

# 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

## Chapter2

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/10.15021/00000977">https://doi.org/10.15021/00000977</a>

## Historico-geographical

### (1) Himalaya in early Indo-Aryan history.

The conception of the Himālaya as a great whole was, no doubt, a product of Indo-Āryan observation and brains: the Greeks, who had not the observation, will have derived it from the Indians. The Indo-Āryans themselves will hardly have attained it before their northward expansion had reached the Outer Himālaya and thence disclosed long lines of snow-topped ridges and peaks. In their early progress over the Pañjāb plain they will not have known even of Kashmir, which is further north and more isolated than is usually conceived, and which may have owed its first contact with Indian culture to the initial Buddhist propaganda, followed by the historically attested Aśokan rule in the IIIrd century B.C. The Himālaya (*Himavant*, in the Plural) is just mentioned in a latish *Ṛg-veda* hymn (X.121.4); and an essential feature of it is realized, though doubtless only upon hearsay, in the famous, far earlier, dialogue with the rivers (R.V.II.33), in which the Bharatas, approaching on the Pañjāb plain the confluence of the Beas (*Vipāś*) and Sutlej (*Śutudrī*), appeal for an easy crossing: the two rivers, which have come racing from 'the womb of mountains', protest that they owe their passage to the God Indra, whose 'thunderbolt arm' had raked out their channels, smashing through Vṛtra's intercepting barrier: the suppliant's emphatic laudation of Indra's feat wins their consent. To scholars who, along with the whole newspaper-reading world, were in *inserie la dais* awaiting the bursting of the glacier barrier on the Shayok tributary of the upper Indus and a consequent wave of destruction down the latter's whole course it can hardly have seemed doubtful that the Vedic poet had a somewhat realistic notion of the sort of event which he describes. Other such Himālayan occurrences are on record; and it chanced that in 1762 A.D. one of the two rivers named by him, the Śutudrī or Sutlej, was so dammed by the collapse of a mountain shoulder that its lower course was reduced to a series of pools and its release was a famous catastrophe. When the *Atharva-veda* took shape, the Indo-Āryans had already progressed down the Ganges valley, and the Pañjāb rivers are grouped together as of Himālayan provenance. The Himālaya figures generally as the source of minerals and of medicinal herbs, two features based upon certain realities, and the second familiar in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and in later Sanskrit literature a standing characteristic of the Himālaya. The repeated mention of the three-peaked mountain Trikakud or Kakubh, which is, no doubt, Triśūl, south-east of Nandā-Devī in the extreme north of Garhwāl, seems evidence of actual vision of the great main range, at least from a summit of the Outer Himālaya.

When we come to the *Mahā-Bhārata*, the view has been transformed by actual

and detailed acquaintance. The sacred places of pilgrimage, Badarīnāth, Kedārahāth, Jumnotrī, associated with the remote sources of the Ganges and Jumna and situated close under the Great Himālaya, are cited as familiarly known. The horizon even transcends the Himālaya: the veneration and mythology of Mount Kailāsa and Lake Mānasa, with stories of the divinities, Śiva, Kuvera, and their attendant Yakṣas, Guhyakas, etc., are as in later times. Kailāsa is already an Olympus, and the region is a resort of Hindu ascetics, *mānasa-tāpasāḥ* (*Mbh.* [...]), 'anchorites of Mānasa'.

There would be no reason in regarding such references as interpolated or as in date posterior to the IIIrd century B.C. They are supported by the evidence of other old texts. Not to rely upon the mention of Mānusa, understood by Caland as = Mānasa, in the *Jaiminiya-brāhmaṇa* (Caland, *Das J.B. in Auswahl*, pp. 289- 290), the earliest Buddhist literature mentions the yak (*camara*), which does not descend below the high Himālaya. Another very ancient Buddhist text, the *Mahā-vastu*, mentions not only the Kailāsa mountain with the city of the Guhyaka, or Kinnara, king on its summit, and the other mythological beings, Yakṣas and Rākṣasas associated by the Brahmanic legends with the same, but also the flocks of waterfowl frequenting Lake Mānasa, and the Śatadru (Sutlej) river in that region: this implies correct information concerning the trans-Himālayan course of the Sutlej in the Kailāsa - Mānasa region. The Buddhist poet Aśvaghōṣa (Ist cent., A.D.) describes the Himālaya (*Saundara-Nanda*, X. vv. 5-14) in verses mentioning among particulars the caves, yaks (*camara*), Kinnarīs and Kirāta people. The *Kauṭaliya-arthaśāstra*, another ancient text, matches by its *Kailāsa-tāpasāḥ*, 'anchorites of Kailāsa', the *Mahā-Bhārata* mention of 'anchorites of Mānasa'. The *Mahā-vastu* also mentions (III. 133.1.12) *tāpasa* as well as *camara*.

There is not, it seems, any objection to crediting the *Mahā-Bhārata*, in the period indicated, with some vague knowledge even of the region beyond Kailāsa-Mānasa: once the latter had been visited by Indian pilgrims some notion of what lay beyond may have resulted inevitably from ocular evidence of trading and other intercourse. In the *Mahā-Bhārata* (Sabhā-parvan, vv. 1038 sqq.) Arjuna, having in the course of his *dig-vijaya* conquered the (cis)-Himavant regions, crosses the Śveta-parvata, 'White mountain', i.e. the snowy Great Himālaya, into the Kimpurusa (= Kinnara) country ruled by Druma, after conquering whom he visits the district *Hāṭaka*, 'Golden', and sees the actual Mānasa, occupied by the Guhyaka people, from whom he exacts a tribute of fine horses. Although some gold is obtained from washings in the Sutlej and also elsewhere, it is natural in connection with 'Hāṭaka', to think of the ancient mining district of Thok-Jalung, which is considerably beyond the Kailāsa range, to the north-east. Arjuna then contemplates an advance northward into the mythical Harivarṣa region, but is dissuaded by its huge potent gate-wardens (*dvāra-pāla*), who point out that it is the Uttara-Kuru country and inviolable: instead

of conquest and tribute he receives gifts of celestial robes, celestial ornaments and celestial 'skins' (*ajina*), possibly a remote echo of the fine wool and shawl-hair of the Byañ-ṭhañ nomad traders.

In spite, however, of the verifiable particulars discernible in the *Mahā-Bhārata* description of the Kailāsa-Mānasa region a substantial knowledge of it cannot be attributed to the Epic. The actual situation may be indicated by the narrative of Arjuna's journey to the scene of his austerities and fight with Śiva (III.vv. 1494 sqq.) and by that of the subsequent expedition of his brothers (vv. 10820 sqq.) for the purpose of awaiting his return.

Here Arjuna, after reaching the mountains with miraculous speed, crosses Himavant and Gandhamādāna and then, passing through difficult country, arrives at Indrakīla, where he settles down in a forest. From the story it seems clear that Indrakīla is the actual Kailāsa, which its name, 'Indra's peg' well describes, and is also the *Indrasya parvata*, 'Indra's mountain' of v. 10833, itself identified by the reference to the supposed descent of the Ganges upon its peak. Arjuna has passed beyond two mountain ranges, Himavant and Gandhamādāna (v. 1495), which should accordingly be distinguishable: yet the place of his sojourn is subsequently described as *Himavat-prstha* (vv. 1531,1541), 'the back, or ridge, of Himavant': this is perhaps excusable, Himavant being taken in a wide sense; but in regard to Gandhamādāna also a confusion will appear.

Yudhiṣṭhira and his party, completing under the guidance of the saint Lomaśa a round of visits to sacred places, have passed (*samatīta*) the Uśīra-bīja, Maināka, Śveta-giri and Kāla-sāila, and one in sight of the sevenfold Canges (III. vv. 10820-1). Here begins a confusion, originally perhaps a matter of readings, *samatīta* being not textually certain; for the place where the party is must be the district of Gaṅgā-dvāra (= Haridwar), where the Ganges cuts through the Outer Himālaya; and, though the mountains Uśīra-bīja, Maināka and Kāla-sāila are provisionally indeterminate enough to be associated therewith, this hardly applies to the Śveta-giri, if that is the Great Himālaya. Moreover, we learn forthwith that the party has yet to enter the Śveta-giri and Mandara and the region of Kuvera, with his Yakṣas, Kimpuruṣas, etc., and to reach Kailāsa, where also is Viśālā (Badarī): it is possible that the introductory verse had originally a different reading or context. Yudhiṣṭhira proposes to leave Draupadī, with Bhīma, (and Sahadeva) at Gaṅgā-dvāra and proceed himself with Nakula and Lomaśa. At this point the whole party arrives at the territory of Subāhu, the Kuṇḍina overlord (*Īśvara*, v. 10866, *adhipati* v. 10868), abounding in elephants and horses and peopled by Kirātas, Taṅgaṇas and Kuṇḍinas. After a kind reception they leave with Subāhu their attendants and equipage and set out on foot towards Himavant (v. 10867). They will enter mount Gandhamādāna, where is Viśālā Badarī, the hermitage of Nara-Nārāyaṇa (vv. 10893, 10898). A

violent storm with a night of separation in the mist is followed by a break-down on the part of Draupadī; but with the aid of Bhīmaś Rākṣasa son Ghatotkaca, who miraculously appears, the party carries on, passing over many districts inhabited by Vidyādhata, Kimpuruṣas, and wild tribes, etc.: at last they descry Kailāsa and in its vicinity the delightful hermitage of Badarī, which they reach. There they settle down happily among the kind hermits.

In this account Badarī is obviously conceived as the terminus of the journey; and this is further emphasized by a long account of stupendous exploits of Bhīma (vv. 11069 sqq.) in the forests of Kuvera on the ridges (*sānu*) of Gandhamādana or on the heights of Kailāsa, anticipating his subsequent (vv. 11674 sqq.) adventures on Kailāsa.

The redactors of the Epic, however, had to deal also with an account of the journey which was not under the illusion that Badarī was the terminus or was near to Kailāsa. Accordingly in v. 11527 begins a resumption of the journey, which, starting from Badarī, and climbing ever higher, arrives only on the seventeenth day on the ridge (*prastha*) of Himavant and discovers on the back (*prsthā*) of Himavant, near to Gandhamādana, the holy hermitage of Vṛṣaparvan (vv. 11541-3). After seven days Vṛṣaparvan sends party on with counsel as to route. On the fourth day they enter the Śveta-(?)parvata, and following Vṛṣaparvan's directions, they reach mount Mālyavānt and the Kimpuruṣa country and with emotion descry Gandhamādana. An inordinately long and detailed description of the rich natural beauties of the country, with references to Gandharvas, Kinnaras, etc., and even to the Ganges (in virtue of its (mythical) descent upon, and from, Kailāsa), closes with arrival at the hermitage of the *rājarṣi* Ārṣṭiṣeṇa, in the vicinity of the 'king of mountain (Kailāsa)'.

It may be interesting to note that in 1807 Moorcroft left Joshimaṭh, not far from Badarī, on May 26 and on July 1, after very trying marches, reached the summit of the Niti pass, whence he had a first distant view of Kailāsa. The route conceived by the Epic is inevitably the same as that of Moorcroft, since from the Badarī district there is no other suitable: it is regularly used by the Hūniyas, 'wool-traders', parties of whom were encountered by Moorcroft, and, no doubt, also by any Hindu pilgrims who proceed beyond Badarī: in fact, Moorcroft passed a cave in which was the corpse of an Indian, whom he conjectured to be a pilgrim.

In general the Epic references to Gandhamādana in the narrative of the journey accord with Atkinson's information, or conclusion, that Gandhamādana is 'the Badarī group of peaks' (pp. 283, 294), 'above Badrinath' (p. 312), 'by the confluence of the Dhaula and the Alaknanda' (p. 332). But from Burrard and Hayden's great geographical work we can perhaps obtain some additional light. Badarī, which is on the Viṣṇu-gaṅgā a little above its confluence with the Dhauli river to constitute the Alakā-nanda, is, in fact, beyond the main Great Himālayan axis, which runs from

Nandā-devī (25,645 ft.) north-westwards to Badarīnāth (23,190 ft.): see Burrard, Hayden, II, Chart XVI. Between these two giant heights is a great gap, through which flows the combined Alakā-nandā; the Dhauli constituent has come from the Niti Pass, far behind the main axis. The Niti Pass is, as the geography states (Burrard, Hayden, pp. 102, 182), not on the main range, but on the parallel 'Zanskar Range', thirty miles to the rear. Badarī itself, always identifiable by its adjoining spring of hot and cold water, is ten miles east of Badarīnāth (Burrard, Hayden *ibid.*, p. 183) and in a trough between the two ranges.

