

みんなくりポジトリ

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

Chapter3

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	https://doi.org/10.15021/00000978

Ethnographical

(1) General views.

(1a) Hodgson.

In modern times the Himālayan populations have been the subject of at least two large theories which, while founded partly upon linguistic evidences, may be regarded as substantially ethnographical. Hodgson's view, the earliest and most comprehensive, with very wide ramifications, conceived of 'the sub-Himālayan races' as all 'closely affiliated' and 'all of northern origin', being 'Turanians', of 'Scythic or Mongolian' somatic type, who had immigrated *via* 'the hundred gates of the Himalaya' (p. 15). He did not countenance any special relation to any particular branch of the 'Turanian', 'the vastest, and most erratic, and most anciently wide-spread, but still single branch of the human race' (pp. 15, 16n, 47n, 30n.). Even the famous, elaborately evidenced, distinction between 'pronominalized' and 'non-pronominalized' languages (pp. 16n, 47n) he did not regard as essential, conceiving that the 'pronominalization' was an internal development, which might take place in different regions independently (p. 16): what he regarded as factual, so far at least as Nepal was concerned, was a temporal-spacial distinction; the middle Himālayan region, most productive and healthy, was occupied by the later immigrants, 'unbroken' tribes of non-pronominalized speech, while the 'broken' tribes, occupying the southern and most malarious regions, had languages 'of the complex or pronominalized type, tending, like their physical attributes, towards assimilation with the Dravidian or the Hor, Sontal or Munda, sub-families' (p. 16). As regards the northern regions, immediately adjacent to the passes, Hodgson was well aware that their 'Bhot' inhabitants 'along the entire line of the Himalaya' were Tibetans. To the dominant (*sc.* unbroken) races he ascribed (p. 31) a moderate antiquity (in Nepal) of 1000-1300 years. He has much to say (pp. 37-9) concerning the Nepal Khas, 'originally a small tribe of creedless barbarians'.

(1b) Cunningham.

Cunningham's original view (*Ladāk* (1854), p. 390) is superficially quite different. He wrote —

'The Tibetan language is now confined to the mountain valleys of the Tsangpo and Indus, and to the upper courses of the Sutluj, the Sarju and the Chenáb. But in ancient days it probably extended over the greater part of the cis-Himālayas, as I can trace by the Tibetan names of the smaller streams ... It is perhaps idle to speculate at what period the Tibetans could have possessed Bisahar (Bashahr), Kyonthal and Sarnar (Simur, Sarmur); but it must have been many

centuries ago, before the Khasas were driven into the hills by the conquering Hindus'

and in a note it is explained that —

'The Kanets of the hills are all Khasas; and in Chamba, Kullu, and Kanawar, they interpose between the Hindus and Tibetans'.

Here the original Himālayans are still of trans-Himālayan affinity, but definitely Tibetan: the Khasas are no longer a small Nepal tribe, but probably the 'Khasas of the lower Panjab hills on the west', expanded, as in the later view, so as to have been 'the original inhabitants of the whole of the lower slopes of the Himalaya, from the banks of the Indus to the Brahmaputra'. This expansion is based upon inclusion of the Kanets, who were indeed known to Hodgson (pp. 14-5), but by him were regarded, along with Khas, Dogras, etc., as of mixed descent, from 'aboriginal Tartar' mothers and 'Arian' fathers. Cunningham could still hold that the prior populations expelled by the Khasas / Kanets, were of Tibetan stock: he does not yet seem to affiliate his Khasas ethnically.

Cunningham's later (1882) view exhibits his greatly extended knowledge of the Kanets (he now spells 'Kunets'), their massive numbers and wide distribution. He still regards Khasas and 'Kunets' as of the same origin, but in view of the facts does not completely identify the two. Mainly on linguistic grounds he connects the 'Kunets' with the Muṇḍā and other cognate races of India. Concerning Kunet language he writes (pp. 131-2) —

'The language of the Kunets ... is a corrupt dialect of Hindi, but it still retains many traces of a non-Aryan language. Thus the word *ti*, for water or stream, is found all over the Kunet area. The word is not Tibetan, but it occurs in the Milchang dialect of Lower Kunawar. It is clearly connected with the *dī* or *tī* of the E. Koch and Moch tribes and with the *da* of the aboriginal and Kolish tribes of Eastern and Central India, the Munda, Santhal, Ho, Kuri and Saur and Savara'.

and he proceeds to cite numerous instances of *ti* from the Kunet area and cognate forms, partly very dubious, from a much wider field.

Ignoring the very excusable description of the language of Kunets, sc. the Kunāwarī, the only such at that time available, as a corrupt dialect of Hindī, and also the changed derivation of the important word *tī*, 'water', previously adduced as evidence for Tibetan priority, we may remark the exiguity of the further etymological items cited on p. 133 as evidence of 'Kol' affinity. In naming such particulars Cunningham was at least outgoing the precedent, which he cites, of Hodgson, who in regard to the language of his (Nepal) Khas had stated (p. 38) merely that their corrupt dialect of Hindī retained 'not many palpable traces (except to curious eyes) of primitive barbarism'.

A partly linguistic observation (p. 127) brought in a further racial designation, *Mon* —

'All the ancient remains within the present area of Kunet occupation are assigned to a people who are variously called Mowas, or Mons, or Motans, and all agree that these were the Kunets themselves. The fact is that Mon is simply their Tibetan name, while Kuninda or Kunet is their Indian name'.

And so (p. 128) —

'I think it therefore very probable that the Mons of the cis-Himalaya may be connected with the *Mundas* of Eastern India, who are certainly the *Monedes* of Pliny, as well as the *Mons* of Pegu I would also suggest that the true name of Mongir was most probably *Monagiri* and that the country of the *Mundas* or *Monedes* once extended northward as far as the Ganges at Mongir'.

Cunningham's 'Mowas, or Mons, or Motans' are evidently the Māve and Movanna, 'leaders of parties in villages', of H. A. Rose's *Glossary* (p. 75) and of the Simla Hill States Gazetteer (Bashar, pp. 20-1), where it is said that among the original 'Khash' inhabitants there arose *māwis* or *movannas*, masterful individuals, who formed small confederacies, and lived by preying on one another, and that the superior class of Kanets trace their descent from the old *māwis*. This is not very favourable to Cunningham's view of the Mons, who will also demand consideration in another context.

The original, and afterwards fully confirmed, statistics which Cunningham gave (pp. 125-6) of the distribution of the Kunets over a wide area furnished a solid base for his theory. But it was his elaborately justified association, though no longer identification, of them with 'the Khasas of the lower Panjab hills and the Khasias of the east' (Kumaon), to which he might have added the Nepal Khas, that gave his view the wide sweep defined *supra*. Late survival of independent Kunet chieftainships in the lower hills of Garhwāl and Kumaon is brought to light; and by deriving the Kunets from the ancient Kuṇindas of the *Mahā-Bhārata* (pp. 129, 135) and of Ptolemy's 'Kulindrine' and by the important discovery (pp. 137-9) of pre-Christian coinage of a Kuṇinda king, a historical frame is provided. It is not quite clear that Cunningham regarded his Khasas/Kunets/Kuṇindas as connected with the pre-Āryan inhabitants of the plains also. His decision (pp. 133-4) in favour of 'a Kolish (sc. Muṇḍā) rather than a Gondish (sc. Dravidian) affinity for the Kunets and other mixed races of north-west India' would not have been repugnant to Hodgson, who also deals mainly with Muṇḍā, though he holds (p. 47, of. p. 61) that 'Himālaya has [also] lingual traits of Draviria': nor would Hodgson, though he does not deal much with ancient emigrations from the plains, have disputed their occasional occurrence (see p. 61) 'countless generations back'.

The mention of Kols brings in a separate question. The authors of several

Gazetteers, in citing Cunningham's theory, have understood him to include among his 'Kolis' peoples the actual 'Kolis' and similar 'impure', 'outcasts', 'menials' (Hodgson's 'helots'), among the hill populations. Everywhere there are some 'depressed' classes of this kind; and experienced observers are apt (e.g. Chamba, pp. 58-9) to regard them as the real aborigines. As the Kunets, who are everywhere respectables, are sometimes by similar or the same observers supposed to be likewise aboriginal, though they would usually put forward a different claim, they are reported to be considered as Kunets degraded for some reason. It may, however, be suspected that Hodgson's view of such tribes of helot craftsmen, whose manners have little, and their tongues nothing, and their physical attributes not much, to denote their race or lineage' (p. 15), as a separate enigma, is nearer to reality.

(1c) 'Muṇḍā' views in the Linguistic Survey of India.

The Muṇḍā theory, as propounded by Cunningham on grounds of observation, tradition and history, has been cited, as we see, with toleration and sometimes with assent, by officials intimately concerned with the populations of the Hill territories. Confirmation may also be found in two later studies in the departments of linguistics and culture.

The first of these two, bringing to light a 'Western group of Complex Pronominalized Tibeto-Burman languages', adopted explicitly an idea and terminology conceived and repeatedly expounded by Hodgson in connection with certain Nepal languages, and others, Muṇḍā, etc., outside. Several of the languages had previously been placed on record, with note of some of their substantial differences from ordinary Tibetan. But the group was first recognized and the characteristics elucidated in an article contributed to the Z.D.M.G. for 1905 (pp. 117 sqq.) by Dr. Sten Konow, who was then collaborating in the Linguistic Survey of India. The L.S. volume (III, Part i, pp. 427-567), expounds and elaborates Dr. Konow's conception, with particulars and descriptions and new materials in regard to each of the languages and a 'Comparative Vocabulary' on the usual model. The languages nearly all belong to the narrow band of territory which has been discriminated *supra* (p. [...]) as immediately south of the Great Himālayan axis, from Chamba in the west to the Nepal frontier in the east: mostly they are included in Cunningham's early reference to Tibetan surviving in the upper courses of the Sutluj, the Sarju and the Chenāb', the most important being the Kunāwarī, which Cunningham subsequently distinguished as 'a corrupt dialect of Hindī.' In two points the new conception differs from the views of Hodgson and of Cunningham respectively: (1) Whereas Hodgson had regarded his Pronominalization as an internal development and not a result of mixture, the 'Muṇḍā' characteristics are now conceived as derived from a 'substrate' language, (2) there is no suggestion of

Muṇḍā migration, the 'substrate' having possibly long preceded the Tibeto-Burmans in the actual areas; nor is anything propounded in regard to areas to the south. But evidently the conception, which has been warmly approved, would harmonize with the theory of an early Muṇḍā population in those areas.

(1d) Przyłuski's 'Austro-Asiatic' view.

The second confirmatory study is contained in two very original papers by the late Professor Przyłuski: for, although his evidences are largely drawn from a wider, Austro-Asiatic range, wherein he was specially at home, he does name (pp. 49, 54, 319), and apparently include, both Muṇḍā, which in the area which he contemplates, viz. the Panjab and the Ganges valley, would be perhaps alone available, and Dravidan. His view, very clearly expounded, is to the general effect that in those regions the Indo-Āryan immigration pierced an aboriginal Austro-Asiatic population, pushed aside both northwards and southwards: some hill peoples are patently envisaged, since his Udumbaras are recognized as such.

Apart from acute observations concerning what is known of the original Panjab peoples and of equivalences north and south of the Indo-Āryan advance, the originality of the papers is most manifest in the actual linguistic details, so meagre in the prior discussions, and in deep studies of primitive Austro-Asiatic cultural ideas and usages traceable in the Indo-Āryan sphere.

(1e) Khasa theory.

With the support of these comparatively modern contributions the 'Muṇḍā' theory begins to wear a somewhat substantial appearance. The second large theory operates with the same racial designation *Khasā*, which functioned as the linch-pin in Cunningham's argument, but with completely different result. Of this term a very speculative use had been made by Atkinson (*op.cit.*, pp. 375 sqq.), who not only brought in the Sanskrit mythology of the primaeval sage or divinity Kāśyapa and the name of Kashmir, with the Indian town Kaspaturus mentioned by Herodotus (iii, 102, iv,44), but proceeded to adduce a large number of superficially more or less similar names from regions adjacent to India (Kophene, Khoaspes) or as remote as Central Asia (Kashgar, the Kasian mountains, the Caucasus, the Ottorokorrhoi), or Baluchistan (Khosa) or even Susa (Kissii, Kossaci). In the light of modern linguistic and historical knowledge such grasping at mere names is simply fanciful. The Linguistic Survey volume (IX. iv, Pahārī Languages and Gujurī), which in its Introduction (pp. 1-16) expounds the new theory, retains some of those items (the Kasian mountains, Kashgar, the Ottorokorrhoi) as giving the impression of an anciently widespread Khasā people; but for the most part it confines itself to matters relevant to its thesis, which is to the effect that —

'the great mass of the Āryan-speaking population of the Lower Himālaya from Kashmir to Darjeeling is inhabited by tribes descended from the ancient Khaṣas of the Mahābhārata' (p. 8).

and further that —

'they were closely connected with the group of peoples nicknamed 'Piśāchas' or 'cannibals' by Indian writers, and before the sixth century (A.D.) they were stated to speak the same language as the people of Balkh. At the same period they had apparently penetrated along the southern slope of the Himālaya as far east as Nepal, and in the twelfth century they certainly occupied in considerable force the hills to the south, south-west and south-east of Kashmir' (p. 8).

Any serious discussion of the view thus summarized must at this point be postponed; but one or two particulars may be noted.

(1) As regards the *Mahā-Bhārata* citations of the Khaṣas, what is most obvious is their paucity and meagreness, especially in comparison with peoples really functioning in the story. They are named only in lists of peoples; and in such cases even the readings of the names are commonly rendered dubious through variants. There is never any clear geographical indication; and in the first passage adduced the region mentioned is at least semi-mythical. Nevertheless there are one or two passages where there is no ground for disputing the reading, even if the list of peoples is anachronistic; and it can be agreed that in some cases the collocation of names does attest a degree of geographical propinquity. In fact, it can be agreed that a situation in the north-west is apparent; and the approval (p. 6) of Sir A. Stein's note, definitely locating the Khaṣas 'immediately to the south and west of the Pir Pantalsal range', on the Kashmir frontier, can be confidently endorsed: the note sums up the evidence of the *Rājā tarāṅgiṇī* history, which was directly acquainted with the Khaṣa people. The evidentiality of this does not depend upon the author's date (XIIth century A.D.); and nothing seems to preclude a location of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, etc., Khaṣas in the same area.

(2) The theory requires and receives (a) the adoption (p. 2) of Cunningham's view concerning the Kanets/Kunets as closely connected with the Khaṣas, and at the same time (b) (p. 6 n 1) the rejection of his derivation of the Kanets/Kunets from the ancient Kuṇindas. This will occupy us later.

(3) A chronological obscurity attaches to the theory both in itself and in relation to the 'Muṇḍā' doctrine. In case the Khaṣa expansion is conceived as taking place during the historical period - and that this was really so may be implied in the remark, (p. 2) —

'The earlier we trace notices regarding them, the further north-west we find them'.

—, then there is no necessary conflict with the 'Muṇḍā' view, which contemplates

the remote period of Indo-Āryan immigration. Concerning the Khas language of Nepal, it is in fact remarked in Sir R. L. Turner's *Nepali Dictionary* (p. xiii) that at the date of a certain Prākṛtie change the speakers of the dialect were probably 'far to the west of their present home'; and there would thus be no inconsistency in the approval accorded (*ibid.*, p. xv) to Przyłuski's researches and the general assent (p. xiii) to the Khas migration doctrine in regard to 'all the Indo-Āryan languages along the southern face of the Himālayas.'

(3) Of Khaśa language no word has hitherto, it seems, been brought to light: the features of Pahārī languages noticed in the Linguistic Survey volume as thence derived are attributed to it upon the presumption that it belonged to the group of 'Piśācha' languages.

(2) Some remarks on the two wide views.

The above two wide theories may perhaps be somewhat clarified by one or two further observations.

In Hodgson's view practically all the Himālayan populations were immigrants from the north: he was, however, prepared to admit that some of the 'broken' tribes, 'with differential physiognomy' (pp. 32, 46), had come, 'countless generations back', from the plains (pp. 46-7, 60-1), and that the 'Ugric stock' (sc. Dravidians) could have entered India from the west (pp. 15-6, 61). The Khas, Kanets, etc., are of mixed breed (p. 15). Cunningham, in conceiving of the helot or menial classes as aborigines of the Himālayas, evidently did not regard them as immigrant at any date; had he done so, there would have been a further problem of still greater obscurity. A like doubt applies to Przyłuski's view, if his Austro-Asiatics of the Panjab plains, shouldered aside by the Vedic Āryans, found in the hills a different race. Instead of a Muṇḍā theory the possibility, rejected by Cunningham, of a Dravidian affinity of the hill populations, who surely must have been at some date immigrant, is evidently contemplated by those who have conjectured Dravidian elements even in the remote northern Burushaski language. Cunningham's Khaśas were by him obviously regarded as immigrant during a historical period from the plains or the lower, outer, mountains. The Khaśas of the Linguistic Survey, which does not envisage a remote antiquity, are likewise assigned to some historical period: if otherwise, there would result the surprizing notion of an Āryan (Śiṇa, Dard, or the like) population of the hills prior to the Indo-Āryan invasion of the Panjab plains.

(3) Indications in early Sanskrit literature.

From the ancient Sanskrit literature itself a few quasi-ethnographical notices of

peoples with which we are concerned have long been known: such, for instance, are those mentioned *supra* concerning Dāsas and Dasyus. But there is very little. The description, in Manu X, 44 and the *Mahā-Bhārata* XVI. vv. 2103 sqq.) of certain peoples as 'fallen', or degraded, Kṣatriyas is not ethnographical, but, as the miscellaneous list shows, doctrinal and is a condescension to certain peoples of military or political value or other respectability. Even linguistic observations are not always useful: the term *Mleccha* did not originally connote even non-Indo-Āryan, or anything more than faulty, speech; in Epic times, however, it seems as if the term, for the very reason of its sparse insertion, does, where it is present, distinguish peoples as non-Indo-Āryan or barbarous'. Of the L.S. citations one (p. 4. n. 8. *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa*, I.vii. iii.8), which states that the Bāhika group of Panjab peoples worship Agni, the fire-god, as Bhava, will not be helpful until an etymology of the name is found; the best is the statement (p. 5 and n. 8) that 'The Bāhlika language is for the Northerners and Khasas native'. The inference that these peoples were Iranian would have been welcome to Professor Przyluski, who held that some Panjab peoples of Epic times were immigrants from Iran.

The Epic, with its political outlook, is naturally rather unmindful of racial differences among the peoples figuring in the story. We are not told, though we may find indications, that the Gandhāra people of Śakuni, son of Subala, were Śakas. We may pass over peoples who are merely named, whether remote peoples of the east (Assam, etc.) or south (Pāṇḍyas, etc.), who are, most likely, late accessions to the text, or trans-Indus peoples, perhaps ancient reminiscences; but even such realistically known neighbours as the Trigartas, Kulūtas and Kuṇindas receive no racial qualification, and their chiefs, or kings, are provided with good Sanskrit personal names.

There is, however, one extensive passage, first brought to light by Lassen and partly summarized in the L.S. volume (p. 4), which has a pointedly ethnographic character. The import of the passage, mentioned *supra* as addressed by Karṇa to the Madra king Śalya, is a denunciation of the un-Āryan and immoral usages of the Madra people, stigmatized as 'filth of the earth', and particularly of the women, 'filth of women'. The simply un-Āryan characteristics are such as (a) lack of caste-distinctions - so that a man could be successively a Brāhman, a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya, a Śūdra, a barber, and then again a Kṣatriya, and after being a twice-born could be in the same place a slave - (b) matters of diet, etc., - eating of flesh even of cows, asses, and dogs, drinking the milk of the same, utensils abnormal (e.g. wooden bowls) and defiled, and so forth. More significant are the charges of laxity, amounting to promiscuity, in matters of sex, accompanied by loud and drunken behaviour on the part of the women. Still more pointed is the allegation of 'confusion of children and barrenness of wives', so that a person's heirs were not his sons, but his sister's sons.

The charge of sexual laxity acquires precision in the designation *Utsava-saṅketa*, used in the *Mahā-Bhārata* (II, vv. 1025, 1191, VI, v. 38 (with Trigartas)) and also by Kālidāsa and in Purāṇas as name of a group ('the seven U.-tribes') of mountain people (*pārvatīya*), partly at least included in the Madra kingdom (the Jammu hills). The term, for which Lassen could suggest no better rendering than 'one who passes his life in gay situations', is also inadequately represented by Pargiter's 'affection (*utsava*) - gesture of invitation', where, however, the notion of sexual promiscuity was detected. For, though *utsava* can be used by the Classical poets in the sense of 'delightful occasion', its proper signification is 'festival', with which meaning it is still used in Hill dialects: *saṅketa*, again, before meaning 'agreed sign' means 'agreed thing', 'convention', and specially 'assignation'. The rendering 'festival-assignation' acquires an ethnographical value from its correspondence to an actual usage of the Koko-nor 'Tanguts' (Tibetans), whose 'cap-gatherings' are, so to speak, 'coming-out parties' of the youth of both sex - as for dancing, repartee songs, etc.: the young men severally snatch the caps of feminine opposite numbers, who are required to go by night and redeem them. The remoteness of the Koko-nor region should not be urged against this comparison, because in the Bhot regions of the western Himālaya there is an ubiquitous institution named Ram-bang which is of a quite analogous character. The sexual conditions prevailing over a great area of the western Himālaya will be more amply evidenced *infra*. The statement that among the Utsava-saṅketas (or Madras in general?) a man's heirs were his sisters' sons, not his own, seems clearly to imply a system of matrilineal descent, which in South India is the *marumakkattāyam* of Travancore and Cochin. It was totally alien to Indo-Āryans and accordingly provoked denunciation. If in the case of the Utsava-saṅketas we think first of Tibeto-Burman connection, the denunciation of wooden and defiled eating-vessels had obvious provocation in the wooden bowls invariably carried in the breast 'pocket' of all Tibetans, east and west, and the method of cleaning them: the Indians required earthen-ware or metal and were markedly scrupulous as to cleaning.

