been unaware of routes further east or may have apprehended from the then controlling Nepalese authorities trouble such as was subsequently experienced in the course of his return. In any case his route was not seriously devious, since before descending to Daba it gave an actual distance view of the Kailāsa over the extensive plain west and south-west of it. Of the somewhat numerous passes east of the Niti and as far as the Kālī river, which is the later Nepal boundary, (see the map in Sherring's *Western Tibet and the British Borderland* and his discussion, pp. 32, 149-150, 164-6, 340-4), one, the Lipu-lekh Pass, is described by Sherring as easy and adaptable even to wheeled transport: it leads to the district and town of Taklakot, the ancient Purang (sPu-*hrans*), west and south-west of Gurīa-Māndhātā. We may note also Captain Rawling's statement (*The Great Plateau*, p. 251) —

'Of all places in Tibet, it' (Pu-rang) is the easiest to reach from India; for the lowest passes in the Western Himalayas lie between 15 and 25 miles distant in a southerly direction, and the three best known can be reached from Almora - the Lipu Lekh 16,750 feet high, *via* the Kali River; the Untadhaura, 17,590 feet, *via* Milam; and the Niti La, 17,000 feet'.

As easy Sherring mentions also (pp. 64, 166, 344) the Tinkar Pass, just within the Nepal border, but leading to scarcely known parts of north-west Nepal. Beyond the longitude of Mānasa-Kailāsa Nepal has two historic routes crossing the Himālaya, the pass at Kyirong (sKyid-groñ), whence journeys have been made both westward and eastward, and the Kutī Pass, *via* Nyanam, much further east, whence Ting-ri, Tashilhunpo or Lhasa would naturally be the goal.

The scientifically, it is understood, important circumstance that in the Himālaya the watersheds in a number of cases fail to coincide with the main axes, many of the rivers having some sources beyond the range whence most of their waters are derived, is, of course, most grandly exemplified by the Indus and the Brahmaputra,

which jointly embrace the whole area and reach India after noticeably similar passages through the western and eastern extremities of the whole. Rather more complex is the case of some of the interior rivers, such as the Chenab and the Sutlej, which before reaching the Indian plains have to cut through more than one of the enclosed bifurcations. The case of the Sutlej seems the more remarkable of the two, since, though it has not to pass the Pir Pañjāl Range, it has a long course, with numerous affluents on both banks, beyond the Great Himālaya, and before passing the latter, in the region of Skipki, has received also the waters of the two joined, considerable, rivers of Spiti, which is rather Himālayan than trans-Himālayan territory, as well as some others: further south it has to penetrate the Dhavaladhār Range and the Outer Himālaya. Then it was in due time found that the two most important contributors of the Ganges, the Alakānandā and the Bhāgīrathā are from sources north of the Great Himālaya; and further east the Kālī river, boundary between Kumaon and Nepal, and the Karnālī, which it joins as a tributary and which in India becomes the Gogra, have their birth in the plains or lakes of the Mānasa-sarovar - Pu-rang region. The conspectur of such observations has been formulated in the remark that a square of a few miles comprises the sources of the four great rivers, Brahmaputra, Indus, Sutlej, Gogra.

All that area is included in the district of mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum, the watershed between the Indus and the Brahmaputra sources being at the Ma (r) -yum Pass and Gun-chu Lake, some 30 miles east of Mānasa-sarovar. Thus the Mānasa-Kailāsa region, which even in the Tibetan view is *od-phyogs*, 'the top region', is, with its Mānasa Lake at 14,900 feet, between the towering summits of Kailāsa, 22,028 feet, and Gurla-Māndhātā, 25,355 feet, in a way the geographical centre of Asia. To that extent the Indian Purānic notion of Kailāsa as the earth's Olympus, with the four great rivers issuing from its flanks, north, south, east and west, has a relation to fact.

But the common Indian and Indianist conception of the region as the acme of sublime remoteness is in direct conflict with the facts. Of all Himālayan territories mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum may be considered as, in a wide geographical sense, the most accessible. To the Ladak countries the Indus valley affords a route which can be used throughout the year, as well as some shortenings, discovered by man, through Spiti on its north-west and west; by Ladak traders the markets of Gartog are regularly visited, and through the same centre pass the triennial ecclesiastical missions to Lhasa. To Gartog the nomads of the great Byañ-thaṅ, 'North Plateau', of Tibet bring their wool and yak-hair for sale, and the district suffers at times from incursions of far-roaming brigand bands from its remoter parts. The Brahmaputra valley is, as was experienced in 1715 A.D. by the Jesuit missionary G. Desideri and in 1904-5, in the reverse direction, by Captains Rawling and Ryder and Lieutenant Bailey, wholly rideable. On the south, as we have seen, the passes from the extreme