These facts may serve to explain, or excuse, some items in the Epic story of the journey. Thus (1) the storm encountered before reaching Badarī may well have been a stock characteristic of the passage through what we now know as the great gap; (2) Badarī was not, as the first narrative conceives, near to Kailāsa, nor could Kailāsa (v. 11029) have been descried before arrival at Badarī; but it may have been known that it could be descried from the mountain ridge, namely, as Moorcroft experienced, from the Niti Pass; (3) the hardships of the journey to Badarī, which are surmounted by many Indians every year, are perhaps rendered more tolerable by the lower altitudes of the passage through the gap and of the point of arrival: whereas the further journey to the Niti Pass, with its constant ascents during seventeen days (*Mbh.* III, v. 11541) and the 'horrors' of the way (Moorcroft, p. 390 and *passim*), must have been even far more formidable than in recent centuries, when it is facilitated by use and by stopping-places; (4) Gandhamādāna near to which, on the 'ridge' or 'back' (*prāṣṭha*) of Himavant (III. v. 11542-3), is the hermitage of Vṛṣaparvan, is rather definitely the Zanskar range or in particular its dominant peak, Kamet (25,447 ft.), which, as can be seen from Chart XVI<sup>1</sup>, is much nearer than Badarīnāth to the Niti Pass, and possibly is visible therefrom: it must have been well known in Badarī. When Gandhamādāna is named where Kailāsa should be meant, it may be remembered that between Gandhamādāna and Kailāsa the Epic conceives of nothing that does not belong to the paradisiacal realm of Kuvera. The very long and endlessly particularized description (III.155, vv. 43-90) of the country is, however, an intrusion of poetico-religious idealization, originally perhaps only an exaggeration of what was actually observable in the vegetable, animal, etc., life and in the general scenery of the middle sub-Himālayan region (Hodgson's *Bavar*); there the lions, tigers, elephants, monkeys, etc., are either still found or are known to have existed. Such idealization may have been a somewhat early topic of the rhapsodists, since passages of similar tenour can be seen in the *Mahā-vastu* (II. pp. 105, 106, 109, Kinnarī-jātaka), *Jātaka-mālā* (XXIV) and even in the Pali *Jātaka* (no. 547, Himavanta-vaṇṇanā). But the actually desolate aspect of the c.100 miles of country between Gandhamādāna and Kailāsa must also have been realized in India; *Rāmāyaṇa*, IV.43, vv. 20-1; 'And, having passed that (mountain named Devasakha),

there is a space of a hundred *yojanas* in all directions, without mountain, river, or tree, void of every creature. That horrid wilderness rapidly passed, you will be thrilled to have reached Kailāsa with its white peak. The *Rāmāyaṇa* nevertheless goes on to dilate, far less expansively, however, than the *Mahā-Bhārata*, upon the Kailāsa palace of Kuvera, its natural and artistic charms and his court of Apsarases, Guhyakas and other semi-divine or semi-demoniac beings.

The return of the Pāṇḍavas to India (*Mbh.* III. vv. 12338-12362) has consistently the following stages —

1. Traversing of Kailāsa, its forests, lakes, caverns, etc., and parting from Ārṣṭiṣeṇa and Lomaśa.
2. A stay in the hermitage of Vṛṣaparvan (v. 12344)
3. A stay of one month in Badarī (v. 12346)
4. Arrival at the country of the Kirāta king Subāhu and entertainment during one day in his city: resumption of what had been deposited with him (vv. 12346 sqq.)
5. A year spent near the Yāmunā (Jumna's) great mountain, with its torrents, snow-crowned red-white peak and great forest (v. 12353).
6. The Duaita-vana, the place of their old residence by the Sarasvatī river, on the border of Maru-dhanvan (the Rājasthān desert).

The real knowledge plainly underlying the above narratives of journeys distinguishes them forthwith from the cosmographical schemes and the mere lists of only vaguely and capriciously located peoples and places which prevail in the later literature and especially in the Puranas. In the *Mahā-Bhārata* itself (Bhīṣma-parvan, vv. 1.sqq.) there is a long Jambu-khaṇḍa-vinirmāṇa-parvan, which after a discussion of omens embarks upon a cosmography of a Purāṇic kind and from v. 309 becomes a description of Bhārata-varṣa, with lists of mountains, rivers, peoples, and *dvīpas*. The late accretion of this whole passage is held to be proved by its textual recurrence in the *Padma-purāṇa* (III (I), 3-9). It cannot, indeed, be denied that either dispersed in the Epic, or even in the above itineraries, some imaginary geographical items do occur: in Arjuna's *dig-vijaya* we find mention of Harivarṣa, an imaginary region, and of the Uttara-Kuru people; and elsewhere Mounts Mandara and Meru, or Sumeru, may appear. But these were ancient fictions from a non-geographical order of ideas; and it may be suspected that the obscurities in regard to their relation to Kailāsa resulted, in fact, from their late and incongruous introduction into Himālayan geography. What seems provable is that the mountains realistically mentioned in the Epic, Gandhamādana, Maināka, Krauñca etc., were observed actualities and not, as in the subsequent Purāṇic, Buddhist and Jain cosmographies, mere names to be moved about in fanciful schemes. Of course, in some cases, e.g. that of the Nandā mountain in the *Mahā-Bhārata*, the fact is patent by reason of the

name still clinging to the recognized geographical feature, e.g. the grand Nandā-devī. This matter being important for our purpose, it seems allowable to confirm it here by some considerations applying to the particular instances.

(1) In attributing to the Kuru-Pāṇcāla period the beginning of Indo-Āryan penetration into the Himālaya we can adduce first the opinion of geographers that 'The first valleys of the Himalayas to be explored by the Aryan people were those of the Ganges and Jumna': those valleys were, in fact, the northern hinterland of the two central and early states. It may be said that for Sanskrit literature in general the gate of approach to the Himālayan regions has always been the gap of Gahgā-dvāra (Haridwar), where the Ganges cuts through the Outer Himālaya. The one Buddhist story which manifests an intimate feeling for the Himālayan region, the story of Sudhana and the Kinnarī Manoharā, found in the *Mahā-vastu*, the *Divyāvadāna*, and elsewhere, is an old legend of Hastināpur, where Sudhana's father was king in which other regional connections can be discerned. In Kālidāsa's *Megha-duta* the route of the cloud on its way to Kailāsa-Mānasa is *via* the *Krauñca-randhra*, 'heron's gap', sc. Haridwar. In modern times Haridwar is the gateway of the thousands of pilgrims who each year proceed to the Himālayan *tīrthas* of Badarīnāth and Kedāranāth.

(2) The Tīrthayātrā-parvan opens with an immensely extensive account (vv. 4021 sqq.) of Indian *tīrthas* and the benefit of visiting them, put into the mouth of Pulastya; it is followed by a shorter list (vv. 8302-8406), classified under the four directions, east, south, west and north, in which Dhaumya propounds to the Pāṇḍavas a tour of pilgrimage. Setting out in Lomaśa's company (v. 8482), the Pāṇḍavas begin by making a sort of *pradakṣiṇā* round in the order indicated, and then (v. 10291 sqq.) concentrate upon the sacred places of *Kurukṣetra* and the *Madhya-deśa*: in most cases Lomaśa expounds by statement or, sometimes lengthy, narrative the sanctity of the place: it is probable that the legend was in general one specially connected with the particular district or rife there. When the Pāṇḍavas start from Kurukṣetra northwards (v. 10524 sqq.), they journey apparently up the river Sarasvatī to its source, which accords with the mention (*supra*) of the Sarasvatī as the final stage of their return.

(3) In connection with the source of the Sarasvatī, in the Outer Himālaya, there is rather frequent mention (III. vv. 8375, 10525 IX. v. 3095, cf. N. L. Dey, *op.cit.*, p. 180) of the *tīrtha* Plakṣāvatarāṇa, where its fountain is in the vicinity of a Plakṣa tree. But in the same connection the Yamunā (Jamna) appears: and it is clear that the source of the Sarasvatī was not remote from the Jumna where the latter cuts through the Outer Himālaya: see III. vv. 10518-10532, where Plakṣāvatarāṇa is actually styled *tīrtha* of the Jumna (*Yamunā-tīrtha*). The district, which is rich in legend (of Paraśu-Rāma, etc.), is described (v. 10524) as the door (*dvāra*) of Kurukṣetra; and this in itself suffices to locate in the same area the Uśīra-dhvaṇa mountain, which in



the Pali *Vinaya* (Mahā-vagga, V. 13.2) and in the *Divyāvadāna* [...] is the northern limit of the Middle Country and north of the Kurus. This Uśīra-dhvaja cannot be separated from the Uśīra-bīja, cited in a *gaṇa* (no. 194) to Pāṇini and mentioned also in *Rāmāyaṇa* VI.3, 32 and in the *Harivaṃśa*: the latter we have seen in connection with Gaṅgā-dvāra; and therefore it should be the Mount Uśīnara from whose table-land the Ganges descends (*Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, I, c.3). The *Mahā-Bhārata* informs us that in the same region 'along the Yamunā' (Śibi) Uśīnara gave his flesh to save the life of a pigeon (vv. 10555-9) that he had there his seat (v. 10595); and it takes occasion to relate the famous story. The upshot of all this that the Uśīnara country, which in Epic and also Vedic times (see Macdonell and Keith, *op.cit.*, I. p. 103) was to the north of Kurukṣetra [...] lay about the sources of the Sarasvatī, extending eastwards at least as far as the Jumna, where it cuts through the Outer Himālaya. The Uśīra-giri, of which, no doubt, the Uśīra-bīja or dhvaja was some part or feature, will have belonged to the Outer Himālaya, the northern boundary of the Uśīnara country: hence the name *Uśīnara-giri* in the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*. Known already in Vedic times, the Uśīnaras were celebrated later in connection with stories of the liberality of their king Śibi (also others? see the Pali *Jātaka*, no. 469); from Buddhist literature the Uśīra-giri came to be mentioned even in Tibetan.

(4) In connection with the Jumna and the Uśīnaras is mentioned the great mountain Bhṛgu-tuṅga (v. 10555), which is further associated with (Paraśu) -Rāma (II. v. 2574) and very pointedly with Gaṅgā-dvāra and Kanakhala (III. v. 8394, 10698): there was the hermitage of Bhṛgu. There is therefore no doubt that it belonged to that region and that the Bhṛgu-tuṅga mediaevally, and perhaps still, recognized in the very distant Kedāra-Mandākinī region is, like the namesake in Nepal, merely a namesake. It is mentioned in *Rāmāyaṇa* I.61.11, where the reference to the sage Roṭka points to the above location.

(5) Maināka, which in later times has been multiplied and variously located, is not near Kailāsa or 'part of the great Himavat range': in the *Mahā-Bhārata* (vv. 10694, 10820) it has been passed before Haridwar and the Ganges are reached, and it belongs therefore, as is recognized by N. L. Dey, to the Outer Himālaya (Siwalik), although we are not able to name a particular peak (Hrśīkeśa?). The (Vedic) *Taittiriya-āraṇyaka* cites it (I.31.2) in company with the Sudarṇana and Krauñca of *Rāmāyaṇa* IV.43.17, 26-8, and 31. The *Rāmāyaṇa* also (IV.42.32) places it immediately after the Krauñca-giri, i.e. Kanakhala, with the Krauñca-randhra or 'bila, 'herons' gap', = the Haṃsa-dvāra (migrant) geese's route, of Kālidāsa's *Meghā-dūta* (I. v. 57); concerning these no more need be said, since Haridwar and Kanakhala are conspicuous on modern maps.

(6) The Kāla-śaila, 'Kāla mountain' (v. 10820) is in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (IV.43.15) connected with a Somāśrama, 'Somaś hermitage, which may be the Somāśrama of v.

8124, named after the king Somaka of vv. 10471 sqq., 10511, and situated within (*madhyataḥ*) Kurukṣetra and along (*anu*) the Jumna (v. 10514): it was therefore suitable for the outset of the *Rāmāyaṇa*'s northward route. The Kāla mountain may, as suggested by N. L. Dey (p. 85), be the Yāmuna mountain of *Rāmāyaṇa* IV.40.20, on which see Lévi, *op.cit.*: the latter figures as nearly the last stage of the Pāṇḍavas' return journey, and in Udyoga-parvan, v. 600, is mentioned in clear connection with the Madhya-deśa.

(7) The Śveta-giri, 'White mountain', identified *supra* as the snowy Himālaya, was found to cause difficulty through a mention of its having been passed in the region of Haridwar, whereas much further on it has still to be traversed. There is every likelihood that the Śveta-giri or parvata is the actual unmistakable axis of snow mountains. But there are several such, and one of them, the Dhavaladhār, with synonymous name 'White ridge', will have been the most prominent in early Indo-Āryan experience. However, this does not greatly help, since the Dhavaladhār had certainly not been passed. It seems, however, possible that one of the two Lesser Himālayan ranges, the Nāg Tibba, which furnishes the southern boundary of the Alakā-nandā valley and perhaps also of the Kuṇinda state, and of which the Hṛṣikeśa peak is only some c.15 miles north of Haridwar, may have been included in the rather general name 'Snowy mountain'. In the subsequent mention the Śveta-giri is clearly the Great Himālaya.