Clearly the Utsava-saṅketas were non-Āryan, concerning the other montane peoples whom we have had occasion to specify, Trigartas, Kulūtas, Kuṇindas, we do not seem to find original notices of ethnographical value: the Sanskrit names given to their kings or chiefs, which we have regarded as non-evidential, could, of course, be thought to point to Indo-Āryan rulers of native populations; but the impression received is in some cases at least in favour of the alternative view, which is also supported by analogies in Further India. Here we shall have to depend on other evidence; but as regards the Kuṇinda king Amoghabhūti, of the coins, whose name was not a poetic invention, it may be noted that its second element, *bhūti*, proves that the caste-status accorded to him was not of a Kṣatriya, but of a Vaiśya. The

Udumbara king Vemaki Rudravarma of Professor Allan's coin (*op.cit.* pp. lxxxv-vi) was clearly a native, as is proved by his surname, unmistakably identical with the tribal name Vaiyamaka of *Mbh.*

An ethnographical indication may be seen in reference to the Kirātas, who are not only *ugra-vikrama*, 'formidable fighters', but also *carmavāsas*, 'skin-robed'. That this contemplates the long skin coats of the Tibetans, and also that the comparison of Cīnas and Kirātas to gold and their troops to a *karṇikāra* forest denotes the pale yellow or isabelline hue of Tibetan peoples we may credit on the ground of much stronger evidence. The 'little Kirāta girl' who in the *Atharva-veda* (X. 4. 14) 'digs a medicament on the ridges of the mountains' cannot, at that date, be other than a western; and her occupation, the quest for herb medicines, exemplifies a practice, or passion, characteristic of Tibetans universally. The Kirātas who in the *Mahā-Bhārata* and later literature are unfailingly named as the natives of the Kailāsa - Mānase region and the cis-Himālayan area to its south are indubitably Tibeto-Burman: and with the same it is reasonable to connect the Kīra people, of supposed Tibetan origin, recorded as invading Chamba from the east during the Xth - XIth century A.D. and whose memory persists in the name of Kīrgraon (Baijnāth), = *Kīra-grāma* in the east of Kangra: the *ta* in *Kirāta*, like that in *Kulūta* (possibly also in *Trigarta*) and like the *da* in Kuṇinda, etc., has the appearance of a Suffix.

The indications of Tibeto-Burman ethnical affinity receive strong confirmation from what is known of Kirātas further east. In the very early history of Nepal a Kirāta dynasty with 29 reigns fills a long period; and there is no possibility of disconnecting them from the existing Kirānti group of tribes, so elaborately discussed, linguistically, anthropologically and historically, by Hodgson in at least three of his essays. Thus their totally Tibeto-Burman affiliation is beyond question. Their present territory is the eastern part of Nepal, whence Tibeto-Burman kinship is continued by the populations of Sikkim, Bhutan and the mountains north of Assam. Hence there is no occasion for doubt when in the *Mahā-Bhārata* or elsewhere we find Kirātas mentioned in connection with Tirhut or Assam.

It is incredible that the Indians should have failed to remark the real affinities of peoples whom they knew so widely, and whom they so definitely discriminated from others, e.g. Kuṇindas and Taṅgaṇas, adjoining them. Only therefore with the stipulation that Tibeto-Burmans are denoted can we approve the statement of Lévi (*op.cit.*, pp. 79-80, 128), that the name applies to all the montane peoples of the Himālaya.

(4) Modern observations and deductions.

(4a) Cis-Himālayan regions.

Perhaps the above few particulars comprise most of the relevant information contained in the ancient Sanskrit texts. Turning to other possible sources, we may cite in regard to the cis-Himālayan territories the elaborate anthropometrical studies recorded in Risley's *The people of India* (pp. cxvi-xi, Kirantis by Col. Waddell, Kanets of Lahul and Kulu by Sir T. H. Holland): Sir T. H. Holland's study of the Kanets, published in full in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, XXXII (1902), pp. 96-121, works out a view of the Kanets of Lahul diversified from those of Kulu by a Tibetan strain akin to that seen in the Tibetans of Darjeeling, an assumption not self-evident. Monographs on Gaddis (by E. O'Brien) and on Ghirths, published as nos. II and III in 'Punjab Ethnography' (see Kangra Gaz. 1904, pp. 77, 79) seem not to be discoverable in English libraries. Modern researches of this character, although their historical significance may be affected by chronological considerations, provide within their limits an objective basis. They can be adequately estimated, however, only by experts; and ordinary persons can better appreciate less technical observations.

In regard to the cis-Himālayan populations we have in the Gazetteers and other works masses of items which may turn out to have ethnographical significance: and in Hodgson's descriptions of the peoples whom he discusses we commonly find external, anthropophysical as well as cultural, observations which in respect of precision and completeness leave nothing to be desired. One passage, of a different, but relevant, import, we may here mention, although it brings in the Indian notion of caste, which for the present we should prefer to shun. The passage, quoted at length by Cunningham, explains how the Khas, as the present ruling race in Nepal, originated in the quasi-marriage of refugee Brāhmins to native Turanian females. The offspring could not be Brāhmins; but the spirit, or, we may suspect, the matrilineal notions, of the natives refused to regard the children as illegitimate, and they came to be accorded by the Brāhmins the status of Kṣatriya, which the present Khas race now holds. Here we may indeed agree that the Kṣatriya status was conferred by Brāhmin influence; and, bringing in the matrilineal notion, we can find evidence for the acceptance of the legitimacy of the offspring. What we venture to criticize is the statistical notion involved in the expression that the Khas were 'clearly of mixed breed, aboriginal Tartars by the mothers' side, but Aryans by the fathers'. The conception of a 1:1 relation of Brāhmin men to Khas women seems fanciful: so many Brāhmins and such uniformity are otiose: in case one such child should have been so distinguished, it is quite intelligible that all children of leading people should soon have been making the same claim; and the claim of a whole tribe

to such status is likely to have resulted from the military prestige which the tribe enjoyed: it may be said that the social working of the caste system is inspired throughout by rivalry for prestige between classes and races. It seems obvious that the great majority of Khas children resulted from unions of Khas with Khas; and this is, in fact, patent in Hodgson's statement that they 'gradually merged the greater part of their own habits, ideas and language (*but not physiognomy*) in that of the Hindus' (p. 38). The statistical fallacy here involved needed mention because Hodgson's phrase 'by the half blood', which perhaps should be 'the one-thousandth blood', has been copied in various similar connections.

One or two other first-hand observations may here be cited: (a) In regard to the people of the 'Bhot' districts in the north of Garhwāl and Kumaon Trail, the first British Commissioner for the district, states in his elaborate 'Report on Kamaon' that —

'Bhotiyas resemble Tartars (Tibetans) in appearance, language, religion, customs and tradition'.

Cf. p. 47, where they are described as 'perfect Tartars'. These statements, carrying a pointed contrast to the main (Khas) population, can be supplemented by Sherring's descriptions, where it is also mentioned that the Bhotias, superficially somewhat Indo-Āryanized, do not relish the imputation of being Tibetans, which, and from no really ancient date, they indubitably are; (b) Next westwards, and in territory continuous with, and similar to, that of the Bhotias, the people of Kunāwar were described in 1825 by Herbert, who remarked upon the 'contrast between Tartars (Tibetans) and Kanauris in appearance and language'; and in 1841 by A. Gerard, who writes that 'The Tartars (Tibetans) are very different in appearance and manners from the inhabitants of lower Koonawur'; (c) Next west-wards, again, we have for Kulu, Lahul and Spiti, the valuable extracts from Lyall's Settlement Report (1871), published in the Kangra Gazetteer 1897, Parts II-IV, as well as the less concentrated information contained in Harcourt's *Kooloo, Lahoul and Spiti* (1871): from these it is clear that physiognomically the Kulu people have no patently un-Indo-Āryan traits, whereas the Lahulis show a 'Mongolian' factor, and the Spiti population is throughly such, a judgement harmonizing with all other evidence; (d) In the very elaborate Gazetteers for Chamba (1904), for Kangra (1904, and 1924-25), for the Simla Hill States (1910), and proportionally in those for Mandi (1904) and Suket (1904), we always find in sections headed 'Population', exhaustive accounts of the peoples, their numbers, vital statistics and classes, their usages, ceremonies, religions, superstitions, their occupations, implements, food, dress, amusements, etc. Their historical or traditional migrations and internal changes of status are related, and generally there is some discussion of race or class origins. In one of two instances, e.g. in the case of the Gaddis, Pangiwāls and Gujars of Chamba, special

populations receive separate treatment. Evidently there must be in this mass of precise and certified information abundant material for historico-ethnographical research. But, except as concerns Lahul and Spiti, we do not often find somatic features adduced in the occasional suggestions of mixed ethnical origins: in fact the Chamba Gazetteer 1904, p. 58 seems to deny such features generally; but see *infra* (pp. [...]) concerning the Ghirths and the Kulu Dāgīs.

1. Two generalities.

The particulars being through multitude and variety somewhat overwhelming, we may call attention to two generalities, the one linguistic and the other economic, which come into view. The numerous Indo-Āryan dialects, which in their totality cover the whole area, excepting the narrow band of Tibeto-Burman in the north, are not in their several spheres diversified or intermingled through differences of social class. It does not seem that there are, as sometimes in India, caste dialects. The Kolis and other low-castes are not linguistically discriminated. This situation, not inevitable, as is proved by the case of (Tibeto-Burman) Kunāwar, where the low-caste Chamangs and Domangs are Indo-Āryan in speech, might be due to the modest numbers of the total populations; but it may exemplify a special complete-ness of the Indo-Āryanization in the sphere of language.

The economic generality is the fact that the bulk of the populations consists everywhere of agricultural peasants. This fact renders it statistically probable that, in the absence of wholesale replacements such as have taken place in north and south America, in Australia and elsewhere, these are descended from the original races dominant in the respective areas: and hypotheses to this effect have sometimes been mooted in the pages of the Gazetteers. Thus the Chamba Gazetteer 1904 quotes (p. 135 and n. 2) Sir J. B. Lyall's remark that —

'There is an idea current in the hills that of the landholding castes the Thākurs, Rāthīs, Kunets and Girths are either indigenous to the hills or indigenous by the half-blood: and that the Brahmans, Rājput̄s and others are the descendants of invaders and settlers from the plains'.

In regard to Kulu the Kangra Gazetteer of 1897 states (II, pp. 58-9) that —

'The Kanets are the low-caste cultivating class of all the eastern Himalayas of the Punjab and the hills at their base, as far west as Kulu and the eastern part of the Kāngra district, throughout which tract they form a very large proportion of the total population. Beyond this tract, in Kāngra proper, their place is filled by Ghiraths... The Kanets claim to be of impure Rājput̄ origin, but there is little doubt that they are really of aboriginal stock... The Kanets are exclusively agriculturists and shepherds. When asked their caste, they as frequently reply "zamindār" as "Kanet".'

The expression 'low-caste cultivating class' must be taken in a strictly Indian sense, as determined by the Indian caste-system. The communities in question are not only entitled by numerical predominance to be regarded as 'the people', but also are shown by other circumstances to constitute socially a 'middle class'. Firstly, they are always sharply distinguished from the really low classes, whether of village menials, labourers or in some cases tenants, or of minor craftsmen or outcasts. Secondly, they are always in social exchange with the higher ranks, which in certain circumstances can take their daughters in marriage and, when reduced in status, become absorbed in them. The designations of this 'middle class' differ geographically and are partly significant.

The Kanets/Kunets, whose area is very extensive, will occupy us *infra*. The Ghirths, who with the Rāṭhīs constitute the two great cultivating tribes in Kangra proper and the hills below it, where they fill much the same position as do the Kanets in the parts to the east, and who in 1921 numbered there 116759, have a caste name which simply means 'householder', Sanskrit *gṛhastha*, and which in India is widely used in addressing miscellaneous companies. Used as a caste-name, it may itself be an indication that the caste was originally undistinguished from the people as a whole. The Rāṭhīs (in 1921 numbering 51,857), who 'prevail throughout the Pālampur and Hamīrpur Tahsils' in (eastern) Kangra, are in Chamba also 'the great cultivating community' and 'often speak of themselves simply as *zamīndār*': there they numbered in 1904 37,973, being 'essentially one caste' with the Ṭhākurs, numbering further 7,243. Here *Rāṭhī* = Sanskrit *rāṣṭrīya*, of which the certified early signification was 'people of the district or realm', was obviously an ancient general, not caste or class, designation: the Ṭhākurs, who 'on the whole rank a little higher than the Rāṭhīs', though 'in some parts of the hills the two names are regarded as almost synonymous', might appeal to the superiority indicated by the Sanskrit *ṭhakkuta*, 'chief', which as early as the VIth-VIIth century A.D. was held by the founder of a dynasty in Nepal; but it does not imply a racial difference. Here we encounter a matter which receives prominence in practically all the Gazetteer accounts, namely the decline in status of originally upper classes. It is everywhere concluded that the oldest available records attest a period of small states, or baronies, governed by Ṭhākurs and Rānās, the latter term being derived from Sanskrit *rājanya(ka)*, a word of which the original meaning is 'one having ruling function or status (*kṣatṛa*). Presumably, therefore, it was applied to ruling persons who did not quite qualify for the title *rājan*, 'king'. As title of such rulers, the term *Ṭhākur* is still alive in Lahul and, along with *Rānā*, in the Simla Hill States; and both are in various districts reported or remembered down to fairly recent centuries. It seems likely that the title *Ṭhākur* was originally borne by native chieftains; and this falls in with the view stated in the Chamba Gazetteer (p. 61), that 'probably most of them originally

were of the Rāḥī caste', or, since they originated in pre-caste times, were 'natives'. Indo-Āryans will have preferred to be called *Rāṇā*: the distribution of the two titles, of which the Chamba Gazetteer furnishes (pp. 61-2) some instructive particulars, might possibly yield some historical profit.

It is generally held that the régime of Ṭhākurs and Rāṇās gave place to the rule of kings (*rājā*), of which the earliest historical instance belongs to a Chamba ruler Meruvarman, (c.680-700 A.D.), a naming of whose ancestors may point to a commencement in the VIth century. The process of 'overthrow of the barons', whereof even the Tibetan kingdom supplies an example belonging to the end of the VIIth century, A.D., necessarily depresses the prior ruling class in the direction of amalgamation with the middle stratum of the population, leaving only some outstanding exceptions. A further stage is reached when a distinctly foreign dominance supervenes. In the hill states such an occurrence is implied in the term 'Rājput', which in modern centuries is appropriated by all the highest castes other than Brāhman, including the ruling families and those claiming connection with them. It is not doubted that many, or most of these are related, as they are fully convinced, to the Rājput̄s of India; and this suffices to impose a limit of date, since even in India there were no Rājput̄s in the requisite sense, prior to the VIIth century A.D. It is of the Rājput̄s only that any mass immigration into Himālayan countries is plausibly alleged. Previous history attests nothing more than one or two incidental invasions; and the countries, insignificant, from the Indian point of view, in population and power, were left to their internal contentions and, as regards the western states, to the action of Kashmir: the genealogical legends concerning castes and families are of an anecdotic character. Even of Rājput̄s no mass immigration is attested; but some weight can be attached to the chronologically ridiculous narrative of Faristah concerning a 'Rathor king of Kanauj', who about the '20th year of Vikramaditya' overran the hills from Kumaon to Jammu. Such a feat may indeed have been accomplished by a 'Rajput' ruler of Kanauj during the VIIIth-IXth century; and from some such period the Rājās or Rāṇās may have begun to regard themselves, as they have done later, as Rājput̄s. But serious immigration of Rājput̄s is more plausibly regarded as caused by Muhammadan, and specially by Mughal, invasions and domination in India: the clearest instance is that of the Gurkha dynasty in Nepal, which before leading a Khas people to the conquest of that valley had had, it is claimed, a long genealogy as chiefs in Chitor, Rājputānā.

The aim of the above remarks is to introduce the fact that Rājūt caste-rank, though the highest and shared primarily only by the actual ruling families and their connections and by the hereditary Rāṇās, has not everywhere preserved the caste from the depression noted in the case of Rāṇās and Ṭhākurs. Thus the Chamba Gazetteer states (p. 132) that, 'excepting good families, they have for the most part

become merged in the general agricultural community'. The Kangra Gazetteer 1883-4 says (p. 89) concerning the Rāṇās, who rank as Rājput, —

'These petty chiefs have long since been dispossessed, and their holdings absorbed in the larger principalities. Still the name of Rāṇā is retained, and their alliance is eagerly desired by the Miāns'.

and (p. 75) —

'The Rājput clans of the second grade might more properly be called first grade Ṭhakars'

and that of 1924-25 says (p. 166) —

'It is not easy to indicate the line which separates the Rājput from the clans immediately below him, known in the hills by the appellation of Ṭhākur and Rāṭhī'.

Of the Kulu Rājput the Kangra Gazetteer II. (1897) states (p. 59) that —

'The Rājput in most places differ but little in character from the Kanets'.

The Simla Hill States Gazetteer says (Bashahr, p. 13) —

'Most of the ruling families are very old. They call themselves Rājput and have been known as such for many generations. Nothing certain can be said further, except that some families themselves say that they are descendants of Brāhmins. Most of the non-ruling Rājput are cadets of the ruling houses. Their tendency is to fall away from the orthodox customs of their tribe, and after some generations to become *halbāhu*, or ploughing, Rājput, with whom the genuine Rājput will not hold any kind of social intercourse. Eventually they descend still lower, and are merged in the Kanet tribe. There are, however, instances of *halbāhu* Rājput families regaining the status of full Rājput after a generation or two by abandoning their irregular practices and being careful about their marriages'.

In these extracts we see a social structure, general in the Hills, Ghirth (in Kangra), Rāṭhī (in Chamba), Kanet (in Kanet area) - Ṭhākur - Rāṇā - Rājput, in which the last three stages are successively superimposed, and each tends to depress the preceding, and the Ṭhākur is mostly absorbed in the first. The process is perhaps exemplifiable among most peoples. What, for instance, happened to Anglo-Saxon leading families during the period when England was ruled by 'Norman blood'? The speciality of the Indian system is that its genealogical element maintains social differences of esteem and observances in existence long after they have lost other significance. The chief practical accompaniments were restrictions upon intercourse, forms of address, diet, the wearing of the sacred thread (*jāneo*) and so forth, handling the plough, etc., but particularly upon marriage. As regards the last item, the rules, less strict than in India, allowed the taking of brides from the next lower caste, which, however, when it took in the lowest of the respectable castes, Rāṭhīs, Ghirths, Kanets, which were of

Śūdra rank, endangered or qualified status. It can be conceived that the concession of Rājput rank to the Rāṇā families, which in general may have been of pre-Rājput (sc. Kṣatriya) origin, was a fiction convenient on both sides; but it may have resulted in part from the depression of the Rājputs themselves through the further superimposition of Musalman influence, general from Mughal times.

We must not be led into further comments from outside upon the complexities of the caste-system, familiar to Indians in all social action and realized through constant experience by those who have lived among them. Hence we pass over all such matters as (a) existence of respectable castes, of traders, etc., with occupations, status and usages obviously imported from India; (b) low, menial and untouchable castes, which may constitute a separate problem; (c) the innumerable subdivisions, septs, etc., which, as in India also, affect social relations within castes and tribes; (d) the relative looseness, in comparison with India, of caste-restrictions in the hills and the progressive tightening of them observed in the Kangra Gazetteer 1883-4, pp. 74-5 and Chamba 1904, pp. 136, 137 n. 3; (e) the, perhaps rare, modification of caste status by ruling authority (Ibbetson, § 338, and Hutchison & Vogel, *op.cit.*, I, p. 66); and (f) the promotion, perhaps with an Indian tempo of 'generations', of individual families through 'general acceptance' (*ibid.*).

What has here been suggested is that the superimpositions have been throughout upon a statistically broad and solid basis, consisting of what may be called 'the respectable Śūdra population'. The term *Śūdra* is not adverse, since its practical import was 'peasant cultivator', for which ancient India had no other applicable term: and in Dravidian India it was bestowed upon the whole similar, non-Brāhman, population. An economic foundation for a statistically predominant and stable population existed in the limitation of area of cultivable land in a territory of steep mountain valleys, a factor explicitly recognized by the people as foundation of some of their usages.

2. Ethnographically significant usages.

Concerning the so defined castes as being, despite admixtures very unstatistically reckoned in the expression 'by the half blood', descendants of the early peoples, void naturally of Indian caste, we might expect to find in their distinctive usages some ethnographically significant items. One such may be seen in the quasi legitimacy of marriages of highcaste persons, even Brāhmins, to lower classes as far down as Ghirths in Kangra, and Rāṭhīs in Chamba, and as Kanets in the Simla Hill States, the offspring being legitimate as Ghirth, Rāṭhī or Kanet. This accords with what was propounded by Hodgson (*supra*, p. [...]) concerning the Nepal Khas, and with its interpretation as implying matrilineal descent. The same conception may be seen in the *chūndavand* system of inheritance, prevalent

'universally among all tribes in Kāngra Proper', and general elsewhere, according to which —

'In case of inheritance by sons of more than one wife ... the first division of the inheritance is made upon mothers, and not upon heads of sons'.

Still more pointed is the evidence of the custom, 'common in all these regions', called *chauhhandu* —

'If a widow continues to reside in her late husband's house, and she bears a son at any time while residing there, the son is considered the (a.?) legitimate heir to her late husband, no matter how long a time has elapsed since the death of the latter. No inquiry is made as to who the child's real father is, and the widow suffers no diminution in reputation'

For Kāngra Kanets the same is stated, with the addition that —

'This is the real custom also of the Girths and other similar castes in Kāngra, though they do not admit the fact so bluntly'.

As regards remarriage of widows, avoided by all strict Hindu castes, it is in Chamba 'customary in all castes in the state, except the Brāhmins and Rājput̄s of the capital and Bhaṭṭiyat Wizārat'; in Kāngra 'among Ghirths, Rāṭhīs and Ṭhākurs and the other lower castes'; in the Simla Hill States (Bashahr, p. 12), 'it is recognized among all Kanets and usually permitted by Brāhmins and Rājput̄s in the upper hills'. It is, indeed, highly general.

Purchase of brides is similarly widespread and usual, in Kāngra (1883-4, p. 63, 1904, p. 77), Chamba (p. 126), Sirmur (1934, p. 58), Mandi Gazetteer, 1904, p. 22, and among Kanets universally (see Tūkā Rām Joshī, *op.cit.* pp. 535-6). The same is the case among the Kumaon and Garhwāl Khasiyas (Almora Gaz., p. 106, Garhwāl, p. 67).

The prevalence of such un-Indian usages in Chamba and Kāngra, the two most westerly of the large hill states, both distinguished for the antiquity and steadfastness of Indo-Āryan rule, and within the range of Kashmir influence, is somewhat surprizing: as regards Kāngra perhaps especially so, since a high authority thought that —

'the people of Kāngra Proper, as distinct from Kulu, approach both in race and language nearer to the western or Dogra than to the eastern or Pahārī group' and, in fact, the Linguistic Survey classes the Kāngra and Dogra languages with 'Standard Panjābī'. When we proceed eastward to the Kanet/Kunet area, the ethnographic indications can be seen to be massive.

3. Kanets: status and usages (general).

The significant particulars adduced in regard to the large classes of agricultural peasants in non-Kanet areas have in one or two instances included references to

Kanets also. Mostly they can be recognized with additional emphasis in relation to the Kanets: as regards —

(a) statistical importance and area:

Cunningham, who had made a practice of recording statistics of local populations visited by him in the course of his travels in the northern hills and in the native states to the south, opens his account of the 'Kunindas, or Kunets' (*Archaeological Survey of India, Report*, Vol. XIV, 1882, pp. 125 sqq.) with figures showing the Kunets of the Cis-Sutlej Hill States to constitute 57 per cent of the total population. Taking account of the trans-Sutlej states and of Mandi, Suklet and Kohlur, he endorses the verdict of the Gazetteer that 'the *Kunets* are practically by far the most important element in the rural population of the whole of the Simla states': he proceeds to add that they are not confined to the hills, but are numerous in the Dun valleys, as well as along the foot of the hills. On a later page (p. 130) he cites Census percentages also for Kulu (58.5), Lahul (76.5) and Spiti (95.1).