north of Garhwāl and Kumaon are frequented during their seasons by traders in both directions and used from ancient times by Hindu pilgrims to Kailāsa and Mānasa. On the west the curve of the Range between the Shipki and Niti Passes includes a number of points of contact with the Bashahr State, of which the Gazetteer (1910) describes a fair number of, no doubt, frontier villages of Tibetan race and speech: the attempt of Captain Alexander Gerard, in 1821, to penetrate *via* Bekhur into mÑah-ris-skor-gsum was frustrated not by impossibilities of route, but by Tibeto-Chinese official resistance. On the western side of the Bashahr State there are routes, some probably ancient, which lead on to Lahul and to Kulu, south thereof. From Almora in Kumaon the distance to Taklakot in Purang is no more than 160 miles of travel.

A word concerning the territorial geography, which, though partly resulting from historical events, cannot but be conditioned by the physical, and in the case of the Himālayan region manifests its influence in a sweeping manner. North of the Great Himāyan axis, from the gorge (*ron*) of the Indus in the extreme west to that of the Brahmaputra in the extreme east, there is no territory that has not been during many centuries Tibetan in language, culture (except for the Muslims of Baltistan) and government. This applies even to Spiti, acquired by British India in 1846 A.D. through defeat of the Sikhs, who had held it as part of the old Ladak kingdom subjected by them in 1835-6 A.D. South of the Great Himālaya all the hill countries from the extreme east to the western frontier of Nepal are Tibeto-Burman or Tibetan in race and speech, though in Nepal a rather ancient measure of Indo-Āryanization and Buddhist and Hindu culture has in late centuries been carried much further through domination by an originally extraneous people of Āryan culture and language (Nepali or Khas-kura). Between the western frontier of Nepal and the eastern limit of Kashmir the whole area has from ancient times been experiencing a continuous Indo-Āryanization which almost reaches the Great Himālaya in its whole length, and only in the extreme north-west, namely in the Pāṅgī district of the Chamba States adjoining the Zanakar district of Ladak, is without a northernmost fringe, marked by intrusion or survival of Tibetan, or Tibeto-Burman, elements. In Garhwāl this fringe, which in general corresponds to the above-noted very mountainous area between the main axis and the clusters of lofty peaks standing out to its south, is clearly shown on Sherring's map as 'Bhot', sc. Bod, 'Tibet'. Its fuller designation, *Bhotānta*, 'Tibet frontier district', somewhat perplexed the early travellers familiar with 'Bootan', or 'Bhutan', as denoting the state still so designated; which name, however, has a different etymology (Tib. *Bum-thaṅ*): the form *Bhotānta* is Indo-Āryan. The 'Bhot' population, incompletely Indo-Āryanized and mainly occupied in trade-intercourse with the trans-Himālayan Tibetans of mÑah-



ris-skor-gsum, likewise also its 'Bhotiyā' speech, a modification of the historic Tibetan, are obviously intrusive and of no very early date: what they replaced, or absorbed, is indicated by the situation in the adjacent and similar districts of Kumaon, immediately adjoining Nepal, where the population has likewise regular trade-relations with the (Purang) Tibetans, but linguistically is not Tibetan, but Tibeto-Burman. The surmise finds confirmation in the Bashahr State, where the Bhot situation is continued as far as the Shipki region in its extreme north, with a cognate Tibeto-Burman, not Tibetan, dialect, 'Kunāwarī'. West of 'Kunāwar', always in communication, across high passes, with Lahul, where are the sources of the Chenab river, the linguistic line is continued unbroken by the cognate Tibeto-Burman dialects of Lahul and then, beyond a spur of the Great Himālaya, by the cognate 'Chamba-Lahulī', adjoining the above-mentioned Pāṅgī district on its east. It may be noted that in Pangi itself (Chamba Gazetteer, 1910, pp. 8, 121) there are villages of 'Bhotauris' (i.e. Bhotāwarīs, from *Bhotāwara*, synonym of *Bhotānta*), incompletely Indo-Āryanized and Buddhist: they would perhaps be Tibetan and 'intrusive', but from the Ladak kingdom.