(8) Concerning the Gandhamādana, which we have, it is hoped convincingly, identified with the Zaskar Range or its great peak, Kamet, it may be added that, as name of the mountain 'behind Badarī', it continued in use in mediaeval times, as may be seen in the late texts *Mānasa-khaṇḍa* and *Kedāra-khaṇḍa*. The non-distinction from the actual Kailāsa, for which, as seen in some passages of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, an explanation was proposed *supra* (p. 31), was perhaps widespread, since in the Buddhist *Aśokāvadāna* (trans. Przyluski, see Index) Gandhamādana is mentioned several times, Kailāsa never: the *Mahā-vyūtpatti* has both.

The above considerations point to an established route for pilgrimage from Kurukṣetra to Badarī, with a less familiar prolongation to Kailāsa. From Kurukṣetra it ascended the Sarasvatī river as far as the vicinity of the Outer Himālaya (siwalik), which it did not there penetrate; turning eastwards, it arrived at the gap of Kanakhala-Haridwar, where it entered the mountains; thence it ascended the valley of the Alakā-nandā branch of the Ganges, which from its source, as the 'Dhaulī' river, at the Niti pass, has, after junction with the Viṣṇu-gaṅgā at Joshimath, traversed the Great Himālaya by the gap between Nandā-devī and Badarīnāth, and after being long hemmed in by the Lesser Himālaya (Nāg Tibba) on the south has, together with the Bhāgīrathī (at Deva-prayag), found a passage through the same, preliminary to

its emergence, as Ganges, on the plains at Haridwar.

The still mainly un-Purāṇic character of these narratives of journeys harmonizes also with the complete ignorance of the Epic in regard to the network of sacred places (*śrīrtha*) wherewith later generations have covered the whole sub-Himālayan region of Garhwāl and Kumaon. The legends of these localities, mountains, rivers, etc., are predominantly connected with persons of the Kaurava-Pāṇḍava story, perpetuating a tradition of acquaintance initiated in the Epic period. In the *Mahā-Bhārata* itself the few place-legends of this kind have no such connection: they relate to ancient sages or divinities; for instance, Badarī is the hermitage of Nara-Nārāyaṇa, Gaṅgā-dvāra of *brahmarṣis*, Kanakhala of Sanatkumāra, Mt. Puru of Purūravas, Mt. Bhṛgu-tuṅga of Bhṛgu (III. vv. 8390-8406).

As residents in the region no Indo-Āryans, other than ascetics in a few settlements, are conceived. North of Haridwar as far as the main Himālaya (Śvetagiri) the human natives are Kuṇindas (with Taṅgaṇas) and Kirātas; in the Kailāsa-Mānasa region beyond they are never other than Kirātas. The relation of Kuṇindas to Kirātas in Subāhu's state is nowhere specified: it might be that of part (clan, ruling clan, or the like) to whole or that of separate peoples under one rule. Subāhu himself is in some passages both 'Kirāta king' and 'Kuṇinda king'. Kuṇindas and Kuṇinda rulers are sometimes mentioned without reference to Kirātas: in III. v. 15594 a chosen son of a Kuṇinda overlord is described as 'a great bowman' and 'a constant mountain-dweller' (*parvata-vāsa-nitya*). The historical and ethnographical implications must be considered *infra*.

As a favoured theme, the Kailāsa-Mānasa region persisted in Sanskrit poetic literature. When we come to the time (IV-Vth century A.D.) of Kālidāsa, we find in the opening verses (1-15) of his *Kumāra-sambhava* a description rather resembling the Aśvaghoṣa passage, but much richer in verifiable details —

1. There is in the North Region a god (*devatā*)-souled emperor of mountains, by name Himālaya, which, plunged in two oceans, eastern and western, stands out like a yard-measure of the earth;
2. Which taken for a calf, with Meru standing (by) as milker expert in milking, all the hills milked out shining gems and potent herbs from the earth shown in that (bovine) form by Prthu;
3. Whereof, as source of gems inexhaustible, the snow is not found a breach in blessedness; a single flaw in a mass of merits is submerged, like the moon's blots in its radiance;
4. And which with its summits holds for supply of coquetry ornaments of Apsarases a mineral wealth, like a timeless twilight with fragments of cloud interspersed in its glow;
5. To whose sunny peaks the Siddhas, after courting the half-way shade of

- clouds ranging up to its flanks, resort when distressed by their showers;
6. Where, without even seeing the tracks, with blood-marks washed out by the glacial streams, the passage of slain elephants is known to the Kirātas through pearls dropped from the gashes of lions' claws;
  7. Where birch-barks, lettered in elephant-red spots with mineral dyes, become to the Vidyādharas' fair ladies of use for the business of love-letters;
  8. Which, filling with the wind from its cave-mouths the hollows in its *kīcaka* reeds, seeks to be furnisher of ground-tone to the female Kinnaras who prepare to sing;
  9. Where from *sarala* (pine) trees, split to ease the cheekitching of elephants, a scent engendered by the flowing sap gives fragrance to the heights;
  10. Where, with gleams reaching the interiors of the cave-dwellings of the foresters and their charmers, plants become at night lamps, not oil-fed, of dalliance;
  11. Where, though the path with its petrified snow tortures toe and heel members, the Horse-head (Gandharva) women, troubled by their ponderous hips and bosoms, relinquish not their leisurely gait;
  12. Which protects from the sun the darkness lurking in its caves, as if afraid of day: even surely towards a mean refugee there is on the part of the lofty proprietorship as towards the good;
  13. To whose title, 'King of Mountains', the yak-females by their hair-fans, white as moonbeans, with the gleam passing to and fro in the tossing of their tails, give substance;
  14. Where for Kimpuruṣa (Kinnara) woman, accidentally shamed by seizure of their silk shawls, the clouds, with their contours floating at the entrances of the cave-dwellings, serve as screens;
  15. Whose wind, conveying the spray of Bhāgīrathī's cascades and violently shaking the deodars, is courted by Kirāta dear-hunters, undoing their peacock-feather (girdles).

The next following verses commence the narrative. In this passage Kālidāsa has obviously intended to interweave with traditional associations, religious and mythological, of the Himālaya and the Kailāsa-Mānasa region (divinities, Kinnaras, Yakṣas, Gandharvas, etc.), items of realistic information: and this procedure, while enhancing the poetic quality of the particular passage, may exemplify a method of working helpful in the interpretation of other passages in his poems. Most of the items, possibly all, are included in one or other of the *Mahā-Bhārata* descriptive passages, and may through recitations of the Epic have become trite. By Kālidāsa himself a good number of them are mentioned in the Himālaya passages of the *Raghu-vaṃśa* (IV. vv. 71-80) and the *Megha-dūta* (I. vv. 50-63), which both add the

musk-deer, the former noting also (v. 73) the Utsava-saṅketas (concerning whom see *infra*), and the latter the migrant *haṃsas* of Haridwar. Bhāravi (VIth cent.) in his *Kirātārjunīya*, Canto V Himādrī-varṇana, still retains the caves (vv. 10, 48), the Ganges (v. 15), the elephants (vv. 7, 9, 25), the *haṃsas* (v. 13), and vegetable lamps (v. 28). Of such items the minerals and herb medicines, known from Vedic times, the Kirāta natives, the yak (*camara*), the elephants and lions have been already mentioned: the *saralas* (*Pinus longifolia*, modern *chili*, v. 9), deodars, *kīcakas* (bamboo forests), fragrant airs, cave-dwellings, 'not-oil-fed' lamps (vv. 10, 14), sc. burning tamarisk stalks, can all be confirmed by modern information. The reference to writing on birch-bark, which in north-western India was practised even B.C., might be regarded as confirming the conjecture (*J.R.A.S.* 1933, p. 410) that the Ṭaṇ-ṣuṇ language may have been used in pre-Tibetan writings: and certainly in the region of the early Brahmanic shrines and pilgrimages there must have been from the first some knowledge of writing as a fact and some use of it; and birch-bark as writing-material was attested even for the (trans-Himālayan) Mānasa-Kailāsa district by Moorcroft. But the early history of Indian scripts in Central Asia and Further India shows that their application to native languages might be delayed for centuries after their introduction.

The refined artistry of Kālidāsa's epithet 'god-souled' (v. 1) does not seek to express the full effect upon Indian sensibility and religious feeling produced by actual acquaintance with the Great Himālaya. This transpires in various passages of the *Mahā-Bhārata* and perhaps still more forcibly in the Purāṇic quotation prefixed by Atkinson to his Gazetteer volume XI —

'He who thinks on Himācala, though he should not see it, is greater than he who performs all worship in Kāśī (Banāres). In a hundred ages of the gods I could not tell thee of the glories of Himācala. As the dew is dried up by the morning sun, so are the sins of mankind by the sight of Himācala'.

Similarly of Mānasa and Kailāsa it is said (*ibid.*, p. 308) —

'Even the beast who bears the name of Māna-sarovara shall go to the paradise of Brahma. Its waters are like pearls. There is no mountain like Himācala; for in it are Kailāsa and Māna-sarovara'.

Kālidāsa's references do not suggest an increase in the knowledge of the Kailāsa-Mānasa region and the cis-Himālayan districts to its south initiated in the late Epic period. It is not likely that the visits or settlements of individual ascetics had ceased; but such persons, even if they returned, would not be transmitters of mundane information, to which indeed the Indian mind, except in connection with the Buddhist propaganda, may have become less open. To general Indianization the intervening centuries of internal conflict and foreign domination will not have been favourable; but it will have been in progress, as some evidences will show, and

especially in a multiplication of sacred places and their legends and of pilgrimages, the strong interest and duty of which is attested in the *Mahā-Bhārata* itself by a special *Tīrtha-yātrā* section (III, adhyāyas, 80-158). For the regions here considered the more or less final outcome can be seen in two tracts belonging professedly to the *Skanda-purāṇa*, namely a *Mānasa-khaṇḍa* and a *Kedāra-khaṇḍa*, translated or summarized in pp. 298-350 of Atkinson's North-Western Provinces Gazetteer, The Himālayan Districts, Vol.II. Here the whole montane area of Kumaon and Garhwāl is shown to be covered with localities and shrines sanctified by legends of Hindu divinities, sages, and heroes, of whom a large proportion figure in the *Mahā-Bhārata* story. A systematic study of these with local knowledge such as helped Atkinson to many identifications might be topographically and historically instructive, perhaps not also ethnographically or linguistically, the names and legends being too predominantly Indo-Āryan. As regards the Kailāsa-Mānasa region the places of pilgrimage mentioned in the *Mānasa-khaṇḍa* are rather numerous; but whether resident groups are anywhere implied is perhaps doubtful. Particular interest belongs to the indication (pp. 310-[...]) of a route to Mānasa which by its mention of Caturdaṃṣṭra, i.e. the Chaudangs district on the Nepal border, points to that followed by Sherring in 1905 from Almora, the least arduous and most direct approach *via* Taklakot-Purang (Spu-hrañs). The return route seems to be different, as is otherwise also not unusual. In respect of date the knowledge of the Kailāsa-Mānasa region apparent in the *Mahā-Bhārata* transcends by many centuries all other information: for the earliest Tibetan notices we have to wait more than a thousand years. The Epic conception was, it appears, as regards the last stage of the route, vague, not clearly distinguishing it from the less barren and desolate Himālayan areas to its south. In accordance with the interest of the pioneers, who were Brahman ascetics, the conception was religious and mythological, the region being described as a kind of paradise. How far the mythology accords with later Indian notions might be made a subject of study. The greatest prominence seems to belong to Euvera, his palace, forest, lake, and his Guhyaka attendants, as well as the, less local, Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, etc. The earliest ascetic settlement is attributed to the divine pair Nara-Nārāyaṇa: in the actual contexts Śiva (except as Arjuna's Kirāta victor) and Pārvatī hardly appear, although elsewhere in the Epic their Kailāsa and Ganges mythology is related and although the later Hinduism of the Himālayan territories is mainly Śaiva. Indra is prominent in Arjuna's Himālayan exploits, and Kailāsa is in one passage designated 'Indra's peg'. The Hanumān episode in *Rāmāyana* III, vv. [...], is conceivably due to the mention in the *Mahā-Bhārata*.

It seems unlikely that for religious significance the Kailāsa should have had to await the advent of Indian anchorites. But any earlier native sanctity may have been only a vague divinization such as Tibetan expresses in the *Jo-mo*, 'Queen', or '*A-ne*,

'Grandmother' or 'Aunt', prefixed to some names of mountain heights. The linguistic question raised by the names *Kailāsa* and *Mānasa*, which are not Indian and not, as Cunningham positively stated (*Ladāk*, p. 43n), Tibetan, requires investigation in company with some other names.