There are, however, two matters, of a negative bearing, which may here be noted. In the first place, the citation of Spiti, with its high percentage (95.1) of Kunets, must surely be due to some misunderstanding. The population of Spiti, markedly different from that of its neighbour Lahul (see Gazetteer, p. [...]), is decidedly Mongolian, sc. Tibetan, in physique, temperament and speech, and has long been so: one can only conclude that in this instance 'Kunet' has been used simply in place of 'agriculturist'. The second point relates to the Kāngra and Chamba States: in Kāngra the Kunets seem to belong only to Bangāhal, 'to the east of Kāngra proper', which adjoins Kulu; in Chamba it seems doubtful whether they exist at all. We have therefore to reckon with the possibility that the Beas river, which was the western limit of the Kulindrine/Kuninda kingdom, is approximately now the western limit of the Kunets. Some other circumstances support this view (see *infra*).

From the present distribution of Kunets Cunningham infers (p. 127) that —

'In the southern hills of Garhwāl and Sarnor they (the Kuninda or Kunet) were early displaced by Brāhmans and Rājput̄s from the plains; but in the inner recesses of the hills, in the valley of the Pabar, and along the southern bank of the Sutlej, they maintained their independence down to a comparatively late date'.

He gives instances of such independence existing as recently as '300 years ago' and even 'until five or six generations back' (p. 129) and records elsewhere [...] that in c. 560 A.D. a 'Kuninda king' was mentioned by Varāhamihira in his Sanskrit.

After referring to a tradition of Kunets, and monuments attributed to '*Maowis* or *Monas*', in Garhwāl also, Cunningham admits a possibility that these were Khaṣas and not Kunets: then continuing, he writes —

'But in the upper valley of the Pabar the *Chuhān* tribe of Kunets continued to

rule over *Chuhāra* until some 10 or 12 generations back, or about 300 years ago, when the last Rājā was treacherously murdered by three Rājput brothers ... The district of Rowahin then comprised parts of the valleys of the Pabar, the Rupin, and the Tons, and was ruled over by several petty chiefs of the Rao or Rowāt tribe of Kunets, who took the title of Rowālu ... The upper portion of the Pabar valley, comprising Silades or Rock district, is said to have still retained its independence until five or six generations back, when it was seized by the Rājā of Bisahar'.

The three river valleys, Pabar, Rupin and Tons, extend into the heights of the Dhavaladhār Range, somewhat to the west of its branching from the Great Himālaya; north of the Dhavaladhār the valley of the Baspa river, which belongs to 'Bisahar', extends far up in the angle between the two ranges, where its beginnings are not remote or inaccessible from the sources of the three. That the Bashahr State should be said to have interposed in this high remote region, contiguous with the extreme south-eastern corner of its territory, is historically interesting.

The continuous area of largely or predominantly 'Kunet' population embraces therefore practically all the Himālayan territories east of Kāngra and Chamba and west of Garhwāl, including the entire valley of the Beas as far down as the point where it enters Kāngra, also the valley of the Sutlej with its tributaries; and further east approximates to the main feeders of the Jumna, which in fact it may at an earlier period have overpassed. Nor can Cunningham's limitation of his original Kunets (with his Khasiyas and Khasas) to 'the lower slopes of the Himalaya' any longer be upheld. He can hardly himself have included Kulu, not to mention Lahul and Spiti, in such a definition. With the present knowledge of the main central area, and especially of the large Bashahr State, whereof the whole northern district, with a population of which it has been said 'We are all Kanits', reaches the actual passes over the Great Himālaya, it can be said that there is, or has been, a compact Kanet area, extending from the Beas to the Jumna and from below Simla to the trans-Himālayan border.

The latest Census statistics (1931) do not maintain Hodgson's high figure (57 per cent) for the proportion of the Kanets in the total population of their area. Probably the large general increase in numbers, and especially the new occupations and classes created by modern Europeanization, have transformed the statistical and economic situation. The 1931 figures for Kanets may be set out as follows: —

Kāngra (i.e. mainly the administrated districts of Kulu, Lahul and Spiti, there being in Kāngra Proper, as stated *supra* (p. [...]), practically no Kanets)

Kanets 72,704 (rural population of whole area 794,053)

(Mandi K. 77,416 (rural pop. 193,904)

(Sunket K. 24,189 (rural pop. 56,007)

(Belaspur K.	22,797 (rural pop. 98,607)
(Sirmur K.	41,925 (rural pop. 140,760)
(Simla Hill States	56,995 (rural pop. 330,850)

(b) *Occupation*: Everywhere the Kanets are occupied, as landholding peasants, in agriculture. This having been attested, in general, by citations, only a few additional items need be adduced —

1. *Kulu*: 'The Kanets hold nearly 60 per cent of the total cultivated area'... 'The Kanets are exclusively agriculturists and shepherds' ... ['The Rājput̄s in most places differ but little in character from the Kanets']
 2. *Lahul*: 'The population is mainly composed of co-called Kanets, but they are different in appearance from the Kanets of Kulu, their features being of the Mongolian type ... Throughout Lahul the people are careful and laborious cultivators. Much of the field work is done by the women ... Many of those who live in Patan are, no doubt, descendants of Kanet settlers from Kulu and Bangāhal; the rest and the inhabitants of Gāra and Rangloi are pure Botias or nearly so ... [The *Thākurs* are the gentry and quondam rulers of the valley. They are more or less pure Botias or Mongolians by blood, but have begun ... to assert a Rājput̄ origin]
- Mandi: 'The Rahu and Khas are two important tribes of the hill Kanets ... They are exclusively agriculturists and are industrious cultivators' [The Rājput̄s are of a First and a Second order, the Second consisting of *Halbai*, or cultivating, tribes, or *als*, and supposed to be inferior]
- Suket: 'The Kanets form the mass of the agricultural community; they perform all kinds of agricultural work with their own hands, and are assisted by their women, who observe no purdah'. ['The Rājput̄s are represented by comparatively few families ... The three higher families and some of the Pahrār will not put their hands to the plough, but the remainder do ...']
- Sirmur: 'Kanets are generally agriculturists and owners of land ... Some Kanet families, by performing the duties of priests, have acquired the sect name of *Dewa* or *Negi*'. ['The Rājput̄s are numerically few ... Rājput̄ families are of two classes - ruling and non-ruling ... Some of them have sunk to Kanet status'].
- Bilaspur: 'The Kanet tribe preponderates and holds 45 per cent of the cultivated land'. ['Fully three quarters of the population are dependent on agriculture. Kanets are the most successful: Rājput̄s and Brāhmins are less painstaking']
- Simla Hill States*:
- Bashahr: 'The principal agricultural classes are Rājput̄s, Kanets, Brahmins and

Kolis. The Kanets preponderate largely ... They have plenty of cattle and many of them make a fair income from trade, to which agriculture is a secondary occupation' ['Rājṣūts are usually agriculturists, and some are employed in the service of the state']

Nalagarh: 'Kanets are spread all over the state ... Most of the Kanets are agriculturists. Some earn their living by selling grain, grass, or wood, or by taking service' ['The majority of the Rājṣūts are connections of the ruling families. They cultivate their lands, and sometimes take service or engage in trade']

Keonthal: 'Kanets predominate as an agricultural class, and hold 61 per cent. of the whole cultivated area'.

Baghat: 'The principal tribes are Brāhmanas, Rājṣūts and Kanets ... A considerable proportion of the Kanet population belongs to the Khash section. The Khash Kanets of Baghat are said to have come from Bashahr' ['Rājṣūts are all offshoots of the Royal family. Most of them are *jāgirdārs*']

Jubbal: 'Kanets form the majority of the population, they are divided into various classes and are all agriculturists'. ['The Rājṣūts, as elsewhere in the hills, fall into an upper and a lower class ... The latter work in their fields and, broadly speaking, differ little from the better classes of Kanets in their mode of life ... It is said that after two or three generations most higher class Rājṣūts deteriorate to second class']

Kumharsain: 'The majority of the inhabitants of the State are Kanets, fully two-thirds of the population belonging to this tribe ... Forty-five per cent. of the cultivated area is held by Kanets'. ['Rājṣūts are generally relations of the Rāṇā, holding *jāgirs*. Some families, originally Rājṣūts, are now-a-days counted as Kanet'].

(c) *Caste and Status*: According to the caste system the Kanets are Śūdras and are not entitled to wear the Brāhmanical thread; but effectively they rank third in the social order, if an inconsiderable number of special groups, India-derived and with India-derived caste-claims, e.g. traders, gold-workers, barbers, etc., are left out of account. The order is Brāhman, Rājṣūts, Kanet, below whom, with a definite line of partition, come various classes of craftsmen, labourers, village servants, menials and outcasts. The Kāngra Gazetteer recognizes two grades of Brāhmanas, Rājṣūts and Śūdras; and among these, and also among the lower classes, there are subdivisions based upon particular differences of usage, caste-scruples, sept, locality. Among the Kanets the subdivisions according to sept and locality are specially numerous, and there is at least one broad division which requires consideration.

In comparison with the plains of India the hill countries have been found

characterized by a relative laxity of caste-usage. From Lyall's Settlement Report on Kāngra the Gazetteer of 1883-4 has (pp. 74-6) a long quotation from which the following may be extracted —

'Till lately, the limits of caste do not seem to have been so immutably fixed ... On the border line in the Himālayas, between Thibet and India proper, anyone can observe caste growing before his eyes; the noble is changing into a Rājput, the priest into a Brāhman, the peasant into a Jat, and so on down to the bottom of the scale. The same process was, I believe, more or less in force down to a period not very remote from to-day'.

Of the original laxity two important particulars have been mentioned in connection with the Chamba-Kāngra area viz. —

(a) frequency and quasi-legitimacy of marriage of women of the great landholding peasant class, in Chamba Rāthīs, in Kāngra Ghirths, to men of the theoretically higher castes, Rājputs (and even Brāhmins), Rānās, Thākurs, and recognition of the offspring as having at least their mothers' caste status, when not actually promoted.

With castes inferior to the Rāthīs and Ghirths such marriage is totally inadmissible.

(b) remarriage of widows, disfavoured only by limited groups affecting a special strictness: and peculiarities of usage in regard to a widow's retention of domicile and bearing heirs to her late husband's family.

From the Kanet area also these items have been incidentally exemplified. A few quotations may here be added, partly in order to exhibit the general status of the Kanets in their area.

Kulu: (Here there are certain deviations)

'The children of a Brāhman and Rājput by a Kanet wife are called Brāhmins and Rājputs; the term Rāthī is often added as a qualification by anyone pretending himself to unmixed blood. In the absence of other children they are their fathers' full heirs ... Among the Kanets and the lower castes the custom hitherto has been that every son kept and treated as a wife was legitimate ... A widow cannot be deprived of her life tenure of her husband's estate for want of chastity so long as she does not go away to live in another man's house'

Lahul: 'There is as much licence in Lahul as in Kulu with regard to intermarriage. The Thākurs take Kanet women as *srījat*, not as *lahri*; and though the sons of such women are not at first considered as Thākurs, yet in a few generations they become equal ... Brāhmins also have Kanet women in their houses, and the sons of such women succeed as if legitimate. Their

fathers will not eat from their hands, but they will smoke with them, ... where the father is not known, or where there is any doubt, illegitimate children follow the caste of their mothers ... No Kanets wear the *jāneo* in Lahul'.

Spiti: In Spiti the population, thoroughly Tibetan, is caste-less. As to widows we read —

'In case the brother-in-law of a widow does not come out of the monastery to take his deceased brother's place, or in case there are no brothers-in-law, the widow can marry again, and does not forfeit her interest in the estate by so doing so long as she continues to reside on it: on the contrary, in default of issue by the first husband, the children by the second will succeed to the estate'

Simla Hill States:

Bilāspur: 'The Rāṭhīs of Bilāspur are believed to be descendants of degenerate Rājput̄s and Kanet mothers' ... 'There are said to be about eighty subdivisions of Kanets in this state ... some of them claim to be illegitimate descendants of various Rājās ... 'The [Brāhman] Dharebars are the priests of the Kanets, and practice all their peculiar customs, such as *rit*, widow remarriage, etc. ... In fact, their wearing of the *jāneo* is practically the only thing which distinguishes them from the Kanets'.

Bashahr: In the case of this state, far the largest, it is important to note that the whole northern area, 'the upper hills', sc. the Kunāwar district, has a population very predominantly Kanet. The Gazetteer inserts a rather full discussion of origins, with particulars of the main general divisions into Khash, Rao, etc., Kanets, a matter to which we shall recur, and of rival assumptions of superiority.

'In the upper hills it is common for Brāhman̄s, Rājput̄s, Bāniās and other trading-classes to marry Kanet girls. Such marriages are in a sense regular, but the children of the union are considered of inferior caste to their fathers and are designated *sarteras*. It is not, however, uncommon for descendants of a *sartera* to regain the status of his father after three or four generations'.

'*Karewa* or widow remarriage is recognized by all Kanets, and usually permitted by inferior Brāhman̄s and Rājput̄s in the upper hills'.

'The Kanets of Kanāwar being Śūdras, the sacred thread cannot be worn by them'.

'The true Kanāwar Kanets have the reputation of being superior in energy,

honesty, and general capacity to those of other parts of the Bashahr State. In former days they held all the positions of trust in the administration, and at the present moment most of the Rājā's personal *entourage*, and the majority of the subordinate State officials are Kanāwarīs'.

Nalagarh: 'Most of the subordinate offices of the state are filled by Kanets'.

Kumharsain: A story purports to explain why the Kanets do not wear the sacred thread.

The above deviations from Indian caste usage may, in so far as they are shared by the populations of Kāngra and Chamba, be regarded as ethnographically not significant, except as evidence of partly matrilineal institutions once general among all the pre-Āryan peoples of the whole area. In the Gazetteers it is here and there suggested that the deviations may be in fact usages once shared by India itself, but there since overpassed and obsolete; but, if no period is named, this seems hardly substantial, and, given a period, how reconcile the facts with the mass of otherwise available information concerning ancient India?

4. Kanets: distinctive usages.

There are, however, two usages which indubitably have special ethnographical significance. The first of them is indicated in the Chamba Gazetteer statement (1904, p. 158) that in the Pāngi district —

'Women are allowed every freedom before marriage'. Such practice is unsuitable for statistical or Gazetteer observation; but it is already noticeable that from Chamba it is reported only in Pāngi, a district in the extreme north belonging to the Chenab valley and adjoining Zanskar, and again from Churah —

'women are allowed every license before marriage'

Churah also being a northern district adjoining Pāngi on its own east. Both these districts being distinguished also by absence of restrictions upon intermarriage between the high castes, it seems possible that the particular usage, which manifestly was not followed among the Gaddis, was exceptional in Chamba as a whole. In Kāngra it does not appear to be mentioned; and obviously it would not prevail in any area of infant marriage, or very juvenile marriage, as in India.

When we come to Kulu, where pre-puberty marriage is rare, the Gazetteer itself goes so far as to state (p. 38) that there —

'Chastity, in short, if regarded as a virtue at all, is by no means considered a duty'.

But, turning now to less official pronouncements, we can refer to Harcourt, *op.cit.*, pp. 235-6, and the remark that —

'With the Kooloo woman chastity has never been a strong point'.

As regards the Lahulis the Gazetteer quotes the judgment of Mr. Heyde, of the Moravian Mission, that 'the standard of sobriety and chastity among them' was 'exceptionally low'. As no more is said, and as in regard to Spiti also the license in question is not remarked, it may be that in those two areas, as in Tibet, the prevalent Buddhist religion has interposed.

Concerning the Simla Hill States the Gazetteer is not here informative. But as regards Kunāwar J. D. Cunningham remarks that —

'Chastity is not held in high esteem; that is, the loss of it is not considered a great disgrace in the eyes of the common people'.

The most informative statement is contained in Sherring's account (*op.cit.*, pp. 104 sqq.) of the (Kumaon) Bhotia *Rambang*, which we have already cited in connection with the Madra 'Utsavasāṅketas'. The Bhotias being Hinduized Tibetans, immigrants of no ancient date, it is likely that they have derived the usage from a prior population, which will have been akin to the Kunāwarīs.

The usage described is totally un-Indian, and, as we have seen, it had been at a very early date a subject of Indian denunciation. Communal drunkenness, simultaneously denounced, is likewise a mark of the Kanet area.

The second usage or rather institution, which is that of 'fraternal polyandry', is of far greater ethnographical importance. In Risley's *The people of India* (pp. 198 sqq), a distinction is made between 'matriarchal polyandry' and 'fraternal polyandry': the former, which does not require kinship among the plural husbands, necessarily involves matrilineal descent and inheritance, since the paternity of any offspring is indeterminate. Of this character was the Nayar marriage of Malabar in southern India; and probably the usage of the ancient Madras of the Panjab was similar, since there a person's heirs were not his sons, but his sister's sons (*supra*, p. 20). 'Fraternal polyandry', prevalent in Tibet, is unknown in India outside the Himālayan districts: the bride is taken into the family as wife of a group of brothers, so that the offspring belongs at any rate to the family and can fit into a patrilineal system of descent and inheritance. It may be conjectured that there has been a historically intermediate system, viz. that of the 'Tanguts' of the Koko-nor region of north-eastern Tibet, among whom the bridegroom is taken into the bride's family and thenceforth belongs thereto.

As prevalent in the Kanet area, fraternal polyandry is reported by practically all observers. J. B. Fraser's *Tour of ... the Himala mountains* (1820) notes it, with abhorrence, in Sirmore (Sirmur, p. 206) and Buschur (Bashahr, p. 360); A. Gerard remarks (*Account of Koonawur* p. 3) that 'polyandry, or a plurality of husbands, prevails'; J. D. Cunningham writes (*op.cit.*, pp. 178-9) —

'The Kunawarees are all Polyandrists, i.e., one house or family has usually but

one wife and she is considered as more particularly the wife of the eldest brother'.

Tikā Rām Joshī writes (*Ethnography of the Bashahr State*, p. 535) —

'Marriage customs resemble those of the Tibetans. Brothers marry a joint wife'.

When we turn to the Gazetteers, we find also help in determining the geographical area of this usage: thus it is attested in regard to —

(a) Mandi (east from Kangra) —

'Polygamy is common and polyandry also not unknown'

(b) Kulu, with Sirāj —

'Polyandry is common throughout Sarāj, and in parts of Wazīrī Rūpī, and is the rule among the inhabitants of the isolated Malāna glen in the Kulu tahsil'

(c) Lahul —

'Polyandry or the taking to wife of one woman by several brothers is a recognized institution and is very general'

(d) Chamba - Lahul (a far north district of Chamba, adjacent, and linguistically related, to Lahul) —

'A modified form of polyandry is prevalent in Chamba - Lahul. At the time of the marriage the younger brother of the bridegroom ... establishes his right as a second husband'.

(e) Sitmur —

'Polyandry is practised commonly in the trans-Giri tract and also partly in the adjoining Cis-Giri tract of the Rainka, Pachhad and Paonka tasils. One wife is jointly married to two or more brothers ... Being son of more fathers than one is the boast of trans-Giri man'.

(f) Simla Hill States (Bashahr) —

'Polyandry prevails in the greater part of Kanāwar and in some places in Rohru tahsil. There are two forms: (1) the higher, where the joint husbands are brothers, and (2) the lower, where they are not brothers. As a rule the former alone is found in Bashahr, but there are instances of the second ... But generally speaking, the practice is for the joint wife to be shared by uterine brothers up to the number of six'.

Then follow statistics showing the great frequency of polyandry among Kanets, and some frequency among Brāhmins and Kolis: and it is said (p. 17) that the practice is followed also in many places where it is not openly recognized.

The practically complete geographical coincidence of Kanet population and fraternal polyandry is not infringed by the instance of Spiti, concerning which it is stated that —

'polyandry is not practised, except among the *dūtālpās* and among the *buzhans*,

the descendants of the monks of the Pin monastery ... and these have adopted the custom admittedly for prudential reasons'.

For the Spiti people are, in fact, not Kanet at all, but thoroughly Tibetan in physiognomy and culture and language, as accords with their geographical situation and history. On the negative side the evidence of Kāngra and Chamba further demonstrates the coincidence. In Kāngra, where there are no Kanets except 'on the eastern border' (sc. adjacent to Mandi), we read that —

'A certain number in Kulu, but practically none in Kāngra proper, practise polyandry'.

Similarly in Chamba, where again there are no Kanets —

'Polyandry, occasionally common in hill tracts, is believed to be almost non-existent in Chamba'.

The fact that polyandry is sometimes unavowed and sometimes excused, as also occurs in Tibet (see Risley, *op.cit.*, p. [...]), may be a tribute to Hindu criticism. The usual justification is, as also elsewhere (see Risley, p. 203), economic or sumptuary, limitation of land or families; but popular explanations of immemorial usages are out of court: and in the present case the divergence on the part of Kāngra and Chamba, where there would be the like excuses, proves that the matter is ethnographical. History also is here concerned: not remote from, perhaps even adjoining, the 'Kanet' area was the ancient Indian state of Pañcāla, which in the case of the princess Draupadi gave a joint wife to the five Pāṇḍava brothers: in the Epic the totally un-Āryan transaction is provided (I. vv. 7131 sqq) with an anecdotal excuse; and it is afterwards (vv. 7238 sqq.) elaborately discussed in the two families and finally concluded with the approval of the sage Vyāsa. It cannot indeed be affirmed that the initiative is ascribed to the Pañcāla family, which, in fact, is represented as at first averse: but that it corresponded to a non-Āryan factor in that people is rendered probable by a second usage ascribed to it, viz. acceptance of payment for brides; in later times the country was celebrated in connection with the *Kāma-sāstra*. Hence it seems likely that in the Kanet area the usage of fraternal polyandry, which cannot have been introduced later, existed in Epic times. As now distinctively a Kanet usage it is recognized in the proverb —

'A Kanet has one mother and eighteen fathers.'

As fully accordant with the above evidence we may add, from the Census Report of 1911 (p. [...]), the following: —

'Polyandry, or the custom of a woman having more than one husband at one time, is peculiar to the Himālayas. It exists in the Kulu sub-division, the Bashahr state (Simla Hill States), and to a smaller extent in the Nahan, Mandi and Suket states ... Polyandry is confined to the upper Himālayas - i.e. Spiti, Lahul and Sirāj in Kulu; Chamba-Lahul in Chamba, Sirāj in Mandi, Rāmpur,

Chīnī (including Kanāwar) and the upper minor states in Bashahar (State) and the trans-Giri part of the Nahan [Simmur] State'

The annexed observation that 'Similar customs are also prevalent among the Brāhmins and Rājput̄s in Kumaon' is not confirmed by the Gazetteers.

5. Three main areas of Western cis-Himālaya populations.

The above characteristics, partly common and partly discriminative, seem to mark three main areas of Western Himālaya populations, namely (a) Kāngra, excluding the administratively annexed districts of Kulu, Lahul and Spiti, (b) Chamba, excluding Chamba-Lahul and possibly Pāngi, and (c) the Kanet country. The chief common feature is the statistical predominance of a class of land-owning peasants, who in the Indian caste system rank as Śūdras, but are sharply distinguished from despised ranks of quasi-serfs, menials and craftsmen both by their own rules regarding marriage and intercourse and by the fact that young women of the class can be taken as legitimate or quasi-legitimate wives of members of the higher orders. Usually their occupation and mode of life and economic condition are shared by smaller groups whose designations or in some points variant usages claim a higher caste rank: such designations, e.g. *Thākur*, *Rānā*, *Rājput̄*, are commonly indicative of ancient ruling authority.