The non-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, communities stretched along the whole line of the Great Himālaya West of Nepal are a phenomenon conditioned obviously by physical geography, and one indubitably of relatively high antiquity; and their limitation to a narrow strip of mountainous territory on the immediate south of the main axis invites research. Other physical factors determining, or partly determining, the areas of historical states, e.g. narrow valleys of great rivers winding among mountains, as in the case of the Chamba State, or isolation by a circumference of high ranges, as in the case of Kulu, Lahul and Bashahr, are recognized as specially prominent in the W. Himālayan region.

Something further should be mentioned concerning two districts, namely Kunāwar and mñah-ris-skor-gsum, which have special importance in relation to the present inquiry. Kunāwar is the northern part of Bashahr, the largest of the 'Simla Hill States'. On the map Bashahr has a rather triangular shape with apex at the north, in the region of the Shipki pass, where the Pīr Pāñjāl parts, at first in a rather south-westerly direction, from the Great Himālaya. Here there are some high passes leading to Lahul. The western limit of Bashahr is continued by a high southerly spur from the Pīr Pāñjāl, which separates that State at first on the west, and then, curving westward, on the north, from Kulu, which also can be reached by high passes. South of Kulu is the small state of Mandi, essentially the valley of the westward turning Beas river after its emergence from Kulu: and again further south the still smaller state of Suket, which borders on the Sutlej to the north of Simla. Thus the southwest corner of the Bashahr triangle bulges somewhat, so as to be partly south, after being east, of Kulu, following the long westward bend of its great river, the Sutlej. The

communications with Mandi and Suket are, no doubt, far less laborious than those with Kulu. The southern limits of Bashahr are constituted partly by some lesser states, some of them even south of Simla, partly by the Dhavaladhār range where it is north of Tehri Garhwāl. The whole eastern limb of the triangle is furnished by the curve of the Great Himālaya from about Badarīnāth to Shipki. The Sutlej, here called Sumudrung (Sanskrit *semudra*) and Satrudra (Sanskrit *Sutudrā*, *Satadru*), flowing midway through the State, has on its right bank many minor affluents from the high ranges of the western border, on its left a few from the Great Himālaya, but including the Baspa and the Pabar, which are considerable streams.

Kunāwar, the northern part of the State, extends on both sides of the Sutlej, with 'a minimum breadth of 12 miles on the right bank and a maximum of 62 miles on the left', from Shipki to the mountains bounding the Baspa valley on its south. Kunāwar therefore comprizes on the west practically all that part of the Bashahr State which adjoins Spiti, Lahul and Kulu and nearly all that has on its east, beyond the Great Himālaya, the Tibetan district of mÑah-ris-skor-gsum. The exact frontier on this eastern side is, no doubt, the heads of the numerous passes crossing this part of the Great Himālaya: it might perhaps be traced by noting in the Directory Appendix (II) to the State Gazetteer the rather numerous villages which are recorded as inhabited by people called 'Nyām or Zār (i.e. Jād)', sc. Tibetan, and are Tibetan or bilingual in speech. It follows from this that trade-dealings of Bashahr with mÑah-ris-skor-gsum are for the most part transacted primarily through Kunāwarī persons. The capital, Rāmpur, of Bashahr is south of the Kunāwar district. The Tibetan name of Kunāwar is Kunu.

mÑah-ris-skor-gsum, now wholly Tibetan in speech and culture, is the westernmost province of the Lha-sa State. Its name and the equivalents *Nari* and *Hun-desh* (*Hūna-deśa*) will call for historical consideration. From the Nepal frontier to Skipki its southern and western boundary is the curve of the Great Himālaya: further north it includes mountain districts. Hang-rang and Chumurti, which have Spi-ti, once part of the Ladak kingdom, on their west. Eastward it extends as far as the Kailāsa and Lake Mānasa and perhaps somewhat further: and here it includes Gartok, which is on a branch of the Indus beyond the Ladak range: and it has a great extension northwards so as to comprize also the large district of Rudok, in the region of the Pangong (*sPañ-skoñ*) Lake: at what precise point on the Indus itself it adjoins Ladak territory seems to be uncertain. North and east of the Pangong Lake stretches the great Tibetan Byañ-thañ, 'North-plateau', sparsely occupied by nomadic groups.

mÑah-ris-skor-gsum is governed by two joint appointees, entitled *Garpon* (*sGar-dpon*, 'Encampment-rulers') from Lhasa, stationed, as we learn from Sherring's book (pp. 150 sqq.), at Gartog, with district governors, *Jongpen* (*rDzoñ-dpon*, 'Fortrulers'), at Rudok, Chabrang, Daba and Taklakot. Gartog, the

administrative centre, consists of two widely separated settlements, Gargunsa (*sGar-dgun-sa*, 'sGar winter-station') and Garyersa (*sGar-dbyar-sa*, 'sGar summer-station'); at the latter takes place in August-September an annual assembly, fair, and mart, frequented by traders from Ladak, Kashmir, Kunāwar (and other cis-Himālayan areas), interested especially in the wool, hair, salt, borax, etc., brought by the nomads of the Byañ-thañ and other parts of Tibet.