## (2) Cis-Himālayan peoples and territories.

Here we must begin by renouncing any discussion of the original advance of the Indo-Āryans across the Panjab plains and into the Ganges valley or of their distribution when more or less settled as shown on the maps included in Macdonell and Keith's *Vedic Index* or in other works. Nor, again, can we consider the evidence adduced in a number of very original papers by the late Professor Przyluski in favour of a Muṇḍā substrate in early Panjab folk-lore and linguistics. The second, indeed, of these two matters, if associated with an old suggestion by Sir Alexander Cunningham concerning aboriginal populations of the Panjab Himālaya, will certainly impinge upon our present subject. But the montane populations, which may have been, as elsewhere, ethnically distinct, may here provisionally be considered apart.

There were, however, during the Kuru-Pāṇcāla period at least two states in the north of the Panjab which included hinterland in the Himālaya: they were those of the Madras and the Trigartas.

The Madras, in the person of their king, Śalya, whose sister, Mādri, was mother of two of the Pāṇḍavas, Nakula and Sahadeva, figure pervasively in the Mahā-Bhārata story: a whole parvan (IX) of the Epic is entitled *Śalya-parvan*. The Vedic literature mentions (*Āitareya-brāhmaṇa*, VIII.14.3) certain Uttara-Madras, 'beyond Himavant' and analogous to the legendary Uttara-Kurus; and another text (*Bṛhad-āranyaka-upaniṣad* III.3.1 and 7.1) refers to Brahman travellers visiting a Brahman resident among the Madras. The implication that the Madras were not Indo-Āryans is strongly reinforced by a famous passage in the Epic, which adduces a number of successive visitors, all Brahmans, denouncing in Indraprastha the moral depravity of the Madra people. They are also designated *Jartikas* and sometimes included under the apparently more general designation *Bāhika*, interpreted by the Paṇḍits as 'Outsiders'.

The Madra capital, Śākala, is definitely located by the *Mahā-Bhārata* indication that from Indraprastha it was reached after crossing the rivers Sutlej, Beas and Ravi. This situation in the Ravi-Chenab *doab* is on the plains immediately south of the Jammu hill territory, into which the Madra state must have extended; for in another passage a portion, at least, of the people, under the designation 'the seven Utsava-saṅketa clans', is stigmatized as 'brigand mountaineers' (*dasyūn parvatavāsinaḥ*).

In the Epic the king Śalya is not represented as a non-Āryan, and his denounced responsibility for the misconduct of his people may have been merely royal. The state acquired at an early date both respectability and prestige, which lasted at least into the VIth century A.D., when Varāhamihira (c.550 A.D.) could still conceive of



a 'Madra king'. It and its capital and its princesses, Mādri, are celebrated in several famous stories, both Brahmanical and Buddhist; and the city, of which the present town of Sialkot may occupy the site, had historical periods of splendour as capital first (c.150 B.C.) of the Greek conqueror Mensnder and subsequently (c.530 A.D.) of the Hūna conqueror, Mihirakula. For full particulars see Dr. B. C. Laws *Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India*, pp. 216 sqq.

A passing mention may be made of the Kekaya people, constantly named in conjunction with the Madras, with whom they share the designation *Bāhika*, and obviously their near neighbours. Their territory was situated, as is apparent from the two *Rāmāyaṇa* itineraries (II.68 and 71) and as was discerned by Lassen, to the east of the Madras and accordingly between the Ravi and the Boas rivers. By the Ayodhyā dynasty of Ikṣvākus the Kekaya country was regarded as their ancestral home, and Rāma's son, Kusá, is said to have become ruler of it. Thus the fatal marriage of Rāma's father, Daśaratha, to the princess Kaikeyī may be conceived as rather a family arrangement than a political alliance.

The Trigarta state, which on account of its (later) capital, Jālandharo, in the Beas-Sutlej *doab*, was on the plains the eastern neighbour of the Kekayas, is commonly and on good authority held to have consisted mainly of the large montane district of Kangra, of which the northern boundary is the Dhavaladhār Range. On its east it adjoins the two minor districts of Mandi and Suket; most of it is north of the Beas river, which, after issuing from Mandi, traverses it from east to west. An original western limit is not statable: but in the *Mahā-Bhārata* the *dig-vijaya* of Arjuna (II, vv. 1025 sqq.) proceeds from the Utsava-Saṅketa tribes to the Kāśmīrakas (with Lohita and his ten *maṇḍalas*), to the Trigartas, Dārvas, Kokanadas, Abhisāras, Uraśas and Siṃhapura, i.e. borderlands of Kashmir, and then to others, Daradas, etc. in the Indus valley and the north. The great fight with the Trigartas, under their king Sūryavarman (Āśvamedhika-parvan) is without geographical or ethnographical indications. But evidently they were regarded as appertaining to a western group of the hill states; and historically Kangra has usually had relations with Kashmir.

In the Epic the Trigartas are important and frequently mentioned: besides Sūryavarman two of their rulers, Kṣemaṅkara (III, vv. 15594-5) and Suśarman (IV, vv. 970 sqq.) are cited as kings (*rājā*). Non-Āryan descent of the kings or people is not apparent; and in modern times Kangra is distinguished by preservation of old Hindu culture and verifiable long genealogies of ruling families. But this has no significance for the Epic period, when even trans-Indus people, Gāndhāras (Iranians) and others, were not racially discriminated: and even the subsequent recognition by Pāṇini, etc., of certain *āyudhājīvisanghas*, 'tribal republics living by arms', as Kṣatriyas may have been merely a compliment to tribes, even non-Āryan, of

'Gurkha' quality and profession. But, very likely, the Indo-Āryanization of a district so little remote as Kangra commenced early. In the time of Hsüan-tsang (c.640 A.D.) 'Jālandhar' was again under a king, Udhita, apparently functioning within the empire of Harṣavardhana.

With the Trigartas must certainly be associated the Audumbaras of *Mbh.* II. v. 1869, where they are mentioned in company with Kāyavyas, Daradas, Dārvas, Vaiyamakas, Pāradas, Bāhlikas, Kāśmīras, Kundamānas, Paurakas, Hamsakāyanas, Śivis, Trigartas, Yaudheyas, Rājanyas, Madras and Kekayas. On the evidence of the coins mentioned infra (p. [...]) they were convincingly located by Cunningham (Arch. Survey. Report XIV, pp. 115-9, 135-6) in the Nurpur district, which is in the north-west of Kangra. Thus they were clearly a montane people, while their ethnical relations have been the subject of an elaborate study by Przyluski.

The Kulūtas, 'people of Kulu', are substantially mentioned in the Epic narrative. In Arjuna's *dig-vijaya* (II, vv. 1014-1020) the Kulūta king Brhanta, who is entitled *parvateśvara*, 'mountain lord', is defeated after a hard struggle, which is followed by reduction of certain 'northern Kulūta' chiefs. In the Kamaparvan (vv. 475-485) the Kulūta overlord (*adhipati*), Kṣemadhūrti, is slain by Bhīma, and his army flees.

The non-mention of the Kulūta's country in the Vedic and Buddhist literature accords with its situation north of the Dhavaladhār, which constitutes the southern boundary of the state. In the general Sanskrit literature also, if we neglect occasional inclusion in Purāṇic lists of peoples, it is ignored. Enclosed on the north, east and west also by great mountain ranges, viz. the Pir Panjal, a spur of the same and the cluster of Bangāhal, which separate it respectively from Lahul, the Sutlej valley and the state of Chamba, it demands an explanation not of its having been so generally overlooked, but rather of the Epic knowledge of it, especially in connection with the fact that in c.635 A.D. Hsüan-tsang made a special deviation in order to visit it. It seems possible that Hsüan-tsang's interest arose from information concerning a route to the Ladak countries and that this route, which in later times has been in constant use and which was followed in 1820 A.D. by Moorcroft, was somewhat known even in the Epic period. But it may be sufficient to point out that by the valley of the Beas, of which the headwaters are in Kulu, the country may have been reachable without too excessive difficulty, either from the Mandi-Suket territory, not remotely north of the Kuru country, or from Trigarta-Jālandhar, which was Hsüan-tsang's starting-point.

The chequered history of Kulu, which at times has been subject to the Ladak state, and which has been in conflict with Chamba, on its west, sometimes perhaps subject to it, and under British India was included in the Kangra administration, may be connected with its service as a route. But ethnical factors will appear to have cooperated; and it is at least clear that the Kulūta people was not Indo-Āryan.

The *Mahā-Bhārata* has now yielded evidence of three peoples in the sub-montane north of the Panjab, namely, in apparently continuous order from west to east.

Madres, KeRayas, Trigartas having a mountain hinterland which in the case of the Trigartas extended as far north as the Dhavaladhār range. It would be reasonable to contemplate the addition of the Uśīnaras, who are explicitly mentioned as neighbours of the Kuru state on its north and clearly situated near the rivers Sarasvatī and Jumna where they emerge from the foothills: they can accordingly have adjoined the Trigartas of the Beas-Sutlej doab. But there is no evidence for Uśīnara territory beyond the foothills and no indication of a non-Āryan origin, except possibly their traditional inclusion in a group which includes the Madras.

Except in the special instance of Kulu, the Dhavaladhār seems to have been the northern limit of the Himālayan outlook of the Epic. There is no detected reference to the people of Chamba, west of Kulu, or to the minor districts, Kaṣṭawār, Bhadrawah, etc., which separate it from Kashmir. The case of what is now the Bashahr state, occupying the Sutlej valley east of Kulu, is, considering the early information concerning the Sutlej, somewhat surprising. It would be less so, if we could adopt the view of Pargiter that 'the Kulindas occupied the southern slopes of the Himālaya, from about Kulu eastward to Nepal': on this matter see *infra*.

The *Mahā-Bhārata* has already shown us Kuṇindas (1) not very remote from Indraprastha, since Arjuna's (northward) *dig-vijaya* commences with an easy victory over them, (2) beyond Haridwar, where the Pāṇḍavas on their journey first encounter them, and not extending as far north as Badarī, which the Pāṇḍavas reach after parting from them. The second of these notices points to the valley of the Alakānandā; and since Haridwar is a gap merely in the Outer Himālaya (Siwalik), there is no difficulty in supposing that Arjuna's first contact with them took place to the north of that range. But, since the *Mahā-Bhārata* list of peoples in the Bhīṣma-parvan includes (vv. 363, 370) not only Kuṇindas, but also 'sub-montane Kuṇindas' (*Kulindopatyaka*), it seems possible that some Kuṇindas were to be found on the Indian slopes of the Siwaliks, which would be in the district Govisana of Cunningham's map (*Ancient Geography*, p. 327). The Brahmapura of the same map correctly indentified by Cunningham (p. 355) with the districts of Garhwāl and Kumaon, must be the Kuṇinda country. It is, however, not clear that the country of the Kuṇindas commenced immediate north of Haridwar: its southern boundary may have been not the Outer Himālaya but rather one of the two parallel ranges of the intermediate Lesser Himālaya, much more formidable, of which one, the Nāg Tibba range is in fact the southern boundary of the Alakānandā as far west as Hrṣīkesh, 0.15 miles north of Haridwar: the same applies to the southern limit of Cunningham's Brahmapura. The Taṅgaṇas, often associated with the Kuṇindas,

create no difficulty, since they are historically known in the appropriate region of Brahmapura (Garhwāl).

The Kirātas, who are mentioned as mixed with the Kuṇindas, are also in all the relevant texts the sole human population of the Kailāsa-Mānasa region and the general population of the Himālaya to its south. The hill Kirātas of the above cited Vedio text cannot be any more eastern people, and the consideration of Kirāta ethnography must start from these facts.

Before reaching the territory of Subāhu, the 'Kirāta king', who on the Pāṇḍavas' outward journey was 'lord of Kuṇindas', and whose territory was 'diversified (*ākīrna*) with Kirātas and Taṅgaṇas and crowded (*saṃkula*) with hundreds of Kuṇindas' (III, vv. 10865-6), the return route of the Pāṇḍavas from Badarī passed through –

'Cīnas, Tukhāras, Daradas and Dārvas and districts of the Kuṇinda having gems in abundance' (*bhūri-ratna*, vv. 12349-50)

a surprising statement, since in the Epic narrative a mention of Cīnas and Tukhāras is here paradoxical. With the *Mahā-Bhārata* text as we have it, in which there are always variants of any proper names, it seems hardly worth while to dwell upon the particular readings shown here in the critical edition. The four peoples belong to the Kashmir region (Dārvas on its south, Cīnas and Daradas on its north), or the trans-Indus world (Tukhāras), in which connections they find mention at various points in the text. The citation of them as belonging to the Badarī and Kuṇinda districts is absurd. The fact seems to be that v. 12350, which in the context is awkward, is a posterior insertion, whereof the cause may be set forth in a note.

The Chamba country is, as already stated, nowhere mentioned in the Epic; it will have been screened not only by the Dhavaladhār range, but also by the Trigartas to the south thereof. It may be remarked that even now we have for the native population of Chamba, if we except the Gaddis of the Dhavaladhār, no tribal name, the identification of the country with Hsüan-tsang's Sam-po-ho, as proposed in J.R.A.S. 1900. pp. 530, 541-2, being, as will appear *infra* (p. [...]), incorrect.