The inference which on grounds statistical and economical has been drawn in accordance with 'an idea current in the hills', viz. that the masses of agricultural peasants are in the main the heirs of pre-Indo-Āryan and pre-caste populations and of their culture, is not confirmed by any ethnical or tribal signification in the terms *Rāṭhī* and *Girih/Ghirih*: as we have seen, *Rāṭhī*, derived from Sanskrit *rāṣṭrya* or *rāṣṭrika*, means probably nothing more than 'native of a *rāṣṭra* (kingdom or district)', and *Ghirih*, Sanskrit *ghastha*, clearly means 'householder'; these were accordingly from the Indo-Āryan side. In the Kāngra area at least one ancient tribal designation, viz. *Udumbara*, is known: as concerns *Traigarta* the same confidence cannot be affirmed, since according to the common interpretation *Trigarta* means 'three-river-valley-land', and in any case *Traigarta* could be merely dynastic. Chamba, as we have seen, was apparently not known to ancient India; and even at present an ethnical name does not appear, provincial designations, *Churāhī*, etc., being usual. As the country was not unified before the VIth century A.D., there may have been a plurality of ethnical or tribal names. In Kāngra and Chamba there are indeed two tribal names, those of the Gaddīs and Gujars; but neither of these has any claim to ancient occupation in Chamba or Kāngra.

The Kanet area presents some patent differences from the situation in Kāngra and Chamba, of which differences the most obvious is territorial. The Kanet population, with uniform status and numerical strength as described, is distributed

over not only the 19 'Simla Hill States', of which many, or most, have had a separate existence at least from Mughal times, but also Sirmur, Mandi and Suket, Bilāspur, Kulu, Lahul, Chamba-Lahul, and (nominally at least) Spiti. This area, which comprizes all the Himālayan districts from the Beas to the Jumna, coincides remarkably with that delimited by prevalence, or at least occurrence, of the usage of polyandry, mostly fraternal, and of post-puberty marriage, together with the associated pre-matrimonial licence.

It seems likely that in respect of religion also the Kanet area should be discriminated. The abundant and valuable information which the several Gazetteers afford on this topic seems to show that in all the Himālayan territories the worship of Hindu divinities is largely modified or replaced by cults and practices directed to quite minor local powers, village and house deities, deities presiding over streams, mountains etc., deified persons, etc.; and the ceremonies are often unorthodox, and the ministrants non-Brahman: in the Kanet area this is so prevalent that the Hindu notions are practically ignored; for the Bashahr State alone the Simla Gazetteer 1904 gives (pp. 37-8) the names of 68 gods, largely unknown to India and confined to limited territories, a few villages, or a single village. The shrines and the practices, which often include sacrifice of goats, are peculiar. It is thought that, though many of the particular cults may be quite modern or recent, the general situation is in continuance of pre-Indo-Āryan conditions. This matter, being one of great complexity and partly one of degree, may here be passed over as ethnographically not sufficiently pointed; for a similar reason we may pass over the widespread traces of ancient matrilineal notions in regard to descent and inheritance. A linguistic consideration which may prove in itself decisive may be held in reserve.

6. Origins (traditional or hypothetic) of Ghirths, Rāṭhīs and Kanets.

The here expounded view, according to which the large classes of land-holding peasants, Ghirths, Rāṭhīs and Kanets, are in the main descendants of the pre-Indo-Āryan, pre-caste, populations of the respective territories, is, as we have seen, not uncountenanced by able administrators. But, since in the Gazetteers other, or at any rate more complex, conceptions are worked out, and since among the peoples themselves there are certain claims or traditions in regard to status, some further observations seem to be requisite.

The Ghirths, who are, as the Census report of 1921 demonstrates, practically confined to Kāngra, are there also predominant in certain areas, especially in Pargana Kāngra, where they constitute 74 per cent of the land-holders. There is a saying that there are 360 varieties of race and the same number of subdivisions of Ghirths. In caste status they rank as 'second class Śūdras'; but there is no evidence of rivalry with the Rāṭhīs, who in Kangra number 52,027 and are 'first-class Śūdras'.

The main distinction is locality: 'in all level and irrigated tracts, wherever the soil is fertile and produce exuberant, the Ghirths abound; while in the poorer uplands, where the crops are scanty and the soil demands severe labour to compensate the husbandman, the Rāṭhīs predominate. It is as rare to find a Rāṭhī in the valleys as to meet a Ghirth in the more secluded hills'. The Ghirths have also a distinct physiognomy —

'The men are short in stature ... dark and sickly in complexion, with little or no hair on their faces. Both men and women have coarse features, more resembling the Tartar than any other type, and it is rare to see a handsome face, though sometimes the younger women may be called pretty'.

On ground of numbers, location, and physiognomy it may reasonably be concluded that the Ghirths represent the old established population of Kāngra Proper, while the Rāṭhīs, whose main mass belongs to Chamba, are outsiders belonging to localities at some period connected with that state or otherwise immigrant. The name Ghirth, which signifies, as we have seen, simply 'house-holder', may date from the early Indo-Āryanization of Trigarta, when there was as yet no competitive tribe in the country. The adjacency to India may have precluded a period of Ṭhākurs, 'native chiefs', who, in fact, do not seem to be mentioned: and the famous stability of the state may have given it a superior resistance to the (late) Rājput domination. Opposition to the Rājput is still attested —

'At present a fierce struggle is going on between the Ghirths and the Rājput. The former have risen up in revolt against the social restrictions imposed by the latter and accepted by the former in the past'.

The Ghirths do not seem to claim Indian origin, though many of them have begun to assume the sacred thread, the Brāhmins refusing to perform the ceremony.

In Chamba the Rāṭhīs, who there, in a total population (1931) of 146,870, number 66,030, have their main concentration and seem entitled to be regarded as 'the people': and this is confirmed by the designation *Rāṭhī*, which, as has been noted *supra*, signifies simply 'native'. The term is, we are informed, shunned by the people themselves as somewhat contemptuous, as has happened in modern political history to its English equivalent: they prefer to be regarded as of *Ṭhākur* descent and class, which is highly natural if *Ṭhākur* properly signifies, as we have suggested 'native chief'. In any case the two terms are Indian and early, probably imposed by Brāhmins. In the Census figures the distinction between Ṭhākurs and Rāṭhīs seems to be ignored, which accords with the rather elaborate discussion in the Chamba Gazetteer 1904: the Gazetteer, which states the then numbers as Rāṭhīs 37,973, Thākurs 7,243, is concerned to account for the unexpectedly large total of the latter by accessions from the Rājput, through intermarriages and other connections, and by assumptions of the slightly superior, but sometimes practically synonymous,

designation, *Ṭhākūr*. Except in one point, the view taken in the Chamba Gazetteer does not differ materially from that set forth above. Starting with Sir J. B. Lyall's observation that —

'There is an idea current in the hills that of the land-holding castes the Ṭhākurs, Rāṭhīs, Kunets and Girths are either indigenous to the hills or indigenous by the halfblood: and that the Brāhmans, Rājput̄s and others are the descendants of invaders and settlers from the plains'...

This popular idea probably indicates the true origin of the Ṭhākurs and Rāṭhīs: it proceeds to work out a not entirely perspicuous complex of amalgamations and fusions from which we may extract as follows —

'There can be little doubt that as a hill tribe they are older than the Brāhmans and Rājput̄s who came from the plains at a later period; and we may safely conclude that the oldest strata among them are descended, either directly or by the half-blood, from the early Āryan colonists in the hills. The first Āryan immigrants intermarried freely with the aborigines, resulting in a fusion of the two races from which may have originated the various low-caste tribes now forming such an important part of the population. But the completeness of the fusion was not at all times uniform, and later waves of immigration may have remained more or less isolated, forming the nucleus of the Āryan community which now comprises the Ṭhākurs and Rāṭhīs'.

'But while this was probably the origin of the tribes it is certain that the general opinion regarding them is also well founded. That they have received large accessions from the other castes, by defections from the Brāhmans and Rājput̄s and by amalgamation of these castes with the Śūdras, is hardly open to doubt. This is the general belief among themselves and their family traditions all tend to confirm it. We may therefore regard the Ṭhākurs and Rāṭhīs as being now a conglomerate people, representing the product of the welding together of many different contributions to their ranks'.

Here for the early natives and their chiefs are substituted certain fictitious aborigines, apparently without chiefs, from whom through union with equally fictitious Āryan colonists are descended in the main the large classes known as Ṭhākurs and Rāṭhīs. There have been subsequent amalgamations with supervenient higher classes and also with low-classes, presumably aborigines, who in the Indian caste-system may have come to be regarded as Śūdras. Provision is also made for casual promotions in status and assumptions of superior status or of the Brāhmanical thread.

Allowance must indeed be made for amalgamations, assumptions and social fictions, and all the more because the process has covered a far longer period than is contemplated in the Gazetteer. Though there is no evidence for early Āryan 'colonies', the Brāhman settlements will have begun in late Epic times, and real

Rājput̄s cannot have appeared before the VIIth century A.D. The *Rānās*, if they were, as we have supposed, Ṭhākurs of, or claiming, Indian lineage, can have been Kṣatriyas, but any attribution to them of Rājput̄ descent would be anachronistic. No doubt there has been an amount of subsequent deterioration of Rājput̄ families into Ṭhākur or Rāṭhī status and a wholesale mixture of Ṭhākur and Rāṭhī families through deterioration of the former or assumption by the latter; but the Ṭhākur-Rāṭhī class does not possess or claim Rājput̄ caste-rank and is reckoned, in fact, as first-class Śūdra.

The statistical fallacy of conceiving the early Ṭhākurs and Rāṭhīs as Āryan 'by the half-blood' has been noted *supra*. Some Āryan admixture is obviously likely to have actually taken place; but any tendency to rely upon such may be mainly effect of the well known competition for caste superiority. High appreciation of the Rāṭhī class is expressed in a Chamba saying —

'As the Indian corn is the first among crops, so the Rāṭhīs are the most important among castes'

The Kāngra Gaz., p. 76, styles them 'the best hill subjects of the Government'. Physiognomically they differ markedly from the Ghirths, which is understandable, as Chamba is separated from Kāngra by the great Dhavaladhār range of mountains: the people seems not to have been known to the Indians of Epic times and their present Indo-Āryan dialects belong to the Pahārī group.

To the Ghirths in Kāngra and the Rāṭhīs in Chamba the Kanets in their area correspond substantially, as is commonly recognized and as has been illustrated by a selection of quotations, in relative numbers, occupation and social status. Perhaps their claim to Āryan descent is more explicit and general: the claim in its perhaps most usual form is to be Rājput̄s debased by adopting widow remarriage. But on the lines of what we have cited concerning the Rāṭhīs the Simla Gazetteer goes on to remark that —

'but it seems most probable that they are descendants of early Āryan invaders, long afterwards conquered by Rājput̄s from the plains'

and produces some grounds, especially unorthodox usages, possibly many of them 'ancient Āryan customs long since abandoned in the plains'. The Hill States Gaz. 1910 (Bashahr) concludes (p. 22) that —

'It would thus appear that the present day Kanet tribe is a mixture of many component elements, but that these have now welded themselves together into a more or less homogeneous people. It is impossible to trace definitely the original application of the word *Kanet*, but the traditional explanation that the term was given first to degenerates from the Higher Hindu castes, and was subsequently extended to include all the upper Śūdras of the hills, is at least plausible'.

The absurd folk-etymologies here adduced, viz. —

Kanet = Sanskrit *kunīta* (!), 'violator', i.e. of the Shāstras,

or = *Kania Het*, 'daughters love', and referring to abandonment of female infanticide practised by Rājapūts,

or (Mandī Gaz., p. 28) = 'giving up *kanet* or custom of their religion, adopting a practice reprobated by the Shāstras'

proves that the origin of the name was unknown.

The Kanets, who in a total rural population (1931) of 820,128 number 223,272 and who live, as we have seen, under a considerable number of separate administrations, are unmistakably a people. The special ethnographical characteristics which have been shown to pervade them are flagrantly un-Indian and therefore more ancient than their historic Indo-Āryanization. Moreover, they are definitely Tibeto-Burman, which is not equivalent to Tibetan: and it will also be made apparent that groups of them still speak dialects of that affinity.

7. Kanets and Kuṇindas (with Taṅgaṇas).

Cunningham's oft-cited derivation of the Kanets, whose name he now spelled as *Kunet*, from the ancient Kuṇinda/Kulinda people was not based merely upon identity of name. By the aid of statistics, partly compiled by himself and partly taken from Census reports, he demonstrated a close correspondence of the Kanet area to that of the large state of Kulindrine as delimited c.180 A.D. in the *Geography* of Ptolemy. He showed that the Kuṇinda people was known to the early *Mahā-Bhārata* and named in various Purāṇas. He discovered and read coins, partly of pre-Christian date, issued in the name of a Kuṇinda king: and he cited a reference to a Kuṇinda king in the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* of Varāhamihira, written about the middle of the VIth century A.D. Cunningham's identification of the Kuṇinda kingdom with Ptolemy's Kulindrine has perhaps never been disputed: a traceless disappearance of it and of its name in the not over lengthy historic interval prior to the emergence of the Kanet tradition is hardly credible.

In the Linguistic Survey Volume IX, Part iv, p. 6 n. 1, Cunningham's view, so solidly based, and frequently cited with approval, is too lightly, it seems, dismissed with the criticism that the spelling *Kunet* is wrong and that —

'The change from 'Kuṇinda' to 'Kanēt' is violent and improbable, though not altogether impossible';

and the suggestion of a connection of the Kanets with Varāhamihira's Kunaṅas, an otherwise unknown people, is not even seriously entertained.

The additional information which we have been able to cite from the *Mahā-Bhārata* in proof of a familiar knowledge of the Kuṇindas/Kulindas from Epic times, and also of their geographical situation, and, further, the ethnographical significance

of the polyandry and other usages which we have shown to coincide in range with the Kanets/Kunets, strongly fortify the theory of Cunningham. A crowning proof, viz. a Kanet/Kunet language, will be discussed in the next, Linguistic, chapter, where also it is proposed to show that the etymological objection stated in the Linguistic Survey is nugatory, if not even self-destructive. Here we may deal with the actual spelling, which may influence some minds.

The name of the Kanets/Kunets seems not to have been traced in Muslim accounts of India; and, if it had appeared, it would probably have been indecisive in regard to the vowels. The earliest modern traveller, J. B. Fraser, in his *Tour in ... the Himala mountains* (1820) has the spelling *Kunoit*, *Kunnoit*, in which, according to his usage, the *ũ* represents the dull sound heard in English *un-*, approximately the same as that of Sanskrit *ā*. Written systematically as *a*, the same sound is, doubtless, intended in the *Kanet* of Hodgson, Cunningham (*Ladák*, p. 293), J. D. Cunningham (*op.cit.*, p. 180 *Kanit*), Harcourt (*Kooloo*, etc., p. 127, *Kaneit*) and the current official Gazetteers. On the other hand a real *ũ* must be understood in the *Kunet* of Atkinson (*op.cit.*, pp. 296-7, etc.), Cunningham's second writing, and perhaps in the *Kunait* of the Bilāspur Gazetteer (p. [...]).

With the name of the Kanets/Kunets must be associated that of *Kunāvar*, the northern, montane, half of the Bashahr State, where practically the whole population is *Kanet*. The *-āvar* is a termination, found likewise in other names of districts and derived from a Sanskrit word meaning 'abode': *Kunāwar* is therefore 'Kun-land'. The spelling with *Ku-* is presented by Captain Alexander Gerard, one of the earliest explorers (1817-) of the country, in his *Account of Koonawur*, which is still the best description. Lieutenant J. D. Cunningham followed (*loc.cit.*) with his 'Kunawar', and J. D. Atkinson with his 'Kunāor'. These three reliable authorities must be credited; and the two last quote also the Tibetan name, *Kunu*, (with *Kunupa* or *Kunpa*, 'man or thing of Kunāwar'), in which the first vowel is not likely to be erroneous. But here also a spelling with *Ka-* has been not infrequent: it was used by Alexander Cunningham at first (*Ladák*, p. 293), and as early as 1819 by Captain J. D. Herbert; in 1854 Sir A. Strachey gave (*Physical Geography ...*, p. 2), with Tibetan *Kunu*, a liberal variety, *Knor*, *Kanor*, *Kanoring*, *Kanaur*, *Kunawar*, etc., of which the second and third, as *Kanor*, *Kanoriñ*, were subsequently supplied, with the guarantee of Dr. Grahame Barley's phonetic precision, to the Linguistic Survey, which prints the name of the languages as *Kanā arē*. In all such instances the *a* is the Sanskrit *a*.

It is clear that the above variations between *Ka-* and *Ku-* in the spellings of the two names are not due to lack of system or of direct knowledge on the part of the writers, who for the most part were competent scholars travelling, or officially employed, in the respective areas. It is, of course, well known that a normal pronunciation is a statistical average which may cover a considerable variety of

actually uttered sound: and the modern unanimity in printing may be no more than an official rule. How far the actual variation *Ku-/Ka* could go may be exemplified by Moorcroft's *Kamaon (A Journey to Lake Manasarovara (1807), pp. 389, etc.)* for *Kumaon*, which is supposed to be derived from Sanskrit *Kūrma*: this is not a blunder by an unqualified traveller; the same *Kamaon* is used by Traill, the highly esteemed first settlement-officer in that district. But the range of the phenomenon in time and space must be further investigated *infra*.

As regards Kanet/Kunet, it may be said that Pandit Tikā Rām Joshī in his *A Grammar and Dictionary of Kanawari* lets the cat out of the bag. Under the entry —

'Kun-das or Kun-nas, n, *The fourth* [sc. Śūdra] *caste of the Hindus*'

he remarks that 'The Simla people call it 'Kanet'; and it is significant that in the Linguistic Survey volume itself (III.i, p. 441) the Kunāwarī man who in the translation is represented as saying 'my caste Kanet' said in his own language 'zūt Kundas'. A *ū* is implied also in the above-cited folk-etymology of *Kanet* as from *Kunita*. There is also a Kanet caste division, Kuin, Kund, Khund, which will require further consideration. The name of Kulu (never *Kalu*), if dialectically related to *Kunu*, *Kuṇinda/Kulinda*, will require investigation as to l/n.

In the *Mahā-Bhārata*, as we have seen, the Kuṇindas are clearly located on the Alakānandā Ganges, north from Haridwar, with a section, Kulīndopatyakas, 'sub-montane Kulindas', presumably situated near or to the plains. The large intermixture of Kirātas indicates that the Alakānandā Kuṇindas were an extreme eastern section bordering on the Kirāta area. This accords with their repeated coupling with the Taṅgaṇas (also in II, v. 1589, VIII, vv. 372) Para (Farther) - Taṅgaṇas, a very obscure people (likewise associated with Kirātas), whom we are now fortunately able to locate. In the old copper-plate records of the Badarīnāth district there are directions concerning a Taṅgaṇa-pura, 'Taṅgana state', which Atkinson has defined (*op. cit.*, pp. 357,484) as the region between the two great sources of the Ganges, the Bhāgīrathī and the Alakānandā, above their confluence at Deoprayāg, before passing through the range of mountains beyond Haridwar. It seems even likely that the name *Taṅgaṇa-pura* survives in that of the forested 'Taknor' range and district in the lower part of the Bhāgīrathī valley: and this is all the more engaging because J. B. Fraser, descending the Bhāgīrathī and passing through the district of 'Thucknor' notes (p. 483) that further to the south stretches the district 'Cuthoor', which is the Katyura of history and the above-cited Kartṭ-pura of a Gupta inscription. A relatively good preservation of ancient nomenclature will have favoured by the annual passage, from early centuries, of pilgrim thousands.

It seems therefore that the Taṅgaṇa country may have corresponded rather closely in area to the modern Tehri Garhwāl, in which is comprised the Bhāgīrathī valley and of which the uppermost Jumna, not distant therefrom, is the western

boundary. Thus the eastern neighbours of the Kuṇindas will have been the (ethnographically undetermined) Taṅgaṇas and, further south, the Kirātas of Garhwāi and Kumaon: which accords with Ptolemy's delimitation of Kulindrine as not extending east of the Jumna. It is consistent with this that there are no Kanets in Garhwāl or Kumaon and that, while some of the general W.-Himālayan usages, viz. purchase of brides, re-marriage of widows to junior brothers of the deceased, inheritance *per stirpes*, are current in the population of the area, the special Kanet licence of unmarried women and the fraternal polyandry are not, except among Bhotiyas, of Tibetan origin, attested.

The statement of Ptolemy which makes Kulindrine extend from Kulu (the sources of the Beas) to the Jumna, requires the inclusion of the Sutlej valley, which it names, even north of the great Dhavaladhār Range; and that is the territory of Bashahr, the largest of the Simla Hill States. In Bashahr, in fact, the whole northern area, Kunāwar, reaching to the Great Himālaya is purely Kanet territory; and its Kanets are, no doubt, the least altered descendants of the ancient people, whose distinct, Tibeto-Burman, language they still speak. How is it then that the *Mahā-Bhārata* is unaware of Kuṇindas in that region and yet is aware of Kunindas south of the Dhavaladhār and as far eastward as the junction of the Bhāgīrathī and the Alakānandā? An answer to this double query may already have been indicated. On the one hand, the Kuṇindas, who in the uppermost part of the Baspa river, which flows along the northern flank of the Dhavaladhār, have left a special dialect of the Kunāwarī language; and their Bashahr successors, whom we have recorded as conquering territory in the Pabar river valley south of the Dhavaladhār; and the Kanets, who in fairly modern times were holding, as Cunningham relates, the upper Pabar valley; were all taking advantage of an ancient, still recognized, not long or specially difficult, route over the Dhavaladhār, connecting the one set of upper valleys with the other. On the other hand, the *Mahā-Bhārata* Indians, whose northern horizon as we have supposed, did not transcend the Dhavaladhār, (except in Kulu), naturally refer only to the Kuṇindas south of it, with whom they had practically to deal; in Ptolemy's time more may have become known.

8. Kanet divisions (Khash and Rao).

It remains to consider certain subdivisions among the Kanets, a matter which substantially is the question of the Khaśas. As has already been seen, it was through identification of the Kanets with 'the Khaśas of the lower Panjab hills and the Khasias of the east' [Kumaon] that Cunningham reached his conclusion that the Kanets, a people of 'Mon' descent and 'Muṇḍā' affinity, were part of a great Khaśa race, which originally extended 'from the banks of the Indus to the Brahmaputra'. The gravamen of this inference is the affiliation of the Kanets to the Khaśas.