The frequently ventilated notion that 'Nari' or 'gNari', i.e. mÑah-ris-skor-gsum, is equivalent to 'Western Tibet' is due, as will be expounded *infra*, to a historical misunderstanding very little current in Tibetan writings. The alternative name, *Hundesh*, which is not Tibetan, but Indo-Āryan (Sanskrit *Hūna-deśa*, 'Hūna-country'), has also led to what is probably a misunderstanding, being interpreted as 'Hun-country' or 'Snowcountry': this also will be considered *infra*.

The part of mÑah-ris-skor-sum with which we shall be specially concerned is the southern, the 'valley', or drainage area of the uppermost Sutlej, which here has in Tibetan the name *Glañ-chen-rtsañ-po*, 'Elephant-river', or *Glañ-chen-kha-bab*, 'Elephant-mouth-fall', derived from the ancient legend of the four rivers issuing from four animals mouths on the four sides of Mount Kailāsa: Moorcroft had used the old Sanskrit *Śutudrī* in the late popular forms *Satadru* and *Satluj*. Other names are, it seems, merely local, as *Muksung* (*Magsang*) in Gerard's *Koonawur* (map) and *Lingti* (for *Tot-ling-ti*) in Strachey, p. 35). Issuing from the western, *Ho-ma-tso*, 'Milk-lake', or *Langak* (Indian names *Rakas-tal*, 'Rākṣasa's pool', or *Rāvan-hrad*), of the two famous lakes, it flows in a general S.E. to N.W. direction to the vicinity of Shipki and Mt. Purgul, where it cuts through the Great Himālaya into Kunāwar. The remarkable character of the 'valley' has been expounded by Strachey, who shows (pp. 31-3) that the bed of the river is in general at the bottom of a secondary valley, often a narrow cañon, some 1000 - 3000 ft deep, cut through an original alluvial plain of over 15000 ft. altitude, detritus from the surrounding mountains. The depth of the main channel renders the river unserviceable for purposes of cultivation at the available levels, which accordingly depends upon the numerous affluents from high side valleys plunging into the Sutlej on either bank. A similar situation in the far west (Karakoram) Hunza-Nagar country is indicated by the description on p. xxxvii of Lt. Col. D. L. R. Lorimer's *The Burushaski Language*, Vol. I.

This situation, which hinders communications between even neighbouring places on opposite banks of the main river, may help to identify the frontier between the two ancient states, Gu-ge and sPu-hrañs (Purang), which jointly occupied the area in question. Both of them are still familiarly known and have been shown on European maps, Gu-ge to the north, sPu-hrañs to the south; both certainly reached Lake Mānasa on the east, and sPu-hrañs, west and south-west of the great mountain Gurla-Māndhātā or Me-mo, and perhaps with a projection to the south thereof, is

represented by the present district and town of Taklakot. On the west Gu-ge certainly reached the Shipki region, while its first and later capitals, Khyuñ-luñ and Tho-ling (Tot-ling mtho-ldiñ), are both on the right bank. Chab-rañ (Tsa-pa-rang), a later capital of the (joint) state and further west than Tholing, is on the left bank: it is stated to have been in Spugrañs. Hence it is probable that the frontier between the two states was constituted by the Sotlej itself. On the north-east Purang, the somewhat lower valley of the Karnālī river, is separated from the actual plain of the twin lakes by the Ladak range just before its terminus in the great Gurla-Māndhātā mountain: the ascent, however, is little perceptible, and the pass, Gurla Pass, leading to Mānasa has an altitude of only 16,200 feet.

In Tibetan literature Purang is described as *sPu-hrañs-gaṅskyis-bskor*, 'sPu-hrañs girt with snow-mountains', while Gu-ge is *Gu-ge-g.yaḥ-yis-bskor*, 'Gu-ge girt with precipices'. This may refer, in the case of Purang, to the great Gurla-Māndhātā mountain on its north-east and east and the main Himālaya which bounds it on the south, and in the case of Gu-ge to the above-mentioned chasms and side-chasms which so prominently characterize the valley of the uppermost Sotlej. The third division of mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum, viz. *Mañ-yul-mtsho-yis-bskor*, 'Mañ-yul girt with lakes', will be discussed *infra*.