To Lahul (north of Kulu), the country of the uppermost sources, Chandra and Bhaga, of the Chenab, and to the territory of the Bashahr state, sc. the Sutlej valley immediately south of the Great Himālaya, the Epic does not seem to allude.

As in the case of the Himālaya in general, the information furnished by the *Mahā-Bhārata* concerning Himālayan peoples and territories, is substantiated by other early Sanskrit literature. The particulars incidentally cited may suffice in proof of this, and we may accordingly pass lightly over the remaining literary sources. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* the two itineraries (II, 68. vv. 11-22, 71. vv. 1-18), from Ayodhyā to the Kekaya country and return, are, of course, important, and one implication has been noted *supra*; but the route does not traverse any mountain district. From

Vālmīki's poem we should not expect first-hand information concerning Himālayan territories. The geographical passage (IV.40-3) has been studied with infinite learning and scholarly acumen by Sylvain Lévi (Journal Asiatique XI. xi (1918), pp. 1 sqq.), who showed that it supplied the foundation of two sections (vv. 12825-12856, 12378-12421) in the *Harivaṃśa* and also of a description of *Jambū-dvīpa* contained in a vast Buddhist text, *Sad-dharma-smṛty-upasthāna-sūtra*, translated into Chinese (539 A.D.) and also into Tibetan. The general character and certain particulars of the matter of the *Rāmāyaṇa* passage indicate for the composition of it a date far anterior to the VIth century A.D., and Lévi was disposed to ascribe it to the early centuries of the Christian Era. This dating and Lévi's view that the geographical scheme, less fanciful than what appears in the Purāṇas, contains items based upon the experience and common talk of actual travellers and traders, give it a certain value. But, as a popularly current scheme, it does not fail to include large penumbras of fancy; and the mere broad division into east, south, west, north, leaves the geographical information, as distinct from normal philological and literary identifications, to be contributed by the reader. Especially in regard to the north the information seems to be loose and partly erroneous. Some particulars have been used *supra*, and anything further concerning the passage may be stated in a note. In Lévi's other masterly article (*Le catalogue géographique des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī*, J.As.XI.v(1915), pp. 19 sqq.) the geographical enlightenment is likewise not inherent in the Sanskrit text and its versions, but supplied by the acumen of the editor.

As regards Buddhist literature in general, it would be rash to assume that there is any sort of information which is not represented in the texts: and what the geography of India and surrounding countries owes to the literature and to the narratives of Buddhist travellers is, of course, inestimable. But concerning the Himālayan areas not much is apparent in Pāli writings; and, if from other Buddhist sources more light should appear, it would be an agreeable surprise.

Further confirmation, chronologically very decisive, comes from sources external to Sanskrit literature. Archaeological facts are —

- (1) in regard to the Kuṇḍina people: The Aśoka Edicts engraven on the rock of Kalsi, which, being in the mountains north of the Dehra Dun, was probably within, or adjacent to, the Kuṇḍina country (Brahma-pura, see Cunningham's map, *op.cit.*, p. 327). This proves that about the middle of the IIIrd Century B.C. the Kuṇḍina country was either actually included in Aśoka's empire or within its sphere of influence.
- (2) in regard to the Trigartas: In the Dharmśālā region, in the north-east of Kangra (Trigarta state), have been found two rock inscriptions (Pāṭhyār and Kanhiāra) in Indian (Prākṛit) language and script (Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī) of the IInd and Ist century A.D.

- (3) in regard to the Kulūtas: A rock inscription at Sālri near Salāṇu, in Mandi territory, recording in writing of the IV-Vth century A.D. a foundation by a Mahārāja Śrī-Caṇḍeśvarahastin, son of Mahārāja Īśvarahastin.

Numismatic evidence comprizes —

- (1) in regard to the Kuṇinda state: Two series of coins, whereof the older, bearing the name of 'Kuṇinda king' Mahārāja Amoghebhūti in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī script, is attributed to the last half of the 1st century B.C. The element *bhūti* in the name shows that the king, if not actually an Indian of Vaiśya caste, had been accorded that status. The second series, with no royal name, is attributed to the IIrd-IIIrd century A.D.

The distribution of the coins, which suggests that the Kuṇindas occupied a narrow strip of land at the foot of Siwalik hills, between the Jumna and the Sutlej and the territory between the upper courses of the Beas and Sutlej, need not be interpreted exclusively.

- (2) in regard to the Trigartas: A Trigarta coin of probably the first half of the second century B.C., with Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī script, is discussed by Allan, *op. cit.*, pp. cxxxix-cl.

With Trigarta country must be associated the rather extensive groups of Audumbara coins, whereof the earliest, with both Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī script, are attributed to the 1st century B.C. The area where prevalingly the coins are found belongs to the north-west of the Kangra district. (Allan, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxxiii-iv, lxxxvii).

- (3) in regard to the Kulūtas: A coin of c.100 A.D., with Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī writing, bears the name of a Kulūta king, Vīrayaśas.

Madra coins have not, it seems, been detected.

The existence of this coinage with Indian Prākṛit language proves that in the hill states a process of Indo-Āryanization had commenced. The use of both Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī scripts, alike on inscriptions and on coins, is a peculiarity shared, it seems, only by the Rājanya coins (locally undetermined): the Kharoṣṭhī might point to an influence from the north-west; and the date of commencement, which seems to average round the IIrd- 1st century B.C., suggests that the movement may have been in some way due to the Greek rule in Śākala.

The last item that we need record is the mention in Ptolemy's *Geographia* (c.180 A.D.), VII.i.42, of a country Kulindrine, situated 'below' the sources of the Beas, the Sutlej, the Jumna and the Ganges. This was elicited by Cunningham (Arch. Survey Report, XIV, pp. 129, 137-8), who recognized in *Kulindrine* the name of the Kuṇindas/Kulindas, whom he also found mentioned in the *Mahā-Bhārata*, the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* and Varāhamihira's *Bṛhat-saṃhitā*. Probably every scholar who has treated of the Kuṇindas/Kulindas has subscribed to Cunningham's view. It will be

realized that Ptolemy's definition, which includes in Kulindrine not only the area which we have found indicated in the Epic, but also Kulu (sources of the Beas) and the Bashahr state (upper valley of the Sutlej) implies a large territory, which Cunningham identified with the range of the modern 'Kunets'. Perhaps for this reason Cunningham conceived that the territory ruled by Amoghabhūti was only a part, namely that of the Kulindopatyakas.

After the time of Ptolemy we have during at least five centuries no substantial historical information concerning Himalayan territories other than Kashmir and Nepal. The few recorded particulars are as follows: —

- (1) mention of the Madrakas (hardly Himālayan) among the tribal peoples rendering homage to the Gupta emperor Samudragupta (c.350 A.D.)
- (2) mention (ibid) of a king of Kartṭ-pura among the frontier-kings (of Assam, Nepal, etc.) who paid homage to the same emperor Samudragupta. The identity of this Kartṭ-pura with the above mentioned Brahma-pura is apparent even in the name, in which *Kartṭ*, 'creator', is a standing designation of the god Brahmā. It appears conclusively in the dynastic title, *Katyuri*, of the ancient kings of Garhwāl and Kumaon, which C. R. Oldham proposed to connect with *Kartṭ-pura*: *Katyuri* is, in fact a regular derivate from *Kartṭ-puriya*. It will be noticed that the donative Plates of the ancient Katyuri kings are issued from their capital, Kārttikeya-pura and that Atkinson (*op.cit.*, p. 468), while admitting without good reason the possibility of a derivation of *Katyuri* from that city-name, thinks that the dynastic name is much older than that of the 'new capital': this is no longer a trouble when the dynastic name is derived from that of the ancient kingdom, Kartṭ-pura, which survived until latish times, as may be seen from the inscription translated in Atkinson's work, p. 516.

The Taṅgaṇa district, 'on the upper Ganges' and perhaps including Badarī (Atkinson, pp. 357, 472), is several times mentioned, as Taṅgaṇa-pura, in the Katyuri inscriptions.

In Vincent Smith's *Early History of India* the area of Kartṭ-pura is wrongly defined on p. 285 and wrongly placed on the accompanying map.

- (3) defeat by a Maukhari king of Kanauj (VIth century?) of a Hūna army (no doubt emerging from Himālayan districts dominated by the Hūna rulers of Kashmir).
- (4) despatch (605-6 A.D.) by king Prabhākaravardhana, of Thanesar, of an army to fight the Hūmas in 'the region which blazes with Kailāsa's lustre'.
- (5) journey (c.635-6 A.D.) of the Chinese pilgrim Hsüantsang, from Jālandhar, in the Beas-Sutlej *doab*, to the mountain-girt country Kulu, reached after a perilous journey of over 160 miles (700 *li*), no doubt through a part of

Kangra or Mandi; southward journey thence, of similar length, across a great mountain and a wide river to the Śatadru country, which borders on a great river. The 'great mountain' is, no doubt, the Dhavaladhār, which the 'wide river', sc. the Sutlej, cuts through somewhat south of Rāmpur. The Śatadru country will accordingly be the Sutlej valley south of the Dhavaladhār. Nirmand, where is the VIIth century inscription mentioned *infra*, is in the valley of the Kurpan river, some few miles above its junction with the Sutlej (right bank). Hence, as it contained a Brahman settlement, it is likely to have been a place of some importance: and this suggests that Hsüan-tsang's route from Kulu followed the valley of the Kurpan river and passed through it. The route from Kulu Ca Niemand is an established one.

Subsequent journey, from Thanesar, to the country Srughna, which from the description is seen to be situated between the Jumna and the Ganges, with great mountains (sc. the Siwalik or one of the two Lesser Himālayan ranges) on its north; from Srughna eastward to Mati-pura and then to Mayapura, then north to Brahma-pura (the Kuṇinda country).

If some year c.700 A.D. is taken as commencement of a quasi-historical period in regard to Himālayan territories of the Panjab, the Simla Hill States and Garhwāl-Kumaon, it must be premised that in most instances anything of the nature of positive history waits, until Muslim, or even Mughal, times. Formal histories of the recognized states may be found in the several official Gazetteers; and for the Panjab Hills there are even more elaborate accounts assembled conveniently in a *History of the Panjab Hill States*, by J. Hutchison and J.Ph. Vogel, (2 vols, Lahore 1933). Archaeological evidence is for Chamba, where it is least scanty, thoroughly treated by Professor Vogel in an Archaeological Survey volume (XXXVI), *Antiquities of Chamba State* (1911). In this department it may be sufficient to cite, as significant for our purpose and chronologically more or less definitely determined, only the following: —

- (1) for Chamba: some short dedicatory inscriptions of a king Metuvarman, who is with probability dated c.700 A.D. (Vogel, *Antiquities*, pp. 138 sqq.)
- (2) for Kangra: the two Baijnāth *praśasti* inscriptions of a chieftain (*rājānaka*) Lakṣmanacandra of Kīragrama (Kirgraon) under a king (*narendra*) of Jālandhara-Trigarta, named Jayaccandra, son of Hṛdayacandra: date c.804 A.D. Of Lakṣmanacandra eight predecessors are named (Bühler, *Epigraphia Indica*, I, pp. 97 sqq.).
- (3) for Kulu: Nirmand donation inscription of a feudatory king (*mahūsāmanta-mahārāja*) Samudrasena, naming three predecessors: date probably early VIIth century A.D. (Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp. 287 sqq.).
- (4) for Garhwāl-Kumaon: several inscriptions on copperplates of approxi-



mately the IXth century A.D., recording donations by 'Katyuri' rulers residing in Kārttikeya-pura (Joshimath region), one of them a king (*kṣīṭiśa*) Lalitasuradeva, with mention of two predecessors, Nimbara and Iṣṭagaṇa' (Atkinson, *op.cit.*, pp. 471 sqq. and *Indian Antiquary*, XXV, pp. 178 sqq.).

These documents by their (Sanskrit) language, style, phraseology and sentiments demonstrate a complete Indo-Āryanization of the action of ruling persons in the areas mentioned during the periods specified; and the long lists of official designations discussed at length by the editors of (1) (pp. 120-134) and (4) (Atkinson, pp. 479-480), lists copied from similar Indian records, show that the whole administration, theoretically at any rate, followed Indian precedents.

Fortunately we have no occasion to consider the history of the following pre-Muslim centuries, for which the materials, viz. genealogies of rulers and chiefs (sometimes verified by coincidences *inter se* or with outside information), traditions, and anecdotes, do not, except in so far as they are obviously concoctions from Indian legend, trench upon the period indicated above. But the view commonly expressed by authorities on the several territories, that Indo-Āryan rule therein commenced with minor chieftainships having titles such as *Thākūr* (*Thakkura*) and *Rānā* does comprehend somewhat earlier centuries.