In common with the other hill castes, including the menial classes and outcasts, the Kanets have endogamous subdivisions, commonly termed *als*, not infrequently local: these, paralleled in India, may be left out of account. But the Kanets, whose *als* are greatly numerous, are credited with a wider, more fundamental, division into Khash Kanets and Rau, Rao, or Rahu, Kanets. It is true that Cunningham, who was well aware of Kanets unmixed with 'Khasās', distinguished as the three great Kanet *gots* only Chuhāns, Mangals and Raos, or Rowāts; but later authorities usually recognize only Khasiya, or Khash, and Rau Kanets; and it is noticeable that this division into 'Karsyas' and 'Raos', of whom the former claim to be Rājpūts, exists even in the separate and isolated state of Kulu. The Kāngra Gazetteer 1897, II (Kulu) likewise states (pp. 58-9) that —

'The Kanets are divided into two great tribes, the Khasia and the Rao or Rahu, and it is probable that the Khasias are really descended from intercourse between the Aryan immigrants and the women of the hills. The distinction between Khasia and Rao is still sufficiently well marked. A Khasia observes the period of impurity after the death of a relation prescribed for a twice-born man; the Rao that prescribed for an outcast. The Khasia wears the *jāneo*, or sacred thread, while the Rao does not'.

The Mandi Gazetteer 1904 makes (p. 29) the same distinction between Rahu and Khas, 'two important tribes of the hill Kanets'; but it also mentions some Kanets who claim to be impure Rājpūts, and Kanets of certain *wasīris* (districts) and the Kulu border, who do not wear the *jāneo*, etc., and 'are supposed to be descendants of the original race of the hills'. Similarly the Suket part of the same volume (p. 20), except that here the two main classes are not clearly distinguished, the majority calling themselves Rahu, leaving the wealthier few to style themselves Khasia, and neither class wearing the *jāneo*.

In Simmur are found 'only pure and Khas Kanets', both claiming superiority, but the former being 'the more civilized: the Kanets of Nahan 'wear the sacred thread, imitate Rājpūt customs and stand higher, socially, than the other Kanets'.

When we advance eastwards to the Simla Hill States, there seems to be more confusion. The Simla Gazetteer mentions (p. 29) a 'most ancient' division into Shātīs and Bāshīs, dating from *Mahā-Bhārata* times and once mutually hostile. Then there are Kanets of inferior status, Khash, Rahu and Kūthārā, the first being 'descendants of concubines (*khwās*) kept by Brahmans or Rājpūts': Kanets and Khash look down upon each other. There are old Kanets, known as Noru, Neru, Nonu, Neonu, and Nolu. Practically all these Khash, etc., claim Rājpūt descent, except some who profess to come from outside and to be Brāhman.

The Hill States Gazetteer mentions the Kurnharsain Kanets (p. 6) as (1) real Kanets, (2) Rāhūs, the former being by far the most numerous. Of the Baghāt (pp. 6-

7) Kanets, mainly Khash, the legends indicate descent from 'the earliest Āryan immigrants', while the others are said to be degraded Rājput̄s. The informative discussion in the Bashahr section (pp. 19-22) exhibits the confusion at its worst. Here we learn that there are two classes of Kanets, superior and inferior. The former are *Khās* Kanets, 'real Kanets', with a term *khās* sometimes perhaps confused with Khash. Many of them trace their descent from the old *māvis*, who belonged to an original Khash population of the hills, void of caste or class. In Bashahr they are known as Khund Kanets, the other being Ghāra. Neoru or Neru is another term applied to those of like descent, and also to children of Brahman̄s or Rājput̄s by Kanet women. Other superior Kanets are 'those of reputed descent from degraded Brāhman̄s and Rājput̄s; and many of them bear the names of Rājput̄ and Brāhman̄ clans'. As inferior Kanets now appear the Khash Rahu, Kuran and Kanari, supposed aboriginal tribes. The Khash, confined mainly to the Bashahr and Baghāt States, have a 'Kuini' section, supposed to include the oldest Khash families. The Rāhūs, few in the Hill States, and the Kurans, including more than one-third of the Bashahr Kanets, are said to have been originally Khash; and a legend of their fall is related. The Kanāris appear to be identical with the Kurans.

In this complexity, which contrasts markedly with the single distinction between Khasia and Rao presented by the more western territories, it seems, in fact, that a linguistic confusion has cooperated and that the *khās*, who so prevalently claim Brāhman̄ and Rājput̄ descent and whose superiority should, in accordance with what has been suggested *supra*, imply a relatively late origin, had brought the term from India. Their intervention found the Khash, or Khasiyas, and the Raos already conscious of separate caste status; and their dominance, where it prevailed, caused a social depression of both. Like many of the Rājput̄s in the other areas, they have themselves subsequently fallen in consideration, and 'Instances are to be seen at the present moment of Rājput̄ families changing their status and becoming Kanets'.

Of Cunningham's 'three great divisions, Mangal, Chuhān, and Rao or Rowāt', which he discriminates territorially, the two former are in the Hill States Gazetteer (p. 20) reported to be of (degenerate or impure) Rājput̄ or Brāhman̄ origin, the Mangals being also few. The Raos or Rahu, likewise few in the States, and provided with a folk-etymology legend, should, no doubt, be considered along with the other Rao. A, so to speak, latitudinal division, though not formal or confined to Kanets, may be historically more significant. The Bashahr Gazetteer remarks (pp. 21-22) that —

'The Kanets of Bilāspur, Nālagarh, and Simmur consider themselves superior to those of the States above Simla. The latter look down on the Kanets of the country between the Mogli *khad* and the Kanānwar border, who in turn think themselves better than the Kanawaris'.

It is highly natural that the more southerly clans, more Hinduized and speaking Indo-Āryan dialects, should disdain their less adapted kindred, whose far northern situation, less caste rigour and Tibeto-Burman speech point to a more faithful retention of the racial characteristics; and it is also natural that the Kunāwarī should have for their highest social classes 'genuine (*khās*) Kanets', known as 'Khund', who insist upon their descent from autochthonous rulers. The terms *Khund* and *Kuin* and the *Kundas* which we have found attested with the signification 'Kanet' have therefore a probable etymology as derived from the early Kuṇindas. Attention may also be recalled to the quotations affirming the superior social quality of the Kunāwarīs, whose efficiency, good will and probity are emphasized by three early explorers, A. Gerard (*Account of Koonawur*, pp. 76-82), J. D. Cunningham (*op.cit.*, pp. 178, 206-7) and J. B. Frazer (*Tour in the Himala mountains*, pp. 264-6, [...]). These commendations recall the favourable estimate of the Chamba Rāṭhīs quoted from the Gazetteer. Physiognomically Fraser reports the Kunāwarīs as strongly marked with features of the Tartar physiognomy; but Gerard gives (pp. 76 [...]) details of a complete difference from the Tibetans of mNaḥ-ris-skor-gsum, with whom they have much to do, and describes them as 'of a dark complexion' and some of them 'ruddy', like his Tibetans, which, no doubt, marks a difference from the 'yellow' (Hodgson's 'isabelline', i.e. greyish yellow) constantly noted by Fraser in regard to the hill peoples further south.

In the main duality of Khasia, or Khash, and Rao a somewhat superior orthodoxy on the part of the Khash is usually attributed to their assumption of the sacred thread and a failure to do so, or a loss of it, by the Raos. But in case the Khash and the other Kanets are held to be descendants, pure or impure, from the ancient Khaśas, as is done by Cunningham and others, the difference becomes an insignificant incident of subsequent Indo-Āryanization: for no one has supposed that the Khaśas were anything but a people or were Indo-Āryan at all.

9. Khaśas and Nepal Khas.

The serious factor in the Khaśa theory is the actuality of the large and somewhat historical Khasiya population of Garhwāl and Kumaon and of the 'Khas' language of Nepal. The second of these two, however, is not momentous. It is not supposed that the Khas, Naipālī or Gurkhālī, language is either native or early in Nepal: it belongs to the Pahārī group of Indo-Āryan; and the above (p. 113) -noted remark in Sir R. L. Turner's *Nepali Dictionary* (p. xiii), that at the date of a certain change the speakers of the dialect were probably 'far to the west of their present home', and also its great similarity to the language of Kumaon, justify the conclusion that Kumaon was the source of its Khas speakers and the language itself. In Nepal the Khas are unmentioned until some date in the XIIth (or XIIIth-XIVth?) century

A.D., when, under an invading ruler, by name Mukundasena, of the Magar tribe of the west of the country, 'the Khas and Magar castes came to the valley of Nepal'. When in 1559 A.D. the Gorkha town and district were appropriated by Dravya Sāh, an ancestor of the present Nepal dynasty, the previous Rājā belonged to a Khaḍka (or Kharka) tribe of the Khas race.

It is curious that neither Hodgson, in his penetrating view of the origin of Khas prestige and Indo-Āryanization in Nepal, nor Lévi in his excellent account, largely following Hodgson, of the Khas, though both of them were aware of Khas people outside of Nepal, realized that the Khas were not properly natives of the country. When under Mukundasena the Khas and Magars for the first time came into the valley of Nepal, it is indicated that he was ruler of the Magar tribe; and it may be inferred that he represented an alien domination over it: and when, some centuries later, Dravya Sāh, overthrew the king of Gorkha, who was of the Khaḍka tribe of the Khas race, he 'collected all the people of Gorkha who wore the brahmanical thread, such as the Thāpās, Busāls, Rānās and Māski Rānās of the Magar tribe'. It seems evident that what Dravya Sāh did was to raise the Magar people of Gorkha again a foreign Khas ruler: and, in fact, Hodgson's elaborate lists include the Thāpās, Busāls, Rānās, and Māski among the Magars and not among the Khas.

The Magars, along with the Gurg to their north, occupy a western area of the Nepal State, where it adjoins the Doti region originally attached to Kumaon. What more self-evident than that Mukundasena, whose very name proves that he was not a native chief of the fierce, uncivilized, Magars, was a scion of one of the several Hinduized Khasiya dynasties which are known to have at a prior date ruled over districts of Kumaon? It is even conceivable that the 'Khaḍka, or Kharka, tribe of the Khas' was connected with the Khargu chief of Katehir (Almora district) who in 1380 A.D. fled before a Muslim army into the mountains of Kumaon. The Nepal Khas, whose original seat is said to have been Gōrkhā, will accordingly have been Nepal Magars with an infusion of ruling Khas from Kumaon, a situation which has had many analogies in the Himālayan regions, and was repeated when under the ancestors of Pṛthitī-nārāyaṇ a Rājput rule was superimposed upon both.

The Khas problem has accordingly to be transferred to the Garhwāl-Kumaon area, where there is a really large population bearing the Khas name. In the three districts, Garhwāl, Almora, Naini Tal, the vastly preponderant Hindu mass is composed of Biths and Doms, the latter (also numerous) corresponding to the like-named low-castes elsewhere and conjectured, by Atkinson also (*op.cit.*, p. 371), to be aborigines. The Biths are subdivided into

Brāhmans and Khas-Brāhmans

Rājputs and Khas-Rājputs

of whom the Khas are the Khasiyas, 'whose claim to be immigrants from an Āryan

source is generally allowed'. The Khas-Rājṣūts are somewhat despised by the genuine Rājṣūts and are not authorized to wear the sacred thread; and the Khas-Bāhmans are absolutely distinct: of the Rājṣūts the great majority are Khas-, which is equivalent to saying that the Khas are the main pre-Rājṣūt population of the country. A long priority of the Khas to any Rājṣūts from the plains is proved by their mention, and nearly always first, in the six grant records, five on copper-plates and one on stone, addressed by Katyuri kings of Kārttikeya-pura, of about the IXth century A.D., to the peoples within their scope. At much later dates, during the time of Chand kings of Kumaon, Khasiya principalities were in existence.

Nevertheless the supposition of an original Khaśa population is, it seems, impossible. How is it possible that some 1,000 or 1,500 years of Indian acquaintance with the Garhwāl-Kumaon region, begun in Epic times and continued with, no doubt, ever-growing familiarity, should have passed without a single reference in Sanskrit literature to its people as Khaśa? From the first, as we have seen, the people, neighbours of the Kuṇḍas, were known as Kirātas; and to Kalidasa they were still Kirātas. The only Khaśas definitely located are those mentioned in the Kashmir history, who belonged, as was proved by Sir A. Stein, apparently with the assent of the Linguistic Survey, to the montane districts immediately south and south-east of that country. Even if geographical significance is attributed to the *Mahā-Bhārata* passage cited by Lévi and the *Linguistic Survey* volume (p. 3), which mentions the Khaśas who dwell about 'the Śailoda river between Meru and Mandara' among the ant-gold-bringing tribes, the region indicated, which Lévi associates with the junction of the Hindu-Kush and the Pamir, is at any rate a semi-mythical country, mentioned also elsewhere (e.g. *Rāmāyaṇa*, IV. v. 39) and beyond the whole Himālaya and Kailāsa. We must not indeed prematurely refuse to consider the possibility of some Khaśa people in the Dard, etc., districts north and north-east of Kashmir during some early period; but they could not have had anything to do, either then or later, with Garhwāl-Kumaon. The other citations in the Linguistic Survey volume are partly mere errors (e.g. the references to Pliny's Attacori, 'Thuni and Forcari', and Ptolemy's Ahasia regis, Kasioi mountains and Ottorokorhoi, which all belong to Chinese Turkistan), or are geographically ineffective. The *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* passage (LVIII, 7, 12, and 51), which 'would appear to show' that by the time of its composition 'the Khaśas had already reached Nepal and Darjeeling', obviously does not do so; and the quotation of the, very late, *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* on p. 5, is even less commendable. The strained interpretations of an assemblage of largely inapplicable items seem the more regrettable inasmuch as it can be partly agreed that 'The earlier we trace notices regarding them', (the Khaśas), 'the further north-west we find them' (p. 2), and can wholly agree that 'in the twelfth century they certainly occupied in considerable force the hills to the south, south-

west and south-east of Kashmir' (p. 8). The date is, in fact, but not without some geographical considerations, the crucial matter.

As regards Garhwāl-Kumaon, it has been already pointed out that as early as c. the IXth century A.D. their population included Khaśas. This date, though later by 1000-1500 years than the first historical facts, might be thought to weaken the claim of the Khasiya, 'Khas-Rājput', to be 'immigrants from an Āryan source'. But a period somewhat preceding the IXth century would accord with the facts relating to the Kanet/Kuṇinda area and with Himālayan history. The fact that the division of Kanets into Khasiya and Rao is found even in Kulu, which certainly from such a date has had a separate history, proves that the interrelation is not of modern origin; and the character of the relation, which is such that the two are not everywhere compresent and that, where they are so, the situation, a mutual social exclusiveness, generally, though not always, based upon a Khash pretension to superior Āryan-orthodoxy, is one of contention shows that the original quasi-amalgamation was not upon equal terms. No one has ever doubted that the Khaśas were a tribe or race, not a caste; and that the Kuṇindas, at any rate, were of that tribe or race is inconsistent with all that is known of them. Hence the relation between the two becomes clear: it was another instance of superimposition, commencing with a domination of Khaśas over Kanets/Kuṇindas and a subsequent partial fusion of the two through a later domination, which would be that of the Rājput.

A reasonable origin of a Khaśa domination over the Kanet/Kuṇinda area can be seen in the post-Mihirakula rule of the Hūna kings in Kashmir. There is the above-noted certainty that in the VIth and VIIth centuries A.D. the Hūnas holding Himālayan territories east of Kashmir were at war with the Maukhari and Vardhana dynasties of Kanauj and Thanesar; and in the VIIIth and IXth centuries the victories of later Kashmir kings over rulers of Kanauj, and even in conflict with the Bengal Pālas, surely imply that the western Himālayan territories were still controlled by Kashmir. As the homelands of the Khaśas, 'to the south, south-west and south-east of Kashmir', were, as is definitely stated by Hsüan-tsang in 633 A.D. subject to Kashmir, it is credible that it was in the Kashmir armies and administration that the Khaśas advanced eastward into the lands of the old Kuṇinda kingdom and there dominated until Rājput times. It is noticeable that in five of the six Katyuri documents mentioned *supra* the peoples addressed include Hūnas, who at the dates cannot have come from anywhere but Kashmir.

As evidence of some special historical relations between the Garhwāl-Kumaon region and Kashmir we may cite also the somewhat striking coincidences (see *infra* pp. 120 sqq) with the latter and with the Dard tribes, which have, no doubt, been influenced by Kashmir, in the nomenclature of social classes: one example is the term *Dom*, which in the Dard area, as in Garhwāl-Kumaon, denotes not merely, as in

India generally, a specially despised caste of scavengers, but the whole mass of inferior, menial and servile classes.

As a further congruity we may cite the fact that the latest historical reference to a Kuṇḍa kingdom is that by Varāhamihira about the middle of the VIth century A.D. What became of the large and important state and its people? It is intelligible that its downfall was due to Hūna rule and Khaśa armies from Kashmir. There is also the fact that in the history of Kāngra-Jālandhara and Chamba, which during the Huna period maintained their integrity, there is no mention of the Khaśas, whose eastward movement may have been, as is affirmed in the Garhwāl-Kumaon traditions, *via* the plains.

10. Kirātas.

If, however, the large Khasia population of the Garhwāl-Kumaon area is to be denied an aboriginal and really early occupation of the country, the gap must somehow be filled. There can be no doubt as to how this could be done. From the Epic period, when the *Mahā-Bhārata* reports the Kuṇḍa State in the Alakānandā valley as 'crowded with hundreds of Kirātas', the whole early Sanskrit literature knows only of forest-dwelling Kirātas as the population of the area, including the Kailāsa-Mānasa region. The Rājīs of the Almora district of Askot, of whom the best and fullest account is that given by Atkinson, *op.cit.*, pp. 362-8, and a more lively picture by Sherring, *op.cit.*, pp. 10-20, are manifestly related to the Rājya-Kirātas named in a Sanskrit *Varāha-saṃhitā* (Atkinson, p. 359). They are sometimes styled Banmanus, 'Forest-people'; and their present situation, very limited numbers and primitive mode of life suggest a comparison with the Red Indians of North America. Atkinson gives reasons for believing that their numbers are greater than had been supposed, that they are numerous 'along the foot of the hills below the province of Doti, the most westerly district of Nepal' (p. 567); and some settled groups in Kālī Kumaon, known as Rawats and Lul, are traditionally held to have been Rājīs (p. 368), 'some almost merged in the Khasiya population', from which they differ in complexion, being somewhat darker, and in their whole mode of life. They claim royal descent from an early prince of Kumaon and comport themselves accordingly; and, in fact, the Kirātas are named, along with the Khaśas, in three of the Katyuri copperplates.

The Kumaon, etc., Kirātas may not have been so absolutely isolated as history suggests from the indubitably kindred Kirānti peoples of the extreme east of Nepal. Their present Nepal neighbours, the strong military Magar and Gurung tribes, are indeed linguistically distinct from them, having languages of the 'non-pronominalized' type of Tibeto-Burman; whereas the 'Jānguli' speech of the Rājīs is grouped, doubtfully, indeed, with the 'Western Pronominalized' dialects. But it was

the view of Hodgson that in Nepal the strong 'unbroken' tribes, occupying the most favourable areas of country, had languages of the 'nonpronominalized' type, and were immigrants of a later period, from, as he surmised, c.1000-1300 years before his time: whereas the 'broken' tribes, confined to the less desirable lands, and having a more primitive culture and a distinguishable physiognomy, used 'pronominalized' dialects with 'Muṇḍā' affinities. This view was most definitely expounded in the essay 'On the Chepang and Kusunda tribes of Nepal', but partly also in that 'On the aborigines of the Himalaya' and 'A cursory notice of Nayakote and of the remarkable tribes inhabiting it'; and vocabularies of Chepang and Kusunda are included in 'Comparative vocabulary of the broken tribes of Nepal'. The Chepang and Kusunda occupy dense forests in the central region of Nepal to the westward of the great valley: Hodgson's description of them and their ways (pp. 45-8), accords singularly with that of the Rājīs given by Atkinson, *op.cit.*, pp. 266-8, and with the description and photographs in Sherring, *loc.cit.*: and an equivalence of Rājīs and Chepang was propounded by Latham in *Ethnology of India*, pp. 11, 16 (*ap.* Atkinson, p. 366). Though between the 'Jāngalī' language of the Rājīs and the Chepang and Kusunda languages, all slightly known, correspondences in detail may be hard to find, it is at any rate true that the two last also are in the Linguistic Survey (III.i, pp. 402-5) assigned to a 'pronominalized' group.

Considering that the Kirānti tribes of the far east of Nepal are undeniably Kirātas and their dialects 'pronominalized', and that the Chepang, etc., of the west-central and Nayakote regions may be link with Kumaon, we might conjecture that at an early date the population from Kumaon to the confines of Sikkim had consisted mainly or exclusively of Kirāta people with 'pronominalized' speech: and, in fact, the traditional history of Nepal records a Kirāta dynasty of 29 reigns, commencing in 'the Dwāpara aeon' and persisting during 10,000 years. But, though in the Epic and other early Sanskrit references there may be nothing inconsistent with the supposition that such a situation existed at their dates, there is at present no apparent reason for indulging in such speculation. The immediate task is to fortify as far as possible the conception of the Garhwāl-Kumaon Kirātas as a people of 'pronominalized' speech and Tibeto-Burman character to account for their almost complete disappearance.

The 'pronominalized' Tibeto-Burman character of the 'Jāngulī' language of the Rājīs, = Rājya-Kirātas, though dubiously viewed in the Linguistic Survey, is substantiated by the affinity of that of their immediate neighbours and partly co-subjects, the Kuṇindas, which we shall show to have been of that kind: and we need not conceal the conviction that the *-ta* in their name is the Suffix, equivalent in use to Tibetan *-pa/-ba*, which we have conjectured in the names *Kulūta* (= man, or thing, of Kulu), and *Kuṇinda* (= man, or thing, of Kuru), to which we may now add the

Nepal *Kusunda* (cf. *Kuswar*). The Kiras of history might be likewise Kirātas. The forester life of the Garhwāl-Kumaon Kirātas is a commonplace of early Sanskrit descriptions; and perhaps Kālidāsa's reference to their relieving the heat by loosening their peacock-tails (loin-bands, as the commentator explains) may point to the exiguous loin-cloths noted and illustrated by Sherring (pp. 13-4). Polyandry, confidently attributed to the Rājīs, is, we have urged ethnographically very significant, especially in the adjacency of the Kanet area. Absence of child-marriage, purchase of brides, employment of Shamanist priests, though common to the Kanets, may be too widespread in the hills to be specially connected with the Rājīs: and the same applies to the levirate, etc., partition of heritage *per stirpes*, in case of a plurality of widows, which naturally are not Rājī features.

As regards the names *Rājī* and *Rājya-Kirāta* and the therewith associated claim to royal ancestry, it may be suggested that the literal translation 'kingdom-Kirātas' is the correct original sense and that it furnishes an interpretation of the name of the Rao or Rau Kanets and of the Chamba Rāḥīs, sc. Rāṣṭrīyas, who are the Chamba equivalents of the Kanets. It is likely that *Rao* or *Rau* is an Indo-Āryan word; and it should then be, as usual, a form of *rājan*, 'king', while the meaning of *rāṣṭrīya* is, as stated, 'native of a district': we can thus get the sense of 'native', 'native Kanet', 'Kirāta of a native state', applied to the local people of districts allowed by Āryan or quasi-Āryan rulers to retain a measure of independence. Hence it is not surprising that of the Khas-Rājapūts also one of three main divisions has the same designation, *Rawāt* (Cunningham's *Rowāt*).