The Indo-Āryanization, which seems to be the real continuous history of the territories, had commenced, as we have seen, certainly as early as the IIIrd century B.C., so that in 700 A.D. it had been in progress during more than a thousand years. So far as evidence attests, the pioneers were Brahman ascetics, who in some cases founded permanent settlements. Of mass immigrations or invasions we have no hint, the Epic *dig-vijayas* being merely military demonstrations. The rather stereotyped stories contemplate only the introduction of individual Indian *kṣātriya*s into native ruling families: even of these the extent may have been greatly exaggerated by fictions. The genealogization of social classes through application of the Indian notion of caste will also have engendered only gradually the mass of fictions incorporated in H. A. Rose's all-comprizing *Glossary of Panjab Tribes and Castes*.

So far as any of this falls within our scope, it may be considered in ethnographical, sociological and linguistic connections. The same applies to certain districts which so far have, except for casual and particular references, escaped mention: these are —

- (a) Mandi and Suket, which are situated between Kulu on their north and the Sutlej on their south and adjoining Kangra on their west.
- (b) Bashahr (the Sutlej valley north of the Dhavaladhār) and the other, smaller, Simla Hill States.
- (c) Lahul and Spi-ti, which, situated immediately south of the Great Himālaya or actually in it, have belonged essentially to the Tibetan, non-Indian, sphere.

None of these has any positive history of early date.

Hindu religion will have accompanied even the earliest pioneers of Indo-Āryanization in the Himālayan districts: hence it is not surprising to find in the *Mahā-Bhārata* a rather developed mythology of the Kailāsa-Mānasa region. But those Brahman ascetics were not missionaries, and it would be only gradually, in settlements acquiring a measure of permanence, that some of them may have bestowed attention upon native observances, recognized local sanctities, localized their own, or erected shrines. Perhaps the earliest surviving evidence of such cooperation is to be seen in the numerous Nāga stones, attesting Nāga worship in connection with springs, which have been found in districts of the Chamba State. These could really endorse a native cult; but, on the other hand, the sanctity of river-confluences, exemplified by the shrines at the *prayāgs* (Kārṇa-prayāg, Rudra-pr; Deva-pr:) in Garhwāl-Kumaon, which are not only Āryan in idea, but are also named after the famous Jumna-Ganges Prayāg at Allahabad. Superficially the recognized religion is nearly everywhere Hindu, prevalently Śaiva and served by Brahmans. But in the more northern areas popular observance is directed more to non-Hindu, local, deities, in some cases, e.g. that of Jamlu in Kulu, presiding over a moderately extensive terrain, but mostly very minor occupants of small shrines; as notably in the Bashahr State, where the Gazetteer commonly gives for each village the name of its local godling, who often has a human impersonation. These unorthodox powers, of apparently casual, and often not remote, origin, are thought to be continuous with pre-Hindu conditions. There are also various communal usages and ceremonies, likewise non-Hindu.

Buddhism, except in its Lamaist form, imported from Tibet and confined to Kunāwar, Lahul and Spi-ti, is in the whole area non-existent. Hsüan-tsang in the VIIth century found in Kulu 20 monasteries (with 1000 monks), in Śatadru 10 (with few monks) and an ancient *stūpa*, in Srughna 5 (or six) (with 1000 monks) and an ancient *stūpa*, in Mati-pura 20 (with 800 monks), in Brahma-pura 5 (with few monks), in Govisana 2 (with c. 100 monks) and an ancient *stūpa*; practically everywhere the Buddhists were in a minority and the pilgrim's experience was not encouraging. It is intelligible that early Buddhist propaganda had found the Himālayan countries preoccupied by the far earlier Brahmanic establishments and legends.

### (3) Trans-Himālayan peoples and territories.

#### (3a) Area of the Ladakh State.

As regards the trans-Himālayan territories here in question, history of any period prior to the VIIIth century A.D. can be promptly seen to be, except for a few isolated particulars, a blank. The sweeping Tibetanization noted *supra* did not even commence before c.700 A.D. and was not active prior to c.800. Any consideration of earlier conditions must be left to a linguistic-ethnographical context; and any relevant matters of later history may find place in a discussion of mñah-ris-skorgsum.

Of the few particulars mentioned the earliest is the Khotan legend connecting the foundation of that state with the name and time of Aśoka, the IIIrd century B.C. This necessarily implies a connection with Kashmir, which figures prominently in several further items of early Khotan tradition. Khotan Buddhism must, in fact, have come, though a date cannot be affirmed, from Kashmir, where it must have taken root in Aśoka's time: and this is confirmed by the existing ruins of a Buddhist *stūpa* in the Hunza-Nagar territory, which also was on a Kashmir route to Chinese Turkestan. Kashmir is implied again in the second item, viz. the existence at Khalatse, in Lower Ladak, of a rock inscription in Indian Kharoṣṭhī script, naming an Indian ruler that *Mo-lo-so*, alias *San-po-ho*, is placed at a great distance, 2000 *li* = c.500 miles, from *Lo-u-lo*, and that elsewhere Hsüan-tsang locates *San-po-ho* ('Sam-pa-ha or Malasa(?)') west of Suvāṃ-gotra, which is the Hunza-Nagar country. This Sam-pa-ha is = Sāmbī, Upper Chitral; and it is therefore probable that it was reported to Hsüan-tsang as the usual goal of the route and was recorded by him by reason of the interest of a country and situation previously known to the Chinese from the Central-Asia side. Thus we receive the impression that the route *via* Kulu and Lahul, which in subsequent ages has been well established, may have been known long before Hsüan-tsang's time, at least to the Hūnas ruling over Kashmir, and that its goal had been the extreme west of the Ladak countries, say Baltistan and the therewith connected Hunza-Nagar, Gilgit and Chitral.

The last item is the fact that Baltistan and its capital, Skardo, which were invaded in c.A.D. 737 by the Tibetans, no doubt *via* Lower Ladak, was at that time in familiar relations with Hunza-Nagar and with Khotan and that its rulers were perhaps of Hūna race. Buddhism, already many centuries old in Khotan, is to some extent attested during the period in the other two: and thus it is well conceivable that the Kulu-Lahul route was of interest in India in connection with Buddhist propaganda and intercourse and may have owed its origin to these.

## (3b) mÑah-ris-skor (khor)-gsum.

In c.1683 A.D. the province of mÑah-ris-skor-gsum was reincorporated in the Lha-sa State through victory over the Western Tibet kingdom, to which in various degrees of dependence it had belonged from c.900 A.D., when that kingdom originated. The name *mÑah-ris-skor-gsum*, not attested prior to that origination, may indeed have been due thereto; for even in connection therewith the, no doubt, earlier designation *sTod-mñah-ris* is used. The expression *mÑah-ris*, which is known from a still earlier time, signifies 'authority-outline (sc. boundary or sphere)'; and it could be used in regard to non-governmental, and even private, ownership. In the *Me-lon* (see Francke, *op.cit.*, p. 92) it denotes the state territory in general. The expression *Stod*, ('High' or 'Upper') -*mñah-ris* relates the province to the Kailāsa-Mānasa region, known, with good reason, as *sTod-phyogs*, 'High-quarter'. The recognition of a separate province may have been due to the fact that the district was not included in the inherited Tibetan kingdom of Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po, but was occupied by an adjoining state, Žaň-žuň. The history of the subjugation and abolition of that state can be elicited from early records.

The first mention of Žaň-žuň is contained in a document (VIIth-VIIIth century A.D.) acquired by Sir A. Stein from the now famous 'hidden library' of one of the cave-shrines at Chien-to-fung, near to Tun-huang/Sha-chou/Śa-cu, in western Kan-su. The document, edited and translated in J.R.A.S., 1927, pp. 821-4 (= *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, II, pp. 53-6), relates the career of a certain Khyuň-po Zu-tse, who rendered various services as a Councillor of the great Tibetan king Khri-Sroñ-rtsan, famous as Sroñ-btsan sgam-po (d. 650 A.D.). In regard to Žaň-žuň it is stated that —

'The chief of To-yo-chas-la Bor Yon-tse, having been overthrown, Zu-tse brought To-yo-chas-la and all the rest of northern Žaň-žuň under the hand of Khri-Sroñ-rtsan and (remained) in favour.'

To-yo-chas-la has been conjecturally identified with a To-yo existing in the district Pu(sPu)-hrañs, bordering on Lake Mānasa. Of Zu-tse, who belonged to the famous Khyuň-po clan, interesting particulars, partly identical with those contained in the above-cited document, are related in the Tun-huang Ms. 250, published by M. Jacques Bacot in *Documents de Touen-houang* (1940-1946), pp. 93 sqq., see also pp. 130-1, 139, 140-2, 147-8; he was, in fact, remembered, as Yu-yar Zu-tse, in Tibetan records of far later date (see now *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, III, pp. 34-5). In Ms. 250 the Žaň-žuň exploit is not mentioned; but a subjugation of that country during the reign of Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po is implied in an entry, under c.644 A.D., in the highly authentic Tibetan Chronicle first signalized by M. Bacot and subsequently edited by him, with translation, in pp. 29 sqq. of the above-cited work —

'In the time of king Sroñ-rtsan Lig (dynastic title of the Žaň-žun rulers)-sña-śur revolted and, having summoned all Žaň-žun to submit, governed it' (p. 29).

Later occurrences recorded in the same Chronicle are as follows —

A.D. 653 (p. 31): 'Spug Gyim-rtsan Rma-chun was appointed to govern Žaň-žun'.

A.D. 662 (p. 32): 'Great Councillor Stoñ-rtsan made in Du-gul a levy (or conducted the administration) of Žaň-žun'.

A.D. 671 (p. 33): 'The royal lady Sña-mo-steñs (or the senior princess) went as consort of Sña-śur Spu-ñas Rhye-rkyug'.

A.D. 675 (p. 34): 'Councillor Btsan-sña, having levied (or administered) Žaň-žun in Gu-rañ of Žime ...'

A.D. 719 (p. 45): 'The rebels of Žaň-žun and of Mard were summoned (to submit)'.

A.D. 724 (p. 47): 'Councillor Sta-gu Ri-tsab having convoked (the summer conference) in (the?) Chos-goñ of Pa-noñ, levied (or administered) Žaň-žun'.

Other original texts in M. Bacot's volume mention among the early principalities of Tibet (a very valuable list) —

'In Žaň-žun the potent (*ñar-pañi*?) chieftain (*rjo-bo*) Lig-sña-śur and the two Councillors Khyuñ-po ta-saňs-rje and Stoñ-lom ma-tse'

and relate the very interesting story of the princess Sad-mar-kar, sister of the Tibetan king Khri-sroñ Lde-btsan (755-797 A.D.) and consort of the Žaň-žun ruler, Lig-myi-rhya, whose husband's neglect of her led to a Tibetan intervention (pp. 155-8) —

'During the same reign, after the expedition against the king of Žaň-žun and the submission, the authority of the Žaň-žun king Lig-myi-rhya was abolished, and all the Žaň-žun people were proclaimed subjects (of Tibet)' (p. 158).

This narrative is of special importance by reason of its mention (p. 155) of Khyuñ-luñ (a place still existent in Gu-ge and shown in maps) as her residence, of her sojourn in the vicinity of Lake Ma-pañ (Mānasa), and of Gu-ge (p. 156) as the country in which the capital was situated.

From the above matter-of-fact and practically contemporaneous reports it is manifest that the Žaň-žun state existed at least as early as the first half of the VIIth century A.D. and that in the second half of the VIIIth century, after various invasions and other incidents, its dynasty was suppressed and its territory incorporated in the Tibetan realm. Its inclusion in the early aggression of Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po's reign accords with its situation as approximately, at least, conterminous with that king's inherited dominion as defined in *Nam: an ancient language* ..., p. 14 : its capital, Khyuñ-luñ, in Gu-ge, a district of the Lake Mānasa region, and the

dynastic name Lig are clearly attested.

No serious addition to this information appears in the relatively late Tibetan histories or their Mongol derivatives. The XIVth century (1328 A.D.) *Rgyal-rabs-gsal-baḥi-me-lon* (often cited as *Me-lon*) mentions merely (see Francke, *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, II, p. 83) that during Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po's lifetime —

'Rtsa-mi and Śiṅ-mi of the east (error for 'west?'), Blo-bo and Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ of the south and the Hor kingdoms of the north (a historical error) and others were brought under subjection'.

The most important Padmasambhava text, the *Padmaḥi-bkaḥ-thaṅ*, which in principle is earlier than the *Me-lon*, does indeed state (II, fol.64, b 5) that 'High (*Stod*, i.e. western) Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ' consisted of 13 Thousand-districts (*Stoṅ-sde*): and the Low (*Smad*, sc. eastern) Sum-pa country, i.e. the famous 'Country of Women' bordering on China, is given the same number. The latter state having been rather important and extensive, the equality allows some estimate of the extent of Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ; but a Bon-po text speaks of —

'Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ flourishing in 9 (not 13) Thousand-districts'. The Bon-po literature, which, though not actually very ancient, incorporates some independent tradition, includes some texts (in Mss. unfortunately not accessible) containing considerable amounts of partly authentic history and biography and of partly fanciful geography. There are accounts of dynasties, central and local, and genealogies of ministers, etc., on the lines of the Lamaist chronicles and the *Padmaḥi-bkaḥ-thaṅ*. Of Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ, which in the Buddhist *Padma-skyed-rabs* (see M. Toussaint's translation, Index) is merely mentioned, there is in a *Srid-paḥi-mdzod* a dynastic list, with perhaps some other particulars, and also a statement that 'High (*Stod*) Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ is separated from Tibet by a (more or less mythical) ravine named Ge-khod-gṅan-luṅ; and elsewhere there is another reference to the frontier between Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ and Tibet. Note has been taken of a derivation of the Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ dynasty from a Khyuṅ, = Indian Garuḍa, ancestor: and there is an item of geographical fact in the statement that —

'In the High (*Stod*) country there are eight great forts (*or towns*, *mkhar*): yet it is celebrated as of four great castles (*sku-mkhar*). Of these one is Khuṅ-luṅ-Rṅul-mkhar; a second is Rgya-la-Gnam-mkhar; a third Rtsa-la-Rtsaṅ-mkhar'.

Here Khuṅ-luṅ-Rṅul-mkhar may be the above mentioned Gu-ge capital, Khyuṅ-luṅ. But the Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ cemetery Śel-la-Mig-dmar-tsho-mu may be a Bon-po fiction.

There is no indication of any revival of the Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ state after its suppression in the second half of the VIIIth century A.D. No doubt it was simply incorporated in the Lha-sa administration; and it may have forthwith received the official designation *Stod-mñah-ris*. Then, no doubt, commenced a process of Tibetanization: during the period c.870-900 (Francke, *op.cit.*, p. 92) a Buddhist monastery was

erected in the country.

It does not appear that the conquest of *Žaṅ-žuṅ* was specially connected with the Tibetan invasions of Ladak (c.700 A.D.), Baltistan (c.737 A.D.), and Gilgit (c.740). The route of those invasions, whereof the stated aim was to attack the Chinese in the Pamir countries, would have followed a shorter and more convenient approach, perhaps *via* Rudok, to the Indus valley, by-passing the Kailāsa-Mānasa region.

The extent of the original *Žaṅ-žuṅ* state is not in any way indicated, except by its identification with Gu-ge: there is no sign of its having been composed of three districts or of its having subsequently been, as a province of Tibet, either made tripartite or increased by additions so as to acquire the designation *mṅaḥ-ris-skor-gsum*. Indeed, the contrary seems evident from the account of the foundation of the West Tibet kingdom, which is as follows:—

The Tibetan king Lde-dpal-ḥkhor-btsan, in whose time was built the above mentioned monastery in Stod-mṅaḥ-ris, had two sons, of whom the one, Skyid-Ide Ṇi-ma-mgon, withdrawing from Tibet, which was in turmoil, repaired to Stod-mṅaḥ-ris, where he built two forts. Upon invitation of Dge-bśes-btsan, (king?) of Pu-hraṅs, he married a certain Hbro-(b)za Ḥkhor-skyoṅ, by whom he had three sons. He built the fort of Ṇi-žuṅs and made it his capital. He brought mṅaḥ-ris-skor-gsum under his sway and ruled in accordance with right.

Ṇi-žuṅs, 'said to be in Pu-hraṅs' (Francke, p. 94), is evidently the Nisung of maps, Gerard's and later. The narrative goes on to state that the three sons were —

'Lha-chen Dpal-gyi-mgon (c.930-60 A.D.); Bkra-śis-mgon, the middle one; and Lda-gtsug-mgon, the youngest, these three. He gave to each of these three sons a separate kingdom' (which the text proceeds to particularize).

Here we have the origin of the expression *mṅaḥ-ris-skor-gsum*; and it remains to identify the three districts, concerning which there have been some misapprehensions.

The local genealogy of Gu-ge, published by Francke (*op.cit.*, pp. 167-171) from a XVIIIth century text, *Dhag-bsam-ljon-bzaṅ*, opens with the statement —

'The eldest of Ṇi-ma-mgon's three high sons was Dpal-ldo Rig-pa-mgon: he received Maṅ-yul; the middle one, Bkra-śis-lde-mgon, received Spu-hraṅs; and the youngest, Lde-btsun-mgon, received *Žaṅ-žuṅ* and the three provinces of Gu-ge'.

Passing over the slight differences in the forms of the names and the error in translation in the concluding phrase, where 'and the three provinces of Gu-ge' should read 'which is Gu-ge, - (these) three', (the 'three' summing up, in normal Tibetan style, the preceeding items), we have the local identification of the three districts as Maṅ-yul, Spu-hraṅs and *Žaṅ-žuṅ*/Gu-ge. With this agree all the really early

authorities. In the *Padmañi-bkañ-thaṅ* (V, fol. 63, b.1) Gu-ge, Pu-rañ and Mañ-yul are linked together in a triad plainly equivalent to mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum. The *Padma-skyed-rabs* speaks (M. Toussaint's trans., pp. 242, 264) of Spu-rañs and Mañ-yul of mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum, and again (p. 244) Žañ-žuiñ is mentioned as connected with Mañ-yul. The Tibetan Me-loñ in its original form (not Francke's Ladak version) has a statement of which the above cited passage from the Gu-ge genealogy is a practically verbatim reflex. The Mongol *Bodhimör*, in making 'Gnari' to consist of Mar-yul, sPorang (Spu-hrañs) and Gung-Shang (i.e. Žañ-žuiñ/Gu-ge, which in Ssanang Ssetsen's text appears as *Kugi*), differs only by the erroneous (see *infra*) substitution of Mar-yul in place of Mañ-yul. That the same triad is orthodox in Tibet appears from the entry s.v. *mÑañ-ris* in Ś. C. Das' *Tibetan Dictionary* —

'name of the westernmost province of Tibet, now known as Ngari Khorsum. It formerly consisted of three districts, Purang, Shang-shung, Mang-yul, which were apportioned to the three princes of the royal family of Tibet'.

From all this it is certain that the kingdom of Nñi-ma-dgon consisted of mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum only and that this was composed of the three districts Žañ-žuiñ/Gu-ge, Spu-hrañs and Mañ-yul.

How then can we account for the variant particulars mentioned in Francke's Ladak chronicle? The answer seems to be that the error was caused primarily by the disappearance of the original Mañ-yul. The Mañ-yul principality was the portion of Dpal-lda Rig-pa-mgon, *alias* Dpal-gyi-mgon, the eldest of the three sons: he became the founder of the extensive Ladak kingdom, far to the west, and Mañ-yul faded out of the picture.

Physically, of course, Mañ-yul did not disappear; and at the present time it is fairly well known, occupying, in part at least, the area of its ancient namesake. In the *Padma-skyed-rabs* (trans. Toussaint, pp. 243-4) the phrase 'Guñ-thañ of Mañ-yul' refers unmistakably to the Guñ-thañ district reached immediately on entering Tibet by the pass at Skyid-groñ (Kiron), in Nepal. By that pass Padmasambhava in the VIIIth century A.D. and Atiśa in the XIth entered from Nepal, the former then proceeding east to Lha-sa and the latter promptly reaching Spu-hrañs in the west. The *Skyed-rabs* speaks also (*ibid.*) of 'the confines of Mañ-yul and Nepal'. In the *Bstan-hgyur* colophons there are several citations (see Dr. Cordier's *Catalogue*, III, pp. 90, 97, 145, 178, 182, 302, 421, 469) of 'Skyid-groñ in Mañ-yul': and the (early XIXth century) *Geografia Tibeta* of Min-tshul Huthuktu likewise assigns (trans. Vasiliev, pp. 10-1) Skyid-groñ, which adjoins 'Ljoñs-dgañ of Ngari', to Dmañ-yul, making its Guñ-thañ extend as far east as Nya-nan (the Kuti pass). From all this it is patent that a district Mañ-yul, containing Skyid-groñ and the Guñ-thañ and forming at present the westernmost part of the large Gtsañ province, reaches the eastern boundary of mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum: and the *Skyed-rabs* makes no distinction between



its above-mentioned Mañ-yul and a Mañ-yul named (p. 244) as either identical or connected with *Žaṅ-žuṅ*. It seems clear that what has happened is incorporation of the original Mañ-yul in the Gtsaṅ province. At the same time we account for two facts, (1) the allotment of Mañ-yul, the nearest of the three districts to Central Tibet, to the eldest son, Rig-pa-dgon, and (2) its (possibly immediate) resumption and incorporation by Lha-sa upon the withdrawal of that eldest son to his large new-founded kingdom of Ladak.

The misapprehensions in the Ladak Chronicle (Francke, pp. 94-5) concerning the originally partitioned area of mÑaṅ-ris-skor-gsum may have been due in part to the amour propre of the large Ladak state in regard to its beginnings, though doubtless mainly to the long interval of time at the relatively late date of the compilation. Those misapprehensions should be briefly noted here:—

(1) The portion of the eldest prince is made to include (a) 'Mar (*error for* Mañ, *see infra*)-yul of mÑaṅ-ris, (b) 'Ru-thogs and the gold-mine of Ḥgog, (c) Lde-mchog-dkar-po', 'Ra -ba-dmar-po', 'Wam-le', (d) 'as far west as the foot of the Kashmir pass', (e) 'all the places of Rgya'. Most of these have been identified by Dr. Francke, following Dr. Marx; Ru-thogs and Ḥgog as Rudok and Thok-ja-lung, Lde-mchog and Wam-le as Demchog and Hanle on the Indus and its Hanle affluent, the 'Kashmir pass' as the Zoji-la, Rgya as the frontier town between Rupshu and Ladak.

Here the particular identifications by Marx and Francke are, no doubt, correct; and the general conception of an advance at first northward, taking in Thok-jalung and Rudok and reaching the Indus at some point, may reflect a true tradition; for the expansion of Mañ-yul, which was east of Kailāsa-Mānasa, would necessarily, in order to by-pass Gu-ge (perhaps including Gartok) take this direction, and Demchog, the present frontier between mÑaṅ-ris-skor-gsum and Ladak, is a suitable point for reaching the Indus. But anything further down the Indus valley, and *a fortiori* the inclusion of the whole of Lower Ladak, etc., as far west as the 'Kashmir pass', is, as concerns the father-king Ñi-ma-mgon, totally excluded by the statement in the same text (Francke, p. 93) —

'Mar-yul (i.e. Ladak) he left undisturbed. At that time Upper Ladakh (La-dwags-stod) was held by the descendants of Gesar, whilst Lower Ladakh (Smad-mams) was split up into small independent principalities'.

Accordingly it is seen that, so far as concerns the father-king, and perhaps also as concerns his son, the specifications in the Chronicle are premature.

(2) The portion of the second son is stated as 'Gu-ge with Pu-hraṅs, Rtse, etc.' Here Rtse is unidentified. The inclusion of Pu-hraṅs, dictated by later amalgamation, deprives the third son of his portion.

(3) The third son's portion is stated as Zaṅs-dkar-sgo-gsum, with Spi-ti, Spi-lcogs, etc., of which the last item is unidentified. Spi-ti, immediately west of Gu-ge,

and perhaps partly of Spu-hrañs, is certainly very Tibetan; but the addition of Zanskar, a large territory bordering on Kashmir, seems highly improbable. The selection may have been contrived to fill the gap caused by the mistaken transfer of Spu-hrañs to the second son.

The uncertainties expressed in the *Geografia Tibeta* (early XIXth century) require no more than a passing mention. With the contemporary situation in mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum, administered by annual appointees from Lha-sa, the author must have been well acquainted. The doubts which he mentions must have been historical, occasioned by the long period of c.750 years (prior to c.1683 A.D.) during which it had belonged to the West Tibet kingdom, alienated from Lha-sa. Adopting as the original triad La-dak (Stag-mo La-dwags), Žaṅ-žun (Mañ-yul Žaṅ-žun) and Gu-go with spu-hrañs he mentions that some prefer Spu-hrañs with Mañ-yul and Zanskar (1), Hchi-ba with Ladak and Balti (2), Žaṅ-žun with Upper and Lower Khrig-se (3); and he suggests the possibility of adopting as the triad La-dwags, Ru-thog and Gu-ge. The confusion and ignorance herein displayed are manifest.

There remains for disentanglement, if possible, a confusion, already remarked in two instances, between Mañ-yul and a Mar-yul. The latter, current as designation of Ladak, 'Low Country', in contrast, no doubt, to Stod-phyogs, 'High (or Upper) Region', sc. the Kailāsa-Mānasa region or upper Tibet in general, is not known, as name of a country, in any really ancient text. It is absent from the documents published in *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents* and from the Chronicle and other texts in M. Bacoŕ's *Documents de Touen-houang*, from the *Padmaḥi-bkaḥ-thaṅ* and *Padma-skyed-rabs*, and from the *Bstan-hgyur* colophons. It arose, no doubt, in the time of the West Tibet kingdom.