The conclusions adopted so far seem to endorse what Atkinson states (*op.cit.*, p. 355) as the outcome of the evidence of Pliny, viz. that —

'the Khaśas occupied the country far to the west of their present location in Kumaon and Nepal, and that the Kirātakas with the Taṅgaṇas held the country between the Tons [Tamasā, tributary of the Jumna] and the Sarda [or Kālī] the present western boundary of Nepal'.

Concerning the progressive disappearance of the Kirātas we may suggest that —

(a) the Kirāta country, owing to its accessibility, its hundreds of Hindu sacred places and shrines, its many thousands annually of Hindu pilgrim visitors and, from about the Xth century, the powerful Chand dynasty from India, whereof a full history is related by Atkinson and in the Gazetteers, has been very intensely Āryanized.

(b) The process of absorption of Kirātas among the Khasiya population, attested by examples in Atkinson, p. 368, may perhaps be further evidenced by the curious list of names of Khasiya rulers of Domkot, wherein Atkinson, p. 510, finds resemblances to the nomenclature of Kirāti dynasty of Nepal. But in our otherwise entire unacquaintance with original Khaśa names and words it

seems preferable to rely upon the substantial analogy of the American Red Indian forest peoples.

By the above considerations we are relieved of the difficulty of accounting for an original Khaṣa gap in a Tibeto-Burman area extending from the Beas river, with an outlying Utsavaśāṅketa block in the Madra (Jummu) hills, to the eastern frontier of Nepal and thence further. The view taken may not clash with the few items of supposed 'Piśāca' speech in Pahārī language adduced in the Linguistic Survey volume: it would indeed be provisionally favourable by providing a reasonable date, since the present Pahārī dialects cannot be, and are not supposed to be, older than say the VIth century A.D.; and also by bringing the Khaṣas from a region, viz. the mountains to the south, south-west and south-east of Kashmir, where history has found them and where their language may well have been 'Piśāca'.

Nor does the view prejudice the supposition of a really early or aboriginal 'Muṇḍā' population either in the non-Tibeto-Burman area west of the Beas or in the Tibeto-Burman area itself. It recognizes a Tibeto-Burman population in its area during at any rate a late Vedic period, but not from all eternity. For any further chronological definition help may be sought from linguistics.

11. 'Menial' classes.

With the Muṇḍā question has generally been associated that of what are commonly mentioned as the 'menial' classes. In all the Gazetteers will be found accounts of these classes, which, though by no means all on one level, and though no less divided among themselves by caste, sept, etc., punctilios than are the respectable classes, are all in regard to marriage, etc., below the line. As the simplest statement, the following may be quoted from the Kāngra Gazetteer 1883-4, p. 95, —

'In the hills, even more than in the plains below, occupations tend to merge into one another, so that it is most difficult to distinguish the outcast classes. The Chamar, the Jhinwar, and the artisans appear to be tolerably distinct. But even this is not the case everywhere; while throughout the hills we find a mixed class known as Kolī, Dāgī and Chanāl, who not only perform the usual services demanded of outcasts, but also follow the occupations of very many of the artisan and higher menial castes. It is impossible to say how many of the people who call themselves Barhai, or some other caste which is sufficiently distinct in the plains, are really Kolī by caste, and have adopted the occupation merely of the caste under whose name they are shown. And even the inferior castes which bear the same name in the hills as in the plains, often adopt very different habits and occupy very different positions in the two tracts. One difference is probably almost universal, and that is that in the hills almost all menial castes occupy themselves very largely in field labour; and in some parts the Kolis are

generally known as Halīs and Sipīs, words in common use in the plains for two classes of agricultural labourers'.

The caste-, or class-, designations, in so far as they are Indian, seem in themselves uninformative; for, while they may have been given to, or assumed by, native groups, it is no less possible that primarily the classes may have been actually immigrants from India for whom the Indo-Āryanization of the previously simpler social structure provided an opening. A noticeable instance is that of the Kunāwar Domang and Chamang, who not only follow the occupation of the Indian Doms and Chamars, but have a distinct, Indo-Āryan, language. Contrast with these the Doms or Dūmnas of the Garhwāl-Kumaon area, a general term for the immensely numerous (199,451 in a population of 1,159,749) non-Āryan population, mainly occupied in servile agricultural labour. In Kāngra and Chamba the Dūmnas, Damras or Dūms seem to correspond to the Doms of India: and in Chamba the Halīs, 'ploughers', 'numbering more than one half of the entire menial community' and 'chiefly engaged in farm work and as servants to land-holders', seem equivalent to the Garhwāl-Kumaon Doms, sometimes also styled Halīs: it seems highly unlikely that such Dom-Halīs should not be, as is usually thought, natives.

In the Punjab Census 1931 the above triad of Kolī, Dāgī and Chaṇāl, with omission of the last, which is merely = Sanskrit Caṇḍāla, is used in the comprehensive sense indicated. They are probably not found outside the Panjab, where the census number is 182, 235; even this figure is deceptive, because outside the Kanet area the only districts where they reach even four figures are Gurgaon (4,853), and Kāngra (87,088), Patiala (8,519), Chamba (1,798). Even in Kāngra the Kolīs belong, it is said, to the country east of Kāngra proper; and we do not know how many of them and of the Dāgīs should really be credited to Sirāj and Kulu. The Dāgīs are said to be of lower status than the Kolīs, who are 'not very much lower than the Kanet and Ghirath or lowest cultivating castes': the name Dāgī, of which there are folk-etymologies, is regarded as approbrious. The case of Kulu is perhaps interesting: Harcourt after stating (*op.cit.*, p. 119) that the population consists 'almost entirely of Kaneits and Daghees', mentions (p. 122) that the 'Daghees' are also termed *Bugatoo* or *Kolies*, the latter name being given to all Kooloo people by those from the plains. In Seoraj the *Daghees* are frequently called *Breetoos*'. Later (pp. 127-8) he records the Lahul population as including '502 Kaneits and 4566 Daghees', and states that these Daghees are said to have come from Kooloo: he mentions in particular their compulsory *begār* service as porters supplying fire-wood, etc., at camping grounds. We cannot indeed rely upon the confusion, elsewhere also discussed, of Kolī with *Kole*, 'man of Kulu'; and Kolīs, though everywhere at least partly agricultural, are in Chamba and Garhwāl-Kumaon also specially weavers. But the relatively high proportion of Dāgī-Kolī people in Kulu and Lahul suggests that

they are a population rather than a caste. Their evident correspondence to the Chamba Halīs and the Garhwāl-Kumaon Doms, as attached to agriculture, and frequently to particular villages, estates, or families, in a status of predial servitude, is evidently a large historical feature of Himālayan sociology. The term *kāma*, = Sanskrit *karmin*, 'labour', represents the general character of their service: in Spiti the Tibetan equivalent, *lapa*, i.e. *lag-pa*, is used: *kāmin* recurs in the Dard area.

The general probability seems to be that the two names, *Dāgi* and *Kolī*, which have no plausible etymology, and which clearly are not caste designations, denote an under-population as such and that the distinction is territorial, though both belong primarily to the Kanet area. Unfortunately this throws no light on the Muṇḍā theory. Everywhere the Kolīs claim to be degraded Kanets and have legends accounting for their fall: and the same is explicitly stated of the Simla Dāgoīs; moreover, a relation specially to Kanet families is sometimes mentioned. Harcourt remarks (p. 123) —

'The *Daghees* may be held to stand in a sort of subordinate rank to the *Kaneits*, though there is often nothing in appearance that would lead an indifferent observer to notice that the two were of different castes'.

Cunningham's connection of the name *Kolī* with that of the Indian Kolarians loses all plausibility if the original form of this was *Krauda*, which is used in a pre-Christian Sanskrit text (with reference, however, to the Kol tribe of north Bihār).

12. Bhotias.

Of the populations of non-Indo-Āryan speech occupying the strip of very mountainous country immediately south of the passes over the Great Himālaya the main bulk has been, as Kuṇindas and Kanets, already considered: linguistically they will come in for extensive further treatment. The remainder, known as Bhotias, but in the Bashahr State designated Nyām, Jād or Zār, require, as Tibetan immigrants from a fairly modern date, not much ethnographical particularization. To a considerable extent they are Hinduized; but some of those in Kumaon retain an original Tibeto-Burman language, perhaps inherited from non-Tibetan predecessors, and the actual Bhotia language, spoken e.g. in the north of Garhwāl, seems to include some particulars of like origin. One of the Kumaon groups, the *Jethoīs* has a designation, explained as signifying 'elder brothers', sc. first settlers, which curiously recurs, as *jathirā*, 'juryman who decides disputes', in the isolated Tibeto-Burman people of Malāna, in Kulu, and again, as *justera*, 'ruling village elder', in the Dard area (Chilās, see *infra*).

(4b) Trans-Himālayan territories.

1. Anthropological date and deductions.

It has been pointed out supra that prior to the Tibetan intervention, which commenced c.700 A.D., the history of these territories is, except for a few isolated particulars, a blank. In regard to ethnography it seems that, unless modern anthropometrics and archaeology come to the rescue, the like, except in one instance, must be said. What can be contributed by those two sciences can be conveniently seen in the valuable work of R. Biasutti and E. Dainelli, *I Tipi Umani*, published (1925) as Vol. IX of Serie II in *Relazioni Scientifiche della Spedizione Italiana De Fillippi, nell Himalaya, Caracorum e Turchestan Cinese (1913-1914)*: here we have by Biasutti the scientific exposé and analysis of the anthropometric materials collected by Dainelli in the field, and by Dainelli himself a discussion of the peoples, in general and in particular, and their cultural conditions, and a record of the available archaeological remains. The main anthropological matter is one originally broached by Drew and Biddulph, viz. the evidence for a non-Tibetan, or non-'Mongolian', element in the population and for a determination of its amount and range. This matter, conceived from the first as a question of partly Āryan, sc. Ṣiṇā or 'Dard', origin of the people of Baltistan and adjacent parts, and frequently noticed by the late Dr. A. H. Francke in connection with traditions or evidences of progressive 'Dard' immigrations into the territories, is decided in the sense that the basic population in Ladak generally, as well as in Baltistan, was 'Dard'/Ṣiṇā, and that a Mongolian/Tibetan factor supervened, modifying in various proportions the somatic and cultural inheritance. Many precise observations are adduced in regard to the distribution and prevalence of the Ṣiṇā/'Dard' contribution, which was not all pre-Tibetan; and the conclusions are pictorially shown in maps. The construction receives in general much support from the historical facts elicited by Biddulph, showing prolonged and intimate relations between the rulers of Baltistan, Hunza-Nagar, Roñ-do, Gilgit and Yasin.

Dainelli's main conclusion seems to be that the 'Mongoloid' factors, somatic and cultural, came from the east, sc. from the Tibetan 'Ciang', i.e. *Byañ-pa*, nomad people of the great 'North-Plateau', *Byañ-thañ*, in whom, however, there are already some traces of elements derived from another source, presumably, as has been suggested, in Chinese Turkestan. The 'Mongol' heritage, most intense in the east of Central Ladak, weakens progressively from east to west, attaining in Pu-rig a transition stage, practically evanescent in the Balti territories and absent among the Brok-pa of the Deosai plains and the Dras area. In Ladak itself an island of Dard speech and culture, relatively early in comparison with the Islamic religion of the Baltis, survives in the Machnopa people of the Indus valley, from about Karmang to

Da-Hanu, and the connected side valleys. It is held that the route of Dard immigrants will have been not the actual Indus Gorge, Roñ-do, but direct from the region of Astor over the Deosai plain.

Perhaps the mixed origin so conceived, and reinforced by the history of political relations between Baltistan and Ladak and by profound characterizations of the two actual populations, will not hereafter be disputed: the view also that the 'Mongol' element came from the Tibetan sphere seems highly probable. But the anthropometrical deductions do not carry a date: in general the advances of the Dard/Ṣinā peoples seem to belong to historical times, and the Dard traditions brought to light by Francke seem too precise for a really ancient memory.

2. Tibetan and other extrinsic items in nomenclature of peoples and classes.

Here it may be not inapposite to emphasize in contrast the far more sweeping influence of the large, continuous and thoroughly Tibetan state in the linguistic sphere. The Tibetan dialects of Purig and Baltistan have sufficient peculiarities to justify separate treatments in the Linguistic Survey of India. In these, and even in Ladakhī, there are phonetic developments and retentions, a certain number of new features of accident, changes or specializations in meanings and phraseology; but there is perhaps nothing affecting the thoroughly Tibetan character of the general grammar and forms of expression or intrusive from an outside language: the actual loan-words are few, and the etymology overwhelmingly Tibetan. This situation, which tends to exclude inferences from speech mixture, resulted naturally from the domination of Tibetan culture in the state business and correspondence and in religion and literature; it deserves mention here, because it includes cases provoking inquiry: thus the term *Brok-pa*, denoting the Dard people of Dras, is not in relation to that, or to any, people a tribal or racial designation; it is, as Shawe mentioned, an occupational term, applied all over Tibet to the nomad or semi-nomad herdsmen and shepherds of the upper valley or plateau 'grazing grounds' (*hbrog*). According to Shawe the application of the term to the Dard people of Dras and of the Indus is due to the Tibetans, sc. the Ladakhīs or Baltis. Biddulph's statement (p. 47) that the Brok-pas name themselves *Rom* should not fall into oblivion; likewise his statement (p. 54) that the Indus Dards call themselves Aderkaro and by the Baltis are named Kyango.

In regard to the name *Machnopa*, which Dainelli has adopted for the Dards of the Indus as a name used by themselves (p. 34) Tibetanists will not easily be induced to conceive that it is related to a 'Ladakhī marriage by *mach-pa*' described (pp. 146-7, 173) as occurring when a brotherless daughter is constituted family heiress and is entitled to take as husband and subordinate consort any junior member of an outside family. *Mag-pa* is the ordinary Tibetan term for 'son-in-law'; but whether it is

restricted to such special cases may be uncertain: among the Koko-nor 'Tanguts' (Tibetans) it seems that all sons-in-law are taken into the family and are there subordinate. But the case of a daughter constituted heiress is an ancient topic of Sanskrit law, discussed under the heading *putrikā*, and from the Gazetteers it seems to be recognized in most Indo-Āryan Himālayan States: in the Dard/Śiṅā area the practice is presumably derived from India.

Other Tibetan quasi-technical terms, intruded perhaps through Skarde domination, into Dard areas, may here be noted. Among the Machnopa people, of whose dialect a few ordinary words also are included in Shawe's list, the terms *Rūshen*, 'high-class people', and *Rūzmed*, 'low-class, people', originally blacksmiths, are Tibetan *rus-chen*, 'great bone', and *rusmed*, 'boneless', in which *rus*, 'bone', is the invariable and ubiquitous expression, like European 'blood', for the idea of lineage or 'breed'. *Gārgyut* also (p. 8) is Tibetan *mgar-rgyud*, 'blacksmith-lineage'. The term used for the priestly families, Shawe's *Lhābdak*, is likewise simply Tibetan *lha-bdag*, 'god-lord', in which *lha*, = Sanskrit *deva*, is often applied to Lamas, kings, etc. Very possibly the Machnopa language had its own equivalents to these terms.

Among the Baltis, whose ordinary language is Tibetan, it is not surprizing that such terms should be in that language; and so we may here merely record the following:—

1. *Trakehos* in *Riboo Trakchos* and *Shall Trakchos*, two of the high social classes (Biddulph, p. 50, Dainelli, p. 132). Here *Trakchos* = Tib. *drag*, 'noble', 'aristocratic', + *chos* or *boos*, 'origin', 'creation', 'created', etc. *Riboo* and *Shali* also are probably Tibetan, though their meanings are not obvious.
2. *Plamopa*, the agricultural main body of the people, etc. (Biddulph, p. 50, Dainelli, p. 132). Here *plamo* is not clear; but *-pa* is the common Tibetan Suffix, denoting 'man (or thing) of-', = Hindi *-wālā*, and it appears in all the names of the 12 subdivisions of the highest (*Wazīr*) class.
3. *Mon*, 'musicians who answer in every respect to the Doms of Gilgit' (Biddulph, p. 50). This term, which will demand further consideration *infra*, comes indubitably from Great Tibet: in the Dard area it is presumably a mere substitute for *Dom*.
4. *Tacur*, 'barber' (Dainelli, p. 133) - Tib. *skra-bzar* (with modern pronunciation).

It is noticeable that in the royal genealogy of Baltistan the four immediate successors of the (legendary) founder have names, reported by Biddulph (pp. 144-5) as *Istak Singeh*, *Brook Singeh*, *Zik Singeh*, *Sik Singeh*, which are really Tibetan, being Tib. *Stag*, 'tiger', *hbrug*, 'dragon', *gzig*, 'leopard', and *śig*, 'louse', combined with *sen-ge*, 'lion', as royal title. In the two next following names the third syllable, *thum*, is the royal title of the Hunza-Nagar rulers, which also terminates the names 2 - 6 in the Śi-sgar (Shigar) genealogy (Biddulph, *loc. cit.*, Cunningham, *Ladāk*, p. 33,

Francke, *Antiquities*, II, p. 192). Tibetan expressions in Dard/Ṣiṇā milieus not appertaining to the Ladak territories are, no doubt, either ordinary loan-words due to cultural contact or a result of political relations between the Balti rulers and the Dards beyond the Indus. Such are —

1. *Yerfah*, 'steward' (Biddulph, p. 42, Lorimer, I, p. xliii) = Tib. *gñer-pa*. In Burushaski this exists as *yerpa*.
2. *Tarangfah*, 'a village official under the Wazir', (*ibid*), perhaps = Tib. *gron-pa*, 'village-man' or *grañs-pa*, 'accountant' (pronounced *trang-pa*): Burushaski *trangfa*, Balti *trampa*.

Charboo (Biddulph, p. 44, Lorimer, I, p. xivii) is not obviously Tibetan.

The Tibetan class-designations used in Ladak Proper (Dainelli, p. 133) do not call for comment.

No particular significance belongs to the above Tibetan items: they seem merely incidental to the Tibetan influence, which did not commence before c.700 A.D., and domination, which eventuated early in the Xth century. But from the Indian side we have to remark some surprizing correspondences in expressions and usages of ethnographical or historical significance, which seem to transcend the Great Himālaya. In many cases, indeed, there may have been intermediacy of Dard or Ṣiṇā peoples, themselves largely dependent upon India: and this may justify the practice of, e.g., Colonel Lorimer, who in his Burushaski Vocabulary reasonably treats forms of Sanskrit origin, when they have Ṣiṇā equivalentents, as related to the latter: as instances of this we may cite —

añaro, *añāro*, 'Tuesday', (Sh. *añāro*) = Sk. *añgāra*

bāgo, 'portion' (Sh. *bāgo*) = Sk. *bhāga*

dīš, 'place', 'room' (Sh. *dīš*) = Sk. *dīš*, *deśa*

pāčī, 'season' (Sh. *pāč*, *pač*, 'half-month') = Sk. *pakṣa*, 'half-month'.

-*apači*, 'beside', 'close to' etc.

-*apačim*, 'from beside' etc.

} = Sk. *pakṣe*, *pakṣāt*

šūl, 'pain' (Sh. *šul*) = Sk. *śūla*, 'pain-prick'

rāčī, 'guard', 'watchman' (Sh. *rāčī*)

rač, 'guarding', 'watching over' (Sh. *rāčh*,)

} = Sk. *rakṣ*, *rakṣa*

yačheni, 'female demon' (Sh. *yačini*): here Sanskrit

yakṣiṇi is, in fact, mentioned.

In some few cases, where a Ṣiṇā equivalent is not cited, a Sanskrit original is for some other reason ignored: such are —

arašo, 'lazy' = Sk. *alasa*, 'lazy'.

pfūt, 'a kind of supernatural being, usually malevolent'.

'demon', = Sk. *lūta*, 'evil spirit or ghost'.

In these words it seems probable that the primary source was the Sanskrit and the

Ṣiṇā source, though immediate, was secondary: in the case of terms of religion there may have been no intermediary: e.g. the above-cited *yačheni*. A similar problem arises in regard to the select list of Ṣiṇā/Kashmīrī equivalents printed in the Linguistic Survey volume VIII. iii, pp. 251-3: it may be affirmed that most of the there cited Ṣiṇā and Kashmīrī forms require for their explanation a recognition of the stage represented by the ancient Sanskrit. The problem is one which recurs whenever etymology of relatively modern stages of a language is apprehensive of dependence upon ancient Classical evidence.

Instances of the Indian correspondences indicated above are the following: —

1. *grestok* (with-*ok* as termination); *grest* (*gròst*, Kashmir), 'cultivator' (Brok-pa of Dras, *ap. Shawe*, pp. 32, 34). This is evidently Ṣiṇā *gresto* 'industrious', Kashmīrī *grīst*, 'a farmer', of the Linguistic Survey list: but that is only a beginning. For obviously it is also the *gṛhastha* or *grīhastha*, popularly *girasta* or *giryasti* or *giresti*, 'householder', 'farmer', of Sir R. L. Turner's *Nepali Dictionary*, and so identical with *Ghirth*, *Girth*, *Ghareth*, which has been discussed *supra* as the designation of the great land-holding caste of the Kāngra State. The combination of meanings, 'farmer', 'land-holder', 'agricultural class', is confirmatory of the view developed *supra* that universally in the Himālayan territories the solid social and economic basis was peasant agriculture. But the fact that the class-name *Girth*, *Ghirth*, *Ghareth*, is on the Indian side confined to Kāngra, which, as we have seen, had close relations with its Kashmir neighbour, and that the meaning 'farmer' recurs in Kashmir and in the Dard area, which was always subject to Kashmir influence, defines as a 'Kashmir group' the area of this linguistic usage. In Kaṣṭawārī the word occurs as *gurasth* (L.S. VIII. ii, p. 492): Its occurrence in Nepali will be further considered.
2. *Kramin*, 'weavers', 'carpenters', 'blacksmiths', 'artisans' in fact, 'among the main body of the Dards' (Shawe, p. 8 n.; Drew, *op.cit.*, p. 427; Leitner, *Dardistan*, p. 63), *Kramin* (or *Kaminn*), 'weavers, carpenters, etc., but not musicians, Appendix IV, p. 10, 'lowest class'; *Krammins*, 'millers and porters, who are numerous in Darel, but do not exist in Hunza or Nager' (derived from Persian *kamin*, 'mean', Biddulph, p. 39); *cremin* (Dainelli, p. 130); *kamin*, 'inferior classes' (Kashmir census report on Balti, *ap. Dainelli*, p. 132). Shawe's derivation of this from *krum*, *Krīm* (i.e. Sanskrit *karma*), 'work', or rather from the Sanskrit derivative *karmin*, 'worker', is rendered certain by the forms and meanings (including Sindhī *kamī*, 'daylabourer', Lahnda *kammī*, 'menial') assembled under '*kāmī*', 'blacksmith', 'iron-worker', in Turner's *Nepali Dictionary*. But we have already (*supra*, p. 202) noted it in Kāngra, and also in the Garhwāl-Kumaon area, with the meaning of 'manual labourer', generally

agricultural and mostly menial or semi-servile. It is properly not a caste term, but occupational and could easily assume the denotation of any particular manual occupation, e.g. that of blacksmith, or the wide sense of 'workman', or even in suitable circumstances, 'slave' (*kāmi*, etc., in Sirājī, etc., L.S. VIII. 2, p. 493, and in Kāngra and several dialects of the Chamba-Kashmir region, L.S. I. ii, Comparative Vocabularies, p. 83). Thus the Kashmir census advisedly uses *kamin* in relation to (inferior) Dard classes.

3. *Dom*, 'musicians, blacksmiths and leather-workers, are most numerous in Yassin, Nager, and Chilas, in which latter place they form a sixth of the population' (Biddulph, p. 39, Drew, pp. 426-7, Leitner, *Dardistan*, p. 63 and Appendix IV, p. 10, 'musicians'); also in Gilgit and 'in the valley below Chitral' (*ibid.*, pp. 50, 65). Biddulph thought that these Doms were probably not aborigines 'in these valleys', but came, 'like the Shins', from the south: perhaps he implies the same by his 'remnants of the early, pre-Aryan, race that inhabited India'.

On the cognates (Sanskrit *ḍomba*, etc) of this term *Dom*, see Turner, *Nepali Dictionary*, s.v. *dum*. In the Ladak region, where it may have been replaced by the Tibetan *Mon*, it is not apparent; for which reason it is not here necessary to discuss the wide distribution in India or the use of the term in the Garhwāl-Kumaon area as a general designation for the whole low-caste population. Biddulph in his sphere reports (p. 39) the low-castes as 'of very dark complexion, coarse features, and inferior physique': cf. Drew, pp. 426-7, who states that they have not a difference of language.

4. *Rono*, the highest caste among the Dard peoples (Drew, pp. 435-6; Biddulph, pp. 34-6; Leither, *Dardistan*, p. 59). The obscurity of the origin of this designation allows a conjecture that it is nothing other than the *Rāṇā* (Sanskrit *rājanyaka*) of the Indo-Āryan Himālayan countries. The status of the Ronos seems to correspond notably to that of the Rāṇās, known from early centuries as local chieftains and still represented by descendants constituting the leading social class. The change of vowel, *ā* > *o*, can be paralleled by not a few examples in *Ṣiṇā*, especially when followed by *n* or *r*, and in Kashmiri it is in certain situations normal. It seems, in fact, quite likely that the status and title originated in Kashmir and was propagated thence: one legend of the origin of the Ronos (Biddulph, p. 35) derives them from the Rajauri state, in the mountains south of Kashmir.
5. *Jushteros*, 'elders', who control the affairs of villages in Chilas (Biddulph, p. 17, Drew, p. 460, Leitner, *Dardistan*, pp. 58-9 (cf. Appendix VI, p. 1), 'Board of Elders', also in Kandia and Chitral). The institution of such 'aldermen' might exist anywhere, as in the case of Spiti, where the village *gaipos* (Kāngra Gaz.

1897, IV, pp. 94-5) are *rgad-pos* (Tibetan), 'elders'. But the form of the word equates it to that of the Kumaon Jethoras, 'elders', (Almora Gaz., p. 98), name of a division of Bhotias, 'who claim to be descendants of the first Bhotia settlers. This term also may therefore be one carried to Kumaon from the Kashmir region by the Khasias.

3. Material analogies between Trans- and Cis-Himālayan conditions.

Among the correspondences of the second kind, sc. those which are not matter of nomenclature, there are some which, though not ethnographical in a racial sense, may be regarded as belonging to what may be termed 'regional ethnography', i.e. are characteristic of a geographical region: thus there is an 'European' culture. Under this head we probably should not include the fraternal polyandry which we have found pervasive among the Kanets and which probably therefore was an usage of their Kuṇinda ancestors. In the Ladak countries it is likely to have been an importation from Tibet; and, since it is not a Dard/Ṣiṇā usage, the Machnopa Dards, who practice it (Shawe, pp. 8-9, Drew, pp. 250n.) may owe it to that contact. It is, however, curious to find (Shawe, p. 8) that the Machnopa justification of it is precisely that which we have found alleged on the Indian side of the mountains, namely the economic fact of the limitation of cultivable land. Since Kulu, Lahul, and Spiti, in all which the practice and the justification are both attested, have been from remote times continuously in communication with the Ladak areas and since they are not remote from the Machnopa Darbs, there may have been an influence from their side.

Biasutti has demonstrated (pp. 141-7) that in the Tibetan family system there is nothing matriarchal and that in the fraternal polyandry the implicit intent is the transmission of the family property intact. It may be said, however, that the notion of matrilineal descent is likewise inherent and is manifest in those cases where, failing a male inheritor, a daughter is constituted heir and is empowered to propagate the family with any consort whom she may choose. The accord of the same right to a widow, provided that she continues to occupy the family residence, seems to be an accommodation to circumstances, since a widow is not of the family: on the Indian side, as we have seen, that exception was very widely upheld. The provision that the widow must marry a younger brother of the deceased may have been a logical restriction of her excessive liberty. How far these exceptions, which on the Indian side were widely legitimate, were upheld by Tibetans may not be known. In the Gilgit area inheritance by a single daughter and levirate marriage of widows are attested (Biddulph, pp. 76 and 82).

In general the notion of matrilineal descent seems independent of that of fraternal polyandry, and it plays a part in some other usages which have come into

view. These are, first, the legitimacy or quasi-legitimacy in the mothers' class of their offspring from fathers of a higher, generally the immediately superior, class; secondly, in the case of polygamic families the division of inheritance *per stirpes*. The latter prevails in Gilgit (Biddulph, p. 82). The inter-caste rule which sharply distinguishes between taking brides from a next, esteemed lower, caste and giving brides to the same seems almost as universal in the Dard area as in the Indian Himālaya.

A remarkable correspondence between *trans*- and *cis*- Himālaya is the strong discrimination of various classes as outside the pale. On the Indian side, where the matter is highly complex, the classes so regarded can be clearly identified by their caste designations, whether these are general, and perhaps originally tribal or ethnic, as Dom, Kolī, etc., or occupational, as *Lohār*, 'worker in iron'. In Tibet and the Ladak regions there are, as Dainelli well argues (pp. 130-3), no castes in the rigid Indian sense, but only class distinctions such as exist in all countries. The dominant socio-economic factor was agriculture: in a society constituted mainly of land-holding peasants the special crafts and services are likely to be few and low esteemed. As this view is in full accord with what we have concluded on the Indian side, we naturally here concur: it may be remarked that the impression, recorded in most areas, that the 'menial' classes represent an under, sc. prior or aboriginal, population, a view in some instances plausible in itself or supported by observed differences of physiognomy, does not necessarily imply that the low classes are prior or aboriginal in the district where they are found: in particular instances, and on the Indian side perhaps commonly, they may have been immigrants for whose occupations there may have been openings due to changed economic conditions. An example of this in the Dard area may be furnished by the Doms, if Biddulph, who attests their distinctive physiognomy, is right in holding that they are not there indigenous, but have immigrated in attendance upon the *Šinās*. Similarly the *Dāgīs* of Lahul, where they are musicians, are stated to have come from Kulu.

4. Beda and Mon.

In Ladak Proper we should not expect to find a social classification seriously different from that described by Śarat Chandra Das in regard to Tibet or that stated in the Kashmir Census report, both of which are reproduced by Dainelli. In neither case is caste on Indian lines suggested; and Dainelli finds little occasion for comment, except in regard to the Beda and Mon of Ladak. We may just remark that two of the low classes, viz. the Beda, 'flute-players' (in Ladak) and the Garra (Tib. *mgar-ra*), 'smiths', had been from ancient times despised classes in Tibet; the Beda are known not only in Lhasa, but also in many Himālayan districts on the Indian side in connection with the famous rope-slide ceremony. But the Mon also require an

explanation not internal to Ladak.

In the Ladak districts a widely, but sparsely, spread class, employed as musicians and of low standing, is known as Mon. It has often been noted, and by A. H. Francke and others it has been brought into connection with traditions, or legends, of a Mon people as early inhabitants of the country and in particular as builders of the ruined forts, etc., *mon-mkhar*, Francke's 'castles of the Mons', seen in various localities. In criticism of this Dainelli, in the first place, positively denies that the Ladak Mon are ever employed as carpenters, which the Moravian missionary Marx had alleged, or as anything but drummers: and he denounces as incredible the survival of an ancient race merely in a restricted and despised employment. It must be admitted that Biddulph likewise (p. 50) describes the Balti Mons as 'musicians', though he adds that 'they answer in every respect to the Doms of Gilgit', whom in the Dard area he cites as 'musicians, blacksmiths and leather-workers'. Dainelli, who notes the absence of any differential physiognomy in these Mons, nevertheless admits in regard to the name, but with his own specification, an originally ethnic sense: citing the well known facts concerning the Tibetan use of the name, and especially in the expression *Lho-Mon*, 'Mon of the south', to denote outside, non-Tibetan, peoples [especially those of the Indo-Tibetan sub-Himālaya], he conceives that both in regard to the Mon musicians and in regard to the 'Mon' castles the term did not carry any historical tradition, but implied only a vague notion of foreign, outside, barbarian, or obscure origin: and he refers to some popular uses of the Italian word *zingari*, 'Gypsies', to people whose mode of life is, or is regarded as, similar.

In this matter we may begin by agreeing that the existence, at any period, of a Mon people in the region of Western Tibet is entirely devoid of historical attestation or credibility. Here we cannot omit a reference to the legendary 'Mowas, or Mons, or Motans', to whom in the Kanet area, on the Indian side of the Great Himālaya, Cunningham found attributed all the numerous ancient remains of stone buildings, and whom the Kanets all agreed in regarding as their own ancestors. It was upon this suggestion that Cunningham conceived his theory of a Mon, or Muṅḍā, origin of the native Himālayan peoples: and, if the form Mon were really certain, the striking similarity of the legends north and south respectively of the Great Himālaya would demand at least some explanation. But of the form *Mon* we have not, in fact, found any other attestation, and of the *Māwis* or *Mowannas*, which names indeed are not etymologically explained, the available accounts do not indicate either an exact analogy or a really ancient date. Hence these should for the present be left out of account.

We can also appreciate Dainelli's objection to recognizing in a small class of practitioners of a despised profession the sole survivors of an ancient ruling race.

But in the Indian system of caste-profession names there seem to be many which originally were ethnic, and perhaps analogies to this phenomenon can be seen in most countries: the case of the *zingari*, cited by Dainelli, is paralleled by the term *Gypsy, Egyptian*, itself, and similarly in French, 'point d'argent, point de Suisse'. Perhaps in such cases the class so named is usually of foreign, or in some way outlandish, origin. This seems, in fact, to be Dainelli's own explanation; but it posits as a starting-point the actual use of the expressions 'Mon' and 'Mon-fort'; and of these it is futile to seek an explanation in the Ladak region, because they must both have been imported ready-made from Great Tibet.

In the case of Great Tibet it is not necessary to confine attention to the wide denotation stated in the Dictionary of Śarat Chandra Das, where the name is defined as applying to the Kirānti tribes of E. Nepal and occurring in *Mon-yul*, 'the sub-Himālayan regions extending from Kashmir to Assam', *Mon-pa-gro* [Mon-Spag-ro], 'the town and province of Pa-ro [Spag-ro] in Bhutan', and *Mon-rtā-dwang* [Rta-dbañ], 'a small principality [in S. Tibet] adjoining the eastern border of Bhutan': to which we may add the Lho-Mon-thañ, 'Mantang' of the maps, capital of the tiny, but ancient, state of Glo-bo on a Nepal-Tibet route near Nowakot. Even this denotation seems less wide and vague than that countenanced by Dainelli. As a racial or gentile name, sometimes spelled *Mon*, the term was familiar even in the time (VIIth century) of Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po, who himself had a Mon wife, and of his early successors: for reff. see M. Bacot's *Documents de Touen-houang* (1904-1946), pp. 182-3. In *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents* (I, pp. 273-4, cf. II, p. 288) we have cited a passage relating to removal (c.791 A.D.) of a Turk tribe to Mon territory, where a town or fort was provided: and in II, p. 299, several Mon individuals are named. As regards 'Mon-forts (or castles)', we may be excused for drawing attention to a discussion in *Nam: an ancient language of the Sino-Tibetan Borderland* (pp. 150 sqq.), where it is pointed out that the expression *Mon-rdzoñ*, 'Mon-fort', used in the Nam country in the VIIIth or IXth century, corresponds notably to the *Mon-mkhar* of Western Tibet. It was inferred that the Mons named were foreign craftsmen, perhaps belonging to the Man-tzū of Chinese border districts, travelling like the Ssü-ch'uanese carpenters and brick-makers of modern periods, who 'do nearly all the building in eastern Tibet', and like the itinerant Chinese smiths, who visit the Tibetan encampments and make 'all their ironwork'. In fact, the Tibetan Gyarung (Rgyal-roñ) district of Ssü-ch'uan is that of which the population is most consistently regarded by the Chinese as 'Mon'. That in course of time the Tibetans should have widened their conception of 'Mon' peoples is not at all unintelligible, since, as the Chinese use of the term 'Man' demonstrates, there were various other peoples, such as the Lo-lo and Mo-so, to whom that ethnical term was applied. But it is to the Mon-tzū of the Rgyal-roñ that a special connection with building is attributed by the

tradition concerning the often described 'towers', for which the region is famous (*Nam*, pp. 66-7).

Accordingly it was in the function of craftsmen that the Mons were connected with the forts; and the period was considerably earlier than the foundation of the Western Tibetan State. It seems therefore indubitable that with this import the expression 'Mon-fort' was carried by the Tibetans into Ladak; and it is quite likely that actual Mon craftsmen accompanied it.

As regards the Beda, of whose designation Biasutti cites Francke's absurd etymology (from Sanskrit *bheda*, 'division'), it is sufficient to mention that in Tibet a person of this class is mentioned (*hbye-hdah*) in the early Chronicle (see M. Bacot's *Documents*, p. 31).

5. Early relations with outside peoples.

The impression received by earlier writers of a fundamentally Tibetan origin and nature of the main populations of the Ladak State is, no doubt, a tribute to the assimilative power of Tibetan culture, especially as backed by the influence of Great Tibet, and of its Buddhist religion. Even Biddulph, who conceived of the whole area as originally in Dard occupation (p. 49) until overflowed by 'a wave of Tartar conquest' 'down the Indus valley from the eastward', thought that even the Baltis, 'though they have undoubtedly a considerable amount of Aryan blood, must be classed as a Mongolian race' (p. 40, cf. p. 48 'a mixed race possessing no distinctive type of their own'). This impression, largely, no doubt, due to extreme Tibetani- zation in language and religion, must yield to the mass of anthropological and cultural materials assembled and with full competence expounded in the work of Dainelli and Biasutti. The actual historical facts, of which Dainelli gives (pp. 156-9) a summary, suffice to prove that the Tibetans did not even make contact with the Ladak countries before c.700 A.D. and did not definitely annex them before the Xth century: it is indeed surprizing that Francke after publishing the actual Chronicle should have continued, if he did continue, to believe in an early basic population of Tibetan race; the utmost that can be admitted is that there may have been some infiltration of nomad 'Ciang' (Byañ-pa) of the great north plateau, the eastern neighbours of Ladak, who can have been in their area far more ancient than the Tibetan State and who were at least quasi-Tibetan. Dainelli's conclusion that the pre-Tibetan population of the whole area, from the east of Ladak Proper westward, was Dard is essentially in agreement with Biddulph's view: but he does not concur in regarding the Machnops of the Indus as a survival of the pre-Tibetan Dards, nor does he hold that none of the other Dard chieftainships, settlements and migrations is posterior. In fact, the relations which Biddulph particularizes of political connections between Baltistan and the Gilgit-Hunza-Nagar region belong to a later

period: the Dard song of progress eastward published by Francke could hardly be of really high antiquity; and the genealogies of local chieftains, though they may be evidence of actual Dard descent, do not reach back to remote centuries. Since the evidence of the anthropological and archaeological investigations is, though scientifically valid, yet chronologically indefinite, and since Dainelli himself admits the possibility of a pre-Dard population, any actual historical notices carrying a date would be welcome.

The Greek accounts of Alexander's expedition and their other writings concerning India do not seem to yield any information concerning the Ladak countries: Ptolemy's *Būtai* (VI.13.3), who belong to Śaka country and are 'along Mount Imaos', the Mustāgh range, may be the Baltis: his Daradrai (VII.1.43), who are 'below the sources of the Indus' and whose 'highlands impend over them', are mentioned along with the Lambatai (Lamghān) and Souastene (Swat); and there is no reason for making them extend beyond the main Dard area, which is the Indus valley up to about Bunji. The country of the gold-bearing ants, if that was, as we hope to have proved, Hunza-Nagar, is neither Dard nor part of the Ladak country, though politically entangled with both.

In the Sanskrit *Mahā-Bhārata*, however, there is a reference, which, though of indefinite date, is certainly, if it really does mention the Śiṅṅā people, the earliest reference to them. This is the recurrent mention of *Cīnas* in connection with western peoples, e.g. II, v. 1843 with Hūnas and Śakas, v. 1846 with Bāhlikas III, v. 1991 with Hārahūnas and Tukhāras, v. 12350 with Tukhāras, Daradas and Dārvas, V, v. 3049, with Balihas (Bāhlikas?), VI, v. 373, with Maradas (Daradas?). In the *Rāmāyaṇa* also, IV, 43, vv. 12-3, Cīnas and Parama-Cīnas are western peoples, along with Kāmbojas, Yavanas, Āraṭṭakas, Bāhlikas, Rṣikas, Pauravas, Taṅkaṇas, Nihāras (Tukhāras?) and Daradas. Goat-skins and deer-skins (*ajina*) of Cīna production are mentioned in *Mbh.* V, v. 3049, and wool-textures of Bāhli and Cīna in II, v. 1846. In these passages, which are probably not later than the early centuries of the Christian era, it seems unlikely that the Chinese should be mentioned; and in general a production of skin robes by Chinese is unexpected: hence the repeated suggestion that by the name *Cīna* Śiṅṅā peoples are meant is not without plausibility. Reliance, however, cannot be placed on this: the Cīnas named in V, v. 584 in connection with Bhagadatta of Assam are probably real Chinese, and Chinese textiles (silk), at any rate, were rather early known in India. Moreover, even if the Cīnas were Śiṅṅā people, there is nothing to suggest that they were in the Ladak country and not in their own main, Dard, region, which, in fact, accords better with the mention of Kāmbojas, Bāhlikas, etc.

A more definite item is the mention in the earliest Khotan legend of 'the cattle-herd boy Hjes and *mu-le* ('girl') Hji'. There can be no doubt that *mu-le*, 'girl', is the

molai 'daughter', of Shawe's Ḥbrog-pa vocabulary, and the *molai*, *mulai*, 'girl', of the Ḥbrog-pa of Dras and other Ṣiṇā dialects: see L.S. VIII, ii, p. 228, and also Biddulph, p. Liv). But this also may have come to Khotan direct from Dardistan; and, since it, occurs only in Ṣiṇā, and not in other Dard languages, may be in that group a loan-word.

6. Hunza-Nagar.

Dainelli cites with approval, and supports with an observation of his own (pp. 176-7), a recognition by Drew (*op.cit.*, pp. 433-4) and Neve of ethnic elements from Hunza-Nagar in the upper valleys of the Ṣi-sgar river, leading up to the Karakoram Range: and at the same time he admits the possibility of some immigration of Yarkandīs during a period when passes over the Range were less impracticable than at present. In view of the intimate relations which have, it is hoped, been proved to have prevailed during the first half of the VIIIth century A.D. between Hunza-Nagar (the 'Gold Race'), Baltistan (Skar-do) and the kingdom of Khotan (not Yarkand, which at that date was unimportant) these two matters are somewhat interlinked: and between Hunza-Nagar and Baltistan there have been in later centuries the political and other connections related by Biddulph. Both call for some serious consideration here: we may endeavour to disentangle them somewhat by first stating what is apposite concerning Hunza-Nagar.

The Hunza-Nagar country, situated at the junction, so to speak, of the Karakoram and the Hindu-Kush, is connected with the Ladak districts only *via* Baltistan, to which appertain the above cited ethnic elements and certain traditions of occasions of direct inter-communications through the now almost impossible Hispar pass. Historically it has been in closer relation to Gilgit and Yasin, with which it shares the inheritance of the still problematic Burushaski language: the Hunza river, carrying also that of Nagar, joins the Gilgit river, at a point one mile below Gilgit, about 23 miles above the confluence of the latter with the Indus, furnishing a route. Of Gilgit the earliest known mention would be one in the Chinese *Tang-shu*, 'Tang Annals', if De Groot's rendering, 'Giāt-to on the river Sai', is preferable to that of Chavannes, 'Sie-to near the river So-i': in the name *Gilgit*, often pronounced *Gilid*, the syllable *Gil*, the *Gīḍa* [-*gīṭṭu*] of a Śaka-Khotanī document (IX-Xth century), might then be an addition, denoting some feature or attribute. The valley of the Gilgit river as far west as the Yasin district has been identified with the often discussed Bolor.

From Colonel Lorimer's precise descriptions and from his map (also those of Drew and Biddulph) it can be seen that Hunza is mainly on the north of the river and of Nagar and leads up over high passes to the Pamir, where is the district of Sarikol. This name, which has sometimes been spelled *Sirikol* or *Serikol*, and which as

having in its first syllable a short vowel is guaranteed by meticulous observation on the part of Sir Aurel Stein, is interesting, if it is, as seems likely, the hitherto missing original of Hsüan-tsang's Sanskrit *Suvarṇagotra*, which on the ground of not far from contemporary translations in both Chinese, *Chin-shi*, and Tibetan, *Gser-rings*, unquestionably signified 'Gold-race' or 'Gold-family' or was so understood. The signification cannot be based upon any etymology, correct or popular, from the Tibetan side: in the time of Hsüan-tsang's journey the large Tibetan State was only in its formation and can hardly even have heard of Sarikol, from which it was separated by immense spaces. The many reasons which we have given for identifying *Suvarṇagotra*, the 'Women's country', with Nagar encourage us to see in the name *Sarikol* the Burushaski word *gul*, 'relations by marriage' combined with *zər*, 'gold'; the latter, even if not the original native term, exists, along with *zərgar*, 'goldsmith', in Colonel Lorimer's Vocabulary, and from its wide and ancient prevalence in Iranian (also in Dard) must certainly have been known in a country frequented by merchants in quest of gold. It seems therefore possible that prior to the immigration of the Wakhīs, people from Wakhan, whose quite alien physiognomy and language are emphasized in Colonel Lorimer's work, the whole Hunza-Nagar territory up to the Pamir was included in the district-name *Sarikol*, *Suvarṇagotra*.