The confusion may have been in origin merely scriptural, ṅ and r being in some Tibetan scripts hardly distinguishable; and this may account for the above-noted occurrence in the source of the Mongol *Bodhimör*. In Francke's translation of the Ladak Chronicle the following passages should be clarified by changing *Mar-yul* to *Mañ-yul* or *vice versa*:—

- p. 113: 'from Bu-rig to Mar-yul (*L.M.S.* 'to the Mar-yum pass') *Mar-yul*, = Central Ladak, is here nonsensical, Bu-rig (Purik) being not distant from 'Central Ladakh', even when not part of it. Read *Mañ-yul*; but the alternative reading, *Mar-yum*, would suit.
- p. 119: 'Mañ-yul clave together'. Read *Mar-yul* = Ladak as a whole.
- p. 238: 'Upper and Lower Mañ-yul'. Read *Mar-yul*, there being no 'Upper and Lower' Mañ-yul.

The other citations of Mañ-yul seem correct. In p. 93 the note —

'mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum usually includes the districts of Ru-thogs, Gu-ge and Pu-hrañs only. Here, however, it seems to include all Ladakh, Zans-dkar,

etc., as well'.

is not only erroneous, as already explained, but also in direct conflict with the preceding 'Mar-yul he left undisturbed', Ladak being part of Mar-yul.

It is necessary to mention, as usually connected with mñNaḥ-ris-skor-gsum during the period of incorporation in the West Tibet kingdom, the minor district of Blo-bo. In the *Geografia Tibeta* (p. 10) 'Glo-bo Sman-thaṅ' is located to the east of Spu-hraṅs and stated to belong to Nepal territory, but to have a Tibetan population and a monastery. With this agrees in the main the statement of Francke (*op.cit.*, p. 84) that —

'Blo-bo is a Tibetan province north of Muktiṇāth (the sacred mountain in N.W. Nepal). Its ancient capital used to be Lho-mon-sdan (Lo-Mantang of the maps)' The situation, sufficiently indicated by the entry 'Lowo' on the maps at pp. 60 and 90 of Francke's *History of Western Tibet*, adjoined mñNaḥ-ris-skor-gsum, being probably immediately south of Maṅ-yul. The 'Sman-thaṅ' of the *Geografia* is, of course, equivalent to Mon-sdan and Mantang. With Žaṅ-žun the district is associated in the *Me-loṅ* (Francke, p. 83) as conquered by the Tibetans during the reign of Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po; and this is confirmed by an entry in the Chronicle edited by M. Bacot (p. 30) —

'A.D. 652: Great Councillor Stoṅ-rtsan summoned Glo-bo and Rtsaṅ-rhya (to submit)'.

Other early references in the *Me-loṅ* to Glo (Blo)-bo can be seen in Francke's translation, p. 85 (conquest in the time of the Tibetan king Khri Ḥdus-sroṅ), p. 90 (held, along with Mon, in the time of Ral-pa-can). During the West Tibet régime it was conquered (p. 96), with Pu-hraṅs, during the period c.1080-1110 A.D. and again (p. 105), with 'Pu-hraṅs, Gu-ge, etc.', during 1532-1560 A.D. The last references to Glo (Blo)-bo in Francke's work relate to the war of c. 1683 A.D., which ended with the restoration, under stipulations expounded in pp. 116-7, of mñNaḥ-ris-skor-gsum to the Lha-sa state: on p. 243 we read of the capture of Skag-rdzoṅ by a Ladak general and of a lake Mes-žaṅ in the country and a place Da-liṅ, in the Kailāsa district; on pp. 233-4 another capture, in 1723 A.D., of the Glo-bo capital, Skag-rdzoṅ, is rather fully detailed; and on this occasion it is made clear that the defenders were Mons. The coincidence with the name, Mon-sdan, of the former capital may suggest that the population was in fact of Mon race; but the Tibetan use of the term may be loose enough to apply to them, even if Nepalese.

After the foundation of the Ladak state by the oldest brother, or by his immediate successor, the first to have the title *Lha-chen*, - Sanskrit *Mahā-deva*, the two remaining brothers, holding respectively districts Gu-ge/Žaṅ-žun and Spu-hraṅs, remained attached to that state, generally in quasi-independence, but from time to

time needing to be 'conquered': particulars, stated in the Ladak Chronicle, can be traced by aid of Francke's Index. Jointly the two families formed a sort of composite state, united by inter-marriages. In the Gu-ge genealogy translated by Francke (*op.cit.*, pp. 170-1, cf. p. 276) the two families are in part intermingled.

The progress of Tibetanization, begun long previously, must have been rapid. In the second and third generations, under King Ye-śes-hod Lha-lde, and Hod-lde, commenced the activity of the famous scholar and saint, Rin-chen-bzañ-po, who by inviting Buddhist divines and artists from Kashmir and India and by translation of canonical texts and erection of profusely decorated monasteries and shrines inaugurated the revival (*phyi-dar*, 'posterior spread') of Buddhism throughout Tibet. The visit of Atiśa, or Dīpaṃkara-śrī-jñāna, the very eminent expositor of Buddhist doctrine and practice, commenced in 1042 A.D. To 1076 A.D. is attributed a great religious council of mÑaḥ-ris. In the genealogy the element *-rmañ*, which from about the XIIth century terminates a series of the royal names, is regarded by Dr. Francke (p. 171) as marking rather a joint (connection with some Nepal Malla kings) than a breach. The capital had been moved from Tho-ling/Mtho-ldiñ, on the Sulej, to Tsaparang/Chabrang, in Spu-hrañs, further south and west, when, in 1624 A.D., the Gu-ge king first welcomed there the Jesuit mission under Andrada, which subsequently, transferred to the Capuchins, lingered on until c. [...] A.D. The king was apparently the one deposed by the Ladak ruler Señ-ge-mam-rgyal (d.1635 A.D., see Francke, *op.cit.*, pp. 108-110); and the country was in c.1683 recovered by the Lha-sa state, which still administers it as part of the present mÑaḥ-ris-skor-gsum.

The known history of the Kailāsa-Mānasa and Žaṅ-žuñ/Gu-ge region, singular, like its geographical situation and its physical formation and aspects, comprizes accordingly periods as follows:—

(1) an inferred early period, during which the Kailāsa and Mānasa were objects of a vague general adoration such as Tibeto-Burman people accord to outstanding natural features;

(2) a period, commencing not later than the IIIrd century B.C., when Indian pilgrims were beginning to glorify the whole region by associating it with the mythology of their greatest divinities and later with the names of their Epic heroes;

(3) a period under the rule of Žaṅ-žuñ, Tibeto-Burman, chiefs, in the course of which originated the Bon religion, which afterwards spread widely over Tibet and adjoining countries;

(4) a period following upon the suppression, during the second half of the VIIIth century A.D., of the native Žaṅ-žuñ kingdom and inclusion thereof, as a border district, Stod mÑaḥ-ris, in the Lha-sa State. Commencement of Tibetanization and introduction of Buddhism.

(5) a period, commencing in the first quarter of the Xth century A.D., of

inclusion, as a semi-independent state, in the West Tibet kingdom founded by a scion of the Lha-sa dynasty.

About the middle of the Xth century, through the inspiration and activity of Rin-chen-bzañ-po and the support of the Gu-ge king, and through organized contacts with Kashmir and India, was initiated an activity, artistic and literary, which led to a revival of Buddhism in Tibet and won for the state a high prestige, both there and in Ladak. In the next centuries the Gu-ge country shared in the developments of Tibetan Lamaism by foundations representing various sects. Rñin-ma-pa, Śākya-pa, Dge-lugs-pa, and, prominently, the Hbrug-pa of Bhutan.

To this period perhaps belongs the beginning of the Tibetan pride in Kailāsa and Mānasa which are celebrated in a sort of national anthem in the openings of inscriptions, and of that religious glorification, perhaps initiated by the sojourn (XIIth century) of the famous ascetic and poet Mi-la-ras-pa, which has surrounded mountain and lake with retreats of resident monks and nuns, and which demands that every Tibetan should, once in his life, make the arduous pilgrimage and circumambulation and that relics of the dead should be cast into the lake.

C.1624 A.D. - [...], patronage by the last king, and subsequent limited toleration, of the first Jesuit, subsequently Capuchin, mission, founded with a view to developing a route of entry into China. Definite conquest by Ladak in 1630 A.D.

(6) C.1683 A.D. reincorporation of mÑah-ris-skor-gsum into the Lha-sa State after a war between the Tibetans, under Mongol control, and Ladak encouraged by the Indian Mughals.

For a full account of Rin-chen-bzañ-po's life, work and school, based upon original texts and documents, and for a deep and original study of the architecture, art, and religious symbolism of the period, it suffices to refer to the fine and scholarly volumes of Professor Tucci's *Indo-Tibetica* (I-III, ii, Rome, 1932-6). The lamentably ruinous state of all that survives in mÑah-ris-skor-gsum itself, as distinguished from the adjacent regions of Spi-ti, Lahul, and Kunawar, is exhibited in *A journey to Toling and Tsaparang in Western Tibet*, by G. M. Young (Journal of the Panjab Historical Society, VII, pp. 177-198) and very thoroughly in the narrative of Tucci's 1933 journey, *Chronaca della spedizione scientifica Tucci nel Tibet occidentale* by G. Tucci and E. Ghersi (Roma, 1934).

In the above chronological summary the item no. (3), or else no. (4), would need an addition or amplification if the name *Hun-desh* or *Hūna-deśa*, alternative to *mÑah-ris-skor-gsum*, signified, as has sometimes been supposed 'Hun country'. In the supposition that the Hephthalite Hun Mihirakula, who after his defeat (c.525 A.D.) in India, obtained possession of Kashmir, and his successors there should have been active in the Himālayan districts to its east there is no *prima facie* improbability: actual Hūna operations in that area are implied by the evidence of a

battle with the Maukhari king (see *supra*, p. 68), whose capital was Kanauj, on the Ganges, far from contact with Kashmir itself. In regard to mÑah-ris-skor-gsum, in particular, explicit confirmation might be found in the almost contemporary statement of Bāṇa's *Harṣa-carita* (trans. p. 132) that, in 605 A.D. king Prabhākara-ardhana of *Sihāṇviśvara* (Thanesar) sent troops to fight again the Hūnas 'in the region which blazes with Kailāsa's lustre'.

Nevertheless the supposition should be resisted. The Tibetans, who would have been in contact with any Hūna power in mÑah-ris-skor-gsum during the VIIth or later centuries A.D., betray no knowledge of them. If the name occurs once or twice in Tibetan texts, it is only in miscellaneous lists of peoples, as in the *Dpag-bsam-ljon-bzan* (ed. Ś. C. Das, p. 4), where they are coupled with *Yūnas* (= Yavanas?), and in certain Bon-po texts. The term *Hūna-deśa* is Indo-Āryan: the term *ūniya*, 'wool-people', is applied by the cis-Himālayan Indo-Āryans to their trans-Himālayan Tibetan neighbours by reason of the great active trade in wool and hair: they are themselves dubbed in return *Mar-cas*, 'Lowlanders', *Hūna-deśa* is accordingly = Sanskrit *ūrṇā-deśa*, 'wool-country'. This obviously solid explanation would be definitely established if the Ūṇas, a Himālayan people twice mentioned in the Sanskrit *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* (LVII, vv. 42 and 57, see Pargiter's trans.), are to be located, as Lassen understood (*Indische Alterthumskunde*, I. 37. n.4 and map), to the north of Garhwāl. Indeed there exists in the Bashahr State a well known village *Ūrni* (on which see Francke, *Antiquities*, I, Index), in such a position.

The notion that *Hiun-des* (sic) means 'land of snow' originated perhaps with Wilson's note on p. 4 of Moorcroft's *Travels* (1837), Vol.I, where Hiun (-des), 'the snow country', is derived from Sanskrit *hima* 'snow': conceivably the *Hiuniya* of the text, in place of Moorcroft's prior *Ūniya*, was also due to the editor. By Cunningham this interpretation was fortified (*loc.cit.*) by citation of Tibetan *Kha-pa-chan* ('*ba-can*'), 'Snowy', which is actually found as a (poetical) designation of Tibet: Hodgson recognized in *Hyūn-des* a 'Khas or Parbatia' (i.e. Nepali) term antithetic to *Khas-des*, 'land of the Khas'. There is no doubt as to Nepali *hiū* (Kumaoni *hyū*, Panjabi *hiū*) = Sanskrit *hima*, 'snow'; but on the basis of the first-hand spellings of Moorcroft and Gerard it may be doubted whether the pronunciation *hiun/hyun* was genuine, or at any rate original; and in view of the information as to use one may ask for further proof of Hodgson's affirmation that by *Hyūn-des* the Parbatias mean 'all the tracts covered ordinarily with snow on both sides of the crest or spine of Hemāchal'. However, folk-etymology may have been here at work.