The curious circumstance that Hsüan-tsang's account of *Suvarṇagotra* is given in connection with his visit to Brahma-pura (Garhwāl-Kumaon), although the country is 'in the midst of the Great Snowy Mountains', 'with Tibet on its east, San-po-ho (Chitral) on its west and Khotan on its north', and further that it partly duplicates his prior (p. 135) account of Bolor (Po-lu-lo), is perhaps not inexplicable. It was in Brahma-pura, which, in fact, 'is bounded on the north by the great Snowy Mountains', sc. the Great Himālaya, that he heard of a famous gold country, beyond, which would be mNāḥ-ris-skor-gsum, the Kailāsa-Mānasa region, Thok Jalung, etc. For the confusion with the ant-gold of Dards, Cīnas (Ṣiṇās), etc., of the 'Women's Country' in the midst of the snowy Karakoram (Himavant, Hemodos) he will have been indebted to his Indian informants, who had already made it in the *Mahā-Bhārata*: as we have seen, it appears in the insertion of a reference (III, v. 12350) to Cīnas (Ṣiṇās), Hūnas, Daradas, and Dārvas, as met in the Kuṇḍa territory, sc. Brahma-pura = Garhwāl-Kumaon.

Like the Wakhī-speakers of the north of Hunza, the Ṣiṇā-speaking people of the southern part of Nagar are regarded by Colonel Lorimer (p. xxxv) as ethnically distinguishable. At what period their immigration commenced seems to be unascertained. Of the main Hunza-Nagar population he gives not only an intimate description from personal observation, but also a summary of a considerable number of anthropometric examinations, of which he perhaps too modestly estimates the

value, but in which he has confidence in so far as they indicate 'a considerable difference' between Hunza and Nagar subjects in certain particulars. In case the remote and isolated situation is, as has generally been presumed and as Colonel Lorimer agrees, the final refuge, often peripherally penetrated, but never overwhelmed by conquest or organized immigration, of a language once more widespread, and in case those who now speak it are ethnically inheritors of it, ethnographical speculation seems to be excluded: the very high antiquity of a language which has been tentatively assigned, on the one hand to Caucasian, on the other to Dravidian, sets them beyond conjecture. But neither Colonel Lorimer's favourable view of the people's morale nor a Dravidian hypothesis concerning the language is absolutely irrelevant here. Colonel Lorimer's 'roseate, even idyllic, picture' (p. xlvii) of the people is distinctly reminiscent of Captain Alexander Gerard's description (1841), of the Kunāwarīs, and perhaps, in some points, of Dainelli's very elaborate ethnographical appreciation of the Ladakhīs. And here we must not omit a mention of Biddulph's prior observation (pp. 30-38) —

'The people of Hunza and Nager ... differ slightly in appearance, the Nager people apparently showing an infusion of Tartar blood, derived, no doubt, from their Iskardo neighbours'.

and (p. 73) —

'The fairest complexions are to be seen among the Boorish of Hunza and Yassin, where individuals may be found who would pass for Europeans. Among them red hair is not uncommon'.

and two particulars which in the Indian Himālaya we have found ethnographically significant (p. 30 and p. 77) —

'They [the Hunza people] are great wine-drinkers, and are reproached by their neighbours for ... and for the immorality of their women'.

The last item (possibly hinted also by Colonel Lorimer, p. xlvii) is endorsed in regard to the 'Women's Country' by a Buddhist text composed by a Balti and Nagar princess and queen in the VIIIth century A.D.

The possibility, studied by some scholars, of Dravidian items in the Burushaski language is not without a bearing upon our present study, to which the still not surrendered hypothesis of a Muṇḍā, sc. quasi-Dravidian, constituent in Himālayan populations and languages is obviously germane. This topic we must from want of competence leave untouched. But of a quite different and not prehistoric, namely Hūna, element in the Hunza-Nagar people a suggestion previously propounded on historical and textual grounds may now, it seems, be repeated as practically a certainty. In the above-cited Buddhist text the authoress and heroine has much to say concerning certain 'wild men', robbers, in her country, with whom she was anxious to make friendship. The 'wild men' were probably related to the brigands

encountered in Sarīkol by Hsüan-tsang in 644 A.D. and to the Hunza robbers who down to modern times have been notorious for waylaying in the Zarafshan valleys the Yarkand caravans bound for the Ladak countries. Their personal names, stated in the text, are in most instances in notable accord with what is otherwise known of Hephthalite Hun nomenclature: and it was argued that the 'wild men' were, in fact, Hephthalite Huns from the Pamir, where a Hephthalite principality is known to have existed even as late as the VIIIth century A.D. In the name *Hunza* the *-za* can obviously be the common Iranian gentile Suffix (from *zāta*, 'born'), which would certainly have been familiar to speakers of Burushaski, a language now full of Iranian loanwords: and, in fact, the people of Nagar affirm, we are told, that the Hunza population, Hunzu-kuts, of the joint, discordant, State are 'Yeshkuns' from the Pamir. The immigrant Wakhīs who now occupy the northern part of the Hunza State have followed their ancient precedent.

The new confirmation which we can now adduce relates to the name, 'A-kun, of one, evidently the chief (p. 232), of the 'wild men'. Concerning him it is said (*op.cit.*, p. 255) —

'There is a certain 'A-ku-na, who formerly (sc. in a previous birth) ...: seek out 'A-ku-na; in the seizing of the country (Khotan?) he will assist ... Formerly that man 'A-ku-na was a king ...'

Inasmuch as on the Chionite-Hephthalite coins (see Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, pp. 13-9, 88, 90, 92, 95) *Akun* is a prominent royal name, the inference that the person, and therefore that the Hunzas of Hunza-Nagar, descended from the Hephthalite Huns of the Pamir, seems irresistible.

From this historico-ethnical observation there might be, as a linguistic corollary, a possibility of detecting in the Burushaski language some few items borrowed from Hun speech. Upon that side issue, all the more unpromising inasmuch as the Hephthalite language, though presumably of Turk-Mongol affinity, is almost totally unknown, we have no qualification or occasion for venturing. But it may be interesting to note that in Burushaski native terms for 'north', 'south', 'east', 'west', seem to have been lacking, since *shamāl*, 'north', and *janub*, 'south', are loan-words from Semitic, found also in others of Professor Morgenstierne's *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, and *jil*, 'east' ('rising (of sun, etc.)'), *bur*, 'west' ('setting (of sun)'), seem likewise extraneous: it is conceivable that *jil* and *bur* were imported by Hūnas and connected with Mongol *jūn*, 'left', 'east', and *baron*, 'right', 'west'.

7. Khotan and Kashmir.

The second matter, relations with Chinese Turkestan, is less obscure. In the first half of the VIIIth century A.D., as is evident from the above-quoted Buddhist text, communications between Khotan and both Baltistan and Hunza-Nagar were active.

This activity may have resulted from the Tibetan effort aimed at the Pamir countries, which was initiated about 700 A.D. and which in the year 737 A.D. inflicted a great defeat upon the allied kings of Baltistan and Khotan, who both fell in the battle. In 740 the Tibetans commenced to extend their influences as far west as Gilgit, where in 747 they were for the time being checked by a famous Chinese expedition over the Pamir. During the remainder of the VIIIth century the Tibetan conflict with China was carried on mainly in Chinese Turkestan and on their eastern frontier: and we do not hear of any further action in the Ladak region. Towards the close of that century the Tibetans commenced an occupation of Khotan, which lasted until late in the Xth century, when Khotan was conquered by the Turks of Kashgar: during that century, which was a period of increasing weakness on the Tibetan side, the Ladak countries seem to have been left to themselves; and the foundation of the Western Tibetan State in the first half of the Xth century was in no way continuous with their previous efforts. The Turk and Muslim rule in Khotan probably led to a complete cessation of political relations with Ladak during several centuries, which, as well as the later history, are void of interest for our present study. Perhaps the very last survival of Khotan connection with Ladak is the unexplained title, *Amachak*, which heads the genealogy of the rulers of Shigar (Śi-sgar), a small state on the like-named river, which during earlier periods must have been on a frequented route of communications, over passes in the Karakoram, with Khotan: as has been pointed out, the title, which is derived from Sanskrit *amātya*, 'councillor', had often, apparently down to the termination of native and Buddhist rule in Khotan, been held by kings and dignitaries of that State.

The beginnings, on the other hand, are of primary concern to us here. The foundation legend of Khotan, which, if we disregard a fictitious prior visit of the Indian Emperor Aśoka, clearly contemplates a date in the last half of the IIIrd century B.C., affirms circumstantially an Indian participation in it. The Indian contingent comes from the west, which indubitably means the mountain valleys to the south-west leading up to the Karakoram passes. For a period not later than the beginning of the Christian Era 'Indian' influence in the Khotan country is definitely proved by the 'Sino-Kharoṣṭhī' coinage, which in its script, Prākṛit language and facture follows the model of the Śaka coins of north-western India and Gandhāra. By what route did the 'Indians' of the IIIrd century B.C. and the coin-models of the Ist century B.C. come to the Khotan region? Most likely the route as far as the passes was that which as late as c.400 A.D. was taken, apparently as normal, by the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Fa-hsien. Fa-hsien did not pass through Hunza-Nagar and did not visit Kashmir: having reached the 'hanging passages' (the Indus Gorge country) and traversed them, he crossed the river into the Dard country. As regards Hunza-Nagar we have no ground, despite the ruins of an ancient *stūpa* near Thol, for

believing that Buddhism had reached it as early as the 1st century B.C. or A.D.: the *stūpa* could have been, no doubt, far later. But there is a linguistic item which may point to relations of even higher antiquity with Khotan. This is the Burushaski word *dir* (Śiṅā *dir*, see Colonel Lorimer's Vocabulary), 'boundary', 'dividing line', or small irrigation channel, 'between fields': that this is connected with Khotani *tir*, 'district', occurring in the names of the very oldest districts, Ḥgum-tir, Dro-tir, Sañ-tir, appears as follows:— In the IIrd - IIIrd century Kharoṣṭhī documents of the Shan-shan State, far away in the east of Chinese Turkistan, it must be seen in the name *Mo-tir*, a district, also known as *Mo* and *Mo-shan*, bordering on Lob-nor: the district name occurs in the personal names *Motireiya* ('man of Motir'), *Motirḍhi* and *Motirḍhiya* (easy misreading of *-ci*, *-ciya*), and *Motiṭom*, *Motiṭom*, Prākṛitized from *Motirtom*, in which *tom* signifies 'thousand (-district)', a local administrative area. The term is even found in north-eastern Tibet, where the Tu-yü-hun people's headquarters, near the Koko-nor lake, was named *Phug-tir*, with a Tibetan from *Phyug-tshams*, in which *tshams*, literally 'border', 'limit', is common in names of districts. This very wide prevalence of the word and its signification seems to indicate that they were of Central-Asian provenance and were imported into Burushaski and Śiṅā through contact. A number of other terms used in the Shan-shan Prākṛit, but of Iranian or Indian origin, e.g. *astam*, *astām*, 'judgment', 'lawcase', *tiṣṣi*, 'span', have likewise been adopted in Burushaski.

Since in the Buddhist text the visits of merchants to the Gold-race country are conceived as quite normal, it is possible that from the side of Central Asia the country had been known from ancient times; and, inasmuch as Herodotus (III. 102) was told that specimens of the 'gold-digging ants' had been in the possession of the Persian king, it may be that the route of the traffic had been over the Pamir. As regards the Hunza-Nagar population, so high an antiquity is, of course, no difficulty.

The case of Kashmir is different. There is no evidence that in early times the Hunza-Nagar country was, or that it has ever been, on a Kashmir route to Central Asia. The far north, mountain-girt country, Kashmir, which even in the *Mahā-Bhārata* appears practically only in lists, became familiarly known in India much later than might have been expected, perhaps only in the time of the emperor Aśoka, following the Buddhist propaganda associated with the name of Madhyandina. Its importance may have originated with the Yüeh-chih. In Khotan Buddhist connections with Kashmir prevail during an early, but not the earliest, period, probably in Yüeh-chih times: the earliest tangible indication is a *sgraffito* on a rock near the bridge of Kalatse, which is dated in a year 184 or 187, probably near the close of the 1st century A.D., and names a Yüeh-chih king. The *sgraffito* is in Indian Prākṛit language and Kharoṣṭhī script: it was, no doubt, a traveller's record, and the situation at a spot where there are several other writings indicate that it was on a

route to Central Asia. The route was far to the east of that of Fa-hsien; Kalatse is east of Baltistan and in Ladak Proper; it is on regular routes from Śrinagar and from Skardo to Leh.

8. Bru-śa and Balti.

The last and most important matter for consideration here is the ethnic name, at present *Burūšo*, *Burušo*, *Burišo*, of the Hunza and Nagar people, with their *Burušaski*, *Burišaski*, language, and their relation to the people and language of Baltistan.

No one perhaps has ever doubted the identity of this name with that of the country Bru-śa (rarely Gru-śa) or Bru-za, known to the Tibetans at least as early as the first half of the VIIIth century A.D., and during the same period known also in Khotan. In the second of these instances, and very familiarly in the subsequent Buddhist literature of Tibet (e.g. *ibid.*, I, pp. 290-1, and see further pp. 262-3), it figures as a Buddhist country: we have one mention (*ibid.*, I, pp. 293-4) of its Bons. As belonging to the region of the Udyāna (Swat) and Tukhāra (Pamir) districts, it is naturally prominent in Padmasambhava texts. There is thus no doubt of its application to the Hunza-Nagar country; but its restriction thereto has to be tested, since Biddulph states (p. 48) that the 'Yeshkuns' among the Indus Dards (Machnopas) are also called 'Broosha'.

For Baltistan and the Baltis the Burushaski names are respectively *Balo* and *Balōyo*: Śiṅā has *Pale*, which may also be represented by a Tibetan *Ba-le* (in a version from some language, see *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, I, pp. 261-2). The usual Tibetan *Sbal-ti* (with probably punning variants *Sbal-gnon*, *Sbal-Icon*, see *ibid.*, I, p. 271, n. 5) has prefixed s to assist pronunciation: Cunningham's *Nang-kod* (*Ladak*, p. 24) perhaps occurs in a c.VIIIth century document (see *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, II, p. 148) as *Nai-gon* (or *-god*), and his *Skardo*, properly name of the capital, reigns alone in the Buddhist text, *ibid.*, I, pp. 148, etc.

The name *Balti*, if connected, as is commonly supposed (Cunningham, *Ladak*, p. 34), with Ptolemy's *Būtai*, is ancient: can the like account be given of Biddulph's *Challaj Bultum* (p. 27), cited as a disused ancient name of Hunza? The Chinese 'Little P'o-lü' and 'Great P'o-lü' are satisfactorily identified by Chavannes with Gilgit and Baltistan respectively. These, along with Hsüan-tsang's *Po-lü-lo*, which is used for both Bolor, Balur, and Baltistan, cannot correspond to *Balti*, *Balo*, etc.: as was suggested in *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, I, p. 176, *P'o-lü* may represent the *Bru* of *Bru-śa* and *-za* (also in *Bru-žal*, *Bru-šal*), being merely the Chinese pronunciation of it; and this seems to be proved by the passage given *ibid.*, p. 32, where the Chinese version actually renders *Bru-śa* by *P'o-lü*. The same appears also in *Hbru-so-lo-na* (*ibid.*, p. 100 and n. 7), the Khotan name of a place on a descent of

the Keria-river valley direct to Khotan and probably identical with the Polu, Polur (Chinese name) still heading that descent: the *so-lo* is likely to be the *śal*, *-śal*, in *Bru-śal*, and the Burushaski *śal*, 'a suffix in place-names in Nagar and to a less extent in Hunza'.

The Chinese association of Gilgit and Baltistan under the common designation *P'o-lü* cannot be lightly regarded. As for Gilgit, we are, of course, not informed either how large an area it comprised during the period (VIIIth century) to which the Chinese accounts belong, or what language then prevailed. At present the language is *Ṣiṇā*; but Colonel Lorimer records (I, pp. xxxiii-iv) 573 speakers of Burushaski resident in the Gilgit administration district (*wazarat*) in 1931; and, since Yasin, much further west up the river-valley, employs the 'Werchikwar' dialect of Burushaski, it seems conceivable that the latter was once prevalent in Gilgit also. As to Baltistan, it was perhaps the items of occasional nomenclature and the historical facts of relations with Hunza-Nagar and Gilgit that induced Colonel Lorimer to present (III, pp. 533-6) a 'List of words common to Balti and Burushaski' (along with kindred forms in Western Tibetan). Those which are common to normal Tibetan, a considerable proportion, do not seem demonstrative.

Evidently, however, the attention bestowed by Tibetan literature upon the Bru-śa country and language, for which it knows also a special (Bru-tsha) form of its alphabet, is excessive for the small state of Hunza-Nagar; and it might be helpful to be able to include Baltistan. But, in fact, the present Balti language is as regards vocabulary very prevalently Tibetan: and, if there are peculiarities in its Accidence and phraseology, as also in the neighbouring dialect of Pu-rig, these are not such as to suggest a connection with Burushaski. More serious is the fact, which it is proposed to demonstrate in the next (Linguistic) chapter, that the Bru-śa language itself, as known to the Tibetans, was not Burushaski.

The existence in the Ladak region of a Bru-śa people and language, which, being a matter of remote philological interest, was naturally not included in Dainelli's survey, evidently concerns the ancient ethnography of the Ladak districts: more especially if the occurrence of the ancient place-name *Hbru-so-lo-na* indicates an extension of the people as far east as the southern foot of the mountains south of Khotan.

As concerns Baltistan one further detail may be mentioned. In *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, I, p. 178, it was conjectured that in the early part of the VIIIth century A.D. it was under a Hūna dynasty: this might have resulted from contiguity to Kashmir. If the conjecture is well founded, it might account for a statement in the Ladak portion of the Tibetan Chronicle (Francke, *op.cit.*, p. 93) that —

'At that time [sc. the time of the foundation of the W. Tibet State] Upper Ladak (*La-dwags-stod*) was held by the descendants of Gesar, while Lower Ladak

(*Smad-rnams*) was split up into small independent principalities'.

As possibly a local tradition, the statement might have some foundation. The 'descendants of Gesar' should have some Central-Asian connection; and it may have been Hūnas who imported the Gasar legend into Western Tibet, which has its own version of it. In case they should have been Hūnas, they might be supposed to have advanced some distance up the Indus valley.

The remaining districts belonging to the Western Tibet State hardly for the most part call for ethnographical specification. In the north along the Śi-sgar river there are traces of both Hunza-Nagar and Balti connections; and Balti settlements are traced at points on the Śa-yok river. Ladak proper, in which also there are Balti and Dard colonies, and which extends eastward to the region of the Pañ-gong lake and there adjoins the Tibetan nomads of the Byañ-thañ, is, of course, the main subject of the elaborate analysis by Dainelli and Biasutti: the 'Mongoloid' elements being almost entirely attributable to the historical Tibetanization, the only remaining question would relate to the prior, Dard or other, population.

The three districts, Zaṅskar, Rupshu and Spiti, which in order from west to east are situated immediately north of the Great Himālaya, do not *prima facie* present ethnographical problems. The Zanskar population, apart from the Dards of Dras and some immigrants from the neighbouring Kashmir, is not discriminated either ethnically or linguistically from Ladak proper: historically somewhat isolated, though crossed by routes from Kashmir and Kaṣṭawār, it is not in the Linguistic Survey volume (III.i) credited even with a separate dialect of Ladakhī. Presumably the small and separate 'Bhot' group in the population of Pangi, the most northerly district of the Chamba State, is immigrant from Zaṅskar or from Ladak generally. Spiti is, as has been seen, markedly Tibetan in physiognomy and culture, and its speech is described in the Linguistic Survey as a dialect of Central Tibetan, closely akin to the 'Nyamkat' [*Mñam-skad*] of mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum and the 'Jāḍ' of Tehri Garhwāl and the Bhotiyā of Garhwāl. Of Rupshu the only inhabitants seem to be a summer population of Byañ-thañ nomads, rather normal Tibetans: on its east are the Tibetan districts of Hañ-rañ and Chu-mur-ti, which belong to mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum.

mÑañ-ris-skor-gsum, completely Tibetanized in speech, religion and government, has replaced the ancient states of Gu-ge, Žañ-žun and Spu-hrañs, which prior to the VIIth century A.D. were evidently in all three respects distinct from Tibet. Though the language was Tibeto-Burman, its relation to Tibetan is provisionally an open question, as is likewise the ethnography, unless the Sanskrit references to the people of the Kailāsa-Mānasa region as Kirātas should be considered evidence. Anything further to be entertained under this head must depend upon a linguistic study.

There is, however, one geographico-linguistic item which has already figured

in ethnographical discussions concerning the western Himālaya. This is the word *ti*, which, as a constituent of river names, was adduced by Cunningham as evidence, in the first instance, of Tibetan, subsequently of Muṇḍā, affinity, and with the second of these was retained by Professor Konow (ZDMG, LIX (1905), p. [...]) and the Linguistic Survey (Ill. i, pp. 428-9). The word, however, as is clear from the Linguistic Survey volume I. ii, 'Comparative Vocabularies', is found throughout the Tibeto-Burman area, and the variants *di*, *du*, *tui*, *tvi*, *chi*, including the standard Tibetan *chu*, are patently cognate with it. In the Western Pronominalized group of Tibeto-Burman, including Kunāwari and the ancient Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ, it rules alone. Apparently Cunningham had not recognized the same *ti* in the numerous place-names in the Ladak region which end in that syllable, and which are, no doubt, primarily names of rivers and river-valleys, the only really habitable areas in the country: such, for instance are Ubs-ti, a place in Zaṅskar, and the districts Spiti (also river) and Chumurti, in which last Professor Tucci has noticed the superfluous prefixing of the Tibetan *chu*, synonymous with *ti*. River names are *Kuk-ti*, *Liṅ-ti*.

The most interesting of these names is that of *Upshi*, *Uk-shi*, etc, a place on the upper Indus, which seems rarely to miss mention by travellers and others concerned with the region. This favour it may owe to its situation on the Indus at a point where the latter is joined by the Han-le river descending northwards from the high Rupshu 'valley or plain': it is the terminal point of Ladak Proper up the river, and is a natural goal of travellers by the ancient route to Ladak *via* Kulu and Lahul or Spiti descending the Rupshu valley to the Indus. That the name *Upsti* contains an equivalent of Tibetan *hubs*, 'gathered', 'collected', is rendered probable by the fact that there is another *Upsti* or *Ubs-ti*, in Zaṅskar, which is not far from a confluence, and more decidedly when we observe that Rupshu itself, a regular derivative from *Rub-chu*, i.e. *rub*, 'rush together' (*rub-te*, 'jointly') - *chu*, 'water', 'river', will be only a Tibetan translation of *Ubs-ti*.

Into the Ladak territories these *-ti* names cannot have been introduced from Tibet, which has not the *ti*; but, since they can have been introduced from Ṣaṅ-ṣuṅ or Kunāwari during the Tibetan period, they hardly supply in general a valid chronological inference. It is perhaps different as regards *Ubs-ti*, an expression highly requisite from the earliest times in the W. Himālayan territories, if it was, as it is proposed to prove, adopted as an equivalent of Sanskrit *samudra* with the signification 'confluence'. In this connection it is interesting to take note of the Balti term *rgya-mtsho*, 'river', which in Tibetan signifies 'ocean', as does *samudra* in the Sanskrit of all Classical and later periods.